

The left-periphery of V2-Rhaetoromance dialects: a new view on V2 and V3

1. Introduction

In this work I analyze V2 and V3 sequences in a Rhaetoromance variety which combines V2 with a complex left periphery typical of Romance languages showing that a split CP perspective can shed light on the apparently bizarre properties of this language.

The V2 phenomenon as originally defined by den Besten (1983) for German and Dutch can be split into three distinct syntactic properties: a) subject inversion, b) second position of the inflected verb (the so called "linear restriction") c) root character of the phenomenon. In the traditional analysis these three properties are accounted for by assuming that in V2 languages the C° position must always be filled, therefore, in main clauses the inflected verb has to move to the C° position. V to C movement results in subject inversion; moreover, the ban against V2 in embedded contexts is derived by the fact that C° is already filled by the complementizer. The ungrammaticality of V3 sequences also follows because there is only one position available higher than C°, namely SpecC. Subsequent work on Germanic languages has shown that the three properties do not always go together: as for the third property, it has been shown by Santorini (1989), Vikner (1995) (among others) that not all Germanic languages display V2 only in main clauses, Yiddish and Icelandic are so called "generalized V2" languages, where V2 is possible in all embedded contexts.

The second observation which contributes to a further definition of the V2 phenomenon comes from Old Romance languages. Following Benincà's (1984) proposal for Old French and medieval Northern Italian dialects, it is generally assumed the Old Romance languages were V2, although the root versus embedded asymmetry is not found in Spanish (cf. Fontana (1993)) and Southern Italian varieties. Moreover, Old Italian did not display the typical "linear restriction" observed in the Germanic domain: in old Italian texts V3 and V4 sequences can be found, although the subject is

located in between the auxiliary and the past participle, in the typical inversion pattern of Germanic languages (from now on g-inversion)¹. The parallel between Old Romance and Germanic is thus based on g-inversion, which becomes the core property defining V2 languages as languages with obligatory V to C movement. Nevertheless, including Old Romance in the set of languages that have the V2 property leaves unexplained why the linear restriction is clearly observed by all Germanic languages, but not by Old Romance. In other words, admitting that Old Romance were also V2 in the technical sense that the inflected verb moved to C° captures the parallel behavior of Romance and Germanic varieties concerning g-inversion, but does not say anything concerning the difference, namely the fact that Germanic obeys the linear restriction, Old Romance (except a given stage in Old French) does not.

On the other hand, the split CP perspective proposed by Rizzi (1997), and now generally adopted for Romance is not immediately compatible with the way the linear restriction is derived in the “classical” theory. If the CP layer has to be conceived as a number of distinct functional projections, each hosting a different type of element and checking distinct semantic features, the traditional account of the linear restriction in terms of V to C movement is no longer valid and we need to reformulate it in the new perspective.

This is what I will try to do in this paper focussing on a Rhaetoromance dialect, which seems to be an intermediate stage between Old Romance and Germanic, as it displays a restricted set of V3 cases. Starting from a structure like the one proposed in Rizzi (1997) exemplified in (1), I will examine various possibilities to account for the linear restriction of the V2 constraint:

(1) Force...(TOP*) (FOC) (TOP*) Finiteness

The first possibility which comes to mind to get hold of the linear restriction is to say that V2 languages do not have this layered CP at all. This has been proposed by Poletto and Tomaselli

¹ g-inversion has to be distinguished from free inversion, where the subject occurs at the right of the past participle.

(1999) for Germanic V2: they assume that the difference between languages which possess a CP layer as the one in (1) and languages which have a single CP projection can be analyzed in terms of Giorgi and Pianesi's (1997) theory of "feature scattering": languages have the option of realizing more than one feature on a single head or "scatter" each feature on a distinct functional head. Rhaetoromance data on V3 sequences described in section 5. show that this is not the case.

The second logical possibility proposed by Poletto (2000) translates the old theory into the new framework basing on den Besten's intuition that V2 is movement to the highest layer of the sentence: we can assume that although there are several CP projections available, V2 languages have to move an XP and the inflected verb to the CP highest position, namely Force in Rizzi's framework. Following this line of reasoning, the difference between two languages like, say, Italian and German would consist in an additional requirement of checking some Force feature both in the head and in the specifier of this projection, a contrast which is active in German but not in Italian.

The third logical option has been proposed by Haegeman (1997) and Roberts (1999), who both assume that V2 is not a property of the highest CP position, but a property of the lowest CP, namely Fin^o, which encodes the [+/-finiteness] distinction in Rizzi's theory. Their system runs as follows: V2 languages have to fill the lowest C position by movement or by merge. Verb movement to Fin^o is a last resort strategy for checking a strong [+Fin] feature, which is in fact not chosen in embedded contexts, where a complementizer checks the Fin feature. The necessity of the verb "being second" is derived by two fundamental assumptions: the first one is that all second position phenomena follow from the EPP, which has to be conceived as a general requirement on having a predicative structure as the highest relation in the clause. Hence, EPP requires an XP movement to SpecFin when the verb is in Fin^o. This explains why there must be at least one XP in front of the verb. The second basic claim accounts for the fact that there can be at most one XP in front of the verb implementing relativize minimality in its recent version (cf. Rizzi (2001)) into the analysis of V2: EPP is a feature which, being "of no particular type in terms of the typology of potential interveners, ... is able to block any type of movement" (Roberts (1999):39). Once an XP has moved

to SpecFin to satisfy the EPP feature in Fin^o, no other element can move to the CP domain without violating minimality. In other words, Fin^o constitutes a "bottle neck" through which only one XP can move. In principle this analysis admits cases of V3 when the first element is base-generated in the CP layer, as left dislocated elements are.

