At the C-T boundary: Investigating Abruzzese complementation[☆]

Roberta D'Alessandro [a,*], Adam Ledgeway [b]

[a] LUCL Leiden, Italian Department, Leiden University, van Wijkplaats 3, 104 c, 2311BX Leiden, The Netherlands
[b] Department of Italian, University of Cambridge, Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages, Sidgwick Avenue, Cambridge CB3 9DA, UK

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

The present article explores the complementizer system of Abruzzese. This system apparently features as many as three different complementizers, and is hence richer than the usual double-complementizer systems found in southern Italian dialects. While a richly articulated conception of the left periphery is demonstrated to provide a simple explanation for the various forms and distribution of two of the Abruzzese complementizers, the same set of structural assumptions are shown to run into severe difficulties when applied to the supposed third Abruzzese complementizer. Evidence is adduced to demonstrate that this element is best viewed, not as a complementizer, but, rather, as a T-element lexicalizing modal features associated with the embedded verb. This is an important finding since it demonstrates how a fine structural interpretation of the C-domain can lead to novel and enlightening analyses of traditional categories, even those traditionally assigned to the complementizer class. At the same time, the analysis highlights how current cartographic assumptions about the fine structure of the C-domain do not necessarily have to be directed towards, or lead to, the discovery of new functional categories and/or candidates for their lexicalization but, rather, can be profitably exploited to throw light on the structure of the T-domain without the postulation of additional functional structure.

© 2010 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Recent years have seen considerable research directed towards the investigation of the fine structure of the C-domain, culminating in the seminal work of Rizzi (1997) which has given rise to a widely-accepted view of the fundamental cartography of the left periphery (cf. also Belletti, 2004; Rizzi, 2004).[1] Significantly, a considerable amount of such work on the split C-system has been conducted on the basis of the rich dialectal variation offered by the linguistic varieties of the Italian peninsula,[2] and in particular the dialects of southern Italy which, in many cases, make use of a dual complementizer system which provides invaluable overt evidence with which to map the fine structural organization of the left periphery. By contrast, the dialects of Abruzzo have gone more or less unnoticed in this respect, despite their apparent use of at least three

---

[☆] In accordance with the phonological context, the quality of final unstressed vowels in the Abruzzese dialect of Arielli varies somewhat between a schwa and a high front vowel. In the orthographic transcription of examples we therefore variously represent final vowels as '-e' and '-i'.

[*] Corresponding author. Tel.: +31 071 527 2186.
E-mail addresses: r.dalessandro@hum.leidenuniv.nl (R. D'Alessandro), anl21@cam.ac.uk (A. Ledgeway).

[1] Much of Rizzi's (1997) sketch of the left periphery is already informally mapped out in Benincà's (1988) descriptive overview of the Italian left periphery. It is also worth recalling that Chomsky (1977) posited a TOPIC position above COMP.

[2] For an overview, see Ledgeway (2010). For individual studies, see, among others, Benincà (1983, 1994, 1996, 2001, 2003, 2006), Munaro (1999, 2003, 2004, 2010), Poletto (2000, 2003, 2005), Munaro and Poletto (2002), Chinellato and Garzonio (2003), Ledgeway (2003a, 2005, 2007, 2008, in press), Paoli (2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2005, 2007, 2010), Benincà and Poletto (2004), Garzonio (2004), Poletto and Zanuttini (2003), Cruschina (2006, 2008, 2010), Damonte (2006, in press), Hart and Ledgeway (2008), Mensching and Remberger (2010), Remberger (in press), Vecchio (2010).

distinct finite complementizers (*ca*, *chi* and *ocche*), often displaying multiple PF spell-outs within the left periphery. In what follows we shall investigate finite complementation in Abruzzese with the aim of testing current assumptions about the structural architecture of the C-domain to see to what extent they can explain the superficially puzzling distribution of the apparent triple series of complementizers employed in the dialects of eastern Abruzzo.[3] In particular, we shall see that our analysis of the Abruzzese data will provide some interesting evidence for the assumption of different types of head-movement operation through the left periphery affecting various types of complementizer.

While a richly articulated conception of the left periphery is demonstrated to provide a simple and elegant explanation for the various forms and distribution of the two Abruzzese complementizers *ca* and *chi*, with some interesting evidence for the assumption of different types of head-movement operation through the left periphery, the same set of structural assumptions are shown to run into severe difficulties when applied to the supposed third Abruzzese complementizer *ocche*. Rather, evidence will be adduced to demonstrate that this element is best viewed, not as a complementizer, but as a T-element lexicalizing modal features associated with the embedded verb.[4] This is an important finding since it demonstrates how a fine structural interpretation of the C-domain can lead to novel and enlightening analyses of traditional categories, even those traditionally assigned to the complementizer class, in this case uncovering a striking parallel in the complementation systems of Abruzzese and southern Calabrian dialects (Ledgeway, 1998; Damonte, 2009, in press). At the same time, the analysis highlights how current cartographic assumptions about the fine structure of the C-domain do not necessarily have to be directed towards, or lead to, the discovery of new functional categories and/or candidates for their lexicalization but, rather, can be profitably exploited to throw light on the structure of the T-domain without the postulation of additional functional structure.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the basic distributional facts regarding *ca*, *chi* and *ocche*. Section 3 provides a theoretical analysis of the core *ca* vs *chi* alternation and the interaction of these with topics and foci, highlighting how the complementizer status of these two elements proves problematic when applied to *ocche*. Section 4 undertakes an in-depth investigation and analysis of *ocche* clauses, demonstrating first that *ocche* cannot be considered a complementizer and concluding with a survey of extensive evidence in support of the view that *ocche* should be considered a T-element. Section 5 provides some concluding remarks.

2. Abruzzese complementizers: the basic facts

2.1. 'Ca' and 'chi'

On a par with the other dialects of southern Italy (Rohlfs, 1969:190, 1983; Ledgeway, 2005, 2006, 2009:§4.3), the unmarked or default complementizer employed in declarative contexts with propositional complements in Abruzzese is *ca* (< QU(I)A):

(1) a.   Penze **ca** Marje ve'   sicuramende
          I-think *ca* Maria comes.indic. surely
          'I think that Maria will definitely come'

     b.   M'   a   ditte **ca** ti   dole   li   pide
          me= he-has said *ca* to-you= ache.indic. the feet
          'He told me that your feet hurt'

As will be explored in greater detail below, unlike in most standard Romance varieties *ca* is not limited to a single occurrence per clause but, significantly, can also be repeated within the left periphery to delimit the borders of topicalized or focalized phrases, according to a pattern quite widely attested within various Italo-Romance varieties (Paoli, 2002, 2003a,b, 2005; Ledgeway, 2003a:§4.3.2.2, 2005:380–389, 2010:§4.3; Damonte, 2006; Vincent, 2006; Vecchio, 2010):

(2) Ji so ditte **ca** dumane, a Urtone, gni lu zie,   **ca** nin gi da'   ji
     I   am said *ca* tomorrow to Ortona with the uncle *ca* not there= must.indic. to-go
     'I told him that tomorrow he shouldn't go to Ortona with his uncle'

Such repetition of the complementizer typically (but not exclusively) obtains when, as in (2) above, two or more topicalized or focalized phrases co-occur and/or when the fronted phrase(s) involved are particularly heavy. Intuitively, then, in examples

---

[3] In what follows, our discussion will focus predominantly on the eastern Abruzzese dialect of Arielli (province of Chieti) and, where specified, some other neighbouring varieties. Unless otherwise stated, in what follows Abruzzese should be understood to refer specifically to the Ariellese dialect.

[4] It is not our aim in this paper to argue either in favour or against a cartographic approach to the functional architecture of the sentential core but, rather, to adduce original evidence to incontrovertibly show that *ocche* is situated within the sentential core (T-domain) and not the left periphery (C-domain), as has been incorrectly assumed in the past. Ultimately, the evidence that we adduce is compatible with (and neutral with respect to) both cartographic and non-cartographic approaches to clause structure, something which we view as a strength of the proposed analysis, inasmuch as the distinction proves entirely orthogonal to the question under discussion. In what follows we therefore deliberately adopt a neutral position, referring to *ocche* as a T(-related) element, which, if desired, may be understood in more fine-grained cartographic analysis to lexicalize a modal head within this T-field such as Cinque's (1999) MoodP_{Irrealis}.

such as (2) the multiple occurrences of *ca* would appear, to all intents and purposes, to function as a form of topic marking, serving to clearly demarcate the topic field sandwiched between both occurrences of *ca* (cf. also Ledgeway, 2003a:§4.3.2.1, 2005:383), although the realization of the lower complementizer always proves optional in these cases, witness (3)[5]:

(3)   Ji   so   ditte   **ca**   dumane,   a   Urtone,   gni   lu   zie,   nin   gi   da'   ji
     I   am   said   *ca*   tomorrow   to   Ortona   with   the   uncle   not   there=   must.indic.   to-go

Now, alongside *ca* Abruzzese also boasts a second complementizer *chi* (< QUID). In most other dialects of southern Italy where a reflex of QUID is attested, it is generally found, according to Rohlfs (1969:190), 'after verbs expressing desire or intention' and hence in complementary distribution with *ca* which is 'used after declarative verbs' (see also Manzini and Savoia, 2005:I, 464). In short, the dialects of southern Italy thus typically mark a Balkan-style distinction in the complementizer system between declarative and epistemic predicates that select for a propositional complement introduced by *ca* on the one hand and volitional and future-oriented predicates that select for an irrealis complement headed by *che/chi* on the other. Examples such as (4), where *chi* heads a clause denoting an event that is unrealized at the time of speaking, would therefore seem to suggest that Abruzzese *chi* is also licensed in irrealis contexts:

(4)   Jè   mmeje   **chi**   ti   sti   zitte
     it-is   better   *chi*   yourself=   you-stand.indic.   quiet
     'You'd better keep quiet'

However, a closer examination of a wider selection of examples soon reveals that Abruzzese *chi* cannot be assimilated *tout court* to its irrealis counterparts found more widely in the South. For instance, it cannot introduce complement clauses selected by *vulé* 'to want' (cf. 5a), despite the latter's archetypal irrealis reading:

(5)   Vuje   **ca** /*** chi**   ve'
     I-want   *ca*   *chi*   he-comes.indic.
     'I want him to come'

Similarly, *chi* is excluded from the irrealis complements to the negated predicate *nin penze* 'I don't think' in (6), where once again it is replaced by the complementizer *ca*:

(6)   Nin   penze   **ca** /*** chi**   li   vo'   fa
     not   I-think   *ca*   *chi*   it=   he-wants.indic.   to-do
     'I don't think he wants to do them'

Given the distribution of *chi* (and its variant *che*) in other southern dialects, evidence such as (5)–(6) might lead one to hypothesize a diachronic spreading of *ca* in Abruzzese as the generalized default complementizer to the detriment of earlier *chi* (cf. the generalization of *ca* in many southern dialects discussed in Rohlfs, 1983:152–154; Leone, 1995:66 n.157; Ledgeway, 2000:70–74, 2009:7–9). However, frequent and still productive examples of *chi* such as those in (7a–d) clearly invalidate this hypothesis:

(7)   a.   Po   esse   **chi**   va   accuscì
          it-can   to-be   *chi*   it-goes.indic.   thus
          'It might be okay as you say'

     b.   Avaste   **chi**   ti   sti   zitte
          it-suffices   *chi*   yourself=   you-stand.indic.   quiet
          'You just have to keep quiet'

     c.   Je   ore   **chi**   la   smitte
          it-is   hour   *chi*   it=   you-stop.indic.
          'It's time you stopped'

---

[5] Another context in which *ca* is frequently employed, which will not be explored further here due to space limitations (though see also footnote 8), is its use in root contexts to introduce rhematic clauses like (i), where it serves in some sense as a presuppositional marker, the implication here being, for example, that the interlocutor should not worry, as the speaker has no intention of coming to his house:

