

Why is it so? An analysis of the V3 cases after *sí* in Old Italian

Cecilia Poletto (Goethe Universität Frankfurt/Università di Padova)

V3 and V1 sequences have been a hot topic of discussion with respect to the supposed V2 syntax of Old Romance since Fontana's dissertation (1991) on Old Spanish. Old Italian (the Old Florentine variety written in the XIII century) is known to have massive violations of the V2 linear restriction, since it allows for both V1 and V3 sequences. The problem originally had to do with the fact that we have to squeeze V3 into a single CP, which does not have any room for the additional constituent. Since Rizzi's proposal (1997) that the left periphery of the clause contains more than one projection, the solution of the problem has become straightforward (see Poletto 2002): if a language has a low V2 in FinP or FocusP, it will allow for recursive topics. If a language on the contrary has a high type of V2 in ForceP, it will at most allow for one constituent, which should be analyzed as an extra-sentential Hanging Topic in the same way as Ott (2011) analyzes Germanic left dislocation. Therefore, V3 has to be split into a) V3, which defines languages with high V2 and an extra-sentential HT; and b) V*, which defines languages with recursive topics and a low V2 (FinP/Focus). Work developed in the last twenty years after Rizzi's proposal has shown that there are different types of topics, both from the pragmatic/prosodic point of view (Frascarelli 2007) but also from the point of view of their behavior (Cecchetto 2001). Here I will concentrate on a type of V3 particularly relevant for V2 syntax, namely those cases where an embedded clause is followed by the element *sí*, 'so'.

- (1) a. E parlandomi così, **sì** mi cessò la forte fantasia
and talking-me so, so me stopped the strong fantasy
'(while he was) talking to me like that, I stopped to dream' (VN 98)
- b. Poi che detta fue questa canzone, **sì** venne a me uno
after that said was this song so came.3sg to me one
'After this song was sang, a man came to me...' (VN 133)
- c. La volpe andando per un bosco **sì** trovò un mulo: e il mulo **sì** li
the fox going through a wood so found.3sg a mule and the mule so her
mostrò il piede dritto
showed the foot right
her his
'while the fox was going through the wood, she met a mule, who showed
right foot' (Nov. XCIV, 337)

Sí has been analyzed in the literature either as a CP expletive (Poletto 2006) or as a pragmatic marker indicating either continuation of a Topic (see Wolfe 2017), which for Old Italian is dubious, since this function is expressed by another particle, *e*, omophonous with the coordination head. Here I will try to connect the reason why *sí* is the only element used in this constructions in OI (cf. Old French where other articles like *lor*, *an*, have the same syntax as *sí*) to its peculiar properties. So, the fundamental research question will be: Why is just the element *sí* used as a resumptive element for frame embedded clause?

I will propose that this is due to two properties of *sí* a) its capability to be combined with several null nouns as WAY, TIME, PLACE to yield “in such a time, way, place”. b) the fact that it can raise from the CP of the embedded clause (see 2a) to the main clause (cf. 2b).

- (2) a. *sì* che li chiovi pareano lettere
so that the nails looked.3pl letters
‘so that the nails looked like letters’ (*Nov.* XCIV, 337)
- b. e ho *sì* saputo fare che li sudditi miei m’hanno cacciato
and have.1sg so been.able do.inf that the subjects my me have.3pl chased.away
‘I have been so skilled that my subjects sent me away’ (*Nov.* VII, 143)

The first part of the talk will be devoted to the analysis of the properties of *sí* in other contexts (as an adjectival or adverbial modifier, as a CP element occurring in embedded clauses before the complementizer and *come* ‘as’). This will show us that *sí* is a pro-adverb and has precisely the properties that are needed to be a resumptive of various types of embedded clauses.

The syntactic analysis I will propose, (as I did in Poletto 2006 and 2014) that *sí* is located in the SpecFocus position, and resumes the embedded clause located in a frame/scene setting position (see Munaro 2010 for an analysis of embedded temporal and conditional clauses in a Topic position in the CP). This clearly derives its syntactic properties, and in particular the fact that a) it occurs only after Topics and immediately before the inflected verb b) it invariably triggers enclisis (notice that OI is subject to a regular Tobler Mussafia effect, unlike French) c) there cannot be any XP intervening between *sí* and the inflected verb.

The syntactic analysis of *sí* can also derive its pragmatic function: since it is located in a SpecFocus position, but it resumes the embedded clause, it takes a Topic (the embedded clause) as its antecedent and turns it into a Focus, excluding the other possible scenarios and pointing out that what follows is valid only in the scenario instantiated by the preceding embedded clause.

If there will be time, I will expand the view to look at the development of embedded clauses as the first element in V2 context, showing that they have a special status with respect to other XPs located in first position, since they are the first to trigger V2 in late Latin (see Longobardi 1994) but the last to be integrated into the system in German, which attests for their special status. I will also show that different types of embedded clauses have a different pattern with respect to the loss of the Tobler Mussafia effect, which will give us a hint towards a better understanding of the relation between embedded clauses and main clauses in the extended CP layer.