In this paper I will show that a) V3 cases are indeed restricted the way Haegeman (1997) and Roberts (1999) predict; b) both the XP and the verb move to positions which are higher than Fin^o crossing over sentential particles which are directly merged in the CP domain c) the necessity to check a strong Force feature in Rhaetoromance but not in Old Italian accounts for the different distribution of XPs in the Comp domain in these languages. In order to derive the particular distribution of V3 instances in the Rhaetoromance dialect of S. Leonardo (from now on Rr), I will adopt a combination of Poletto's (2000) hypothesis that in Germanic languages the inflected verb raises to a very high position in the CP layer with the Haegeman and Roberts' idea that the number of XPs moved to the CP layer cannot be more than one, and that this is due to a property of a low CP position.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 2 I illustrate a modification of Rizzi's theory proposed by Benincà (2001), which is essential to the framework I adopt here. Benincà shows that there is no Topic position lower than the Focus layer, hence all Left dislocated elements are located higher than focalized elements; moreover, inside the "Topic field" there is a special position for scene setting adverbs, and Focus is a field containing several projections too. In section 3 and section 4 I discuss further modifications to the split CP structure proposed by Rizzi (1997). In section 5 the number and type of V3 sequences found in Rhaetoromance, are described and discussed. In section 6. I formulate a proposal which captures the distinction between Old Italian and Rr V3 sequences.

2. Topic and Focus

In order to analyze V2 on the basis of a split CP analysis we first have to have a precise hypothesis on the type, number and properties of FPs contained in the CP area. Therefore, in this section I

briefly sketch the arguments given in Benincà (2001) and Benincà and Poletto (2001) which on the basis of Italian data modify the Topic/Focus portion of the CP structure proposed in Rizzi (1997) leading to a structure containing three sublayers: a) a low one containing a number of Focus projections and b) an intermediate one containing topics or themes which have a resumptive clitic and c) a high one containing base generated Hanging Topics (HTs). The Topic/Focus portion of the CP structure results to be different from the one proposed in (1):

(2) [Hanging TopicP [Force complementizer [Left Dislocation [FocusP [IP]]]]]

The three sublayers illustrated in (2) contain a number of functional projections, here I concentrate on some data that provide evidence for the internal composition of these "fields". This structure differs from (1) in essentially two aspects: the first has to do with the lack of a Topic layer lower than Focus, the second with the split between Hanging Topic (HT) and Left Dislocation (LD).

In Benincà and Poletto (2001) the internal structure of each layer is examined. HT has to be distinguished from LD on the basis of the following differences: a) HT does not copy the case (or the preposition) of the resumptive element in the clause, while LD does, b) there can only be one HT, while there can be more than one left dislocated element, c) the resumptive pronoun does not need to be a clitic, but can be a tonic pronoun or a full DP d) HT requires a resumptive element while LD only does when the element is the direct object e) HT is marginal (in some languages impossible) in embedded clauses, LD is not f) when possible in embedded contexts it occurs before the complementizer while LD occurs after it. (see Benincà and Poletto (2001) for examples and for a detailed discussion of these differences). This last piece of evidence distinguishing HT from LD also shows that HT is located higher, while LD is located lower than Force. This will constitute an important fact when considering V3 in Rr interrogatives.

The other important claim I will make use of in this paper is that LD can only occur higher than Focus. The first argument showing that there is no Topic lower than Focus proposed by Benincà (2001) is the ungrammaticality of sentences like (3):

- (3) a *A GIANNI, un libro di poesie, lo regalerete
 To GIANNI, a book of poems, you will give it
 ‘You will give a book of poems to Gianni’
 b Un libro di poesie, A GIANNI, lo regalerete
 a book of poems, To GIANNI, you will give it

In (3a) a left dislocated object (*un libro di poesie*) is located lower than contrastive focus and the sentence is ungrammatical, the opposite order illustrated in (3b) is perfectly well formed. However, Rizzi (1997) provides cases in which a left dislocated element seems to occur lower than a contrastive element:

- (4) a QUESTO a Gianni, domani, gli dovremmo dire!
 this to Gianni, tomorrow, to-him should tell
 ‘Tomorrow we should tell this to Gianni’
- b A Gianni, QUESTO, domani gli dovremmo dire!
 to Gianni, THIS, tomorrow, to-him should tell
- c A Gianni, domani, QUESTO gli dovremmo dire!
 to Gianni, tomorrow, THIS to-him should tell

Among the three sentences, (4c) has the correct order LD, Focus and is derived also by the structure given in (2). In (4b), the element located lower than Contrastive Focus is an adverbial, which has been shown by Benincà (2001) to occupy a position specialized for adverbs located lower than the usual preverbal subject position at the IP border. Therefore, it does not constitute a valid counterexample to the hypothesis in (2). However, (4a) seems a clear case of a left dislocated indirect object occurring lower than contrastive focus. Again, it is possible to show that this is not a genuine case of base generated LD but an instance of movement to a low secondary Focus position. First of all, the resumptive clitic in (4a) can be analyzed as a case of clitic doubling, and not as a true resumptive pronoun as the following sentence shows:

- (5) Gliel’ho detto a Gianni
 to him-it have told to John
 ‘I told this to Gianni’

Benincà (1988) notes that in colloquial Italian sentences like (5), where the clitic doubles a DP in its argumental position, are common. Therefore, the fact that a dative is doubled does not constitute compelling evidence in favor of its dislocated status.

Second, Benincà (2001) shows that the indirect object in that position is sensitive to the weak cross over effect, a typical property of operator-variable chains, which is displayed by focussed elements but not by topics, as the contrast in (6) shows:

- (6) a *A MARIA, Giorgio_i, sua_i madre presenterà
to Maria, George, his mother will present
‘His mother will present Giorgio to Maria’
- b Gianni_i, suo_i padre l_i'ha licenziato LD
Gianni_i, his_i father has fired him_i
‘Gianni has been fired by his own father’

Therefore, sentences like (4a) can be interpreted as two Foci and not as of LD embedded under a Focus and we can rely on data like the one in (3) and assume a simpler structure as the one illustrated in (2). Therefore, Focus, on a par with LD, is also a complex field containing more than one projection. We will not further discuss the internal structure of the LD and Focus fields (for details see Benincà and Poletto (2001), as it is not relevant to the main question discussed here, namely the distribution of V2 and V3 sequences in Rr. In the next section I present some data which suggest that an additional projection lower than HT but higher than LD has to be added to the structure in (2).