(i)   **Ca**   n'   gi   venghe   a   la   casa   te!
     ca   not   there=   I-come.indic.   to   the   house   your
     'Don't worry, I've no intention of coming to your place'

d. Je   mmeje **chi** ji   lisse   caccose
    it-is better *chi* to-him= you-leave.indic. something
    'It's better to leave him something'

As we have already seen in (5)–(6), however, the irrealis reading cannot be the sole determinant of *chi* in (7a–d). Comparing (5)–(6) with (7a–d), one might be tempted to conclude that Abruzzese *chi* appears in conjunction with impersonal predicates. However, this hypothesis is immediately contradicted by the following counterexamples:

(8) a. Je   lu   vere **ca** li   vo   fa
         it-is the truth *ca* it= he-wants.indic. to-do
         'It's true that he wants to do it

     b. Je   nnormale **ca** fa   lu   calle
         it-is normal   *ca* it-does.indic. the heat
         'It is normal that it is hot'

To sum up, *chi* appears in some irrealis contexts and in some impersonal clauses, but not in others. Moreover, in certain environments *chi* alternates with *ca*, as shown by the contrast between (7d) and (9):

(9) Je   mmeje **ca** dumane, a Urzogne, la   schidine, nni li   juche
     it-is better *ca* tomorrow at Orsogna the pools   not it= you-play.indic.
     'You'd better not play the pools tomorrow at Orsogna'

The correct generalization would then appear to be that the complementizer *chi* is exclusively licensed in unselected irrealis clauses (cf. 4, 7a–d), hence excluded in both selected irrealis clauses (cf. 5–6) and in unselected realis clauses (cf. 8a–b) where it is uniformly replaced by *ca*. Now these facts find a straightforward explanation if we assume, following Ledgeway (2003a, 2005), that in the dialects of southern Italy the encoding of realis and irrealis modal features on the lowest C-head Fin° is overtly spelt out at PF in the morphological distinction between the two complementizers QU(I)A > *ca* and QUID > *che/chi*, respectively. As illustrated by Ledgeway, for many early southern dialects, as well as Damonte (2006) and Vecchio (2010) for a number of modern Salentino varieties, movement of the complementizer from C-Fin° to a higher left periphery position, typically an intermediate Foc° or Top° head or the highest Force° head, often results in a distinct morphological form of the complementizer in its higher spell-out position. For instance, in Old Salentino the underlying realis complementizer *ca* (cf. 10a) and subjunctive complementizer *cu* (cf. 11a) are both realized as *che* whenever they occur with a topicalized or focalized phrase (cf. 10b, 11b), suggesting that in these cases the feature bundles resulting from movement from Fin° to Force°, for example, are associated with a specific phonomorphological spell-out (for discussion, see Ledgeway, 2003a:§4.3.1).[6] Indeed, the correctness of this analysis is confirmed by frequent examples like that in (12) where, in the presence of a heavy topic, both higher and lower complementizer positions are simultaneously spelt out in their distinct PF-realizations:

(10) a. vi   dicu **ca** deu lu farà
         you= I-tell *ca* God it= will-do
         'I tell you that God will do it'

     b. dicimu **che** in questo mundo no v'   à   nullo largo   homo
         we-say *che* in this   world not there= has.indic. no   generous man
         'we say that in this world there are no generous men'

(11) a. illu volce **cu** nuy sappessemu [...]
         he   wanted *cu* we knew.subj.
         'he wanted us to know'

     b. vole   **che** de la gracia che t'   à   facta tu la ricognoschi da   lui
         he-wants *che* of the favour che you= he-has.indic. done you it= recognise   from him
         'he wants you to repay him for the goodwill he has shown you'

---

[6] The technical implementation of the idea that the complementizer is morphologically spelt-out in a different form in the course of the derivation in accordance with the different positions its targets within the C-space relies on a Distributed Morphology analysis (Halle and Marantz, 1993), in which only semantic and formal features are merged into syntactic trees. Consequently, lexical insertion (and hence the distinction between individual words) only occurs later in the derivation during the phonological computation following the readjustments of the morphological component (for further discussion, see Ledgeway, 2005:205 n.38).

(12)   vedé   **che** si illo non avesse lo   consilho de Sidrac, **ca** illu non potea   nulla   fare

      he-saw *che* if he   not had   the advice   of Sidrac *ca* he   not could.indic. nothing   do.inf

      'he realized that, if he did not receive Sidrac's advice, he could not do anything'

Applying this same analysis to the Abruzzese data, we can suppose that here too the Fin° head may be spelt out at PF as *ca* (realis specification) or *chi* (irrealis specification), but with the difference that in complement clauses where Force° is directly selected by a matrix predicate (Rizzi, 1997), Fin° must invariably be realized together with Force° (formally this can be implemented by assuming either Fin-to-Force raising or merger of a syncretic Force-Fin head). In this variety, the resultant complex feature bundle, irrespective of the underlying modal specification of Fin°, is invariably spelt out as *ca*, thereby obscuring in many contexts an 'underlying' *chi* (cf. 5–6). However, whenever the specification of Force° is not directly selected, as happens in unselected contexts such as subject clauses, Fin° remains *in situ* and it is precisely in these cases that its modal specification is spelt out distinctly at PF as *ca* (viz. realis; cf. 8a–b) or *chi* (viz. irrealis; cf. 7a–d).[7,8] This, in turn, explains the presence of *ca* in the irrealis subject clause in (9) above because here Fin° has had to raise through the left periphery to Force° to license the Topic field (cf. also 2 above), whereupon the complex feature bundle is once again spelt out at PF as *ca*, thereby obscuring an 'underlying' *chi*.

Indeed, this analysis finds support in the observation that, on a par with the Old Salentino example in (12), it is also possible in examples like (9) to simultaneously spell out the lower first-merge position of the complementizer in Fin°, in which case it surfaces, not insignificantly, at PF as *chi* (crucially the opposite order *chi*...*ca* is never attested):

(13)   Je   mmeje **ca** dumane,   a Urzogne, la   schidine, **chi** nni li   juche

      it-is better *ca* tomorrow at Orsogna the pools   *chi* not it= you-play.indic.

      'You'd better not play the pools tomorrow at Orsogna'

2.2. Ocche

We now turn to the main focus of this study, namely jussive and optative clauses. Unlike the other dialects of southern Italy, Abruzzese (together with some Molisan dialects) is reported (cf. Savini, 1881:180; Ledgeway, 2000:284–285 n.7) to present in this marked modal context a third complementizer *ocche* (with diatopic variants *occhi*, *accò* and *ccò*). This complementizer, which is apparently derived from a shortened form of *VOLET > (v)ò 's/he wants' + QUID > che (Rohlfs, 1969:182–183), is specialized in marking both jussive (cf. 14a) and optative (cf. 14b) modality:

(14)   a.   Dije   **ocche** zi   li   magne   tutte quande

            tell=him *ocche* self= them= eats.indic. all   as-many

            'Tell him to eat them all up'

      b.   Si li vo'   fa'   **ocche** li facce

            if it= he-wants to-do *ocche* it= he-do.subj.

            'If he wants to do it, let him do it'

---

[7] This view finds further support in a subset of root clauses introduced by an overt complementizer (cf. also footnote 6 above), where once again the realis (cf. i.a) vs irrealis (cf. i.b) distinction surfaces in the form of the unselected complementizer *ca* vs *chi*, respectively:

(i)   a.   **ca**   nin chische
        ca   not you-fall.indic.
        'Don't worry, you're not falling/going to fall'

    b.   **chi** nin chische
        chi   not you-fall.indic.
        'Mind you don't fall!'

[8] It is also interesting to note that clauses selected by nominal predicates behave differently, insofar as the realis (*ca*) vs irrealis (*chi*) distinction does surface in the form of the complementizer, witness the revealing minimal pair in (i.a–b):

(i)   a.   M'   a   vinute lu   dubbje **ca** n' avesse   successe caccose
        me= has come the doubt *ca* not had.subj.3sg. happened something
        'I was struck by the doubt that something (which was supposed to happen) hadn't happened'

    b.   M'   a   vinute lu   dubbje **chi** n' avesse   successe caccose
        me= has come the doubt *chi* not had.subj.3sg. happened something
        'I was afraid that something had happened'

We take this preliminary evidence to indicate that complements to nominal predicates, unlike those to verbal predicates, do not project the Force° position (cf. similar assumptions standardly made about bridge verbs), hence the overt realis-irrealis distinction spelt out in the form of the complementizer under Fin°. We leave this aspect of Abruzzese complementation for future research.

Interestingly, there would seem to be a tendency in all dialects of southern Italy to retain distinct marking for jussive and optative modality, as witnessed by the fact that the morphological (imperfect) subjunctive, which has all but been jettisoned in most southern dialects, is exceptionally retained precisely in jussive and optative clauses (Rohlfs, 1969:69; Ledgeway, 2003b:§2.4; 2009:504, 509–511), witness the following Neapolitan and Calabrian (Cosentino) examples in (15)–(16), respectively:

(15) a. Dincéllo   ca **venesse**   ambressa ambressa
          tell=it=him   ca he-come.subj.   at-once   at-once
          'Tell him to come at once'

      b. Papà **dicesse** tutto chello che vò,   ma io…
          dad say.subj. all   that that he-wants but I
          'Let dad say all he likes, but I…'

(16) a. m'   a   lassatu dittu ca **turnassa**   a ra casa
          me= he-has left   said that I-return.subj. to the house
          'He left me a message that I should return home'

      b. Ca   i   **spinnassa**   ri sordi si idda unn i   vo
          that them= he-spend.subj. the money if she not them= wants
          'Let him spend his money if doesn't want it'

By contrast, in these same contexts Abruzzese (and Molisan) dialects allow, apparently indifferently, both the indicative or the (imperfect) subjunctive,[9] as (17) illustrates:

(17) ò cchə lə **mann**   /**mannèss**
      ocche   it= he-sends.indic. /he-send.subj.
      'Let him send it' (Giammarco, 1968–85:1370)

It would therefore appear that the dialects of southern Italy present two, in part, complementary ways of marking jussive and optative modality, namely through (imperfect) subjunctive verb morphology (the vast majority) and/or a specialized complementizer *ocche* (Abruzzese and Molisan dialects).

3. Complementizer positions and the fine structure of the left periphery

Above we have argued that in Abruzzese the differing modal specification of the lowest C-related head Fin° is correlatively marked at PF in the surface form of the complementizer, namely *ca* [−irrealis] vs *chi* [+irrealis]. Additionally, we have seen that in selected contexts, viz. complement clauses, selection of the relevant force specification requires the Force° and Fin° heads to be realized syncretically as a single head through Fin-to-Force movement, a movement operation which is spelt out at PF in the undifferentiated form of the complementizer *ca* [±irrealis] (cf. 18a, 19a), as further witnessed by the fact that in both realis (cf. 18b) and irrealis (cf. 19b) clauses *ca* always precedes any fronted topics or foci:

(18) a. M'   a   ditte [$_{ForceP}$ **ca** [$_{FinP}$ ~~ca~~ [$_{TP}$ ve'   sicuramende]]]
          me= he-has said   *ca*   he-comes.indic. surely

      b. M'   a   ditte [$_{ForceP}$ **ca** [$_{TopP}$ sicuramente [$_{FinP}$ ~~ca~~ [$_{TP}$ ve']]]]
          me= he-has said   *ca*   surely   he-comes.indic
          'He told me that (surely) he will come (surely)'

(19) a. Vuje [$_{ForceP}$ **ca** [$_{FinP}$ ~~chi~~ [$_{TP}$ ve'   dumane]]][10]
          I-want   *ca*   he-comes.indic. tomorrow

---

[9] With some highly irregular verbs such as *fa'* 'to do, make', even residues of the present subjunctive are occasionally found such as *facce* 'he do' in (14b) above.

