# Rethinking Romance Microvariation through si 

Sam Wolfe, University of Oxford

- General acknowledgement that contemporary Romance varieties show extensive morphosyntactic microvariation (Kayne 2000, 2005; Poletto 2000, 2002; Manzini \& Savoia 2005; D'Alessandro, Ledgeway \& Roberts 2010; Benincà \& Munaro 2010; Dindelegan 2013; Ledgeway 2015; Jiménez-Fernández 2015; Schifano 2018)
- Much of this variation can be attributed to variation within the left periphery of standard and non-standard Romance varieties (cf. Manzini \& Savoia 2003, 2010; Damonte 2005; Ledgeway 2010; Benincà \& Munaro 2010; Haegeman 2012; Cruschina 2012; Corr 2016; Cruschina \& Ledgeway 2016;\$31.3).

How does this synchronic claim relate to both historical and diachronic studies of Romance morphosyntax? There are broadly three schools of thought at present.
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## A Different Approach

Homogeneity in V2 syntax but rich variation in other domains (Poletto 2013; Wolfe 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018)
(Semi)-Homogenous SVO Accounts
Emphasise both homogeneity of SVO syntax and overall continuity in core clausal syntax from early Romance to the present day (Lemieux \& Dupuis 1995; Kaiser 2002;

Rinke 2007; Sitaridou 2011, 2012)

The microvariation found in the medieval period may correlate with a purported North/South split (Zamboni 1998, 2000) in Romance syntactic typology (Ledgeway 2012:312-319; Wolfe 2018, in press)




Both reported for French and Italian (Adams 1987b:4;
Roberts 1993:§2.2; Vance 1997:78-79; Salvesen \& Bech 2014:223; Poletto 2014) but found across Medieval Sicilian, Sardinian, Occitan, Spanish and Piedmontese (Wolfe 2016,
2018)


G-Inversion consistently correlates with discourse-linking and OLD information subjects, whereas R-inversion typically occurs with quantified, heavy and NEW information subject expressions (Wolfe 2018:Ch 3-7)
et en faciendo estos seguramientos, ha él ya pensado and in make.PROG these assurances have.3sG he already think.ptcp
'And in making these assurances, he has already thought . . . '(OSp.,Lucanor)

## VS.

e ancora eranu vivi alcuni pirsuni
and still be.3PL.PST alive some people
'And some people were still alive . . . '(OSic., Gregoriu)


G-Inversion consistently correlates with discourse-linking and OLD information subjects, whereas R-inversion typically occurs with quantified, heavy and NEW information subject expressions (Wolfe 2018:Ch 3-7)


SVO dominant in embedded domain in all varieties except Sardinian (embedded VSO, see Virdis 1996; Lombardi 2007 and Wolfe 2015)




New Information Focus licensed across the earliest texts but seemingly lost by the 13th century in most Northern Romance varieties


Poletto (2002) and Wolfe (2015, 2016, 2018) - The locus of V2 effects can vary within the left periphery. Minimally this concerns Fin or Force



## Adont si atirent leurs messages

Then si take.3PL.PST their messages
'Then they take their messages' (Fleischman 1991:260)
Old French

Old French

Spissi cuolpi mortali sì le dava
frequent blows mortal SI CL gave
'He struck him with many deadly blows' (Ledgeway 2008:438)
Old Neapolitan
Adont si atirent leurs messages
Then si take.3pL.PsT their messages
'Then they take their messages' (Fleischman 1991:260) Old French
Spissi cuolpi mortali sì le dava
frequent blows mortal SI CL gave
'He struck him with many deadly blows' (Ledgeway 2008:438) Old Neapolitan
Guillems de la Tor si fon ..... joglars
Guillem de la Tor si be.3sG.PST jongleur'Guillem de la Tor was a jongleur' (Wolfe 2018:§2.2.4)
Old Occitan

Adont si atirent leurs messages
Then SI take.3PL.PST their messages
'Then they take their messages' (Fleischman 1991:260)
Spissi cuolpi mortali sì le dava
frequent blows mortal SI CL gave
'He struck him with many deadly blows' (Ledgeway 2008:438)
Old Neapolitan
Guillems de la Tor si fon joglars
Guillem de la Tor SI be.3sG.PST jongleur
'Guillem de la Tor was a jongleur' (Wolfe 2018:§2.2.4)

## Old Occitan

Après sili dist
After SI CL say.3sG.PST
'Afterwards, he said to him' (Sermoni Subalpini, 1, 140, 36)



Continuity or microvariation?