3. The scene setting position

In this section I will examine data of a V2 Rhaetoromance variety spoken in the Badia valley, in the village of S. Leonardo. This dialect displays the core property of V2 phenomenology, as it has g-inversion. It also displays a V2 matrix versus embedded asymmetry, but only in wh contexts, a fact which will not be further discussed here. As for the linear restriction, this is not always respected (see section 5), but for the moment I will leave these cases aside concentrating on the analysis of circumstantial adverbs. The examples in (7) illustrate g-inversion, those in (8) and (9) the linear restriction:

- (7) a **T** vas gonoot a ciasa sua S. Leonardo
 you go often at home his
 ‘You often visit him’
- b Gonoot vas-**t** a ciasa sua
 often go-you at home his
- c *Gonoot t vas a ciasa sua
 often you go at home his
- (8) a *Da trai l liber ti a-**i** de a Giani
 sometimes the book to-him have-I given to John
 ‘Sometimes I gave a book to John’
- b *L liber da trai ti a-**i** de a Giani
 the book sometimes have-I given to John
- (9) a *A Giani l liber ti ai bel dè
 to John the book to-him have-I already given
 ‘I already gave the book to John’

The examples in (8) and (9) show that these dialects obey the V2 linear restriction: when two (or more) elements are located at the left of the verb, the sentence is ungrammatical. This is true when the two elements are two internal arguments (as in (9)), a lower adverb and an internal argument (8), two lower adverbs, or a lower adverb and the subject (but see below for a detailed discussion of V3 orders).

Evidence in favour of the idea that circumstantial and quantificational adverbs can occupy a special high position inside the CP layer, is already provided by the lack of contrastive focalization that circumstantial adverbs display with respect to other adverbial elements.

In V2 varieties the first position of the clause is often considered to be a Focus position, this is true at least for objects but surely not for subjects (cf. Zwart (1997) for a recent analysis of these facts)) and for expletives like German *es*. Adverbs split into two classes with respect to focalization: lower adverbs² can only appear in first position when they are contrastively focalized, circumstantial adverbs do not need any particular intonational contour and are not necessarily associated with the contrastive-focus interpretation:

- (10) a Duman n vagn-l pa nia
tomorrow not goes-he not not
‘Tomorrow he is not coming’
b DUMAN n vagn-l pa nia
tomorrow not goes-he not not (interpret. “not-tomorrow”)
- (11) a *Trees l feje-l
always it does-he
‘He always does it’
b TREES l feje-l

Modulo the V2 property this is true also in languages like standard Italian: lower adverbs must be contrastively focalized, circumstantial adverbs need not:

- (12) a SEMPRE lo fa
always it-does (he)
b *Sempre lo fa
- (13) a DOMANI viene
tomorrow comes (he)
‘Tomorrow he will come’
b Domani viene

All adverbs can occupy a Contrastive Focus position in the CP layer, as the grammaticality of (10b) and (11b) show. Only circumstantial adverbs can occupy a very high position where they are not focalized, and do not interfere with the V2 linear restriction, as the contrast between (10a) and (11a)

² I use here Cinque (1999) terminology, lower adverbs are those adverbs that are located of the specifiers of the

indicates. Indeed, the semantics of sentences like (13b) is completely different from contrastive focus, as here the adverb provides the hearer with some background information or "setting the scene". Therefore, I will refer from now on to the high position occupied by non focalized circumstantial and quantificational adverbs as a "scene setting position".

Additional evidence that the class of circumstantial adverbs has to be kept apart from all other adverbial classes when it occurs in first position is provided by subject agreement patterns: in dialect of S. Leonardo there are three possible agreement patterns, as exemplified in (14):

- (14) a Duman mangia la muta pom No clitic
tomorrow eats P. apples
'Tomorrow the girl will eat apples'
- c Duman mang-la la muta pom Full agreeing clitic
tomorrow eats-she the girl apples
- d ??Duman mang-l Maria pom Only older generation
- e Dar incà vegn-el la si Third person clitic
just here comes-it the fence
- f Dar incà vegn-la la si Full agreeing clitic
just here come-she the fence
- g La muta mangia pom
the girl eats apples
'The girl is eating apples'
- h *La muta la mangia pom
the girl she eats apples

In (14a) the inverted subject is not doubled by any subject clitic and is located at the left of the object. In (14b) a full agreeing clitic doubles the postverbal subject (which is still in a pre-object position). A third agreement pattern, where an expletive third person singular masculine clitic doubles the postverbal subject, is exemplified in (14d, e). As this is only marginally possible with transitive verbs while it is perfect only with inaccusatives, I will leave this third pattern aside. Notice that the only possible pattern with a preverbal subject is the one without any clitic, as the contrast between (14g) and (14h) show, so the same as the one exemplified in (14a) with a postverbal subject. I will consider here the first two patterns. When a lower adverb is selected only one of the two patterns is possible, namely the one with the doubling clitic:

possible movement positions of the past participle.

- (15) a *Gonoot mangia la Maria pom
often eats the Mary apples
'Often Mary eats apples'
- b Gonoot mang-**la** la Maria pom
often eats-he the Mary apples
- (16) a *Bele pom mangia la Maria
already apples eats the Mary
- b Bele pom mang-**la** la Maria
already apples eats-he the Mary
'Mary is already eating apples'
- (17) a *Dut mangia la Maria
everything eats the Mary
- b Dut mang-**la** la Maria
everything eats-it the Mary
'Mary eats everything'

This is not true for circumstantial adverbs, which admit both agreement patterns, as shown in (14). Hence, circumstantial adverbs display a different intonational pattern and can trigger a special subject agreement when they are located in first position. Although these data show that circumstantial adverbs have to be singled out as a special class, they do not show how this is encoded in the structure of the CP layer.