[10] For expository simplicity, in this and subsequent examples we represent the first-merge position of the complementizer as *chi*, although it must be understood that the semantic and formal features first merged in the Fin° head in this and similar examples are not associated with any morphophonological features at this point in the derivation, in that lexical insertion is assumed to be a late PF process (cf. footnote 7).

b.   Vuje [ForceP **ca** [TopP DUMANE [FinP **chi** [TP ve']]]]
      I-want   *ca*   tomorrow   he-comes.indic
      'I want him to come tomorrow'

By contrast, when Force° is not selected, as is systematically the case in subject clauses, there is no Fin-to-Force movement and Force° and Fin° are realized as independent heads, giving rise to the [−irrealis] vs [+irrealis] morphological distinction on the complementizer (cf. 20a–b) found more widely in many other southern dialects:

(20)   a.   Je   nnormale [ForceP Ø [FinP **ca** [TP ti   sti   zitte]]]
            it-is normal   *ca*   yourself= you-stand.indic. quiet
            'It's normal that you should remain silent'

       b.   Je   ore [ForceP Ø [FinP **chi** [TP ti   sti   zitte]]]
            it-is hour   *chi*   yourself= you-stand.indic. quiet
            'It's time you kept quiet'

However, in the presence of a topic or a focus the complementizer merged in Fin° must raise to Force°, a movement operation which is morphologically reflected in the form *ca* overtly assumed by the irrealis complementizer spelt out in this higher position (cf. 21). Simplifying somewhat, here we follow Ledgeway (2003a:§4.3.2.1, 2005:§4.4.2.1) in assuming Fin-to-Force movement to be required in these cases in order to activate the Topic-Focus fields, the heads of which Fin° licenses when it passes through TopP and FocP *en route* to Force°.[11]

(21)   Je   mmeje [ForceP **ca** [TopP dumane, [TopP a Urzogne, [FinP **chi** [TP ci   ve'
       it-is better   *ca*   tomorrow   at Orsogna   there= he-comes.indic.
       'He'd better come to Orsogna tomorrow'

Turning now to jussive and optative clauses, we observe here that, unlike *ca* and *chi* which we have seen may often raise to Force° where they come to precede topics and foci, *ocche* appears to invariably surface at the lower edge of the left periphery, presumably in Fin°, witness its position to the immediate right of the clitic left-dislocated topic *la machine* 'the car' in (22):

(22)   Ji   so ditte (***ocche***) la   machine **ocche** zi   la pije
       to-him= am said *ocche*   the car   *ocche* self= it= he-takes.indic.
       'I told him to take the car'

Nevertheless, just like *ca* and *chi* (cf. 2, 13), the jussive/optative complementizer *ocche* may also co-occur with a higher complementizer *ca* when the Topic or Focus fields are activated (cf. 23a). However, differently from *ca* and *chi*, in such cases *ocche* may co-occur with as many as two higher complementizers (cf. 23b):

(23)   a.   So   priate   Ddi, **ca**, si cullù vinge li   lizziune, **ocche** facce   cascà
            I-am   prayed   God *ca* if he   wins the elections *ocche* he-make.subj. to-fall
            lu   guverne
            the   government

       b.   So   priate   Ddi, **ca**, si cullù vinge li   lizziune, **c' ocche** facce   cascà
            I-am   prayed   God *ca* if he   wins the elections *c' ocche* he-make.subj. to-fall
            lu   guverne
            the   government
            'I asked God, if he wins the elections, to bring down the government'

Above we argued that such complementizer doubling in realis (cf. 2) and irrealis (cf. 13) clauses is the result of Fin-to-Force movement with multiple PF-realization of the lowest and highest copies, ultimately a reflex of a parsing process licensed by the interpretive requirements of the computational system. In short, the lowest copy of the complementizer left in Fin° (or perhaps in Top° or Foc°; see Ledgeway, 2005:§4.2.2.2) is exceptionally spelt out at PF to isolate the Topic/Focus spaces from the embedded I-space, as shown by the fact that such examples typically involve multiple topics and foci and/or

---

[11] There is considerable evidence from other languages such as Saramaccan and the Kwa language family that the Top° and Foc° heads can be lexicalized by specific topic and focus particles (Aboh, 2004, 2006). A plausible assumption then is that languages might differ as to how they license these functional heads in terms of first merge (Saramaccan, Kwa languages) vs move (southern Italian dialects). As expected, in the former case complementizer and topic/focus particles are formally distinct, but are homophonous ~~in~~ the latter case.

'heavy' (viz. structurally complex) constituents (e.g. embedded relatives, topicalized clauses). In the general case, economy considerations of the PF component ensure that lower copies remain phonetically null, but can be exceptionally overridden in examples like these by requirements of the LF component which license the overt PF-realization of the lower copy in order to unambiguously demarcate the margins of the Topic/Focus fields with respect to the embedded I-space and, thereby, facilitate the parsing of the overall sentence (for detailed discussion of the possibility of multiple spell-out of lower copies in non-trivial chains, see Nunes, 1999).

Returning now to the examples in (23a–b), the above interpretation of the multiple spell-out of realis and irrealis complementizers is not readily available. By way of example, consider the ungrammaticality of the following sentence:

(24)   *Ji   so   ditte   **ca** la   machine, ~~ocche~~ zi   la   pije
        to-him=   I-am   said   *ca* the   car   self= it=   he-takes.indic.
        'I told him to take the car'

If we were to claim that the higher complementizer(s) in (23a–b) were also the overt spell-out of the lowest complementizer *ocche* as it raises through the left periphery to Force°, then we should also expect the lowest copy (i.e. first-merge position) of the complementizer to be able to remain phonetically null, especially in the presence of a 'non-heavy' or single topic/focus, on a par with the realis (cf. 18b) and irrealis (cf. 19b) complementizers. Yet, the ungrammatical status of (24) in which only the highest copy in Force°, but not its first-merge position in Fin°, is given PF-realization, shows that *ca* cannot be simply interpreted as a distinct PF-realization of *ocche* once raised to Force°. Rather, evidence like this suggests that *ca* and *ocche* must, at some level of representation, be considered separate elements, since the jussive/optative modal value of such clauses can only be licensed if Fin° is lexicalized by *ocche*,[12] irrespective of whether or not Force° is simultaneously lexicalized (cf. 22). It follows therefore that in (23a–b) the occurrences of *ca* and *c'* cannot represent simple higher spell-outs of the lower *ocche*. In what follows, we shall consider detailed evidence to establish the proper relationship, derivational or otherwise, of *ca*, *c'* and *ocche* in examples such as (23a–b).

4. Ocche-clauses

4.1. Ocche a complementizer?

Above we noted how, in the presence of fronted topics or foci, *ocche* may co-occur with a complementizer *ca* (henceforth ca_1) lexicalizing the higher Force° head (cf. 25a), as well as with an intermediate complementizer *c'* in some lower position (cf. 25b). It seems natural to interpret this intermediate complementizer as an elided form of *ca* (henceforth ca_2), as confirmed by examples like (25c) where *ocche* occurs in its negated form *nocche* (see section 4.2.3) and the intermediate complementizer now surfaces in its non-elided form *ca*:

(25) a.   Ji   so   ditte   **ca** la   machine **ocche** zi   le   pije
           to-him=   I-am   said   *ca* the   car   *ocche*   self= it=   he-takes.indic.

      b.   Ji   so   ditte   **ca** la   machine **c' ocche** zi   le   pije
           to-him=   I-am   said   *ca* the   car   *c' ocche*   self= it=   he-takes.indic.
           'I told him to take the car'

      c.   Ji   so   ditte   **ca** la   machine **ca nocche** zi   le   pije
           to-him=   I-am   said   *ca* the   car   *ca nocche*   self= it=   he-takes.indic.
           'I told him not to take the car'

What then is the position of ca_2 in (25b–c)? Clearly, the answer to this question presupposes a proper understanding of the position and function of *ocche*. Hitherto we have been assuming, in accordance with the traditional view (cf. Savini, 1881:80; Rohlfs, 1969:182–183; Tekavčić, 1980:441–446; Ledgeway, 2000:284–285 n. 7), that *ocche* is a complementizer and, in particular, on the basis of evidence like (22) the lexicalization of the lowest C-related head Fin°. Accordingly, as noted above, ca_2 cannot be the spell-out of a higher copy of *ocche*, since the latter always has to be spelt out at PF, whereas the PF-realization of lower traces is only licensed in exceptional circumstances including, as we have already seen, to demarcate the Topic-Focus fields from the embedded I-space. We are forced to conclude therefore that ca_2 must occupy a position between the Topic-Focus fields and Fin°.

4.1.1. C'ocche: ca_2 a topic/focus marker?

One possibility then is to interpret ca_2 in examples like (25b–c) as a topic/focus marker first-merged in the head of Top° or Foc° which licenses a topicalized or focalized constituent in its associated specifier, hence the observed order Topic/Focus

---

[12] This explains the grammatical, though irrelevant, declarative reading of (24), namely 'I told him that he is taking the car'.

+ ca_2. On first appearance, this possibility would seem a plausible solution since it is the case that ca_2, together with ca_1, only shows up when the left periphery hosts one or more topicalized or focalized constituents, but is never licensed when the Topic-Focus fields remain inactive, witness (26):

(26)   *Ji   so   ditte **c' ocche** zi   le   pije
        to-him= I-am said   *ca ocche*   self= it=   he-takes.indic.
        'I told him to take it'

Accordingly, in examples like (25b–c) we would have to recognise a complementizer ca_1 in Force°, alongside of a homophonous topic marker ca_1 in Top°, and a jussive complementizer *ocche* in Fin°:

(27)   …Force° Top°   Fin°…
        ca_1 ca_2 *ocche*

Such an analysis strikes us as highly unsatisfactory and implausible, inasmuch as it fails to capture the empirical observation that Force° and Top°/Foc° have identical formal realization, hence are very likely to be one and the same item. However, under this analysis postulating two or more different lexical items with different functions but the same phonological form simply remains an unexpected and otherwise inexplicable oddity. Intuitively, it would seem more natural to treat both occurrences of *ca* in examples like (25b–c) as derivationally related. Indeed, given the optionality of ca_2, which we have seen is a typical property of lower copies, we would be forced into the contradiction of saying that ca_2 is a topic marker first-merged in Top°, but that a higher copy of it ends up in the head of Force°, a typical complementizer position. This seems a rather unnatural conclusion since we have already adduced independent evidence in relation to examples like (21) above to show that TopP and FocP can be activated, and hence licensed, by raising through their head positions the complementizer first-merged in Fin° on its way up to Force°. There seems then little motivation for postulating a further *ad hoc* licensing mechanism of Top° and Foc°, especially when the supposed topic/focus marker involved happens to share the same form as the complementizer that fulfills this same function through Fin-to-Force movement.

