Main claims The aim of this paper is to investigate the properties of si-topicalisation in Old French. I will essentially make two claims: (1) si may be both a head and a phrase, depending on its structural position and on what kind of element that is topicalised. This is in turn related to the structural position of the preceding topic; (2) topicalisation with si as a head is generated by movement and behaves in a way that strongly resembles Germanic Clitic Left Dislocation (GCLD).

Outline Topicalisation is a process that places an XP in a left-peripheral position. This XP may be picked up by a resumptive element in the clause proper. In Old French, three different elements may resume the topicalised element: the personal pronoun, the demonstrative pronoun and the left-peripheral particle si (1). While the first two are quite rare in Old French, topicalisation with si is common. Si may follow initial adverbial clauses (1a), initial PPs, adverbs, and DPs (1b).

(1) a. Et [quant le Pasque fu passee], si y vinrent trestout.
   and wuen the Easter was passed si there came all  
   ‘And when Easter was over, everybody came there.’  (clari, p.8)

   b. [Vostre mere] si fu moult sage
   your mother si was very wise
   ‘Your mother was very wise.’    (atrper, p.50, v.1576)

Si is a prominent feature in medieval Italian and French. The status of si is much debated in the literature. While some consider it to be a head (Ferraresi and Goldbach, 2003; Ledgeway, 2008) others see it as a phrase (Benincà, 2006; Donaldson, 2012; Salvesen, 2013). The novelty of the present proposal is to claim that it may in fact be both.

In (1a) si may be replaced by a pronominal subject or an XP that functions as the first element of a V2 structure. However, when the element preceding si is a PP, an adverb or a DP (1b), si is the only element which may intervene between the topic and the finite verb. The difference may be captured by assuming that the fronted adverbial clause is merged in a clause-external position (Kiparsky, 1995), that I will dub FrameP (Benincà and Poletto, 2004), that is followed by a regular V2 structure. Non-clausal XPs, on the other hand, are in SpecTopP and si is the lexicalization of Topo. I assume that the locus of V2 is FinP (pace Wolfe (2015)).

(2) [FrameP adverbial clause [ForceP [TopP XP [Topo si [FinP si [Fin\' Vfin]]]]]]

The structure in (1b) strongly resembles GCLD (3). In this kind of topicalisation the resumptive d-pronoun (dem ‘them’ in (3)) immediately follows the topicalised element (Altmann, 1981; Grohmann, 2000; Axel, 2007; Salvesen, 2013).

(3) [Naboene], [dem], kjenner vi ikke.
neighbours.DET they know we not
‘We don’t know the neighbours.’

Norwegian

It is common to assume that the fronted GCLD been moved into this position (for detailed analyses, see among others Grohmann (2000); Grewendorf (2002); Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007), but pace Frey (2004)). According to Holmberg (2015) the V2 property requires movement of a finite verb into a head in the left periphery, followed by the movement of an XP into
its specifier. In (3) the resumptive d-linked pronoun in SpecFinP fulfills this requirement. In fact, if the fronted topic had been base generated, the derivation of the V2 structure would have crashed, as no element is moved into or through SpecFinP.

In Old French, the clitic status of the object pronoun renders structures like the one in (3) impossible. However, the versatile element sī is used in the exact same position as the Germanic resumptive pronoun. When the non-clausal XP preceding sī is moved to SpecTopP, there is no overt phonological material in SpecFinP, and the derivation must be rescued by the presence of sī. In Germanic it is assumed that the resumptive pronoun is what satisfies this criterion. In Old French, no d-pronoun may surface in SpecFinP. However, there is no overt material between Fin⁰ and Top⁰, and as such sī is visible from Fin⁰ and satisfies the phonological requirement of the V2 criterion. This is essentially the same analysis as the one proposed for adverbial resumption by Holmberg (in prep.) and Salvesen (in prep.).

Consequently, the derivation of the two structures is as follows (4).

(4) clause-external clause: \[\text{FrameP} \text{ adverbial clause} \langle \text{FinP} \text{ sī} \langle \text{Fin} \langle \text{V}_\text{fin} \rangle \rangle \rangle \]

(5) clause-internal topic: \[\langle \text{FinP} \text{ sī} \langle \text{Fin} \langle \text{XP} \rangle \rangle \rangle \]

In Modern French, it is assumed that topics are base generated (De Cat, 2007). Thus, the above analysis implies that Old French differed from Modern French in that it topics also could be moved.
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