



## Historical Syntax and Linguistic Theory

Paola Crisma (ed.), Giuseppe Longobardi (ed.)

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199560547.001.0001>

Published: 2009      Online ISBN: 9780191721267      Print ISBN: 9780199560547

### CHAPTER

## 20 On the Germanic properties of Old French

Eric Mathieu

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199560547.003.0020> Pages 344–357

Published: March 2009

### Abstract

This chapter shows that, in addition to V2, Stylistic Fronting and Quirky subjects, Old French had the following Germanic properties: Object Shift and Transitive Expletive Constructions. All these constructions were available because: (i) the Old French EPP was split; (ii) a special Topic position appeared above TP.

**Keywords:** Old French, Object Shift, Transitive Expletive Constructions, split EPP, topicalization

**Subject:** Historical and Diachronic Linguistics, Linguistic Theories, Grammar, Syntax and Morphology

### 20.1 Introduction

This chapter shows that a certain cluster of properties found in a subset of North Germanic languages (e.g. Icelandic, and possibly Faroese) can also be found in Old French. In addition to V2 configurations, all the following properties are available: (i) Stylistic Fronting; (ii) Quirky Subjects; (iii) Object Shift; and (iv) Transitive Expletive Constructions.

Building on work by Cardinaletti and Roberts (2002), Dupuis (1989), Roberts (1993), previous work of mine (Mathieu 2006a) has already established that Stylistic Fronting (SF, henceforth) was part of the inventory of grammatical constructions of Old French, while in a recent paper I also show that Old French had Quirky Subjects (Mathieu 2006b). In the latter paper, a correlation is established between the two constructions in that, if a language has SF, then it also has Quirky Subjects (though the opposite may not be true, e.g. the case of modern German).<sup>1</sup>

Other correlations of the sort have been made in relation to Germanic languages. A case in point is Hiraiwa (2001) who shows that Germanic languages allowing SF also allow Object Shift (OS, henceforth) while Bobaljik and Jonas (1996)—following Bures (1992)—show that Germanic languages allowing Transitive Expletive Constructions (TECs, henceforth) also allow OS. In fact, it can easily be shown that Germanic languages allowing SF also allow TECs. The prototypical language belonging to that group is Icelandic, an Insular Scandinavian language (there is dialectal variation for the case of  $\downarrow$  Faorese).<sup>2</sup> Mainland Scandinavian languages, on the other hand, do not tolerate SF, Quirky Subjects, OS (of full-NPs), or TECs.

Since Old French has SF, the typological prediction that is made is that it should also have both TECs and OS. The aim of this chapter is to show that this prediction is indeed borne out. Whereas in Mathieu (2006a) and Mathieu (2006b) I concentrated on SF and Quirky Subjects respectively, the present study therefore focuses on TECs and OS in Old French, introducing not only new data, but also a new comprehensive analysis that accounts for the distribution of all properties aforementioned, namely SF, Quirky Subjects, OS, and TECs. These are argued to be possible constructions in the grammar if the pronominal features of the verb are capable of checking the [D] feature of  $T^0$  independently of the [P] feature associated with the preverbal position (cf. Holmberg's 2000 split EPP) and if a special Topic position (dubbed Top+P to differentiate it from the topic phrase to which topicalized elements raise in V2 configurations) is available/accessible. If the EPP becomes unsplit, the special topic position is no longer available/accessible and all the constructions under review become obsolete. While the idea that OS might be productive in the grammar of Old French has been put forward before by Zaring (1998), the facts about TECs in Old French are not well known. Although I introduce new data that strengthen Zaring's original insight, I nevertheless show that many of the examples that she introduces are cases, not of OS, but of scrambling (of the kind found in West Germanic languages).

The influence of Germanic on what was to become French may have been through contact, first through the invasion of Gaul by the Franks, and second, by the Normans in the North-West. The initial causes for the splitting of the EPP and the creation of a special Topic position above TP might thus be external. The reason why SF, Quirky Subjects, OS, and TECs disappeared from the grammar of French is because the EPP mutated from a complex form (a bundle of two organized features, [D] and [P]) into a simple form (where [D] and [P] are one).