The decisive argument showing that circumstantial adverbs occupy a special position in the CP domain is provided by embedded contexts, where a circumstantial adverb can only be focalized:

- (18) a Al m a dit c DUMAN va-**al** a Venezia +**focus**
he me has told that tomorrow goes-he to Venice
'He told me that he is going to Venice tomorrow.'
- b *Al m a dit c duman va-**al** a Venezia
he me has told that tomorrow goes-he to Venice
'He told me that he is going to Venice tomorrow.'

In Poletto (2000) I argued that the contrast between (18a) and (18b) can be accounted for in terms of split CP in the following way: the special position position for circumstantial adverbs is only available in matrix clauses. Given that the semantics of these adverbial when they are located in this sentence initial position is precisely that of "setting the scene", it is plausible that such a position is only needed (hence possible) in a matrix domain where this type of information is expressed. The fact that the "scene setting" position occupied by this special class of adverbs is only found in matrix clauses immediately recalls the distribution of HT. As we noted in section 3., HTs contrast with LD because they are at least marginal in embedded contexts: they cannot occur in embedded domains in French and in relative clauses in standard Italian (cf. Benincà and Poletto (2001) for a discussion on this point). Therefore, being (at least partially) restricted to matrix contexts seems to be a property of the "outer portion" of the CP layer, the one located higher than Force, which is obviously present in both matrix and embedded contexts.

If we are on the right track, there should be some empirical evidence which helps us singling out the scene setting position both from the higher HT position. This is provided by the possibility of having a scene setting adverb in V2 contexts, while a HT is ungrammatical in declarative clauses:

- (19) a Duman ti dai l liber a Giani
tomorrow to-him give-I the book to Giani
'Tomorrow I will give the book to John'
- b *Giani, ti ai bel dè l liber
John, to him have-i given the book
'John, I already gave him the book'

Hence, scene setting adverbs can satisfy the V2 requirement, and be located immediately before the verb, while HTs cannot. That the scene setting position is lower than the HT position, which is most probably only a position for DPs, can be shown on the basis of standard Italian, where circumstantial adverbs can occur lower than HTs but the reverse is not true (we report here data from Benincà and Poletto ((2001: 46), which the reader is referred to for a detailed discussion):

- (20) Mario, nel 1999, gli hanno dato il premio Nobel
Mario, in the 1999 to-him have given the Prize Nobel
'M., in 1999, they gave him the Nobel Prize'

- (21) a ??Nel 1999, Mario, gli hanno dato il premio Nobel

in the 1999, Mario, to-him have given the Prize Nobel

- b *Sul giornale, Mario, ne hanno parlato malissimo
on the newspaper, Mario, of him have spoken very badly
'They spoke very badly about Mario o the newspaper'

As (20) and (21) show the ordering scene setting-HT is ungrammatical, while the opposite is possible. Hence, these data show a) that HTs and scene setting have to be distinguished because they cooccur b) scene setting is located lower than HT.

The structure of the CP layer assumed here can thus be modified as it follows:

(22) [Hanging TopicP [Scene setting [Force [Left Dislocation [FocusP [IP]]]]]]

We will adopt this structure in the following sections.

4. New context particles

Badiotto has a number of sentence particles, some of which occurring at the very beginning of the clause, some others occurring in sentence internal position. I concentrate here on the particle *pa*, which marks the lack of any presupposed context, and is compatible with all sentence types, with the same semantics. In a recent paper Poletto and Zanuttini (2001) propose that *pa* is located in a low Comp position. Firstly, elements marking this type of pragmatic features are typically located in the CP domain, as the locus where informational structure is encoded and in particular, if we are right in following Benincà's (2001) intuition that the Focus field is lower than the Topic field, it belongs to the lowest portion of the left periphery. Syntactic evidence in favor of this claim is provided by the following examples:

- (23) a Al a *pa d sigy* mangé (S. Leonardo)
SCL have pa of sure eaten
'He has surely eaten'
b *Al a *d sigy pa* mangé
SCL has of sure pa eaten
c Al a *pa magari* bel mangé
SCL has pa perhaps already eaten

- ‘Perhaps he has already eaten’
- d *Al a *magari pa* bel mangé
- (24) a Inier a *pa* Giani mangé la ciara
yesterday has pa John eaten the meat
‘Yesterday John ate meat’
- b *A i m a domané s al n fus *pa* bel.
SCL SCL me asked if SCL neg was pa nice
‘He asked me whether it was nice’
- (25) a ch' al vagnes ma ince os cumpagn!
that he comes prt also your friend
‘Your friend may come in’
- b *ch' al vagnes pa ince os cumpagn!
that he comes prt also your friend

The particle *pa* occurs higher than "higher adverbs" in Cinque's (1999) hierarchy, it also occurs higher than the subject located in SpecAgrS or, following more recent minimal accounts, SpecTP; hence higher than the highest IP elements. Furthermore, it is incompatible with a low complementizer, as the interrogative complementizer *se* and the complementizer of suppletive imperative forms like the one in (25b); it contrasts with other particles (cf. (25a) which are perfectly grammatical in these contexts and which occur lower than *pa* when the two are combined (cf. Poletto and Zanuttini (1999) on the syntax and semantics of these particles in imperative clauses):

- (26) a Faal pa ma!
do-it prt. prt.
‘Please, do it’
- b *Faal ma pa!

Hence, the semantics and the syntax of *pa* both indicate that its position is on the border between CP and IP. *Pa* is also used in other dialects, which have lost the V2 property and can have main interrogative clauses introduced by a complementizer. *Pa* and the interrogative complementizer are incompatible also in main interrogatives, just like in V2 Rhaetoromance embedded ones:

- (27) a Olà che tu vas? Pera di Fassa
 where that you go?
 ‘Where are you going?’
- b Olà pa tu vas?
 where interr marker you go?
- c *Olà che pa tu vas?
 where that interr. marker you go?
 ‘Where are you going?’
- d *Ola pa che tu vas?
 where interr marker that you go?

