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Abstract
This paper sets out to investigate the nature and characteristics of an interesting construction where what appear to be two finite complementisers (i.e. two che) are allowed to cooccur in subordinate clauses. The purpose of the paper is two-fold. First, to offer the reader a detailed description of the construction in both its domains of existence – some north western Italian dialects and Early Romance texts – highlighting the differences and similarities. Secondly, through a comparison with a similar construction in Romanian, to throw some light on the status of the subjects found in the left periphery. Ultimately, the aim is to make a contribution to the understanding of the left periphery in the wake of Rizzi (1997), Benincà (2001) and Benincà and Poletto (2002), refining the use of the term ‘complementiser’.

1. Introduction

The combination of the recent interest in functional projections and their breaking down in syntactically and semantically different heads on the one hand, and of the recognition that the head of the Complementiser Phrase (CP) does more than simply demarcate clause boundaries on the other, has motivated the formulation of a more complex CP structure (cf. Rizzi, 1997; Benincà 2001; Benincà and Poletto, 2002). In this system the illocutionary force of the clause is encoded in the higher position, Forceº, while the lower one, Finº, is perceived as expressing modality.

In this paper I investigate an interesting construction where two che – the counterpart of the standard Italian finite complementiser – are allowed to cooccur in the same clause. This construction is observed in two north western Italian dialects, a conservative variety of Turinese and a variety of Ligurian – Tur and Lig henceforth –, and in some early Romance texts, taken from the ‘Opera del Vocabolario Italiano’ (OVI) Internet site.

The purpose of this paper is to focus on a little studied construction and provide a detailed description of its characterising features. On a more theoretical level, by comparing these varieties, the paper aims to throw some light on the function of the lower che – che2 henceforth –, the way this information is expressed through different structural strategies, on the content of the left periphery, and finally on the status of the subjects therein included.

(1) provides a sample of the construction investigated. As can be seen, in the main clause there is a verb that selects a ‘that clause’ introduced by the finite complementiser che/que. This is followed by a phrasal element which in turn is followed by a second che/que:

(1) a Gioanin a spera che Ghitin ch’ as John SCL hope.pr.3s that Margaret that SCL+rfl
nē vada Tur part go.subj.3s
‘John hopes that Margaret leaves’

b A Teeja a credda che a Maria ch’ a Teresa SCL believe.pr.3s that the Mary that SCL leave.subj.3s ‘Teresa believes that Mary will leave’

c Poi a lui promectere se fe’ che, poi ch’elli averia Isocta al re Marco menata, ch’esso tornaria a lui in sorlois, perché esso volea lui e Lancelocto insieme avere ‘And then he got promised that after having escorted Isocta to king Marco, that he would return to him in Sorlois because he wanted to have together him and Lancelocto’ (Con, 21:155, 13th c Tuscan, OVI)

d Sire, je te adjure par le vray Dieu que ta fille Tarsienne, que tu ne la donnes a mariage a autre que a moy ‘Lord, I beg you in the name of the true God that your daughter Tarsienne that you do not give her in marriage to anybody but me’ (Apoll, f48b, 14th c French, in Wanner, 1995:421)

e Onde dize Josepho que en casa de so padre que le llamaron primera mentre Ciro. ‘Where Joseph says that in his father’s house that he was first

(Gen Est 177r2.6, 13th c Castilian, in Wanner, 1995: 422)

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 introduces the reader to the characteristics of the ‘Double CHE Construction’ – DCC – in Tur and Lig, providing an analysis of the function and position of che2 and investigating some of the consequences stemming from it, specifically the status of subjects in the left periphery, drawing on a comparison with Rumanian. Section 3 analyses the Early Romance texts and interprets the differences with the DCC in Tur and Lig as the reflection of two different structural representations.

2. The DCC in Tur and Lig

2.1 The facts

In some embedded contexts, Tur and Lig allow for what appears to be the equivalent of the finite complementiser che in standard Italian to be realised twice: a higher che (che1) and the lower che2. Che2 is not allowed to follow che1 unless there is some syntactic material phonetically realised between the two. This resistance against the repetition of morphemes is reminiscent of the Obligatory Contour Principle in phonology (Leben, 1973; Goldsmith, 1979b; and much subsequent work), which requires adjacent phonemes to be contrastive. In an interesting paper Neeleman and van de Koot (2001) show
how the repetition of morphemes is also avoided at the syntactic level. This restriction on the appearance of *che1* and *che2* adjacent to each other in Tur and Lig can thus be analysed as an instance of syntactic haplology.