## 20.2 Object Shift

---

The aim of this section is to show that Old French had Object Shift.

p. 346 First, it is important to point out that Old French is a VO language (like Icelandic), not an OV language (like German). Although Latin was an OV language, Old French lost that feature very early on. This does not mean of course that OV orders were not possible, but it must be the case that they were derived from an underlying VO order. The example in (1), from around 1180, shows that the default order is VO. The object is underlined.

(1)

Et	cil	respont	que	il	ne	quiert
and	this-one	reply-3SG	that	he	not	ask-3SG
Avoir		mie <u>desaventure</u>				
have-INF		FORC misfortune				
‘And he replies that he does not seek to have his own misfortune.’						
<i>(Le Chevalier à la Charrette 2650–1)</i>						

When the object has shifted to the left, it is thus a case of OS. The claim that Old French had OS is not new. Zaring (1998) is the first author to have given an analysis of such a process in the language. She bases her conclusions on the behaviour of *ce* ‘this’. In order for her argument that *ce* ‘this’ can undergo Objet Shift in Old French, Zaring first establishes that *ce* in Old French is not a clitic element. We know that it is not a clitic because it can appear in first position in V2 constructions as shown by examples such as (2).<sup>3</sup>

(2)

Li	rois	respont:	‘ <b>Ce</b>	sai	ge	bien...’
the	king	answer-3SG	this	know-1SG	I	well
‘The king answers: “This, I know well.”’ (Zaring 1998: 320)						

Next, Zaring reports that if a lexical verb is infinitival, direct object *ce* never follows that verb. Rather, it precedes the infinitive and follows any matrix material as (3) shows.

(3)

Mes	la	reine	ne	peut	<b>ce</b>	croire...
but	the	queen	not	can-1SG	this	believe-INF
‘But the queen could not believe this,...’ (Zaring 1998: 321)						

If the lexical verb is a past participle, *ce* immediately precedes the participle as shown by (4).

(4)

Sire,	por	coi	avés	vos	<b>ce</b>	fait ?
Lord	for	what	have-2PL	you	this	done

'Lord, why have you done this?' (Zaring 1998: 321)

p. 347 If the lexical verb is finite, *ce* (or its dialectal variant *çou*) occurs either in a postverbal position (as expected) or in a preverbal position, following the subject, giving SOV order, as exemplified in (5). This pattern is attested almost exclusively in embedded clauses in Zaring's corpus.

(5)

...	et	quant	li	rois	<b>çou</b>	entendi,	sus	est	saillis,...
	and	when	the	king	this	hear-PAST.3SG	up	is	leapt

'...and when the king heard this, he leapt up...' (Zaring 1998: 322)

The problem with the examples introduced by Zaring is that, on the one hand, they involve compound (3) and infinitival tenses (4), and on the other, embedded clauses (5). These contexts are not possible OS environments in Scandinavian languages. These facts have been captured under Holmberg's (1999) generalization: OS is only possible when the verb has moved to  $C^0$ . In view of these facts, I suggest that most, if not all, of the examples introduced by Zaring are cases of scrambling.<sup>4</sup> Scrambling is very similar to OS in that an object has been raised passed a negative adverb. However, contrary to OS, it is possible to scramble an object when the verb has not raised to  $C^0$ . In sum, since Object movement in Old French is possible in embedded clauses and when the verb has not raised to  $C^0$ , it appears that the examples introduced by Zaring (1998) are not clear cases of OS.

Another problem for Zaring's analysis is that she only gives examples where an object has shifted to the left but with no adverb present in the structure. Therefore, it is not easy to check whether the object has in fact remained within the VP or whether it has actually undergone movement to the edge of the VP. Clearer examples would need to involve VP adverbs. Finally, in the examples that she gives, the object has often undergone long Object movement (she does in fact make a distinction between *short* OS and *long* OS), that is, the object has raised past the finite verb. These cases do not appear to be cases of OS either.

This does not mean, however, that the operation dubbed OS was not available at all in Old French. In view of examples such as (6a and b), introduced by Arteaga (1998), I would like to argue that Old French did have OS. In (6a) the object *sa poverte* 'his poverty' appears to the right of the adverb while in (6b) the object *un hannap* 'a goblet' surfaces to the left of the adverb. What (6b) thus clearly shows is that the object has been

p. 348 moved to the edge of the VP. ↵

(6)

a.

b.