The literature on the particle sI across Medieval Romance is truly vast is full of claims which are often in direct conflict with one another.
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## Points of Agreement:

Derived from a temporal deictic adverbial SIC, itself < VP adverb 'like this' (Salvi 2004:15 n. 66; Rosén 2005:228-230; Pinsker 2006:65, 107-108; Ledgeway in press a)
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SI is located in the C-layer (Benincà 1995, 2004, 2006; Poletto 2006, 2013; Ledgeway 2008; Salvesen 2013)

## Different Analyses:

SI is a marker of same-subject reference/topic continuity (Fleischman 1991, 1992; Van Reenen \& Schøsler 1992, 1993, 2000;

Benincà 1995:184; Vance 1995)

SI is a Head which is an alternative (Ledgeway
2008:452-465) or complementary strategy (Ferraresi \& Goldbach 2002:18-23) to V-to-C movement

St is a Fin (2013:143), Focus (Poletto 2005:218, Benincà 2006:64 or Force (Wolfe 2018) expletive

The Topic Continuity Account

> SI does not occur at the beginning of a portion of text in either French or Sicilian (in line with Marchello-Nizia 1985:25; Ménard 1988:328; Lemieux
> \& Dupuis 1995:96; Vance 1997:54; Van Reenen \& Schøsler 2000:86; Buridant 2000:508; Bonnard \& Régnier 2008:209)
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SI often occurs with pre- or post-verbal discourse ACTIVE subjects (Foulet 1928:301; Marchello-Nizia 1985:7; Fleischman 1991:265-266,271; Ferraresi \& Goldbach 2002:12; Salvesen 2013:156; Buridant 2000:509)
ceste ville si est mult riche
this town sI be.3sG very rich
'and this town is very rich ...'
(Old French, Villehardouin1 86, 4)
chisto monaco sì ricuntava multe cose...
this monk si tell.3sg.pst many things
'this monk told him many things'
(Old Sicilian, Gregoriu 11, 18)

## ceste ville si est mult riche

this town si be.3sG very rich 'and this town is very rich ...'
(Old French, Villehardouin1 86, 4)
chisto monaco sì ricuntava multe cose... this monk si tell.3sg.pst many things 'this monk told him many things' (Old Sicilian, Gregoriu 11, 18)
this town SI be.3sG very rich 'and this town is very rich ...'
(Old French, Villehardouin1 86, 4)
chisto monaco sì ricuntava multe cose... this monk si tell.3sg.pst many things 'this monk told him many things' (Old Sicilian, Gregoriu 11, 18)

Givón's (1983) Topic Accessibility Hierarchy

Zero > Pronouns > Definite > Cleft > Indefinite (Simplified)
chisto monaco sì ricuntava multe cose... this monk si tell.3sg.pst many things 'this monk told him many things' (OId Sicilian, Gregoriu 11, 18)
ceste ville si est mult richethis town sl be.3sG very rich'and this town is very rich ...'(Old French, Villehardouin1 86, 4)
chisto monaco sì ricuntava multe cose... this monk si tell.3sg.pst many things 'this monk told him many things' (Old Sicilian, Gregoriu 11, 18)
Zero > Pronouns > Definite > Cleft > Indefinite (Simplified)
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Accessibility Hierarchy
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If SI is indeed a marker of Topic continuity it is not clear why it should co-occur with readily accessible DPs

# Microvariation and SI <br> Previous Research on SI 

The Topic Continuity Account

Si does not occur at the beginning of a portion of text in either French or
Sicilian (in line with Marchello-Nizia 1985:25; Ménard 1988:328; Lemieux \& Dupuis 1995:96; Vance 1997:54; Van Reenen \& Schøsler 2000:86; Buridant 2000:508; Bonnard \& Régnier 2008:209)

SI often occurs with pre- or post-verbal discourse ACTIVE subjects (Foulet
1928:301; Marchello-Nizia 1985:7; Fleischman 1991:265-266,271; Ferraresi \& Goldbach 2002:12; Salvesen 2013:156; Buridant 2000:509)