4.1.2. C'ocche: ca_2 a complementizer?

We have seen in the previous section that if ca_2 is taken to be a topic/focus marker lexicalizing Top°/Foc°, this amounts to saying that it is not a complementizer and that there are therefore at least two different lexical items that share one phonological form. We noted instead that the alternative and preferred analysis is to view ca_2 as a complementizer which raises from Fin° to Force°, (optionally) leaving an overt copy in Top° or Foc°. If ca_2 is a complementizer, then two possible analyses of (25b–c) present themselves: either ca_2 sits in Fin° together with *ocche* giving rise to a syncretic head *c'ocche*, or ca_2 sits in an additional Fin-related projection. According to Rizzi (1997), Fin° specifies the modality and/or finiteness of the clause, hosting such items as the Italian infinitival complementizer *di* 'of' and, according to Poletto (2001), marked modal verb forms such as the subjunctive in Italian complementizer deletion contexts. Not by accident, in many recent analyses the Fin° head has also often been termed Mood° (see, for example, Rivero, 1994; Krapova, 2001; Roussou, 2000, 2001; Roberts and Roussou, 2003:77ff.), a designation entirely in accord with Rizzi's (1997) original assumptions which also identify Fin° as the locus of potential mood distinctions within the C-system. Also significant in this respect is Vincent's (1998:151–152) conclusion that mood and finiteness should be ultimately understood as subparts of a single grammatical category (see also Miller, 2002:1, 68–69). While Vincent claims that finiteness and mood are *in* the same category, he admits that they represent two different subparts of it. This ultimately entails that finiteness and mood are not the same thing. One could go about this claim in two ways, either by maintaining that finiteness and mood are two features of one functional head, which would amount to claiming that *ca* and *ocche* are merged together syncretically in a single Fin° head (viz. *cocche*), or by maintaining that there exist two Fin-related heads (viz. *c'ocche*), which encode finiteness and mood features separately. Below we explore what the consequences of these two assumptions would be.

4.1.2.1. Split-Fin°.

If ca_2 and *ocche* lexicalize different projections, we are forced to conclude that ca_2 sits in an additional Fin-related projection situated within the lower C-space between Top°/Foc° and *ocche*. This amounts to claiming that information about tense and mood canonically assumed to be syncretically encoded in the Fin° head can be scattered across two distinct heads (cf. Giorgi and Pianesi's (1997) Feature Scattering Principle), just as tense and mood are frequently assumed to be distributed across several projections in the I-domain (Cinque, 1999). Let us then hypothesize the existence of two different Fin-related heads, here informally labelled as Fin-T° and Fin-Mood°, which mirror and replicate in a more rudimentary nature Cinque's Tense and Mood fields in the I-domain. *A priori* this approach would predict, and immediately allow us to understand, the co-occurrence of the two lower complementizers, ca_2 (albeit in its elided form *c'*) in Fin-T° marking the finite [+tensed] state of the embedded clause, and *ocche* spelling out its [+optative] modal specification in Fin-Mood°. If this is correct, then (25b–c) will have the structure in (28):

(28)   …Force° Top°/Foc°   Fin-T°   Fin-Mood°…
        ca_1 ca_2 *ocche*

Some considerations are in order here. The first concerns the relation between ca_1 and ca_2: how are they related to each other and are they related to each other at all? We observed above that ca_2 is optional, suggesting that it is linked to ca_1 and, in all probability, represents its lower copy, a PF residue of Fin-to-Force movement. However, this analysis completely fails to explain why ca_2 may only appear if the left periphery also simultaneously hosts a topicalized or focalized constituent. More specifically, if ca_2 were a finiteness complementizer lexicalizing the higher of the two Fin-related heads and overtly marking the [+tensed] feature of the embedded clause, then we should expect it to be able to surface in all jussive and optative clauses, irrespective of the presence or otherwise of topics and foci. Contrary to fact, however, the availability of the split-Fin structure posited here appears to be intimately tied to the activation of the Topic-Focus fields, witness the ill-formedness of examples like (29)[13]:

(29) *Dije   **c' ocche** l'   allave   la   machine
      tell=him   *ca ocche* it=   he-washes.indic.   the   car
      'Tell him to wash his car'

Rather, the ungrammaticality of examples like (29) highlights the *ad hoc* nature of the split-Fin analysis being explored here, inasmuch as the relevant scattering of the Tense and Mood features is inexplicably permitted and required just in those cases where the Topic-Focus fields host a fronted topic and/or focus. Moreover, it is not clear why it is the *ocche* complementizer (cf. 30a), rather than ca_2 (cf. 30b), which surfaces whenever the feature scattering option is not available and a single syncretic Fin° head is realized:

(30) a.   Dije   **ocche** l'   allave   la   machine
            tell=him *ocche*   it=   he-washes.indic.   the   car

      b.   *Dijje   **ca** l'   allave   la   machine
            tell=him *ca*   it=   he-washes.indic.   the   car
            'Tell him to wash the car'

Another problem with the split-Fin analysis considered here is that it fails to account for the fact, to be discussed in greater detail in section 4.2.1, that material can occur between the two Fin-related heads, as seen in (31) where the embedded subject *Marije* intervenes between ca_2 and *ocche*. A left-dislocated topicalized interpretation of *Marije* can be immediately ruled out in (31), since the Topic field is situated to the left of ca_2, here represented by the if-clause introduced by *si*. Although the two postulated Fin° heads can presumably project associated specifier positions, it is not at all clear what modal feature this canonical subject is able or needs to check by apparently raising to the specifier of Fin-MoodP.

(31) Je   so   ditte   **ca** si nin funzione la   machine **ca** <u>Marije</u> **ocche** le   porte
      to-him= I-am   said ca_1 if not works   the   car ca_2 Maria   *ocche* it= she-takes.indic.
      a   lu   meccaniche
      to   the   mechanic
      'I told him that, if her car won't work, that Maria should take it to the mechanic'

Finally, to our knowledge, no other cases or evidence of a split-Fin structure have been reported in the literature, despite the vast amount of research carried out on the fine structure of the C-domain in recent years. This observation, which *a priori* weakens the robustness of any potential crosslinguistic appeal of a split-Fin structure, also highlights a serious danger inherent in many current approaches to clause structure which simplistically interpret overt surface lexicalizations of functional categories as robust evidence for the postulation of new functional projections. As this Abruzzese example of the discontinuous expression of the complementizer acutely demonstrates, such a superficial approach can often raise more problems than it is intended to solve, since there is no one-to-one correspondence between bundles of features and particular functional heads.

4.1.2.2. Syncretistic Fin°. Finally, we must consider the possibility that ca_2 and *ocche* in examples like (25b–c) instantiate a syncretic Fin° head *c'ocche* (or better *cocche*), simultaneously encoding both finiteness (viz. [+tensed]) and mood (viz. [+optative]). In this case, the fine structure of the left periphery of examples like (25b–c) would be as in (32):

(32)   …Force Top Fin…
          ca_1 ca_2 + *ocche* (=*c'ocche*)

This idea finds some initial support in the existence of some other Abruzzese dialects such as Ortonese and Chietino (see also Rohlfs, 1969:183), where the equivalent of Ariellese *ocche* is always spelt out as *cocche* (orthographically also *ch'ô cche*), even in the absence of topics or foci:

---

[13] Note incidentally that the ungrammaticality of (29) remains constant, irrespective of whether *c'* is assumed to lexicalize its first-merge position Fin-T° or a derived position in Force°.

(33) a. Li   biscutte **cocche** zi   li   magne
          the   biscuits   *cocche*   self= them=   he-eats.indic.
          'May he eat the biscuits (if he wants)!'

      b. dijjə   **ch' ô cch**ə   sə   nə   vajə
          tell=him *cocche*   self= therefrom= he-goes.indic.
          'Tell him to leave'

      c. le   rré dicə **ch'ô cch**ə jə   faccə   parlà   lu   serpèndə
          the king says   *cocche*   him= he-make.subj. to-speak the snake
          'the king orders that he should have the snake talk to him'

Although no doubt derived historically from the univerbation of *c'* and *ocche*, synchronically we can conclude that in these varieties the structure of the jussive/optative complementizer has been lexicalized in the now non-decomposable form *cocche*, ultimately the realization of a simplex Fin° head. As such, the erstwhile ca_2 of *cocche* (namely, *c-* < *ocche*) is no longer available to raise alone to Force° over a fronted Topic or Focus stranding *ocche* in Fin° (cf. 33a), as appears to be the case in Ariellese (cf. 25). Indeed, as a single head, nothing can possibly break up the erstwhile subcomponents of *cocche* in these varieties.

In Ariellese, by contrast, the facts are quite different and hence the syncretic head analysis of *c'ocche* (namely, *cocche*) runs into severe problems. Firstly, as noted in relation to examples (25c) and (31) above, *c'ocche* can indeed be split up by intervening material including negation (…*ca* **n'***ocche*…) and subjects (…*ca* **Marije** *ocche*…), a possibility entirely incompatible with the syncretic head analysis. Secondly, given the optionality of ca_2, which we know typically surfaces in the presence of one or more heavy topicalized or focalized constituents as the PF residue of the operation Fin-to-Force movement, we would be forced to conclude that under the Agree relation Force° probes just the relevant finiteness [+tensed] feature on the Fin° head. Consequently, *c'* alone may raise to Force° without pied-piping of the [+irrealis] feature, with the result that *ocche*, the latter's PF spell out, remains stranded *in situ* in the head of FinP. The singular assumptions associated with this analysis just sketched are, however, somewhat striking. While it is unproblematic to assume that the T and Mood features on Fin° are unbundled and hence able to enter Agree individually rather than an as a composite feature bundle, the analysis relies on a level of substructure below the head (X°) level being visible and accessible to the narrow syntax in order to enable a subpart of the morphological structure of the syncretic Fin° head, namely *c'* [+tensed], to undergo Move. In short, this amounts to a form of excorporation, albeit of a subhead, although excorporation is generally excluded under standard minimalist assumptions (see, however, Roberts, forthcoming). Even assuming this syncretic Fin° head analysis to be correct, it begs the question why the same analysis is not available to neighbouring dialects like Ortonese and Chietino where the appropriateness of analysing *cocche* as a syncretic Fin° head is beyond all doubt. Structurally, there is an unmistakable difference between Ortonese/Chietino *cocche* on the one hand and Ariellese *c'ocche* on the other, inasmuch as the former displays all the hallmarks of a simplex lexical item, ultimately the lexicalization of a single head position, whereas the latter still appears to behave as two separate lexical items distributed across two heads.

Finally, interpreting *c'ocche* as a single syncretic head *cocche* fails to make any sense of the empirical observation that ca_2 is excluded from the lexical structure of the jussive/optative complementizer if the Topic-Focus fields remain inactive (cf. 34a). In such cases, *ocche* is the sole form available (cf. 34b). This is a surprising result since, all things being equal, the lexical structure of the jussive/optative complementizer should remain constant, since in all cases it is invariably merged in the Fin° head.[14]

(34) a. *Ji   so   ditte **c'ocche** le   mette   a   lu   garagge la   machine
          to-him= I-am   said   *c'ocche*   it=   he-puts.indic. to   the garage   the car

      b. Ji   so   ditte **ocche**   le   mette   a   lu   garagge la   machine
          to-him= I-am   said   *c'ocche*   it=   he-puts.indic. to   the garage   the car
          'I told him to put the car in the garage'

---

[14] A similar argument comes from the partially complementary distribution of *ocche* and *c'ocche*. If *c'ocche* were a syncretic head (viz. *cocche*), then we should expect it to occur not just in selected contexts (cf. i.a), but also in unselected contexts (cf. i.b), contrary to fact:

(i) a. j'   a   ditte a soreme   ca si zi li   vule'   uarda' **c'**ocche zi   li   uardeve
        to-her= he-has said to sister=my ca if self= him= wanted to-watch *c'ocche* self= him= she-watched.indic.
        'he told my sister that if she wanted to watch him then she should watch him!'

    b. (***c'**)ocche li dice   si li vo'   dice
        c'ocche   it= he-says.indic. if it= he-wants to-say
        'May he say it if he wants to!'

Undoubtedly, these facts point to *c'* in *c'ocche* as still independently behaving as a complementizer, since its distribution proves sensitive to the [±selected] distinction.