---

<b>lloc deduit</b>	<b><u>ledement</u></b>	<b>sa</b>	<b>poverté</b>
there live-PAST.3SG	joyfully	his-F.SG.OBL	poverty-F.SG.OBL

---

‘There he joyfully lived his poverty.’

(*La vie de Saint Alexis*, year 1050, line 261, in Arteaga 1998)

---

---

<b>Son</b>	<b>compaignon</b>	<b>donna</b>	<b>un</b>
his-M.SG.OBL	companion-M.SG.OBL	give-PAST.3SG	a

---

---

<b>hannap</b>	<b><u>lieement</u></b>
goblet-M.SG.OBL	joyfully

---

‘He joyfully gave his companion a goblet.’

(*Dits C*, line 233, in Herslund 1980:10 and Arteaga 1998)

---

Additional examples collected via *Frantext* by myself can be found in (7) and (8). In (7) the nominal *home* ‘man’ is below the adverb *laienz* ‘here’ whereas in (8) the nominal appears above *laienz*.

(7)

a.

(8)

il	n'avait	<u>laienz</u>	<b>home</b>	qui
there	not-have-PAST.3SG	here	man-M.SG.OBL	who

poïst			parler	
can-PAST.3SG			speak-INF	

'there was no man here who could speak.'

(*La Quête de Saint-Graal*, year 1220, p.15)

Mes	il n'ot	<b>chevalier</b>	<u>laienz</u>
but	it not-have-PAST.3SG	knight-M.SG.OBL	here

qui	seust	par	ou	il	i	entra
that	know-PAST.3SG	by	where	he	there	enter-PAST.3SG

'but there was no knight here who knew from where he had come in'

(*La Quête de Saint-Graal*, year 1220, p. 7)

One might object that these examples are expletive constructions with postverbal subjects, rather than involving objects. However, note that the nominal is in the oblique, not the nominative case. Old French showed two types of expletive constructions: one in which the verb agreed with the postverb nominal, with that nominal surfacing in the nominative (the case of modern English), as illustrated in (9), and another in which the verb agreed with the expletive, while the postverbal nominal is in the oblique case (the case of modern French).

(9)

- a.
- b. ↵
- c.

Mais	ill	i	sont	venu	serjanz
but	EXPL	there	be-3PL	come	servants-M.PL.NOM
et		escoier			
and		riders-M.PL.NOM			
‘But there came servants and riders.’					
<i>(Parise, 2009–10, in Buridant 2000: 324)</i>					
Il	morront		maint	vaillant	chevalier
EXPL	die-FUT.3PL		many	brave	knights-M.PL.NOM
‘There will die many brave knights.’					
<i>(Gaydon, 8327, in Buridant 2000: 324)</i>					
Il	i	corurent		.vii.	roi
EXPL	there	run-PAST.3PL		seven	kings-M.PL.NOM
et		.xv.		duc	
and		fifteen		dukes-M.PL.NOM	
‘There ran there seven kings and fifteen dukes.’					
<i>(Le Couronnement de Louis, AB, 631, in Buridant 2000: 324)</i>					

To summarize Section 20.2: I have shown that, in addition to SF and Quirky Subjects, Old French has OS, and thus patterns with Icelandic which has all the properties just mentioned. Old French also had scrambling. The idea according to which Old French had both Object Shift and scrambling is in line with the view that OS is attested not only in Scandinavian languages, but also in languages like German and Dutch, except that German and Dutch allow scrambling as well, while Scandinavian languages allow only OS (Bobaljik and

Jonas 1996). In the next section, I add one more property that Old French shares with Icelandic: Transitive Expletive Constructions.

## 20.3 Transitive Expletive Constructions

TECs are available in Icelandic and in German, (10a) and (10b) respectively, but not in languages like English and Danish, (10c) and (10d) respectively.<sup>5</sup> TECs are constructions where an expletive appears in the subject position while both a subject and an object appear in the postverbal position.

p. 350

(10)

a.

b. ↴

c. \*There ate many Christmas trolls a pudding. (English)

d.

---

það	hafa	margir	jólasveinar		borðað	búðing.	(Icelandic)
-----	------	--------	-------------	--	--------	---------	-------------

---

there	have	many	Christmas.trolls		eaten	pudding	
-------	------	------	------------------	--	-------	---------	--

---

‘Many Christmas trolls have eaten pudding.’