> Even more problematically
> SI also occurs with brand NEW information subjects
> (This has generally gone undiscussed)

```
E si i furent e Gerine Gerers
and SI LOC.CL=be.3pL.PST and Gerin and Gerers
'And Gerin and Gerer were there'
(Old French Roland 107)
in chilla vallij sì era unu homu de amirabilj virtuti
in that valley si be.3SG.PST a man of admirable virtues
(Old Sicilian Gregoru, 34, 18)
```


## The Head Account

SI occurs with both G- and R-Inversion in Old French and R-Inversion in Old
Sicilian. This is the exact effect fronted XPs have but unexpected if SI is a Head
(pace Ledgeway
2008:444-445)

Quant eles furent faites, si fu la chose teüe que... when they be.3PL.PST do.PTCP sI be.3sG.PST the thing keep-quiet.PTCP that
'When they [the covenants] were completed, it was kept secret that we would go to Babylon' (Old French, Villehardouin1, 30, 3)
et in là ... sì nchi fiche sanctu Benedictu unu oratoriu
and in there si CL make.3sG.PST Saint Benedict an oration
'And there (where the altar of Apollo was), Saint Benedict gave an oration (Old Sicilian, Gregoriu 51, 1)
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The Head Account

Si occurs with both G- and R-Inversion in Old French and R-Inversion in Old Sicilian. This is the exact effect fronted XPs have but unexpected if SI is a Head (pace Ledgeway 2008:444-445)

If Head SI co-occurs with verb movement through Head adjunction the wrong order of $\mathrm{V}+\mathrm{sl}$ is predicted (Ledgeway 2008:439, n.3)

The Head Account


We are also left with a conceptual problem of formulating a potentially ad-hoc account of why in a V2 language V-to-C movement obtains in all contexts except where $s$ is present
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Fits with the observation that SI is difficult to define in semantic terms. Foulet
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The Phrasal Expletive Account

Declines at exactly the same time as the V2 constraint (Likely 15th century for both French Marchello-Nizia 1985:200 and Fleischman 1991:278 and Sicilian)

Parallel distribution to V2satisfying XPs: Near-total absence in the embedded domain in asymmetric later Old French Lemieux \&
Dupuis 1995:96; Ferraresi
\& Goldbach 2002:11,
2003:113) and more frequent in more symmetrical Old Sicilian (Wolfe 2018:Ch3)

But is there more we can say?
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\begin{aligned}
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Old Sicilian sı can be preceded by a range of constituents, but shows an overwhelming tendency to occur in third or more position or to be preceded by a clause.
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Chisto Pietro, vedendo sancto Gregorio afflicto, sì llo ademandao This Pietro see.PROG Saint Gregory suffering SI CL ASK.3SG.PST 'This Pietro, seeing Saint Gregory suffering, asked him...' (Gregoriu 5, 8)

Old Sicilian si can be preceded by a range of constituents, but shows an overwhelming tendency to occur in third or more position or to be preceded by a clause.

Chisto Pietro, vedendo sancto Gregorio afflicto, sì llo ademandao This Pietro see.PROG Saint Gregory suffering SI CL ASK.3sG.PST 'This Pietro, seeing Saint Gregory suffering, asked him...' (Gregoriu 5, 8)
lu cumpagnuni di Eneas, audendu lu bonu parlari di la regina the companions of Eneas hear.PROG the good words of the queen et girandusi ad Eneas sì li dissi
and turn.PROG.CL to Eneas SI CL say.3PL.PST
'Eneas's companions, hearing the positive words of the queen and turning to him said...' (Eneas 20, 9)
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Microvariation and SI } \\
& \text { SI IN OLD SICILIAN }
\end{aligned}
$$

The vast majority of preverbal constituents for both texts were tagged as unambiguously discourse OLD (either + ACTIVE or + ACCESSIBLE).

This applies to both those in $\mathrm{XP}+\mathrm{SI}$ configurations and sı-third configurations.

The vast majority of preverbal constituents for both texts were tagged as unambiguously discourse OLD (either + ACTIVE or + ACCESSIBLE).

This applies to both those in XP + SI configurations and sı-third configurations.