Therefore, we can assume that it occupies a low position in the CP layer. This position has to be lower than the position of the inflected verb in V2 contexts, which obligatorily precedes it. As *pa* can only be present in the clause when the sentence conveys new information outside a context, we propose that the position it occupies is the syntactic reflex of its semantics: *pa* occupies a "new information" (NI) position in the lower portion of the CP layer.³ Concerning the status of the particle as a head or a specifier, the head movement constraint forces us to assume that it occupies the specifier position of the NI projection, as the verb is moving to its head and then to higher head positions. The analysis of *pa* as a low SpecCP has interesting consequences for the analysis of V2 in the split CP framework. As discussed in section 1 one possible way to reconcile the V2 linear restriction and the split-CP hypothesis has been proposed by Haegeman (1997) and Roberts (1999), who assume that the inflected verb occupies the lowest CP position and, being subject to the EPP requires an element in its specifier position, which then blocks all other elements which might move to the CP domain. In Badiotto a particle is merged in a low SpecCP, while the verb moves higher, and the XP at its left must obviously be even higher. This shows that the position targeted by the inflected verb and by the XP at its left is not the lowest position in the CP domain, but a higher one. We will come back to this in section 6.

5. The distribution of V2 and V3

³ In Benincà and Poletto (2001) this position is the same where XPs corresponding to the new information of the clause are located in languages like Old Italian and Old and modern Sicilian. This is still to be ascertained, but we will leave this question aside for the moment.

Once we have established the precise layering of the CP structure and the fact that the verb is raising higher than the lowest position we now turn to the distribution of V2 and V3 sequences. Let us first consider V2 instances. In Rr the set of elements that can satisfy V2 is restricted to focalized constituents, scene setting adverbs and wh-items; HTs and LD items cannot enter a V2 structure:

- (28) a *L Giat, l'ai odu⁴
the cat, it have-I seen
'I have seen the cat'
- b *Giani, ti ai bel baiè
Giani, to him have-I already spoken
'I already talked to John'
- c *De Giani ai bel baié
of Giani, have-I already spoken
'I already talked about John'

This is totally unexpected in the traditional view that places whatever element in SpecC. It is also unexpected under Poletto and Tomaselli (1999) approach that analyzes V2 languages as having an "unscattered CP": if any type of element can satisfy the V2 requirement, why should HT and LD elements be excluded?

On the other hand, the V2 constraint in Rr is not absolute, V3 depends on the type of elements that occur in first and second position. This is a general property of V2 languages, where V3 orders are admitted, but always in a very limited way which depends on the type of the first of the two XPs preposed to the inflected verb. Standard German for instance displays V3 cases which look (at least partially) similar to Romance HT or to LD:

- (29) a Peter, ich werde ihn sehen
Peter, I will him see
- b Den Peter, den habe ich gesehen
the+acc. Peter him have I seen
'I already saw Peter'

⁴ a sentence like this is ambiguous between a HT and a LD. The fact that it is ungrammatical shows that not only the HT is out but also the LD possibility.

A closer examination of all the possible V2 and V3 patterns found in Badiotto making use of the layered structure of the CP field we have adopted from Benincà and Poletto (2001), reveals a complex pattern which is only partially similar to the one of standard German in (29).

As in the Germanic languages, it is not possible to have V3 with two XPs in the Focus field:

- (30) a *Da trai l liber ti a-i de a Giani
 sometimes the book to-him have-I given to John
 ‘Sometimes I gave a book to John’
 b *L liber da trai ti a-i de a Giani
 the book sometimes have-I given to John

The same is true for the combination of a focalized constituent and a wh-item:

- (31) *L LIBER che ti a de a Giani?
 the book who to him has given to John
 ‘Who gave the book to John?’

However the combination of a focalized constituent (or a wh item) with a scene setting adverb is marginally possible⁵:

- (32) ?Duman, GIANI vaighest
 tomorrow, GIANI see-you
 ‘Tomorrow you will see John’

⁵ An apparent exception to the pattern outlined here is the case of scene setting adverbs: as illustrated in section 3 scene setting adverbs are marginally possible in the first position of a V3 clause. This could in principle be considered as evidence in favor of the direct merge of scene setting adverbs into the Scene Setting where they surface. If this is so, they should not satisfy the V2 requirement, on a par with HT and LD cases. Contrary to our expectations, they do:

- (i) a Duman vagnet
 Tomorrow comes-he
 b L GIAT ai odu
 THE CAT have-I seen

The sentence in (ia) contains a scene setting adverb, which behaves like the focalized object in (ib). So, the evidence provided by (ia) and (ib) is contradictory: (ia) indicates that, at least marginally scene setting adverbs can be directly merged in CP, while the fact that they satisfy the V2 requirement on a par with focalized and wh- items shows that they must have operator-like properties. The solution to the puzzle rests on the marginality of sentences like those in (32), which are in fact accepted only by the younger generation: scene setting adverbs like *duman* do display operator-like movement from the IP to the left periphery, but can also marginally be analyzed as DPs and only under this analysis be directly merged into the HT position, which is an exclusively a position for DPs. This also explains the feeling of the speakers who note that in a sentence like (ia), the adverb is "out of the sentence" while this is not true of cases like (ib).

I will discuss the intermediate status of examples like (32) in section 7. The only possible V3 orders that are clearly admitted in declarative clauses when the first of the two elements is a HT:

- (33) L liber, A GIANI ti l'ai bel dé
the book, TO GIANI it have-I already given
'I already gave the book to John'

Left dislocation is not possible as the first element of a V3 structure, as the following example shows:

- (34) *De Giani CUN PIERO ai bel baié
Of Giani, WITH PIERO have-I already spoken

The situation changes radically in interrogative sentences, as it is possible to left-dislocate all XPs in front of a wh-item; this may be a subject as illustrated in (35b), an object as in (36) or an adverb as in (37):

- (35) a De Giani, con che bai-la pa?
of Giani, with whom speak-she interr. prt.?
'With whom did you talk about John?'
b Giani, ci o-I pa?
John what wants-he interrogative marker?
'What does John want?'
c *Ci Giani o-I pa?
what John wants-he interrogative marker?
- (36) a L liber chi l tol pa?
the book who it takes interrogative marker?
'Who is going to take the book?'
b *Chi l liber l tol pa?
who the book it takes interrogative marker?