(Bobaljik and Jonas 1996: 209)

---

Es	gessen	einige	Mäuse	Käse	in	der	Küche.	(German)
----	--------	--------	-------	------	----	-----	--------	----------

---

there	eat	some	mice	cheese	in	the	kitchen	
-------	-----	------	------	--------	----	-----	---------	--

---

‘There are some mice eating cheese in the kitchen.’

(Bobaljik and Jonas 1996: 209)

---

*Der	har	nogen		spist	et	æble.	(Danish)
------	-----	-------	--	-------	----	-------	----------

---

there	has	someone		eaten	an	apple	
-------	-----	---------	--	-------	----	-------	--

---

‘Someone has eaten an apple.’ (Bobaljik and Jonas 1996: 208)

---



A popular analysis of TECs and the parametric variation behind them comes from Bobaljik and Jonas (1996). These authors argue that languages with obligatory verb raising in non-V2 environments have a split IP structure (Icelandic, German, Dutch) and that conversely languages in which the verb remains in the VP have a simple IP (mainland Scandinavian). Split-IP languages have more specifier positions in the IP complex than languages with a simple IP. OS is made possible because by raising to  $\text{AgrO}^0$  a specifier is created for the object to move to. If the verb does not move to  $\text{AgrO}^0$ , then no specifier for the object can be licensed, therefore OS is not possible (this is thus the way Holmberg's generalization is accounted for/derived). The correlation between the availability of TECs and OS is made to follow from the fact that the verb has raised to  $\text{AgrO}^0$  in the first place. Once the verb raises to  $\text{AgrO}^0$ , it can raise further to  $\text{T}^0$ . Therefore, two subject positions are created: Spec-AgrSP and Spec-TP. Because Spec-TP is licensed by movement of the verb to  $\text{T}^0$ , TECs are possible: all TECs require two subject positions. In languages where the verb has not raised to  $\text{T}^0$ , only one subject position is accessible and thus TECs are not possible.

Bobaljik and Thráinsson's analysis (Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998) is even more radical in that they argue that clauses in Icelandic and mainland Scandinavian languages contain a different number of functional projections. For example, Danish realizes tense and agreement in a single projection, whereas Icelandic projects separate tense and agreement phrases. This is correlated to the fact that in Danish there are no separate morphemes for tense and agreement whereas in Icelandic, there is one morpheme for tense and another for agreement (Thráinsson 1996).

Although Bobaljik and Jonas (1996) and Bobaljik and Thráinsson (1998) address the correlation between V to I movement and the grammaticality of TECs, they do not discuss the relevance of V2. V2 appears to be a crucial factor for an account of the difference between languages that allow TECs and OS, on the one hand, and those, on the other, which do not. If all that is needed for a language to have TECs and OS is V to I movement, then modern French should exhibit both operations, since that language has V to I movement (Pollock 1989), when in fact TECs are clearly not available in its grammar. One could argue that what is really needed for the licensing of specifiers is rich agreement (modern French has poor verbal agreement). However, the theory will face problems with languages like Italian and Spanish which clearly have V to I movement *and* rich agreement. Yet, these languages do not have TECs or OS.

Another problem for Bobaljik and Thráinsson is the following. If, as they argue, rich agreement correlates with two separate morphemes for tense and agreement (with thus two separate specifiers created), then not only languages like Italian, Spanish, but even modern French will qualify. The modern French future, for example, shows that one morpheme denotes tense (*-er*) while another denotes agreement (*-ai*), thus we get *je parlerai* 'I will speak'. Pollock's (1989) analysis, whose two subject positions thesis is adopted by Bobaljik and Jonas (1996) and Bobaljik and Thráinsson (1998), should automatically qualify French as a TEC and OS language.

In sum, French shows that it cannot be the sole presence of TP as an extra subject position that allows TECs to be licensed. It cannot be the sole presence of CP either, because of the fact that mainland Scandinavian languages do not have TECs. I want to adopt Koenen and Neeleman's (2001) proposal according to which only if both projections are present is it possible to generate TECs. At least two projections are required and these can be taken to be Spec-TP and Spec-CP. In order to have TECs and OS, a language thus needs not only V to I, but also I to C movement. As Vikner (1990, 1995) observes there is a correlation between verb movement and the grammaticality of TECs in languages that have both V to I and V2. Old French fits the bill: it has both V to I and V to C. Therefore, it is expected that Old French has TECs and the prediction is borne out as (11) and (12) show. On the other hand, Modern French only has V to I movement, therefore it is expected that the language does not have TECs, as (13) shows.