4.1.3. Summary

Above we have demonstrated that the traditional assumption that *ocche* is a (lower) complementizer is not directly supported by its interaction with the distribution of the higher complementizer *ca*, irrespective of whether it surfaces in its lower first-merge (ca_2) or higher derived (ca_1) positions. In particular, we have highlighted how a fine structural analysis of the left periphery, combined with a dynamic model of feature scattering/bundling on functional heads with fluid instantiations across different functional heads and differing PF-realizations, as exemplified in the asymmetric lexicalization of the higher and lower complementizers *c' + ocche*, fails to explain the Abruzzese facts. Revealing in this respect is the observation that a split-CP analysis of the left periphery has been shown to fail to accommodate the full range of elements traditionally assumed to belong to the Abruzzese left periphery but, rather, has profitably led us to question the continued appropriateness of considering *ocche* a lower complementizer. In short, what has clearly emerged from the discussion above is that if *ocche* is still assumed to be a (lower) complementizer, then there are not sufficient positions in the higher portion of the C-domain to accommodate all the attested instances and combinations of *ca*.

4.2. Ocche: a T-element

Following the conclusions of the preceding section which have underlined the inappropriateness of the traditional classification of *ocche* as a complementizer, in what follows we shall demonstrate how *ocche* is more appropriately viewed as a T-element, a conclusion reinforced by a comparison with the genuine complementizer *ca*. These preliminary assumptions are represented schematically in (35), where the hierarchical ordering makes a number of predictions about the surface linear order in both *ca*- and *ocche*-clauses which we can test directly here.

(35) $[_{CP}$ Force°-ca_1...Top°/Foc°...Fin°-ca_2 $[_{TP}$ SUBJ Neg° T-*ocche*...$[v$-VP...$]]]$

4.2.1. Subject positions

Let us begin by considering subject positions. Under the traditional assumption that *ca* is a complementizer, from any of its positions in the C-domain in (35) $ca_{1/2}$ is straightforwardly predicted to precede its clausal subject in SpecTP, as borne out by (36a). This same line of reasoning, however, throws up a non-trivial problem with the traditional complementizer analysis of *ocche* which, by contrast, can never precede a canonical preverbal subject (cf. 36b):

(36)   a.   spere   <u>ca</u>   dumane   (<u>ca</u>)   **esse** /**Gianne**   ve
                I-hope   *ca*   tomorrow   *ca*   he   /Gianni   comes.indic.
                'I hope that tomorrow he/Gianni will come'

        b.   *so   ditte   <u>ocche</u>   **esse** /**Gianne**   l'   accatte
                I-am   said   *ocche*   he   /Gianni   it=   buys.indic.
                'I said that he/Gianni should buy it'

Rather, the subject either precedes *ocche* (cf. (a) examples below) or occurs in postverbal position sentence-finally (cf. (b) examples below) in accordance with the differing pragmatic values of the utterance. As in Italian (Lepschy and Lepschy, 1994:146; Benincà, 1988:119, 168–170; Salvi, 1988:54), the unmarked order of the subject in thetic sentences is postverbal with unaccusatives (cf. 37b) but preverbal with transitives (cf. 38a) and unergatives (cf. 39a). The opposite order, by contrast, obtains when the subject carries a marked pragmatic interpretation such as contrastive focus.

(37)   a.   so   ditte   **Gianne**   ocche   ci   vaje
                I-am   said   Gianni   *ocche*   there=   goes.indic.

        b.   so   ditte   ocche   ci   vaje   **Gianne**
                I-am   said   *ocche*   there=   goes.indic.   Gianni
                'I ordered that Gianni go there'

(38)   a.   so   ditte   **Gianne**   ocche   llave   cchiù   ppinne
                I-am   said   Gianni   *ocche*   washes.indic.   more   clothes

        b.   so   ditte   ocche   llave   cchiù   ppinne   **Gianne**
                I-am   said   *ocche*   washes.indic.   more   clothes   Gianni
                'I ordered that Gianni do some more washing'

(39)   a.   so   ditte   **Gianne**   ocche   fatije   di   cchiù
                I-am   said   Gianni   *ocche*   works.indic.   of   more

> b. so   ditte ocche fatije   di cchiù **Gianne**
>   I-am said *ocche* works.indic. of more Gianni
>   'I ordered that Gianni work more'

In short, the superficial evidence reviewed here would suggest that *ocche* is not a complementizer but, rather, must be situated in some position below the subject in SpecT. However, we still need to rule out the possibility that in the (a) examples above *Gianne* is not in some left-peripheral position, since a topicalized or focused reading of the subject would prove entirely compatible with *ocche* lexicalizing the lower complementizer position Fin°. Indeed, topicalized (cf. 40a) and focused (cf. 40b) non-subject constituents may occur before *ocche*:

(40) a. Je   so   ditte ca **la machine** <u>ocche</u> zi   le   pije
          to-him= I-am said *ca* the car   *ocche* self= it= he-takes.indic.
          'I told him that he should take the car'

      b. Je   so   ditte ca LA MACHINE <u>ocche</u> zi   pije,   nno la   vespe
          to-him= I-am said *ca* the car   *ocche* self= he-takes.indic. not the vespa
          'I told him that he should take the car, not the vespa'

However, evidence like that in (41a–e) suggests that the position immediately preceding *ocche* corresponds to SpecTP rather than a left-peripheral position:

(41) a. Je   so   ditte ca **la machine** c' ocche zi   li   pije
          to-him= I-am said ca_1 the car ca_2 *ocche* self= it= he-takes.indic.
          'I told him to take the car'

      b. so   ditte ca, si ni funzione la machine, ca **Gianne** ocche le   porte
          I-am said ca_1 if not works   the car ca_2 Gianni *ocche* it= takes.indic.
          a   lu   meccaniche
          to the mechanic
          'I said that, if the car won't work, Gianni should take it to the mechanic'

      c. *Je   so   ditte ca, si ni funzione, ca **la machine** ocche le   porte
          to-him= I-am said ca_1 if not works ca_2 the car   *ocche* it= takes.indic.
          a   lu   meccaniche
          to the mechanic
          'I told him that, if it won't work, he should take the car to the mechanic'

(41a) shows an example of a left-dislocated topic *la machine* 'the car' sandwiched between two complementizers, ca_1 in Force° and ca_2 in Fin°. Incontrovertible proof that ca_2 actually lexicalizes the lowest complementizer position Fin° and *ocche* a position within the I-space is provided by the grammaticality contrast between the following two examples: whereas the embedded subject *Gianne* can be placed between ca_2 and *ocche* in (41b), the left-dislocated object *la machine* (or any other non-subject constituent for that matter) cannot occur in this same position in (41c). Crucially, this demonstrates that the position immediately above *ocche* but below ca_2 is not a left-peripheral position but, rather, a dedicated subject position, namely SpecTP.[15] It follows from these considerations that *ocche* is not a complementizer, but a T-element. Consequently, the ungrammaticality of *ocche* + Subject + V sequences like (36b) is exactly parallel to the general ungrammaticality of sequences of Aux + Subject + V in declaratives in modern standard Romance (cf. It. *l'ha Gianni comprato lit. 'it=has Gianni bought').

---

[15] Also significant in this respect is the behaviour of bare quantifiers like *nisciune* 'nobody', which can occur in both canonical preverbal subject positions (SpecT) as well as in left-peripheral focus-fronted positions (SpecFoc). As expected, *nisciune* can therefore substitute a canonical subject like *Gianne* in (41b) situated between ca_2 (Fin°) and *ocche* (T°; cf. i.a), as well as occur between ca_1 (Force°) and ca_2, (Fin°; cf. i.b), in which case it can only receive the expected contrastively focused reading:

(i) a. So   ditte ca, si ni funzione la machine, ca **nisciune** ocche le   porte   a   lu   meccaniche
         I-am said ca_1 if not works   the car ca_2 nobody   *ocche* it= takes.indic. to the mechanic
         'I said that, if the car doesn't work, that nobody should take it to the mechanic

     b. So   ditte ca NISCIUNE c' ocche le   porte   a   lu   mecchaniche
         I-am said ca_1 nobody ca_2 *ocche* it= takes.indic. to the mechanic
         'I said that NOBODY should take it to the mechanic'

4.2.1.1. Indefinite subject 'nome'. The sole exception to our observation above that subjects can never follow *ocche* is provided by the indefinite pronoun *nome* '(some)one, people' (Rohlfs, 1968:232; Hastings, 1994; D'Alessandro and Alexiadou, 2006), witness examples like (42):

(42) Ocche ce **nome** va
      ocche there someone goes.indic.
      'Let people go'

The exception, however, is only apparent. As an indefinite 'weak' subject (in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke, 1999; Cardinaletti, 2004), D'Alessandro and Alexiadou (2006) argue that *nome* targets a lower position in the clause than SpecTP, a 'weak subject' position they associate with SpecAgrSP following Cardinaletti (2004) and Beghelli and Stowell (1997).[16] Direct evidence for this claim comes from the observation that whereas *nome* precedes lexical verbs (cf. 43a), which do not raise to T° in Ariellese (cf. section 4.2.2), it invariably follows temporal, aspectual and modal auxiliaries (cf. 43b), as well as object clitic pronouns (cf. 43c), that all target a T-related position:

(43) a. Alloche **nome** <u>magne</u> bbone
          there one eats.indic. good
          'One eats well there / The food is good there'

      b. Alloche <u>a</u> **nome** magnite bbone
          there has.indic. one eaten good
          'One ate well there / The food was good there'

      c. Alloche <u>le</u> **nome** magne
          there them= one eats.indic.
          'One eats them there / They are eaten there'

We conclude then that rather than support the complementizer status of *ocche*, the order *ocche* + *nome* actually provides further support for our claim that *ocche* is a T-related element.

4.2.2. Verb positions

According to the structure in (35), if *ocche* lexicalizes a T-related position, then its associated verb cannot raise to T°, but must sit in a lower position. In embedded clauses headed by *ca*, by contrast, no such restriction on the position of the embedded verb is expected since the T° position is not otherwise lexicalized. To test these predictions, let us then consider the position of the verb in relation to the various adverb positions posited by Cinque (1999), who identifies two syntactic spaces, a Higher Adverb Space (HAS) hosting 'higher sentence adverbs' such as *fortunately* and *usually*, and a Lower Adverb Space (LAS) hosting 'lower pre-VP adverbs' such as *always* and *well*. We begin by considering the position of the verb in root clauses and embedded clauses introduced by *ca*:

(44) a. (penze ca) (***tutte**) je <u>diche</u> **tutte** [*v*-VP…
          he-thinks *ca* all to-him= I-tell.indic. all
          '(he thinks that) I tell him everything'

      b. (penze ca) ji (***bbone**) <u>stire</u> **bbone** [*v*-VP…
          he-thinks *ca* I good iron.indic. good
          '(he thinks that) I iron well'

      c. (penze ca) ji (**sembre**) li <u>cande</u> (**sembre**) [*v*-VP… ssi canzune
          he-thinks *ca* I always them= sing.indic. always these songs
          '(he thinks that) I always sing these songs'

      d. (penze ca) Marje (**ggià**) li <u>cunesceve</u> (**ggià**) [*v*-VP…
          he-thinks *ca* Mario already them= he-knew.indic. already
          '(he thinks that) Mario already knew them'

---

[16] Note that in Chomsky (1992), by contrast, AgrSP is assumed to occur above TP, whereas Cinque (1999:110-115) assumes it can be freely generated on top of any of the functional projections within the IP area (see also Cardinaletti, 2004:146).

    e.   (penze   ca) ji ne (**manghe**) li   <u>sacce</u>   (**manghe**) [$_{v\text{-VP}}$...quisse

        he-thinks *ca* I not-even   them= knew.indic. not-even   these

        '(he thinks that) I don't even know them'

The ungrammaticality of (44a–b) with the adverbs in preverbal position highlights that in Abruzzese the finite lexical verb must vacate the *v*-VP complex raising at least above the lowest adverbs of the lower pre-VP adverb space, witness its position to the left of the (plural) completive aspectual projection (AspP$_{\text{PlCompletive}}$), here lexicalized by *tutte* 'everything, and all lower functional projections including, for example, VoiceP represented here by the manner adverbial *bbone* 'well'. In general, finite lexical verbs raise then at the very least to positions immediately above the functional projection which hosts (unstressed) *tutte* 'everything', but can target a variety of positions within the higher portion of the lower pre-VP adverb space delimited to the left by presuppositional adverbial negators (cf. Italian *mica*), as the variable position of the verb with respect to AspP$_{\text{Perfect}}$ (*sembre* 'always'), TP$_{\text{Anterior}}$ (*ggià* 'already') and Neg1P$_{\text{Presuppositional}}$ (*manghe* 'not even') in (44c–e) illustrates. It would appear then that, unlike languages such as French where finite lexical verbs always raise to the highest T-related functional position within the HAS where they come to precede all higher sentence adverbs (Belletti, 1990:44–45; Cinque, 1999:11–13), finite lexical verbs in Abruzzese display relatively low V-movement to the LAS below the T-field on a par with what has been noted for other southern Italian dialects (Ledgeway and Lombardi, 2005).