## Pietro sì adimanda ad sancto Gregorio

Pietro si ask.3sG.PST to Saint Gregory
'Pietro asked Saint Gregory...' (Gregoriu, 8, 19)

The vast majority of preverbal constituents for both texts were tagged as unambiguously discourse OLD (either + ACTIVE or + ACCESSIBLE).

This applies to both those in XP + SI configurations and sı-third configurations.

> Pietro sì adimanda ad sancto Gregorio Pietro si ask.3sG.PST to Saint Gregory 'Pietro asked Saint Gregory...' (Gregoriu, 8, 19)
chisto monaco sì trovao uno grande serpente... Lo serpente sì llo secutao this monk SIfind.3SG.PST a great serpent the serpent SI CL follow.3sG.PST 'This monk found a great snake, the snake followed him....' (Gregoriu 11, 27)

> Microvariation and SI SI IN OLD SICILIAN

This observation also extends to the small number ( $n=5$ ) of fronted direct objects found in Gregoriu, which are all discourse-active (cf. Prince 1981:243; Chafe 1987; Lambrecht 1994:165). The same applies to prepositional objects:

This observation also extends to the small number ( $n=5$ ) of fronted direct objects found in Gregoriu, which are all discourse-active (cf. Prince 1981:243; Chafe 1987; Lambrecht 1994:165). The same applies to prepositional objects:

## et chesta tentacione sì lo fice

and this temptation SI CL do.3SG.PST
'And this (type of) temptation happened...' (Gregoriu, 12, 22)

## e kista parte sì tene <br> tuctu

and this part sI keep.3SG.PST all
'and all (...) keep this part...' (Gregoriu 77, 17)

This observation also extends to the small number ( $n=5$ ) of fronted direct objects found in Gregoriu, which are all discourse-active (cf. Prince 1981:243; Chafe 1987; Lambrecht 1994:165). The same applies to prepositional objects:
et chesta tentacione sì lo fice
and this temptation SI CL do.3SG.PST
'And this (type of) temptation happened...' (Gregoriu, 12, 22)

```
e kista parte sì tene tuctu
and this part sl keep.3sG.PST all
'and all (...) keep this part...' (Gregoriu 77, 17)
```

et de le cose che erano all'orto

## sì nde li donao...

and of the things that were at=the=vegetable garden $\mathrm{SI} \mathrm{CL} \quad \mathrm{CL}$ give.3SG.PST
'And he gave... from all the things that were in the vegetable garden' (Gregoriu 12, 6)

Orders where sl is the third, fourth or even fifth constituent are extensively attested (c.43\% of attestations) in both texts. V3* orders are typical of Early Italo-Romance varieties (Benincà 2004, 2006; Ledgeway 2009; Poletto 2006, 2014; Wolfe 2015, 2016, 2018).

Orders where sI is the third, fourth or even fifth constituent are extensively attested (c.43\% of attestations) in both texts. V3* orders are typical of Early Italo-Romance varieties (Benincà 2004, 2006; Ledgeway 2009; Poletto 2006, 2014; Wolfe 2015, 2016, 2018).

Lo abbate, audendo ço, sì llo salutao the abbot hear.PROG this SI CL greet.3SG.PST 'Hearing this, the abbot greeted him...' (Gregoriu 15, 9)

Orders where sl is the third, fourth or even fifth constituent are extensively attested (c.43\% of attestations) in both texts. V3* orders are typical of Early Italo-Romance varieties (Benincà 2004, 2006; Ledgeway 2009; Poletto 2006, 2014; Wolfe 2015, 2016, 2018).

Lo abbate, audendo ço, sì llo salutao
the abbot hear.PROG this SI CL greet.3SG.PST
'Hearing this, the abbot greeted him...' (Gregoriu 15, 9)

Allura, Eneas, videndu fugiri li Latini, sì ordina di andari
then Eneas see.PROG leave.INF the Latini si order.3sG to go.INF 'Then, Eneas seeing the Latini leave gave the order to go...'' (Eneas 214, 17)

# Microvariation and SI Si in Old Sicilian 
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(1994) terms)
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## What is sI's function in Old Sicilian?

In Eneas we see the strongest evidence for a Topic continuity analysis of the type advocated by Fleischman (1990) and
others.