(12)

↳ (13)

Il	nel	gari	ses	osbers
----	-----	------	-----	--------

EXPL	not-him	protect-3SG	his-M.SG.NOM	hauberk-M.SG.NOM
------	---------	-------------	--------------	------------------

blancs

white-M.SG.NOM

'His white hauberk didn't protect him.'

*(Le Brut de Munich, 1775, in Arteaga and Herschensohn 2003: 5)*

Li	chastiaus	dont	il	parloient
----	-----------	------	----	-----------

the	castle-M.SG.NOM	of-which	EXPL	spoke-3PL
-----	-----------------	----------	------	-----------

tantes	gens
--------	------

many-F.PL.NOM	people-F.PL.NOM
---------------	-----------------

'The castle that many people spoke about.'

*(Montreuil, line 9312, in Arteaga and Herschensohn 2003: 5)*

*Il	mangèrent	deux	enfants	un	gâteau	au	chocolat.
-----	-----------	------	---------	----	--------	----	-----------

it	eat-PAST.3PL	two	children	a	cake	at-the	chocolate
----	--------------	-----	----------	---	------	--------	-----------

'Two children ate a chocolate cake.'

In (11) and (12), the verb agrees with the nominative postverbal logical subject, not with the expletive. This is clear in (12). The fact that the postverbal subject is in the nominative case in (11) also shows that

agreement is with the verb, since in later stages of French, the postverbal logical subject shows up in the accusative.

To summarize so far: we have established that not only SF and Quirky Subjects are available operations in the grammar of Old French (Mathieu 2006a and b), but so are OS (and scrambling) and TECs. A parametric account is needed to explain these facts and to differentiate Old French from modern French, the latter not allowing any of these constructions. This parameter will also explain the differences between insular Scandinavian languages, on the one hand, and mainland Scandinavian languages, on the other.

## 20.4 The analysis

Based on the fact that SF in Old French can target two elements, one XP and one head (in that order), I proposed in Mathieu (2006a) that SFronted elements in Old French move to a special projection dubbed Top+P. The SFronted XP raises to the specifier position of Top+P while the SFronted head raises to Top<sup>0</sup>. I thus argued that SF is not movement *to* (Holmberg 2000), but *through* Spec-TP. In order to reach Spec-Top+P, an XP must pass through Spec-TP, which must in that case be empty in order to function as an escape hatch. This is how the connection between the possibility of SF and subject gaps is accounted for. The solution avoids the inconvenience of postulating movement of phonological matrices *into* Spec-TP as in Holmberg (2000). Moreover, we avoid movement of heads to specifier positions, an operation that violates one of the central tenets of generative grammar.

p. 353 My proposal nevertheless relies on the idea first proposed by Holmberg (2000) that the EPP can undergo feature fission between [D] (a categorial feature) and [P] (a feature requiring visibility, i.e. a specifier to be filled), with the added twist that: (i) the EPP need *not* undergo fission (to account for the optionality of SF); (ii) the features [D] and [P] may not necessarily come  $\downarrow$  packaged as a bundle, [D] can appear on T<sup>0</sup> while [P] can be on Top+ (this builds on work from Ritter 1992, 1993, 1995; Taraldsen 1994; Sigurðsson 1996; Bejar 2003 where  $\phi$ -features do not come packaged as unorganized bundles, but follow a feature hierarchy instead). (14a) gives the structure for Old French main clauses while (14b) introduces the configuration for Old French embedded clauses. Following Roberts and Roussou (2002), I assume that in V2 contexts the fronted XP is in the specifier of a Topic position, the verb in Fin<sup>0</sup> and the subject in Spec-TP.<sup>6</sup> In embedded clauses, FinP is not present (the verb does not raise to C<sup>0</sup> in such environments in Old French). Instead, complementizers appear in Force<sup>0</sup>.<sup>7</sup>