The material between *che1* and *che2* can be represented by a variety of elements: it can be a full DP subject (cf. (1) a and b), a quantified subject (cf. (2) a, b, i, and ii), a left dislocated phrase – both direct and PPs (cf. (2) c, d, iii and iv) – an adverbial (cf. (2) e and v). The examples from Tur and marked by *T* and those from Lig by an ‘*L*’:

(2)  

\[ (2) \begin{array}{l}
T \text{a} & \text{Mari a a spera *che* gnun *ch*’ as nè} \\
 & \text{Mary SCL hope.pr.3s that nobody that SCL+rfl part}
& \text{dèsmentia}
& \text{forget.subj.3s}
& \text{‘Mary hopes that nobody forgets about it’}
\\
T \text{b} & \text{Majo a pensa *che* cheidun *ch*’ a-j}
& \text{Mario SCL think.pr.3s that somebody that SCL.dat}
& \text{l’ abia già daje ‘l lìber}
& \text{L have.subj.3s already give.pple.dat the book}
& \text{‘Mario thinks that somebody has already given (him/her) the book’}
\\
L \text{i} & \text{A Teeja a credda *che* nisciun *ch*’}
& \text{the Teresa SCL believe.pr.3s that nobody that}
& \text{u digga a veitè}
& \text{SCL tell.subj.3s the truth}
& \text{‘Teresa believes that nobody tells the truth’}
\\
L \text{ii} & \text{A Margaitin a pensa *che* quarchedun *ch*’ u}
& \text{the Margaret SCL think.pr.3s that somebody that SCL}
& \text{l’ aggia avuu in bun vutu}
& \text{L have.subj.3s have.pple a good mark}
& \text{‘Margaret thinks that somebody has got a good mark’}
\\
T \text{c} & \text{A chërdo *che*, le fior, *ch*’ a l’ abia}
& \text{SCL believe.pr.3p that the flowers that SCL L have.subj.3s già}
& \text{cataje Miclin}
& \text{already buy.pple.they.acc Michelle}
& \text{‘They think that Michelle has already bought the flowers’}
\\
T \text{d} & \text{Gioann a spera *che*, a ca soa, *ch*’ as}
& \text{John SCL hope.pr.3s that to house their that SCL+rfl}
& \text{vado tòst Luch e soa fomna}
& \text{go.subj.3p soon Luke and his wife}
& \text{‘John hopes that Luke and his wife go soon back home’}
\end{array} \]
credde ‘to believe’, pensà ‘to think’ sperà ‘to hope’), which selects a ‘that clause’, and how the embedded verb is in the subjunctive mood.
The presence of the subjunctive is in fact a requirement for the appearance of *che2*: other tenses such as present and future indicative and conditional, as shown in (3), are not compatible with it, in either variety, as the ungrammaticality of the following shows:

(3)  

T a  *A dis *che Mari e Gioann *ch’ a mangio  
SCL say.pr.3s that Mary and John that SCL eat.pr.3p  
nen ‘d ranen  
eg of frogs  
‘S/He says that Mary and John do not eat frogs’

T b  *Giòrs a spera che Majo *ch’ as n’  
George SCL hope.pr.3s that Mario that SCL+rf part  
andarà tòst  
go.fut.3s soon  
‘George hopes that Mario will go away soon’

T c  *Majo a pensa che Franchin *ch’ as n’  
Mario SCL think.pr.3s that Frank that SCL+rf part  
ancozerìa  
realise.cond.3s  
‘Mario thinks that Frank would realise it’

L i  *U Gianni u disa che a Maria *ch’ a nu  
the John SCL say.pr.3s that the Mary that SCL neg  
mangia de rainocce  
eat.pr.3s of frogs  
‘John says that Mary does not eat frogs’

L ii  *U Francu u spera che u Gianni *ch’ u  
the Frank SCL hope.pr.3s that the John that SCL  
telefoneà  
phone.fut.3s  
‘Frank hopes that John will phone’

L iii  *U Gianni u credda che Margaitin *ch’ a  
the John SCL believe.pr.3s that Margaret that SCL  
mangeescia sta turta  
eat.cond.3s this cake  
‘John thinks that Margaret would eat this cake’

Thus, we can conclude that in Tur and Lig the following rule is operative:

(4)  

Insert *che2* if and only if:

a  there is syntactically realised material separating it from *che1* AND

b  the verb in the embedded clause is in the subjunctive mood.
While the first restriction is the application of a more general constraint – i.e. syntactic haplology – the second needs to be further investigated.