- (37) a Gonot ula va-**al** pa?
 often where goes-he interrogative marker?
 ‘Where does he often go?’
- b *Ula gonot va-**al** pa?
 where often goes-he interrogative marker?

While the sequence left dislocation-wh-item is grammatical, the opposite wh-item/left-dislocation order is totally excluded.

Rr left-dislocation displays the usual properties of Romance left-dislocation, namely: a) recursivity, (cf (38)); and b) free word order of left-dislocated elements (as shown by the grammaticality of the pairs (38a)-(38b) and (38c)-(38d) and occurrence in embedded contexts, as illustrated in (38e)).

- (38) a Giani, inier, ci a-**al** pa fat?
 John yesterday what has-he interrogative marker done?
 ‘What has John done yesterday?’
- b Inier, Giani, ci a-**al** pa fat?
 yesterday John what has-he interrogative marker done?
- c Giani, inier, l as-**t** ody?
 John yesterday him has-you seen?
 ‘Did you see Joh yestesrday?’
- d Inier, Giani, l as-**t** ody?
 yesterday John him has-you seen?
- e Al m a demanee Giani, can c al vagn a ciasa
 he me has asked John when that he comes at home
 ‘He asked me when John is coming home’

The contrast between declaratives and interrogatives is illustrated in (39) by a minimal pair:

- (39) a *Giani, duman l vaiges-**t**
 John tomorrow him see-you
 ‘You will see John tomorrow’
- b *Giani, duman l vaiges-**t**?
 John tomorrow him see-you
 ‘Will you see John tomorrow?’

Rhaetoromance left-dislocation is similar to standard Italian left-dislocation (as it is recursive, all orders of left-dislocated elements are possible and embedding is allowed), although this is a V2 variety. The only difference with respect to standard Italian is the limited context in which left-dislocation may occur in Rhaetoromance.⁶

Summing up what we have seen so far:

- a) V2 is only possible when the first constituent is a focalized XP, a scene setting adverb or a wh.-item
- b) V3 instances are possible in declaratives only if the first constituent is a HT (or marginally a scene setting adverb) and the second is a focalized XP or a wh-item.
- c) V3 in interrogative clauses is possible if the first element is a HT or a LD items.
- d) Interrogative clauses also admit V4 structures, given that it is possible to combine HT with LD and LD is recursive.

6. V3 and split CP

In this section I will propose an analysis which accounts for the data illustrated in section 5.

First, we noted that the V2 requirement can only be satisfied by a moved element, elements like LD and HT cannot occur at the immediate left of the inflected verb in the S. Leonardo dialect.

The grammaticality of V3 sequences also depends on the type of elements that are located to the left of the verb: V3 sequences are excluded if both elements are moved to the CP domain. This includes all cases of two focalized elements or a focalized element and a wh, whatever the ordering of the two elements is:

- (40) a *Foc Foc
- b *Foc wh
- c *Wh foc

V3 is only possible when one of the two elements is merged inside CP and not moved which leaves only sequences formed by a HT or LD element (which have been analyzed by Cinque (1990) as base generated in the position where they occur) and by a focalized or wh-item. I will refer to this

⁶ The contrasts just presented combined with the fact that HTs and LDs cannot be found as the first element of a V2 declarative clause, but can always be realized in interrogative clauses, (because interrogative clauses always contain a

phenomenon as the “restriction on type”, meaning by that that V2 and V3 are sensitive to the type of elements located at the left of the verb.

Second, the ordering of the two elements is rigid: the first of the two elements preceding the inflected verb has to be merged in CP (either HT or, in interrogatives, a LD). If the first of the two elements is a focalized element and the second is a HT, the sequence is out even if the first restriction is respected:

- (41) a *Foc HT
b HT Foc
c *Wh HT
d HT Wh
e Wh LD
f *LD Wh

I will refer to this as the “restriction on ordering”.

Third, an asymmetry between main interrogatives and declaratives has been observed in Rr: in interrogative clauses a LD can occur in front of a wh-item, but this is not the case for a focalized element in declarative clauses:

- (42) a LD Wh
b *LD Foc

I will refer to this as the “wh-asymmetry”.

The three restrictions illustrated in (40), (41) and (42) are straightforwardly captured within the split CP framework adopted here on the basis of the following assumptions: a) the first assumption we need to make is Haegeman’s (1997) and Roberts’ (1999) proposal (already illustrated in section 1) that in all V2 languages the verb has to move at least to the head of a low CP position because that head has a strong feature. Moreover, in order to satisfy EPP, an XP has to move to the Spec position of this low CP position, which, being “neutral” in terms of features, blocks all movements of other XPs to the CP domain by minimality.

If we assume Haegeman’s (1997) and Roberts’ (1999) analysis of V2 which excludes V3 sequences on the basis of a restriction on movement through the lowest CP position, we predict that: a) if V2 is a condition which leads to the deletion of EPP features, we expect that no element

wh-operator which satisfies the V2 requirement), has the effect of rendering LD much more common in interrogative

which is directly merged in a higher CP can satisfy this condition. Hence, only elements that are merged in or moved to (or through) SpecFin can satisfy V2, while elements that are merged higher than this position cannot. This prediction is borne out, as no LD or HT can satisfy the V2 requirement. b) On the other side, V3 cases are possible only when the first of the two elements preceding the inflected verb is merged directly inside CP and not moved from within the clause because all movements across SpecFin is banned by minimality. This prediction is also borne out, as the only elements that can occur in the first position of a V3 sequence are merged in CP. Hence, the restriction on type can be straightforwardly derived by Haegeman's (1997) and Robert's (1999) system: given that focalized elements and wh-items are both moved to the CP layer, they would both have to move to the low SpecCP position, which is not possible in an antisymmetric framework where there is only one specifier position as the one adopted here following Kayne (1994). Alternatively, one of the two would have to move crossing the low SpecCP position, violating minimality. Therefore, a combination of two moved elements is never possible in V2 languages, nor is the combination of two elements merged in a higher CP.

b) The second assumption is that the CP layer is split also in V2 languages; furthermore it is similar to the CP of non V2 languages as modern standard Italian and is made of (at least) the following projections:

(43) [HT [Scene setting [Force [LD ... [LD [Focus [WH]]]]]]]]

The Focus position needs to be distinguished from the position of wh-items as Cinque (p.c.) noted, because it is possible to combine a focalized element with a wh-item in embedded interrogative clauses, as shown in (44)⁷:

(44) Mi hanno chiesto A GIANNI chi ha portato il libro, non ad Antonio
 they asked me to Gianni who has taken the book, not to Antonio
 'They asked me who sent the book to John, not to Antony'

The restriction on ordering formulated above can be captured if we combine Haegeman and Roberts' proposal with the split CP in (43): we saw above that it is not possible to combine two

contexts than in declarative ones. This has also been noted in diachronic work of Old French by Roberts (1993).