(14)

a. [TopP [Top+P [FinP [TP]]]]	Main clauses
b. [ForceP [Top+P[TP]]]	Embedded clauses

Turning now to the correlation between the availability of SF and the availability of Quirky Subjects, I follow previous work of mine (Mathieu 2006b). In that article, I account for the fact that oblique non-pronominal subjects in Old French are in complementary distribution with SFronted elements by assuming that they both target the Spec-Top+P position. Consider (15).<sup>8</sup>

(15)

- a.
- b. \*que [a sa mere] [de la honte] ne chaut
- c. ✓que [de la honte] ne chaut [a sa mere]
- d. ✓qu'[a sa mere] ne chaut [de la honte]  
'that the shame doesn't bother his mother.'

*que	[de	la	honte]	[a	sa	mere]	ne	chaut
that	of	the	shame	to	his	mother	not	matter-3SG

p. 354 The proposal is thus that if Top+P is not available then Quirky Subjects are not possible in a given language (the relevant case features of Quirky Subjects are not enough). Language change can lead to a situation where both SF and Quirky Subjects disappear. Fischer (2004: 208) has recently argued that in mainland Scandinavian languages oblique subjects and SF disappear roughly at the same time as a consequence of the loss 'of the extra functional material', namely the higher projection that hosts both SFronted elements and Quirky Subjects. French corroborates this idea, since the older stage of the language had both SF and Quirky Subjects, but the modern alternative does not have any of these constructions.

Next, I would like to argue that the special position I have postulated for SFronted elements and Quirky Subjects is where expletives are merged in Old French. This is a claim I have not made before and which is therefore one of the new central hypotheses of the present study. Rather than being directly merged in Spec-CP (i.e. Spec-TopP), expletives are first merged in Spec-Top+P and only then are they raised to Spec-CP (i.e. Spec-TopP). Old French *il* is thus a kind of 'expletive topic' (see the discussion about Icelandic in Section 20.3). As in the case of SFronted elements, the expletive is an asserted topic while the element that has remained behind (here the contentful subject) is focused. This is the effect an impersonal construction with an expletive usually has. This is uncontroversial. What is new, however, is the conclusion that stems from the logic followed presently: TECs have the same format as SF constructions. Consider (16).

(16) [<sub>TopP</sub> *Il* <sub>i</sub> Top<sup>0</sup> [<sub>Top+P</sub> <sub>t<sub>i</sub></sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin<sup>0</sup> *nel + gari* [<sub>TP</sub> *ses osbers blancs* T<sup>0</sup>]]]]

*Il nel gari ses osbers blancs* (cf. 35)

Expletives can never appear postverbally when an element other than the expletive appears in Spec-TopP (the same generalization holds with Quirky Subjects). Generally, impersonal *il* in matrix clauses is left unexpressed if not found in CP in Old French (Arteaga and Herschensohn 2003). (17) is thus ungrammatical.

(17)

*Dans	leur	chambre	mangèrent	<b>il</b>	deux	enfants
in	their	bedroom	eat-PAST.3PL	EXPL	two	children
un	gâteau		au		chocolat.	
a	cake		at-the		chocolate	
'Two children ate a cake in their bedroom.'						

p. 355 There are cases, as witnessed by (18), however, where impersonal *il* appears postverbally with Spec-CP filled by another element. However, as Arteaga and Herschensohn (2003) correctly point out, these examples involve agreement of the verb with the pronoun. Therefore, the construction is rather different from those introduced in (9) where the postverbal subject does not appear in the nominative, but in the accusative. What we do not find is equivalents of (18) with the associate of the expletive in the nominative.

(18)

Si	ot	<b>il</b>	assez	en	la	place	barons	et
thus	have-PAST.3SG	EXPL	many	in	the	place	barons-M.PL.OBL	and
chevaliers		qui	la	voldrent			retenir	
knights-M.PL.OBL		who	her	want-PAST.3PL			retain-INF	
'Thus there were many barons and knights in the place who wanted to retain her.'								
(La Quête de Saint Graal, year 1220, p. 106, 16, in Vance 1997: 234 and Arteaga and Herschensohn 2003: 12)								

Since Vance (1989) and Roberts (1993), the postverbal pronouns in cases such as (18) have been treated as clitics adjoining to C<sup>0</sup>. They considered nominative pronouns (they agree with the verb), while the expletive surfacing in constructions where the postverbal subject is nominative and the verb agrees with that postverbal subject instead of the pronoun, is not a nominative pronoun.