2.2 **Che2: its position and function**

2.2.1 **Function**

In Rizzi’s (1997) split CP structure, the traditionally labelled ‘C’ is broken down into four distinct heads, ForceP, TopP, FocP and FinP. The projections at either extremity of the field, Force° and Fin°, host, respectively, the finite and non finite complementisers in standard Italian, *che* and *di*. The former position expresses information on the force of a sentence, while the latter acts as an interface between the higher and lower domains, and encodes modal information. Adopting such a system, *che1*, being the counterpart of the canonical finite complementiser *che*, can be placed in Force°. As for the position filled by *che2*, the situation is not as simple. It is necessary to make a slight diversion in order to gather some further evidence bearing on the issue.

The previous subsection has clearly pointed out how the realisation of *che2* is directly dependent on the presence of a subjunctive verb in the embedded clause. Traditionally (cf. among others, Bolinger, 1968; and Terrell and Hooper, 1974) the contrast between the indicative and the subjunctive mood in embedded clauses has been analysed in terms of ‘assertion’ and ‘non-realis and irrealis’ respectively. Given that the verbs in the Lig and Tur DCC main clause do not imply the reality of the complement clause they select and the link with the subjunctive, it could be concluded that *che2* is linked to the [-realis] content of the embedded clause. If this were indeed the case, we would expect *che2* in other [-realis] contexts, but not in [+realis] ones.

These predictions are not borne out. Firstly, in the examples in (3), we can see how future indicative and conditional – which refer to a [-realis] situation – do not allow *che2*. Secondly, the examples in (5) show how factive verbs – i.e. verbs that imply the truth of their complement clause, in other words verbs that select a [+realis] complement – are compatible with *che2*:

(5)  
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
T & a\quad M a r i a\quad a\quad r e g r e t a\quad c h e\quad G i o r g \quad c h'\quad a\quad s i a \\
L & i\quad A - a\quad M a r i a\quad g h e\quad d e s p i a z a\quad c h e\quad u\quad M a r i o\quad c h'
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
M a r y\quad S C L\quad r e g r e t . p r .3 s\quad t h a t\quad G e o r g e\quad S C L\quad b e . s u b j .3 s \\
d e s m e n t i a s s - n e \\
 f o r g e t . p p l e . p a r t \\
'M a r y\quad r e g r e t s\quad t h e\quad f a c t\quad t h a t\quad G e o r g e\quad f o r g e t t e d\quad a b o u t\quad i t'
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
L & i\quad A - a\quad M a r i a\quad t o - t h e\quad c h e\quad u\quad M a r i o\quad c h'
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
t o - t h e\quad M a r y\quad t o . h e r\quad f e e l\quad s o r r y . p r .3 s\quad t h a t\quad M a r i o\quad S C L\quad s c r e a m . s u b j .3 s \\
 u s b r a g i a\quad s e m p r e \\
'S M a r i a\quad i s\quad s o r r y\quad t h a t\quad M a r i o\quad i s\quad a l w a y s\quad s c r e a m i n g'
\end{array}
\]

Clearly, the connection between *che2* and [-realis] cannot be maintained. It lies outside the scope of this paper to enter into the controversial discussion of the
semantics of the subjunctive, and therefore I will simply acknowledge the clear link between che2 and the subjunctive.

Why would che2 only appear when introducing a subjunctive embedded clause?