Turning now to *ocche*-clauses, the relevant facts are given in (45):

(45)   a.   Ocche (***tutte**) <u>facce</u>   **tutte cose**, si li vo   fa

        ocche all   he-does.subj. all-things   if it= he-wants to-do

        'Let him do everything, it that's what he wants!'

    b.   Ocche (***bbone**) li   <u>stire</u>   **bbone**

        ocche good   it= he-irons.indic. good

        'May he iron them well!'

    c.   Si ssa canzone ji   piace,   ocche (***sembre**) le <u>cande</u>   **sembre**

        if this song   to-him= pleases *ocche* always   it= he-sings.indic. always

        'If he likes this song, then may he always sing it!'

    d.   Marje ocche (***ggià**) le <u>prepare</u>   **ggià**   [$_{v\text{-VP}}$... 'ntante ca   ve   cullù

        Mario *ocche* already them=   prepares.indic. already   while   that comes that-one

        'Let Mario prepare them already while he's on his way'

    e.   N' ocche (?**manghe**) li <u>penze</u>   **manghe** quesse [$_{v\text{-VP}}$...

        not *ocche* not-even   it= he-thinks.indic. not-even this

        'May he not even think it!'

The contrast between (44) and (45) immediately highlights how the position of the finite lexical verb is not the same in *ocche*-clauses and root/*ca*-clauses. In *ocche*-clauses the finite verb must raise not only above AspP$_{\text{PlCompletive}}$ (cf. 45a–b), but also to the left of all lower pre-VP adverbs contained in the LAS (cf. 45c–d), including the presuppositional adverbial negator *manghe* situated at the leftmost edge of the LAS (cf. 45e). In short, the evidence of (45a–e) squarely places the finite lexical verb within the HAS, albeit below *ocche*.[17] This higher movement of the modally-marked verb is not at all peculiar to Abruzzese, but has also been observed for Salentino (cf. 46; Hart, 2006:§2) and Calabrian (cf. 47b; Ledgeway, 2009:12–14), where the otherwise generalized low V-movement to the LAS (cf. (a) examples) gives way to a higher movement within the HAS in subjunctive-style clauses (cf. (b) examples):

(46)   a.   (tice   ca) l'Anna   (**già**)   u   <u>sapia</u>   (**già**)

        he-says that the-Anna already it= knew.indic. already

        '(he says that) Anna already knew'

---

[17] Although it is not generally possibly to test higher speaker-oriented adverbs like 'perhaps' and 'frankly' in these contexts on account of their pragmatico-semantic incompatibility with the specific modal reading of *ocche* clauses, it is possible to test an adverb like the deictic temporal adverb *allore* 'then, at that time'. As the example in (i) illustrates, while *allore* can occur to the right of *ocche*, it cannot occur between *ocche* and the verb. These facts confirm then the claim in the text that the verb exceptionally raises to a high position within the IP-space in *ocche* clauses (although the position of *allore* to the left of *ocche* remains ambiguous, as it could equally be interpreted as occurring *in situ* in the higher IP-area or in a left-peripheral topicalized position).

i. je   so   ditte **allore** ocche (***allore**) li face'

   to-him= I-am said then   *ocche* then   it he-did.indic.

   'I told him to do it then'

b.   speru   cu (*già) u   <u>sape</u>   già

     I-hope *cu* already it= he-knows.indic. already

     'I hope that he already knows'

(47) a.   (dicia   ca) chiri   (**sempe**) si   <u>vidanu</u>   (**sempe**)

     (he-says that) those-ones always   selves= see.indic. always

     '(he says that) they always see one another'

     b.   vo   chi chiri   (*sempe) si   <u>vidanu</u>   sempe

     he-wants *chi* those-ones always   selves= they-see.indic. always

     'he wants them to always see one another'

Whatever the correct theoretical interpretation of this apparently robust pattern of modally-driven higher V-movement in the dialects of southern Italy, the data might seem *a priori* incompatible with the idea that *ocche* lexicalizes a T-head, since the finite lexical verb also appears to raise to a high position. Superficially, then, the higher position assumed by the finite lexical verb could be taken to suggest that *ocche* actually sits in a C-related position above the finite verb raised to T°. This possibility, however, can be immediately ruled out by at least two considerations.

Firstly, we have already seen in section 4.2.1.1 that the indefinite weak pronoun *nome*, which targets a AgrP below TP, precedes finite lexical verbs (cf. 43a) but follows auxiliaries (cf. 43b). On the non-controversial assumption that auxiliaries lexicalize a T-related head, the obligatory position of the finite lexical verb to the right of *nome*, including in *ocche*-clauses (cf. 48a–b), must locate it in the lower portion of the HAS, but not in T°:[18]

(48) a.   Ji   so   ditte ocche nome   <u>magne</u>

     to-him= I-am said   *ocche* someone eats.indic.

     'I told him that one should eat / that there should be food'

     b.   Dije   ocche le   nome   <u>facce</u>

     tell=to-him *ocche* it= someone does.subj.

     'Tell him that someone should do it / that it should be done'

Secondly, *ocche*-clauses are incapable of hosting all types of functional predicate, including perfective auxiliaries (cf. 49a), modals (cf. 49b–c) and aspectuals (cf. 49d–e):

(49) a.   *Ji vulé   ocche l'   avesse   fatte

     I   wanted *ocche* it= he-had.subj. done

     'I wanted him to have done it'

     b.   *Ocche puzza   murì

     ocche you-may.subj. to-die

     'Would that you could die!'

     c.   *Ocche vuja   jucà   a   ccarte

     ocche you-want.subj. to-play at cards

     'Would that you would want to play cards!'

     d.   *Ocche sta   a magnà quand' arrive ji sinnò   j'   ammene!

     ocche he-is.indic. to to-eat when arrive I otherwise him= I-hit

     'May he be eating when I get there, otherwise I'll give him a hiding'

     e.   *Ocche va   magnenn li   lupine a   la   feste

     ocche he-goes.indic. eating   the lupines at the party

     'May he eat lots of lupines at the party'

The ungrammaticality of the examples in (49) finds an immediate explanation: if the T° head is already lexicalized by *ocche*, then it cannot simultaneously host a functional predicate, since this would be competing for the same

---

[18] The verb's failure to raise to a T(ense) head in *ocche* clauses can be straightforwardly related to the usual assumption that subjunctive clauses lack (deictic) Tense.

position.[19] However, under the traditional complementizer analysis of *ocche*, the ungrammaticality of the examples (49) simply remains mysterious.

4.2.3. Position of negation

Turning now to the position of negation, according to the structure in (35) the expected order of negation in conjunction with a true complementizer is COMP + Neg, a prediction indeed borne out for *ca* (cf. 50a), but not for *ocche* (cf. 50b):

(50)   a.   M'   a   ditte <u>ca</u> **nni** vvi'
            me= he-has said   *ca*   not   come.indic.
            'He told me that you are not coming'

       b.   **n**<u>ocche</u>   li   dice   si   nni li   vo'   dice
            neg-*ocche* it= he-says.indic. if   not   it= he-wants to=say
            'May he not say it if he doesn't want to!'

Of course, the initial position of negation in *nocche* (orthographically also *n'ocche*) could be taken to support the traditional complementizer status of *ocche*. Following the seminal work of Rizzi (1997), the C-system is commonly held to replicate, albeit in a more rudimentary fashion, a number of core featural distinctions of the I-system, variously marking in accordance with parametric variation such categories as negation (cf. Basque negative complementizers; Laka, 1990). On this view, Abruzzese *nocche* could be viewed as the lexicalized negative counterpart of a complementizer *ocche*, much along the lines of the Latin complementizer pair UT/NE. Alternatively, *nocche* – or better *n'ocche* – could be analysed as the lexicalization of two distinct C-related functional heads, namely Neg° (*ni > n'*) and Fin° (*ocche*).

However, we have reviewed considerable evidence above to exclude the possibility that *ocche* can be a considered a C-element, demonstrating instead that it must be situated within the T-field. Indeed, the order Neg + *ocche* is entirely in line with this analysis. In particular, we follow Zanuttini (1997) in assuming two positions for preverbal negators, a higher position NegP1 situated above TP and a lower position NegP2 situated below TP, a hypothesis robustly supported by the Abruzzese data. Thus, alongside the predominant order Neg + *ocche* + V in which the negator *ni* is merged in NegP1 above *ocche* merged in T° (cf. 51a), we also find (especially among younger speakers) the order *ocche* + Neg + V (cf. 51b) in which we take *ni* to have been merged in NegP2:

(51)   a.   Diche ca   si   ni   li   vo   fa',   [$_{NegP1}$ **n'** [$_{TP}$ ocche li facce]]
            I-say   that if   not it=he-wants do.inf   not   *ocche* it=he-does.subj.

       b.   Diche ca   si   ni   li   vo   fa',   [$_{TP}$ ocche [$_{NegP2}$ **ni** li facce]]
            I-say   that if   not it=he-wants do.inf *ocche*   not it=he-does.subj.
            'I say that if he doesn't want do it, then let him not do it'

Clearly, the analysis of *ocche* as a T-element offers an elegant solution to the facts in (51a–b), deriving the variable behaviour of negation in conjunction with *ocche* in a principled fashion from independently argued differences in negation positions, whereas under a complementizer analysis of *ocche*, the facts in (51a–b) would require us to do make additional assumptions about distinct negation projections situated in the C- and T-domains.[20]

---

[19] As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, the same result can be obtained within a cartographic approach by assuming that *ocche* raises to various T-related positions within the higher IP area, thereby blocking the lexicalization of all types of functional predicate within this same area.

[20] Interestingly, two anonymous reviewers point out that the negation facts analysed here are also amenable to an alternative analysis according to which negation is merged in a low position in the clause within a layered NegP containing four distinct negation projections from which different classes of negator can then raise to, or Agree with, corresponding functional projections situated higher in the clause to license their different surface positions and/or interpretations (cf. Poletto, 2008). According to this typology, as a member of the class of negators consisting of *n* + vowel the Abruzzese negator *ni* should, as with all such negators of this class in Romance, invariably raise to the highest Neg1 position. Consequently, the apparent variable position of the negation in (51a–b), according to the reviewers, is to be seen as reflex of *ocche* moving from T to Mood thereby crossing over *ni*. Appealing though this may be, we believe that the analysis in the text is superior. First, the proposed alternative, while apparently explaining the variable position of the Abruzzese negator *ni*, does this at the cost of introducing the *ad hoc* assumption that in the speech of younger speakers *ocche* raises from T° to Mood, but not in the speech of older speakers. In short, the resolution of one (apparent) problem is done at the expense of creating a new problem centred on the otherwise unmotivated distinction between movement or not of *ocche* from T° to Mood. Second, the data on negative splitting have, to date, all been based on northern Italian dialects where there is rich crossdialectal evidence for various types of negator and possible associated positions, whereas southern dialects do not appear to offer any such evidence (and hence have not been discussed in the relevant literature); it is not immediately obvious that an analysis of negation for northern dialects is appropriate for the dialects of the South (for further evidence along these lines in relation to negation doubling and tripling in Afrikaans and Brazilian Portuguese, see Biberauer, 2007, 2008; Biberauer and Cyrino, 2009). Essentially, the split negation approach assumes that different Neg positions correspond to different pragmatico-semantic interpretations, hence the rejection of our analysis of (51a–b) where the same negator is argued to occur in different positions without any difference in meaning (see also Cinque, 1999:122–126 for arguments and evidence that NegP can be freely generated on top of a number of functional projections within the T-domain).