So far, I have accounted for the availability of three out of the four properties that Old French and Icelandic share, namely, SF, Quirky Subjects, and TECs. These constructions are all made possible because a special position in a split CP layer is made available. That special position is Top+P, a special topic position in the left periphery of the clause that seems to be available if V2 is available (the reverse is not necessarily true,

since mainland Scandinavian languages, as has already been mentioned, have V2, but no SF). The other crucial factor involved in the constructions under review is the splitting of the EPP, with the scattering of the two features that make up the EPP on two different heads.

The remaining property to account for is the case of OS. We cannot assume like Bobaljik and Jonas (1996) that the object raises to the specifier of AgrOP since agreement projections are no longer part of the theoretical apparatus of Minimalism. On Bobaljik and Jonas's account, movement of the verb to AgrO<sup>0</sup> forces the creation of a specifier (hence the availability of OS), and since the verb has raised to AgrO<sup>0</sup> in the first place, it can raise further to T<sup>0</sup>, creating another subject position by way of Spec-TP in addition to Spec-AgrSP independently available. Chomsky (1995) abandons AgrSP and AgrOP for the simple reason that they have no relevance at LF, agreement on the verb being on this view devoid of meaning. In order to account for OS, he argues that v\* can have more than one specifier. v\* is thus assigned an EPP feature, but only if this has a semantic effect on the outcome (optional rules are outcome-dependent).

p. 356 On this view of OS, it is not clear how the correlation between the availability of SF, Quirky Subjects, and TECs on the one hand and OS on the other can be made to follow. I would like to propose that the correlation in question stems from the fact that after movement to the outer specifier of v\*, the object further raises to the specifier position of TP (this movement in essence thus replaces the operation DISL proposed by Chomsky for Icelandic). When the EPP has been split into [D] and [P], recall that [D] probes from T<sup>0</sup> while [P] appears on a different head, namely Top+<sup>0</sup>. Suppose the shifted object satisfies the peripheral feature associated with T<sup>0</sup> (recall that TP is a strong phase in Old French), but that the subject or another potential goal raises to the specifier of Top+P (which is basically another subject position, in the large sense of the term) satisfying the [P] feature associated with T<sup>0</sup>.

Finally, let us turn to the question as to why SF, Quirky Subjects, OS, and TECs are no longer possible in modern French. I would like to tie the disappearance of SF, Quirky Subjects, TECs, and OS to a change in the feature make-up of the EPP. Old French had a split EPP while this was lost at some point. The loss of the split EPP goes hand in hand with the loss of strong agreement. This idea is connected to the popular view about the loss of SF in mainland Scandinavian. It has often been claimed that in languages like Old Swedish the loss of V to T movement and the loss of SF took place simultaneously in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Falk 1993: 184). The generalization is that languages like Danish and Swedish do not have V to T movement, thus SF is not available whereas Icelandic has V to T movement, thus SF is a possibility in that language. According to Holmberg (2000), once the verb does not raise to T<sup>0</sup>, it cannot check the [D] feature associated with T<sup>0</sup>, thus SF is no longer possible. Instead, the subject of the sentence checks both the [D] and the [P] feature of T<sup>0</sup>. The problem with this idea is that since modern French has not lost V to T movement (Pollock 1989), but crucially lacks SF, this account needs a slight revision.

What appears to be essential for SF is that, regardless of whether the verb has raised to T<sup>0</sup>, the verbal agreement should have the relevant pronominal properties so that null subjects are possible. Once verbal agreement lost its pronominal properties (null subjects are not possible in modern French), SF was no longer available. Since the [P] feature of EPP+ is dependent on [D] when both features are scattered on different heads, it becomes no longer possible for the EPP to be split. Since Quirky Subjects and TECs rely on a split EPP and a Top+P position, these two constructions also disappeared from the grammar of French once the EPP could no longer be split.

p. 357 The absence of V to I movement has also been called for by Bobaljik and Jonas (1996) as an explanation of the lack of TECs in mainland Scandinavian. In Section 20.3 we adopted Koenen and Neeleman's (2001) proposal according to which only if both TP and CP are present is it possible to generate TECs (cf. Vikner's Generalization). In the present theory, this can be translated as tying the split of the EPP together with the availability of TopP with the availability of V2. For SF and for the other constructions under review in this study to be operative in a given language, it is not sufficient to have the possibility of [D] feature checking by

the verb. What a language must have at its disposal is the availability of the EPP+ feature, i.e. the case where [D] and [P] are not packaged as an unorganized bundle. This option together with the creation of Top+P only seems possible if CP is not only split, but accessed via verb movement and topicalization (i.e. V2).