It has been argued in the literature (cf., among others, Giorgi and Pianesi, 1997; von Stechow, 1995) that the subjunctive is deficient. The term 'deficient' could be interpreted both morphologically and semantically. Semantically, because on its own the subjunctive does not give rise to any real temporal interpretation; morphologically, because sometimes there is no real morphological differentiation in the present paradigm between some forms of the indicative and the subjunctive. This deficiency is also witnessed in Tur and Lig: the following tables illustrate the comparison between the present indicative and the present subjunctive for a verb of the first conjugation, (6) a. Tur parlè and (6) b. Lig parlà, to speak. A similar – but not identical – pattern is also found with verbs of the second and third conjugation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present Ind</th>
<th>Present Subj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>mi i parlo</td>
<td>che mi i parla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>ti it parle</td>
<td>che ti it parle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>chiel a parla</td>
<td>che chiel a parla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>noi i parloma</td>
<td>che noi i parlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>voi i parle</td>
<td>che voi i parle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>lor a parlo</td>
<td>che lor a parlo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present Ind</th>
<th>Present Subj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>mi i parlu</td>
<td>che mi i parla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>ti ti parli</td>
<td>che ti ti parli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>lé u parla</td>
<td>che lé u parla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>nuatri parlemmu</td>
<td>che nuatri parlemmu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>vuatri parlè</td>
<td>che vuatri parlè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>luatri i parlan</td>
<td>che luatri i parlan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us assume that due to this deficiency, the subjunctive mood ‘needs’ to be marked in another way, i.e. through the insertion of che2. As it was briefly mentioned above, the use of che2 is a matter of optionality. If this new assumption were on the right track, we would then expect che2 to be ‘less’ optional with those forms of the verb that are identical in both indicative and subjunctive, and ‘more’ optional with those that are morphologically distinct. The prediction is borne out this time: che2 is ‘less’ preferred with first singular and plural in Tur and first singular in Lig, precisely those forms that are already different.

A further consideration. As already mentioned, the DCC is restricted to very few speakers, who can be described as ‘conservative’, both with respect to their lexical and syntactic choices. Only a few Italian dialects have the two distinct paradigms, indicative and subjunctive, and some – cf. above – are
losing or have completely lost the distinction. The ‘conservatism’ of the speakers who show the DCC can thus also be extended to their trying to maintain the difference between the two moods, which, in younger speakers, has been lost.

Considering all the above facts, I would therefore like to suggest that che2 is a subjunctive particle.

### 2.2.2 Position

The previous subsection has highlighted the dependency relation between the subjunctive and che2, suggesting that this latter is a modal particle. Cinque (1999) posits several heads with modal content at the edge of his extended IP; Rizzi (1997) assumes the lower of the heads in the CP, Fin°, to encode modality. Whether a Mood° is then part of the IP or the CP is an open issue, further complicated by the high degree of decomposition of the two functional projections. This in turn bears on the position filled by che2, whether it is in the IP or the CP.

A similar situation is found in Rumanian, where embedded subjunctive clauses are marked by the particle . There has been some debate on whether fills a position in the CP or the IP (cf. Dobrovie Sorin, 1993; among others).

What about che2 then?

So far it has been shown how che2 fills a position lower than che1, left dislocated and focalised phrases. An investigation of the elements that form a cluster with che2, subject clitics, made adopting Poletto (2000) has concluded that subject clitics in Tur and Lig belong to one of the higher types, placed in the CP (cf. Paoli 2001). Since che2 precedes them, its position must also be in the CP.

A connection has been made between the ‘rarity’ of the DCC and the decline in the use of the subjunctive in the younger generations. These latter, alongside the absence of che2, lack other constructions, which are used by the older generation and possibly related to the ‘extra’ position created by che2. One of these is the way wh questions are constructed: together with the wh element and the overt finite complementiser che, the older generation also makes use of an additional question marker strategy, subject clitic verb inversion. These constructions are not possible for the younger generation, where the subject clitic verb inversion phenomenon is now lost:

(7)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ta Coma } & \text{ch’ it l’ has-to } \text{cusanà?} \\
& \text{how that SCL L have.pr.2s-SCL cook.pple} \\
& \text{‘How have you cooked it?’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ Tb Chi } & \text{ch’ a ven-lo stassèira?} \\
& \text{who that SCL come.pr.3s-SCL tonight} \\
& \text{‘Who is coming tonight?’}
\end{align*}
\]

It has been argued (for example by Goldsmith, 1979), that complementisers and subject clitic verb inversion in interrogative clauses are in complementary
distribution 7. Maintaining that subject clitic verb inversion is an instantiation of V to C movement (cf. among others, Poletto 2000), I would like to interpret the evidence in (7) as a further indication that the extra position made available by che2 in older speakers is in the left periphery of the clause.

Further evidence can be derived by the observation of the relative position of other elements. It is generally accepted (cf. Zanuttini, 1997) that the Neg head subcategorises for IP complements, marking the boundary between the CP and the IP.