4.2.4. Co-occurrence of 'ca' and 'ocche'

Finally we briefly note that the structural representation in (35) above also provides an immediate and straightforward explanation for the otherwise problematic assumption that Abruzzese apparently allows the concatenation of three complementizers (viz. *ca...ca...ocche*). Now, according to (35) such strings only consist of two complementizers (viz. *ca...ca*), whereas *ocche* realizes a T-related head, a structural conclusion which allows us at the same time to understand many of the apparent complementizer properties of *ocche* observed above if we interpret these, following Chomsky (2007, 2008), to be a reflex of a mechanism of feature inheritance/transmission from the phase head C° to T°.

At the same time, we now have a principled explanation for the presence or otherwise of *ca* in conjunction with *ocche* (viz. (*ca...(ca))...ocche*), as well as being able to explain the impossibility of omitting *ocche* in jussive/optative clauses (viz. *ca...* (*ocche*); cf. 21): whereas there is rich crosslinguistic evidence for the non-pronunciation of complementizers including, among others, English *that* (Rizzi, 1990), German *daß* (Vikner, 2005), Italian *che* (Poletto, 2001; Giorgi and Pianesi, 2004) and Salentino *cu* (Hart and Ledgeway, 2008; Ledgeway, in preparation), it is distinctly unusual for T-elements to be involved in such (PF-)deletion processes. It follows without further stipulation that a true complementizer such as Abruzzese *ca* is amenable to omission, but a T-element such as *ocche* is not.

4.2.5. Summary

In the above discussion we have adduced evidence to support the hypothesis that Abruzzese *ocche* is situated in the I-domain, in particular an overt spell-out of a jussive or optative feature on T°, and consequently not comparable to canonical Romance complementizers. The facts which have led us to this conclusion are summarized in (52):

(52) a. (*ca* +) subject/*non-subject + *ocche*

  b. *ocche* + *nome*

  c. **ocche* + Aux

  d. (Neg +) *ocche* (+ Neg)

  e. *ca* (+ *ca*) + *ocche*

  f. *ca* *(+ *ocche*)

5. Conclusion

The complementation system of Abruzzese has been shown to be considerably richer than that of the other dialects of the Upper South of Italy, boasting not only a dual complementizer system but also a modal subordinating particle *ocche* situated in the I-space. Thus, while in one respect Abruzzese appears to be a perfectly well-behaved dialect of the Upper South of Italy in its use of a dual complementizer system, in another it parallels the southern Calabrian dialects of the Extreme South of Italy in its use of the jussive/optative subordination marker *ocche*, identical in many respects to the southern Calabrian irrealis subordination marker *mu* (with variants *ma* and *mi*). Just like *ocche*, *mu* has been argued by Ledgeway (1998) and Damonte (2009, in press) to be a T-element, rather than a complementizer, and hence shares with Abruzzese *ocche* numerous striking properties (cf. Ledgeway, 1998:23–32), including the orders Subject + *mu* and Neg + *mu* (e.g. **no**mmu; cf. Abruzzese **no**cche), the ability to co-occur with a complementizer (e.g. **ca/chi**...mu; cf. Abruzzese **ca**...ocche), the impossibility of PF-deletion, and a general incompatibility with modal auxiliaries.

Not only has our investigation of the Abruzzese data provided further substantial evidence to test and explore many current assumptions about the fine structure of the left periphery, including various types of head-movement operation often involving multiple PF spell-outs, but it has also brought to light a grey structural area at the C-T boundary where a number of phenomena traditionally associated with the C-domain have been shown, in the light of a nuanced interpretation of the structural architecture of the left periphery, to be more appropriately associated with the higher portion of the I-domain. This is not a surprising result given current assumptions about feature transmission and inheritance between phase heads and their complements (Chomsky, 2007, 2008), which would lead us to expect some division of labour in the marking of subordination between the C° and T° heads through a dynamic model of feature scattering with fluid instantiations across different functional heads and differing PF-realizations, as most acutely exemplified in the concatenation *ca...ca...ocche*.[21] At the same time, our analysis has demonstrated the need to exercise a healthy measure of caution in the treatment of apparently recalcitrant items such as (*c'*)*ocche*, which superficially might be taken to provide

---

[21] An anonymous reviewer remarks on the supposed anomalous nature of the analysis which permits the sole marking of subordination (in jussive and optative clauses) through lexicalization of the T° position alone by *ocche*. On the contrary, such a situation is explicitly predicted on current assumptions regarding feature transmission from the phase head C° to its complement T° and is crosslinguistically very robustly attested. For example, in Italian hortative jussives the marking of subordination can be marked through the subjunctive morphology of the verb under T° alone (cf. i.a) or both on T° through the subjunctive verb morphology and on C° through the lexicalization of the complementizer *che* 'that' (cf. i.b). Similarly, in southern Calabrian dialects irrealis subordination is generally marked on the T° head alone through lexicalization of a particle *mu/ma/mi* (Ledgeway, 1998; Damonte, 2009, in press), with no PF-realization of the C° head (cf. i.c):

robust evidence for additional functional projections but which, we have shown, can often be more effectively accommodated within existing structural assumptions.

Acknowledgements

References

Aboh, E., 2004. The Morphosyntax of Complement-Head Sequences. Clause Structure and Word Order Patterns in Kwa. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Aboh, E., 2006. Complementation in Saramaccan and Gungbe: the case of C-type modal particles. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 24, 1–55.
Beghelli, F., Stowell, T., 1997. Distributivity and negation: the syntax of each and every. In: Szabolcsi, A. (Ed.), Ways of Scope Taking. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 71–107.
Belletti, A., 1990. Generalized Verb Movement. Rosenberg & Sellier, Turin.
Belletti, A. (Ed.), 2004. Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 3. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Benincà, P., 1983. Il clitico a nel dialetto padovano. In: Cortelazzo, M., Prosdocimi, A., Vanelli, L., Zamboni, A. (Eds.), Scritti linguistici in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini. Pacini, Pisa, pp. 25–35.
Benincà, P., 1988. L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate. In: Renzi, L., Salvi, G. (Eds.), Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione. Vol. I: La frase. I sintagmi nominale e preposizionale. Il Mulino, Bologna, pp. 129–194.
Benincà, P., 1994. La sintassi dei clitici complemento nelle lingue romanze medievali. In: Benincà, P. (Ed.), La variazione sintattica. Studi di dialettologia romanza. Il Mulino, Bologna, pp. 213–245.
Benincà, P., 1996. La struttura della frase esclamativa alla luce del dialetto padovano. In: Benincà, P., Cinque, G., De Mauro, T., Vincent, N. (Eds.), Italiano e dialetti nel tempo. Saggi di grammatica per Giulio C. Lepschy, Bulzoni, Rome, pp. 23–43.
Benincà, P., 2001. The position of Topic and Focus in the left periphery. In: Cinque, G., Salvi, G. (Eds.), Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 39–64.
Benincà, P., 2003. Strane e misteriose somiglianze sintattiche fra le antiche varietà italiane. In: Marcato, G. (Ed.), Italiano. Strana Lingua? Unipress, Padua, pp. 235–245.
Benincà, P., 2006. A detailed map of the left periphery of medieval Romance. In: Zanuttini, R., Campos, H., Herberger, E., Portner, P. (Eds.), Negation, Tense, and Clausal Architecture: Crosslinguistic Investigations. Georgetown University Press, Georgetown, pp. 53–86.
Benincà, P., Poletto, C., 2004. Topic, focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In: Rizzi, L. (Ed.), The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 2. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 52–75.
Biberauer, T., 2007. A closer look at negative concord in Afrikaans. Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus 35, 1–51.
Biberauer, T., 2008. Doubling and omission: insights from Afrikaans negation. In: Barbiers, S., Koeneman, O., Lekakou, M., van der Ham, M. (Eds.), Microvariations in Syntactic Doubling. Emerald, London, pp. 103–140.
Biberauer, T., Cyrino, S., 2009. Negative developments in Afrikaans and Brazilian Portuguese. Paper presented at the 19th Colloquium on Generative Grammar. University of the Basque Country, Vitoria-Gasteiz.
Cardinaletti, A., 2004. Toward a cartography of subject positions. In: Rizzi, L. (Ed.), The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 2. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 115–165.
Cardinaletti, A., Starke, M., 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: on the three grammatical classes. In: van Riemsdijk, H. (Ed.), Clitics in the Languages of Europe. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 145–233.
Chinellato, P., Garzonio, J., 2003. La particella 'o' in due varietà di toscano: un'analisi di interfaccia tra sintassi e pragmatica. In: Marcato, G. (Ed.), Italiano. Strana Lingua? Unipress, Padua, pp. 305–309.

(i) a. [$_{CP}$ Ø [$_{TP}$ Non si **ripeta**!]]
                    not self= repeat.3sg.subj.
     b. [$_{CP}$ **Che** [$_{TP}$ non si **ripeta!**
             that   not self= repeat.3sg.subj.
         'Let it not happen again!'

(ii) vogghiu [$_{CP}$ Ø [$_{TP}$ **mi** scrivi   u bigghiettu]]
      I-want   *mi* he-writes.indic. the note
      'I want him to write the note'

To these examples we can also add the well-documented case of those Salentino dialects (Hart and Ledgeway, 2008; Ledgeway, in preparation) that regularly permit the non-pronunciation of the subjunctive complementizer *cu* 'that', with marking of irrealis subordination encoded solely on the T° head through the *raddoppiamento* ('consonantal lengthening') exhibited by the raised verb (cf. iii.a), parallel in many respects to the frequent encoding of subordination in Welsh through mutation on the verb under T° alone (Roberts, 2004). Significantly, in these same Salentino dialects *cu* (namely, Fin°) has to be realized if the C-domain hosts fronted topics or foci (cf. iii.b), parallel to the realization of *ca* in conjunction with *ocche* in the presence of fronted topics and foci in Abruzzese (cf. section 4.1).

(iii) a. *ogghiu* [$_{CP}$ (**cu**) [$_{TP}$ [**kk**]*anta*]]
           I-want   cu   he-sing.indic.
           'I want him to sing'
       b. *ogghiu* [$_{CP}$ CRAI   *(*cu*) [$_{TP}$ [kk]*anta*]]
           I-want   tomorrow cu   he-sing.indic.
           'I want him to sing TOMORROW'

In short, subordination marking solely on T°, and not (exclusively) on C°, turns out to be very common crosslinguistically.

Chomsky, N., 1977. On wh-movement. In: Culicover, P., Wasow, T., Akmajian, A. (Eds.), Formal Syntax. Academic Press, New York, pp. 71–132.

Chomsky, N., 1992. A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory. Reprinted in Chomsky, N., 1995. The Minimalist Program. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 167–217.

Chomsky, N., 2007. Approaching UG from below. In: Sauerland, U., Guartner, H.-M. (Eds.), Interfaces + Recursion = Language? Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 1–29.

Chomsky, N., 2008. On phases. In: Freidin, R., Otero, C., Zubizarreta, M.-L. (Eds.), Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud. MIT Press, Cambridge Mass, pp. 134–166.