⁷ In addition to this, it is well known that there can be more than one LD element in Romance; Benincà and Poletto (2001) show that there are several LD positions, some of which can be distinguished on the basis of their syntactic and semantic properties. However, we leave this further refinement out, because it is tangential to the question discussed here and simply note the fact that there can be many LD position with "... between the two LD projections.

moved elements at the left of the inflected verb, however, Haegeman's and Robert's proposal does not block sequences where one of the two elements is moved and the other is base generated in CP, as Hanging Topics and most probably Left dislocated elements are. Hence, the combination of one moved element with one element merged in CP is predicted to be grammatical by Haegeman and Robert's framework. This is however not sufficient to account for the distribution of V3 sequences in Rr: as noted above the only possible ordering is the one in which the first element is a LD or a HT (namely the one that is merged in CP) and the second is a moved element (a focus or a wh-item). This follows crucially from the format of the split CP adopted here: if the "Topic field" containing Hanging Topic and Left Dislocation is located higher than the one of moved elements like Focus and wh-items, the only possible ordering is precisely the one in (43): given that HT and LD elements are merged higher than Focus and wh-items, there is no possible derivation for the ordering in (41 a, c,f). On the contrary, if a split CP is simply conceived as recursion, the restriction on ordering remains unexplained.

As for the third restriction, namely the asymmetry between interrogative and declarative clauses, this is a priori unexpected if the null hypothesis is maintained, namely that each element moved to CP domain ultimately targets the projection where its features are checked, so wh-items move to a wh-projection, focalized elements to a Focus projection and scene setting adverbs to the scene setting position. We need an additional device to account for this. Moreover, we also have to keep in mind that this restriction is language specific; as mentioned in the introduction, Benincà (1984) shows that Old Italian did have declarative sentences where a LD element was followed by a Focus. Hence, Old Italian did not show any interrogative/declarative asymmetry; LD was always possible provided it was located higher than a focalized constituent or a wh-item.

In Poletto (2000) I proposed that the position ultimately targeted by focalized elements in Rr is higher than the LD position: this means that once the focalized XP has reached its SpecFocus position, it has to raise further to a higher position, which must be located lower than Hanging Topic (given that Hanging Topic-Focus sequences are possible), but higher than LD, as shown in (45):

(45)[HT [Scene setting [Force [LD [LD [Focus [WH]]]]]]]]

This position already exists, in Rizzi's account it is Force, namely the projection where the sentence is typed. Suppose that the Force position has strong features that must be checked before spell out in Rr. This means that it must be filled by some element. In embedded contexts a complementizer is

merged in Force⁰, in matrix clauses it is targeted by all elements moved to the CP layer. If focalized elements move higher than LD, one might expect that the sequence Foc-LD is possible, which is not true (cf. (41) above). An independent constraint proposed by Rizzi (1997) rules out this sequence: suppose that the inflected verb has to raise to Force⁰, given the head movement constraint it should have to stop in the head of the LD position before moving higher. This is not possible: as Rizzi (1997) notes, the head position of a Topic projection is not accessible to verb movement, because it already contains strong features; hence the inflected verb cannot move through the LD⁰ head and reach the head of the V2 position giving rise to ungrammaticality.

Therefore, both orderings Focus-LD and LD Focus are excluded in Rr, with the consequence that LD is banned from declarative clauses.

Consider now interrogative clauses. There is empirical evidence that the Force projection typing interrogative clauses is located much lower in the structure than declarative Force (Rizzi (1997) and Rizzi (2001a) assumes this; see Poletto and Pollock (2000) for a detailed discussion on the position of Interrogative Force). Therefore, in interrogative clauses the inflected verb does not need to raise higher than the LD position, because the interrogative sentence is already typed lower; LD is thus perfectly compatible with interrogative clauses.

On this basis, we can also derive the difference between Rr and Old Italian: in Old Italian the Force position does not need to be checked before spell out; focalized elements remain in SpecFocus, therefore the ordering LD-Focus is possible, on a par with the sequence LD-wh-item. Thus, Old Italian represents the “null option” mentioned above, a language in which Force does not have strong features, hence no further movement is required higher than the position where the semantic features of an XP are checked. Hence, V2 languages, all have a low CP projection where strong features have to be checked, some of them have an additional requirement of checking the higher Force projection. Verb movement to Force results in a ban against LD in declaratives but not in interrogatives, hence V3 sequences are very limited and we observe an asymmetry between interrogatives and declaratives.

This amounts to saying that V2 is a conspiracy of different factors, some of which are language specific, while others are common properties of the CP layer. The language specific factors are: a) the requirements of checking a low CP, common to all V2 languages and b) the necessity to check Force features, which is only necessary in some V2 languages. Independent properties of the

CP layer are: a) the layering we have described above, b) the distinct positions for declarative and interrogative Force and c) the ban against verb movement through the LD positions.

Considering the V2 phenomenon as a complex set of requirements instead of trying to find out a single property which characterizes all V2 languages also has the advantage of discharging that burden of the major difference between Old Italian and Rr on independent factors, namely the distinct realization of Force in interrogatives with respect to declaratives, a fact which is true of Romance in general and not simply of V2 varieties⁸. On the other side, a modular account of V2 is more flexible and permits to account for the differences among V2 languages as well as for the difference between V2 and non V2 languages.