Unfortunately, in Tur negation is expressed post verbally, by either nen or pa. In Lig, on the other hand, negation is preverbal, expressed by nu, which precedes the second person singular subject clitic ti, but follows the third person singular a and u and plural i. When che2 is triggered, it appears to the left of negation, thus suggesting that it belongs to the CP rather than the IP domain:

(8) L i. A Maria a credda che, a quest’ua, ch’ u the Mary SCL believe.pr.3s that at this time that SCL nu su na u campanellu nisciun neg play.subj.3s the bell nobody
'Mary thinks that, at this time, nobody would ring the bell’

L ii. U Gianni u credda che, quella ca, ch’ i nu the John SCL believe.pr.3s that that house that SCL neg l’ aggian zà vista have.subj.3p already see.ppl
‘As for that house, John thinks that they haven’t already seen it’

Accepting that che2 is placed in the left periphery and considering the mood restriction on its appearance, I would like to claim that it fills the lower of the heads in Rizzi’s (1997) system, Fin°. The next section considers some of the consequences this analysis generates.

2.3 The status of subjects in the left periphery

By claiming that che2 is in the left periphery of the clause, all the elements to its left are in the CP, too. Examples (2) a, b, i and ii are rather problematic, given that they suggest that there exists a position in the left periphery of the clause available to quantified subjects, which, following (Rizzi 1986), are generally unable to undergo left dislocation. I have argued elsewhere (cf. Paoli to appear), that full DP subjects appearing to the left of left dislocated phrases are to be considered left dislocated themselves. I would like to propose that the quantified subjects sandwiched between che1 and che2 in all the examples above are not in their canonical position and are either left dislocated or in a focalised position.

Cinque (1990) sets out to investigate four major cases of A’ dependencies – successive cyclic Wh Movement, long Wh Movement, apparent Wh Movement of NPs and the relation between a resumptive pronoun and a sentence initial phrase in the ‘CLitic Left Dislocation’ constructions – CLLD – with the aim of
finding a unifying account that can satisfactorily derive them from more general principles.

He claims (1990:xv) that the conditions on long Wh-Movement are not to be viewed as conditions on this specific type of movement *per se*, but a more general condition on A' chains, be they created by movement or base-generated. Cinque also identifies (1990:xiv) in ‘the intrinsic referential character’ of a phrase the prerequisite for undergoing long Wh Movement. Given that the conditions on this type of movement are to be considered as conditions on A' chains, we must conclude that referentiality is a requirement for A' dependencies, including therefore CLLD structures. In other words, in order for an element to be able to be left dislocated it must be referential, in the sense of Pesetsky’s (1987) D linking.

Thus a linked is created between what Rizzi (1990) labels as ‘referentially è marked’ phrases – i.e. a phrase can undergo long Wh Movement only if it receives one among agent, theme or goal è role – and the requirement that these phrases be strictly referential, i.e. that they refer to specific members of a pre established set.

The importance of the role played by referentiality becomes even more apparent when a further connection is established between left dislocation and the ability of entering a binding relation: CLLD is a ‘pure representation of binding relations’ (Cinque (1990:164, note 15)). Binding, in turn, is defined in terms of ‘referential index’ – from Rizzi (1990):

\[
X \text{ binds } Y \text{ iff:}
\]

1. \(X \text{ c-commands } Y\)
2. \(X\) and \(Y\) have the same referential index

To sum up: an element can be left dislocated only if it is intrinsically referential, which in turns implies that it must be able to enter into a binding relation.

Given these premises, it can be seen how a quantified element – that is generally considered unable to undergo left dislocation – can indeed enter CLLD constructions as long as it can be interpreted as specific.

This is indeed the case when a quantified subject appears to the left of a left dislocated phrase, as the examples in (9) show, where the quantified subject is interpreted as referring to a specific individual or a member of a pre established set:

(9) \(T\) a Majo a spera \textbf{che} gnun, dle fior, \textbf{ch'} a Mario SCL hope.pr.3s that nobody of the flowers that SCL sia desmentiassne be.subj.3s forget.pple.part

‘Mario hopes that nobody forgets about the flowers’

This interpretation is supported by some interesting facts in Paduan. Paduan does not exhibit obligatory SCLs: these are only present when the subject is left dislocated. Paola Benincà (pc) has described how a quantified subject preceding a left dislocated element requires the presence of a subject clitic. If, on the other hand, there is no left dislocated element to the right of the quantified element, no resumptive clitic can appear:
The most natural position for a quantified subject is post verbally, suggesting that whenever it appears pre verbally, it is discourse prominent.