Nevertheless there is 'leakage' in this system, with CLAUSE + SI and SI-third cases still accounting for the majority of the data.

Poi adunca ki luppiter appi audutu a Venus, sì li rispusi Then therefore that Jupiter had heard to Venus SI CL respond.3sG.PST 'Then, once Jupiter had spoken to Venus, he responded...' (Eneas, 12, 10

What is sl's function in Old Sicilian?

This is clearly not the correct analysis for Gregoriu, where we have already seen that the number of overt preverbal subjects increases significantly (2\% vs. 36\%).
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This is clearly not the correct analysis for Gregoriu, where we have already seen that the number of overt preverbal subjects increases significantly (2\% vs. 36\%).

## What is sl's function in Old Sicilian?

The number of tokens where the subject is readily identifiable from the discourse context also increases (14/47 vs. 116/200).

SI is also found with postverbal subjects in this text which are discourse-NEW.

De chistu Bonifaciu sì recunta multi miraculi unu previte
of this Bonifaciu sitell.3sG many miracles a priest
'A priest told of many miracles performed by this Bonifaciu' (Gregoriu 22, 22)

This is clearly not the correct analysis for Gregoriu, where we have already seen that the number of overt preverbal subjects increases significantly (2\% vs. 36\%).

## What is sI's function in Old Sicilian?

The number of tokens where the subject is readily identifiable from the discourse context also increases (14/47 vs. 116/200).

SI is also found with postverbal subjects in this text which are discourse-NEW.

This is clearly not the correct analysis for Gregoriu, where we have already seen that the number of overt preverbal subjects increases significantly (2\% vs. 36\%).

## What is sl's function in Old Sicilian?

The number of tokens where the subject is readily identifiable from the discourse context also increases (14/47 vs. 116/200).

SI is also found with postverbal subjects in this text which are discourse-NEW.

This strongly supports the alternative V2 expletive account of SI .

[^0]SI can readily be preceded by multiple XPs in both texts,
suggesting it is relatively low with the CP.
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## Where should Old Sicilian sı be located in an articulated left periphery?

Pace Poletto (2006. 2014) it seems inappropriate to locate s। in the Focus field given its encoding of Topic continuity in Eneas.

The Topic field is a likely candidate, but again this runs into problems as si in both texts can be preceded by XPs which are not necessarily Frame-setters.

Ma
But
'But after Eneas's death Ascaniu baptised him...' (Eneas 225, 7)

SI can readily be preceded by multiple XPs in both texts, suggesting it is relatively low with the CP.
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Pace Poletto (2006. 2014) it seems inappropriate to locate s। in the Focus field given its encoding of Topic continuity in Eneas.
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## Where should Old Sicilian si be located in an articulated left periphery?

Pace Poletto (2006. 2014) it seems inappropriate to locate sı in the Focus field given its encoding of Topic continuity in Eneas.

The Topic field is a likely candidate, but again this runs into problems as SI in both texts can be preceded by XPs which are not necessarily Frame-setters.

Ma [Frame poy la morti di Eneas, [Theme Ascaniu ... sì cumbaptiu
But after the death of Eneas Ascaniu si baptise.3sG.PST
'But after Eneas's death Ascaniu baptised him...' (Eneas 225, 7)

SI can readily be preceded by multiple XPs in both texts, suggesting it is relatively low with the CP.
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## Where should Old Sicilian sı be located in an articulated left periphery?

Proposal: Sı occupies Spec-FinP in both Old Sicilian texts, but for distinct formal syntactic and pragmatic reasons.

SI merged in
SpecFinP

| SI is a last |
| :---: |
| resort $V 2$ |
| satisfier |
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## But what does 'last resort' mean?

Holmberg (2015, forthcoming): V/2 is only satisfied by internal merge.

All constituents co-occurring with SI are Topics or Frame-setters. These are base-generated (Cinque 1990; Benincà \& Poletto 2004;

Frascarelli 2008) so cannot satisfy V2.


Old French si can be preceded by multiple constituents but sl-third orders are never frequent within the corpus.