8. Conclusion

In the preceding sections I argued in favor of a split CP analysis for a V2 variety, the Rhaetoromance dialect of S. Leonardo in the Badia valley. The data we considered here shed light on the following questions: a) it is not possible to analyze V2 languages as having an “unsplit CP” and derive the linear restriction in this way; b) the CP layering of V2 languages is identical to the one of non V2 languages; c) the V2 phenomenon derives from the properties of at least two projections (Force and Fin).

The Rr data analyzed in this paper clearly exclude some of the possible theoretical accounts of V2 illustrated in section 1. For instance, it is clear that postulating that V2 languages have an unsplit CP consisting of a single projection does not capture the Rhaetoromance pattern. A weak version of the same basic idea as the one proposed in Poletto and Tomaselli (1999) which postulates that

⁸ Our analysis could be in principle extended to Germanic languages. Nevertheless, it is not clear whether the construction known as “Linksversetzung” in languages like German is really the counterpart of Romance LD, given that it differs from Romance LD with respect to the following properties: a) it is never recursive and b) it does not occur in embedded domains. In Romance, these two properties are typical of the HT and not of LD, thus suggesting that the so called Linksversetzung is probably to be located in the HT position, which is the highest position in the sentence. This in turn opens up the problem of the position of the “Nominativus pendens”, which has all the properties of Romance HT (it only occur in main clauses, it is not recursive, and it does not “copy” the case of the argument in the clause). These considerations show that we have to be cautious in extending the CP structure elaborated on the basis of Romance data trying to find the Germanic analogues of LD and HT. Therefore, I will leave this to future research.

whenever V3 cases are found a "feature scattering" process along the lines proposed by Giorgi and Pianesi (1997) has applied, still does not account for the complex pattern of Rhaetoromance. In Poletto and Tomaselli's proposal, feature scattering is constrained by a general restriction which imposes that the mechanism that scatters one feature per projection can only apply starting from the lowest feature and proceeding to the higher ones. If we assume the CP structure discussed above, this analysis fails to predict the difference found between HT and LD on one side and Scene Setting on the other: scene setting adverbs are found in V2 constructions but only marginally in V3, while LD and HT cannot occur in V2 but only as the first element of the V3 sequence. This is not expected in such a system: given that LD is lower than Scene Setting it should be possible to have an LD constituent immediately followed by the inflected verb, which is not the case. Among the possible analyses mentioned in section 1, we also have to discard an analysis which imposes a requisite of spec-head agreement between the verb and whatsoever element in Comp (a sort of wh-criterion extended to all XPs found in CP) because this cannot derive the peculiar restrictions V3 sequences in Rr show.

Although the analysis proposed by Haegeman (1997) and Roberts (1999) does not immediately capture the whole complex pattern illustrated above, it does when it is combined with the format of the split CP proposed by Benincà and Poletto (2001), which is adopted here.

Moreover, the difference internal to the V2 languages concerning V3 sequences can be modularized by assuming that some V2 languages but not all have a strong Force feature, while all V2 languages have a strong Fin feature.

The idea that V2 languages allow different V3 patterns depending on the type of strong features assigned to the various CP projections is also potentially promising to account for language variation within the domain of Germanic languages.

References

- Benincà, P. (1984). Un'ipotesi sulla sintassi delle lingue romanze medievali. *Quaderni Patavini di Linguistica*, 4:3-19. Reprinted in Benincà (1994a).
- Benincà, P. (1988). L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate. In L. Renzi ed., *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione*, pages 129-194. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Benincà, P. (2001). Syntactic Focus and Intonational Focus in the Left Periphery. In G. Cinque and G. Salvi, eds., *Current Studies in Italian Linguistics Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Benincà, P. & C. Poletto (2001). Topic, Focus and V2: on defining the CP sublayers. Ms. University of Padua.
- Cinque, G. (1990). *Types of A-bar Dependencies*, vol 17 of *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Cinque, G. (1999). *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- den Besten, H. (1983). The Verbal Complex in Continental West Germanic. in *On the Formal Syntax of the West Germania* a cura di W. Abraham, John Benjamins, Amsterdam. pagg. 155-216.
- Fontana, J. M. (1993): "Phrase Structure and the Syntax of CLitics in the History of Spanish" PhD. diss. University of Pennsylvania.
- Giorgi A. and F. Pianesi (1997) *Tense and Aspect: from Semantics to Morphosyntax*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Haegeman, L. (1997): "Negative inversion and the structure of CP". Paper presented at the Linguistic Colloquium, University of Wuppertal.
- Kayne, R. (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Vol. 25 of *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Poletto, C. (2000). *The Higher Functional Field in the Northern Italian Dialects*. Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford.
- Poletto, C. & J-Y. Pollock (2001). On the left periphery of Romance interrogatives. Ms Universities of Amiens and Padua.
- Poletto, C. & A. Tomaselli (1999). Towards a typology of V2. Talk delivered at the XV IGG Siena.
- Poletto, C. and Zanuttini R. (1998). Making Imperatives: Evidence from Rhaetoromance. To appear in Ch. Tortora ed., *Studies in honor of Paola Benincà*. Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi L. (1997). The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In L. Haegeman, ed., *Elements of Grammar*, pages 281-337. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Rizzi, L (2001) *Locality and left periphery*, Ms; University of Siena
- Rizzi, L. (2001a) On the Position Int(errogative) in the Left Periphery of the Clause. In G. Cinque and G. Salvi, eds., *Current Studies in Italian Linguistics Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Foris, Dordrecht.

- Roberts, I. (1993). *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax: a Comparative History of English and French*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Roberts, I. (1999) The C-system in Brythonic Celtic Languages, V2 and the EPP. ms. University of Cambridge.
- Santorini, B. (1989). The Generalization of the Verb-Second Constraint in the History of Yiddish. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- Vikner, S. (1995). *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Zwart, J.-W. (1997). *Morphosyntax and Verb Movement*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.