Cinque, G., 1999. Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-linguistic Perspective. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Cruschina, S., 2006. Informational focus in Sicilian and the left periphery. In: Frascarelli, M. (Ed.), Phases of Interpretation. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 363–385.

Cruschina, S., 2008. Discourse-related features and the syntax of peripheral positions: a comparative study of sicilian and other Romance languages. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge.

Cruschina, S., 2010. Fronting as focalization in Sicilian. In: D'Alessandro, R., Ledgeway, A., Roberts, I. (Eds.), Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 247–260.

D'Alessandro, R., Alexiadou, A., 2006. The syntax of the indefinite pronoun nome. Probus 18, 189–218.

Damonte, F., 2006. Complementatori e complementi congiuntivi in alcuni dialetti Sardi. In: Padovan, A., Penello, N. (Eds.), Osservazioni sul sardo (Quaderni di lavoro ASIt n. 6) Unipress, Padua, pp. 71–95.

Damonte, F., 2009. On the variation of the southern Calabrian particle mu. Paper presented at the 4th Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax Meeting, University of Cambridge, 29–30 June 2009.

Damonte, F., in press. Matching moods: mood concord between CP and IP in Salentino and southern Calabrian subjunctive complements. In: Benincà, P., Munaro, N. (Eds.), Mapping the Left Periphery. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Garzonio, J., 2004. Le frasi interrogative non-standard in fiorentino. Rivista italiana di dialettologia 28, 219–235.

Giammarco, E., 1968–1985. Dizionario abruzzese e molisano, 5 vols. Ateneo, Rome.

Giorgi, A., Pianesi, F., 1997. Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Giorgi, A., Pianesi, F., 2004. Complementizer deletion in Italian. In: Rizzi, L. (Ed.), The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 2. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 190–210.

Halle, M., Marantz, A., 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In: Hale, K., Keyser, S.J. (Eds.), The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 111–176.

Hart, V., 2006. Subject positions in Salentino cu-clauses. Unpublished MPhil thesis, University of Cambridge.

Hart, V., Ledgeway, A. 2008. Reinterpreting cu-deletion in Salentino. Paper presented at the 3rd Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax Meeting, University of Pescara, 5–6 June 2008.

Hastings, R., 1994. L'espressione del soggetto indefinito in un dialetto abruzzese. L'Italia dialettale 57, 9–34.

Krapova, I., 2001. Subjunctives in Bulgarian and modern Greek. In: Rivero, M.L., Ralli, A. (Eds.), Comparative Syntax of the Balkan Languages. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 105–126.

Laka, I., 1990. Negation in syntax: on the nature of functional categories and projections. Unpublished doctoral thesis, MIT.

Ledgeway, A., 1998. Variation in the Romance infinitive: the case of the southern Calabrian inflected infinitive. Transactions of the Philological Society 96, 1–61.

Ledgeway, A., 2000. A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy: A Minimalist Approach. Blackwell, Oxford.

Ledgeway, A., 2003a. Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: la doppia serie di complementatori. Rivista italiana di dialettologia 27, 89–147.

Ledgeway, A., 2003b. Linguistic theory and the mysteries of Italian dialects. In: Lepschy, A.L., Tosi, A. (Eds.), Multilingualism in Italy: Past and Present. Legenda, Oxford, pp. 108–140.

Ledgeway, A., 2005. Moving through the left periphery: the dual complementiser system in the dialects of southern Italy. Transactions of the Philological Society 103, 336–396.

Ledgeway, A., 2006. The dual complementiser system in southern Italy: spirito greco, materia romanza? In: Lepschy, A.L., Tosi, A. (Eds.), Rethinking Languages in Contact: The case of Italian. Legenda, Oxford, pp. 112–126.

Ledgeway, A., 2007. Old Neapolitan word order: some initial observations. In: Lepschy, A.L., Tosi, A. (Eds.), Histories and Dictionaries of the Languages of Italy. Longo, Ravenna, pp. 121–149.

Ledgeway, A., 2008. Satisfying V2 in early Romance: merge vs move. Journal of Linguistics 44, 437–470.

Ledgeway, A., 2009. Aspetti della sintassi della periferia sinistra del cosentino. In: Pescarini, D. (Ed.), Studi sui dialetti della Calabria (Quaderni di lavoro ASIt n. 9) Unipress, Padua, pp. 3–24.

Ledgeway, A., 2010. The clausal doma: CP structure and the left periphery. In: D'Alessandro, R., Ledgeway, A., Roberts, I. (Eds.), Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 38–51.

Ledgeway, A., in press. Subject licensing in CP: the Neapolitan double-subject construction. In: Benincà, P., Munaro, N. (Eds.), Mapping the Left Periphery. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ledgeway, A., in preparation. Reinterpreting cu-deletion in Salentino. University of Cambridge.

Ledgeway, A., Lombardi, A., 2005. Verb movement, adverbs and clitic positions in Romance. Probus 17, 79–113.

Leone, A., 1995. Profilo di sintassi siciliana. Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, Palermo.

Lepschy, A.L., Lepschy, G., 1994. La lingua italiana. Storia, varietà dell'uso, grammatica. Bompiani, Milan.

Manzini, M.R., Savoia, L., 2005. I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa, 3 vols. Edizioni dell'Orso, Alessandria.

Mensching, G., Remberger, E.-M., 2010. Focus fronting and the left periphery in Sardinian. In: D'Alessandro, R., Ledgeway, A., Roberts, I. (Eds.), Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 261–276.

Miller, G., 2002. Nonfinite Structures in Theory and Change. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Munaro, N., 1999. Sintagmi interrogativi nei dialetti italiani settentrionali. Unipress, Padua.

Munaro, N., 2003. On some differences between interrogative and exclamative wh-phrases in Bellunese: further evidence for a split-CP hypothesis. In: Tortora, C. (Ed.), The Syntax of Italian Dialects. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 137–151.

Munaro, N., 2004. Computational puzzles of conditional clause preposing. In: Di Sciullo, A., Delmonte, R. (Eds.), UG and External Systems. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 73–94.

Munaro, N., Poletto, C., 2002. La tipologia dei wh-in situ nelle varietà alto-italiane. Quaderni patavini di linguistica 18, 79–91.

Munaro, N., 2010. Criterial conditions for wh-structures: evidence from wh-exclamatives in northern Italian dialects. In: D'Alessandro, R., Ledgeway, A., Roberts, I. (Eds.), Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 292–311.

Nunes, J., 1999. Linearization of chains and phonetic realization of chain links. In: Epstein, S.D., Hornstein, N. (Eds.), Working Minimalism. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 217–249.

Paoli, S., 2002. Il doppio 'che' nei dialetti piemontesi. In: Marcato, G. (Ed.), La dialettologia oltre il 2001. Unipress, Padua, pp. 231–236.

Paoli, S., 2003a. COMP and the left-periphery: comparative evidence from Romance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Manchester.

Paoli, S., 2003b. Mapping out the left periphery of the clause: evidence from north-western Italian varieties. In: Quer, J., Schroten, J., Scorretti, M., Sleeman, P., Verheugd, E. (Eds.), Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2001. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 267–285.

Paoli, S., 2005. COMP: a Multi-talented category. Evidence from Romance. In: Brugè, L., Giusti, G., Munaro, N., Schweikert, W., Turan, G. (Eds.), Contributions to the XXX Incontro di Grammatica Generativa. Cafoscarina, Venice, pp. 185–202.

Paoli, S., 2007. The fine structure of the left periphery: COMPs and subjects. Evidence from Romance. Lingua 117, 1057–1079.

Paoli, S., 2010. In focus: an investigation of information and contrastive constructions. In: D'Alessandro, R., Ledgeway, A., Roberts, I. (Eds.), Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 277–291.

Poletto, C., 2000. The Higher Functional Field. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Poletto, C., 2001. Complementizer deletion and verb movement in standard Italian. In: Cinque, G., Salvi, G. (Eds.), Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 265–286.

Poletto, C., 2003. Conservazione e innovazione in alcune particelle frasali dall'italiano antico alle varietà moderne. In: Marcato, G. (Ed.), Italiano. Strana Lingua? Unipress, Padua, pp. 311–317.

Poletto, C., 2005. Sì and e as CP expletives in old Italian. In: Batllori, M., Hernanz, M.-Ll., Picallo, C., Roca, F. (Eds.), Grammaticalization and Parametric Variation. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 206–235.

Poletto, C., 2008. On negative doubling. In: Cognola, F., Pescarini, D. (Eds.), La negazione: variazione dialettale ed evoluzione diacronica (Quaderni di lavoro ASIt n. 8) Unipress, Padua, pp. 57–84.

Poletto, C., Zanuttini, R., 2003. Making imperatives: evidence from central Rhaetoromance. In: Tortora, C. (Ed.), The Syntax of Italian Dialects. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 175–205.

Remberger, E.-M., in press. Left peripheral interactions in Sardinian. In: Grohmann, K., Tsimpli, I.-M. (Eds.), Exploring the Left Periphery. Lingua 118 (special issue).

Rivero, M.L., 1994. Clause structure and verb movement in the languages of the Balkans. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 12, 63–120.

Rizzi, L., 1990. Relativized Minimality. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Rizzi, L., 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In: Haegeman, L. (Ed.), Elements of Grammar. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 281–337.

Rizzi, L. (Ed.), 2004. The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 2. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Roberts, I., 2004. The C-system in Brythonnic Celtic languages, V2, and the EPP. In: Rizzi, L. (Ed.), The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 2. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 297–328.

Roberts, I., forthcoming. Agreement and Head Movement. Clitics, Incorporation and Defective Goals. MIT Press, Cambridge Mass.

Roberts, I., Roussou, A., 2003. Syntactic Change. A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rohlfs, G., 1968. Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. II. Morfologia. Einaudi, Turin.

Rohlfs, G., 1969. Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. III. Sintassi e formazione delle parole. Einaudi, Turin.

Rohlfs, G., 1983. Distinzione di due congiunzioni in dialetti d'Italia (nel senso del latino ut e quod o quia). In: Benincà, P., Cortelazzo, M., Prosdocimi, A., Vanelli, L., Zamboni, A. (Eds.), Studi in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini. Pacini, Pisa, pp. 147–154.

Roussou, A., 2000. On the left periphery: modal particles and complementisers. Journal of Greek Linguistics 1, 65–94.

Roussou, A., 2001. Control and raising in and out of subjunctive complements. In: Rivero, M.L., Ralli, A. (Eds.), Comparative Syntax of the Balkan Languages. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 74–104.

Salvi, G., 1988. La frase semplice. In: Renzi, L. (Ed.), Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione. Volume I: La frase. I sintagmi nominale e preposizionale. Il Mulino, Bologna, pp. 29–113.

Savini, G., 1881. La grammatica ed il lessico del dialetto termano. Forni Editore, Bologna.

Tekavčić, P., 1980. Grammatica storica dell'italiano. II. Morfosintassi. Il Mulino, Bologna.

Vecchio, P., 2010. The distribution of the complementizers/ka/and/ku/in the north Salentino dialect of Francavilla Fontana (Brindisi). In: D'Alessandro, R., Ledgeway, A., Roberts, I. (Eds.), Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 312–322.

Vikner, S., 2005. Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Vincent, N., 1998. On the grammar of inflected non-finite forms (with special reference to old Neapolitan). In: Korzen, I., Herslund, M. (Eds.), Clause Combining and Text Structure, Copenhagen Studies in Language, vol. 22. pp. 135–158.

Vincent, N., 2006. Il problema del doppio complementatore nei primi volgari d'Italia. In: Andreose, A., Penello, N. (Eds.), LabRomAn: Giornata di lavoro sulle varietà romanze antiche. Università di Padova, Padua, pp. 27–42.

Zanuttini, R., 1997. Negation and Clausal Structure. A Comparative Study of Romance Languages. Oxford University Press, Oxford.