Old French si can be preceded by multiple constituents but si-third orders

|  | SI Third |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% of Corpus |
| Roland 1100 | 6 | 2.99 |
| Charrette 1177-1181 | 3 | 2.40 |
| Villehardouin 1199-1213 | 17 | 4.24 |
| Clari 1205 | 2 | 0.70 |
| Queste 1225-1230 | 1 | 0.33 |

> Microvariation and SI SI IN OLD FRENCH

In terms of pragmatics, preverbal constituents are discourse old as in Sicilian after the 12 th century. Prior to this, there are a small number of focal constituents occurring before sı (New Information Focus being widely licensed preverbally in Early Medieval Romance, cf. Poletto 2014:Ch1 and Wolfe 2016:§3).
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In terms of pragmatics, preverbal constituents are discourse old as in Sicilian after the 12th century. Prior to this, there are a small number of focal constituents occurring before sı (New Information Focus being widely licensed preverbally in Early Medieval Romance, cf. Poletto 2014:Ch1 and Wolfe 2016:§3).

## Cunquerrantment si finereit li bers

conquering.ADV SI end.3sG.COND the nobleman
'The Lord would end his life as a conquering hero' (Roland 2867)

## Reis Vivien si succuras en Imphe

King Vivien si help.2sG.fut in Imphe 'help King Vivien there in Imphe' (Roland 3995-3996)

> Microvariation and SI SI IN OLD FRENCH

In a parallel fashion to Sicilian, Wolfe (2018:343-344) shows that the proportion of overt subjects co-occurring with si increases diachronically:

In a parallel fashion to Sicilian, Wolfe (2018:343-344) shows that the proportion of overt subjects co-occurring with si increases diachronically:

|  | OVERT SUBJECTS |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{N}$ | \% of Corpus |
| Roland 1100 | 19 | 9.45 |
| Charrette 1177-1181 | 18 | 6.12 |
| Villehardouin 1199-1213 | 50 | 12.47 |
| Clari 1205 | 71 | 24.91 |
| Queste 1225-1230 | 38 | 12.67 |

Unlike Sicilian, sl-initial clauses make up a much larger proportion of the corpus (c. $70 \%>45 \%>38 \%>39 \%>32 \%$ ) although decline diachronically:

Unlike Sicilian, sı-initial clauses make up a much larger proportion of the corpus (c. $70 \%>45 \%>38 \%>39 \%>32 \%$ ) although decline diachronically:

Si tenoit<br>chascuns une hache

si have.3SG.PST each an axe
'Each had an axe' (Charrette 31b, 1091
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# What is sl's function in Old French? 

In the Roland, the earliest text examined, there are striking parallels with OSic. Eneas which favour the Topic continuity analysis.

In the late 12th century texts, Charrette and Villehardouin, the distribution is broadly similar to Gregoriu, with initial FrameSetters and Topics permitted. V3 is qualitatively similar but never as widespread.
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## What is sI's function in Old

 French?```
Overwhelming preference
    for ClAUSE + SI
configurations and near-
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    ARGUMENT + SI
```

Uniquely in 13th century French we also find evidence that si has undergone further upwards grammaticalisation (Roberts \& Roussou 2002; Van Gelderen 2009 )to a ForceP expletive:

## What is sI's function in Old French?

```
Overwhelming preference
    for ClAUSE + SI
configurations and near-
    total absence of
    ARGUMENT + SI
```

Adverbials are all Speaker Oriented or FrameSetting adverbials (Poletto 2000: 100; Beninca \& Poletto 2004: 66; Öhl 2010: 62)
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The bleaching of its status as a Topic continuity marker is also key.

There is now a growing picture that the syntactic makeup of the Medieval Romance left periphery is not homogeneous

The data on SI are more heterogeneous than typical
accounts suggest

There is evidence for language-internal diachronic and synchronic
microvariation in both Old Sicilian and Old

French
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## Microvariation and SI Conclusions



Holmberg's 'V2 only satisfied by MOVE' hypothesis is yet to be fully tested for Medieval Romance

If it is subject to variation, the low occurrence of Subject + SI configurations in French vs. Sicilian could be accounted for in terms of topicalisation via movement as opposed to MERGE.

We still do not understand the changes that si causes on the syntax of the languages in question.

Thank You


[^0]:    Where should Old Sicilian sı be located in an articulated left periphery?