## 20.5 Conclusion

---

This article has shown that Old French shared with insular Scandinavian languages, not only V2 configurations, in addition to Stylistic Fronting and Quirky Subjects (as shown in previous work of mine), but also Object Shift and Transitive Expletive Constructions. A proposal was given for this cluster of properties: in Old French the EPP was split between a [D] and a [P] feature and a special Topic position was available above TP. The split EPP became unsplit through time and the special Topic position responsible for all the constructions under review was no longer available/accessible in later stages of the language.

## Primary Sources

---

*Le Chevalier à la Charrette* (Chrétien de Troyes) c.1180.

The Charrette Project (Princeton University), <<http://www.princeton.edu/~lancelot/ss/>>.

*La Queste del Saint Graal* c.1220 (1225?) Published by Albert Pauphilet. Paris: Éditions Champion, 2003. Translation by Emmanuèle Baumgartner, *La Quête du Saint Graal*. Paris: Editions Champion, 2003.

## Notes

---

- 1 Although, Moore and Perlmutter (2000) argue that German does not have Quirky Subjects, but inverted objects, Eythórsson and Barðdal (2005) make a good case for the idea that German has Quirky Subjects after all. Whether German does or does not have Quirky Subjects is, however, orthogonal to the point that I am presently making.
- 2 For example, not all speakers accept TECs (cf. Jonas 1995). There are also differences between Icelandic and Faroese with regard to SF. Whereas DPs can be SFronted in Faroese (Barnes 1987), only abstract denoting DPs can undergo the stylistic operation in Icelandic (Holmberg 2000). Finally, whereas Quirky Subjects are still very productive in Icelandic, they are in the process of being lost in Faroese (Eythórsson 2000, 2002).
- 3 Further evidence for the idea that *ce* 'this' is not a clitic is provided by the facts that: (i) it can also occur in isolation; (ii) it can be modified by *tout* 'all'; (iii) it can be conjoined. All these properties are known to be impossible for clitic pronouns.
- 4 There is an alternative proposal according to which left dislocation of objects in Old French compound and infinitival clauses is a case of SF. This is what I argue in fact in Mathieu (2006a). However, in that paper I do not deal with scrambling or OS, and the solution that is provided in the present chapter in terms of scrambling stems from the logic developed here.
- 5 Although, if the subject is shifted to the right edge of the clause, the sentence is improved as shown in (i)—this observation is attributed to Richard Kayne by Chomsky (2001), but see also n. 17, p. 208, in Bobaljik and Jonas (1996):

(i) ??There ate a pudding many Christmas trolls.

- 6 Although Old French is not explicitly discussed in Roberts and Roussou (2002), it is clear that the ideas they develop for V2 languages can be extended to Old French (see Labelle and Hirschbühler 2005 for such an extension).
- 7 It must be noted that the Top+P position is not associated with presupposed, but asserted topics. The process behind SF is one that allows an element to simply get out of the way, as it were, so that the most embedded element becomes focalized. The process is thus akin to what Zubizarreta (1998) calls P-movement, except that according to the analysis developed here movement of Stylistic elements happens in the narrow syntax, not at PF. There is independent evidence that SF is relevant for narrow syntax from the behaviour of auxiliaries. Although these are potential candidates in terms of c-command for raising to Top<sup>0</sup>, they nevertheless remain *in situ* leaving other elements to be SFronted. I follow Holmberg (2000) in viewing this fact as evidence that narrow syntax is where SF is derived.
- 8 The situation with pronominal Quirky Subjects is different: since they are clitics they adjoin to T<sup>0</sup> (and possibly further up

to  $\text{Top}^0$ ) directly and thus do not move to any specifier position.