I would like to propose that when the quantified subject follows a left dislocated phrase it is focalised.

Benincà and Poletto (2002) have argued against Rizzi's TopP recursivity, claiming that both TopP and FocP are not single projections but a field comprising distinct types of topics and foci. In particular, they argue for a hierarchical order within each field, where contrastive focus is higher than informational focus.

As previously mentioned, Tur does not have a pre verbal contrastive focus position: heavily stressed phrases must appear post verbally.

Rumanian, as argued by Alboiu (2000), does not have a pre verbal position available to informational focus phrases. Following Benincà and Poletto (2002) in assuming a Top field higher than – and delimited downwards by – a Foc field, I ascribe the deviance of the following – Alboiu, p.c. – to ‘somebody’ being in a non licensed position:

(11) ? *Spera ca de data asta, numai de fete, cineva se ocupa
hope.pr.3s that of this time only of gir ls somebody can.subj.3s
'S/He hopes that somebody this time will take care only of the

Here *numai de fete* is contrastively focused, and given that in any one sentence only one element can bear contrastive focus, *cineva* cannot receive discourse prominence and s therefore in an ‘illegal’ position.

The acceptability of the following in Tur – where a quantified subject appears to the right of a left dislocated phrase – suggests that it is focalised:

(12) T a Luch a pensa che, ‘d ‘ste robe, gnun ch’
Luke think.pr.3s that of these thing nobody that as dësmentia
SCL+rfl part forget.subj.3s
'Luke thinks that nobody has forgotten these things’

This fits in with what mentioned above about the most neutral position for a quantified subject.
che2 is a morphological marker to ‘support’ the morphologically deficient subjunctive;
the position of che2 has been identified as Fin°;
the subject positions identified in the left periphery are not canonical and belong to the Top and Foc fields.
The next section turns to investigation of the DCC found in Early Romance texts.

3. The DCC in Early Romance

3.1 The facts

13th century Romance varieties exhibit a construction where two finite complementisers (che/que – henceforth, QUE1 and QUE2) are allowed to be simultaneously realised.

The data presented here is derived from two different sources: the Early Italian data comes from the ‘Opera del Vocabolarion Italiano – OVI’ Internet database and the other Early Romance data is taken from Wanner (1995).

Since the construction seems to be consistently realised across languages – in Castilian, just as in Tuscan and French, the QUE occurs twice when some element of the sentence intervenes between the higher complementiser and the verb of the embedded clause – I will concentrate on the Early Italian and Castilian data.

Although on its way out, the DCC construction is still found in the 16th century, and it becomes ungrammatical in the modern languages.8

In the data gathered so far there is no indication that the two QUE were allowed to appear in a sequence. I will take this as a strong indication that QUE1 and QUE2 could not be simultaneously realised unless they were separated by phonetically realised syntactic material. Again, I will take this to be an instantiation of the syntactic haplology constraint.

As for the type of material sandwiched between them, there is a fair variety. In early Castilian texts the position can be filled by a causative, a temporal expression, a prepositional phrase, a subject, a relativised subject as shown, respectively, in (13) a, b, c, d and e:

(13) a  ... diz que porque la poblara alli brennio pora premia & danno de los Romanos que pusiera aquell nombre verona (Gen Est; f171r1.14)
     ‘S/He says that because Brennio had populated it to put pressure on and harm the Romans, that he had given it the name of Verona’

b  ... fueron los desuiando de leuar los consigo en la batalla diziendo les que daquella uez que escusar los podien. (Gen Est;179v2.19)
'And they managed to avoid to take them with into battle by saying that on that occasion that they could be excused'

c ...Cuenta Maestre godofre en la quinzena parte del libro patheon que ... & que de espada, nin aun de otra arma, que non auien piedad ninguna contra sos enemigos en batalla (Gen Est; 171r1.22) 'Master Godofre says in the 15th part of his book ... and that they would not spare their enemies the sword or any other weapon while in battle'

d ... & diz que las que eran sabidoras del mal que murieron dello & las otras que les non touo danno ninguno (Gen Est; 172v2.6) 'And they say that those who knew about the illness that they died of it; and that the others did not receive any harm'

e ... muchos ydolos fechos a grandes Noblezas assi que dize el autor que la cosa mas onrrada & el mayor tesoro que los daquella ysla auien que aquellos ydolos eran (Gen Est; 172v2.26) 'Many idols made in great luxury, so that the biggest treasure owned by those on that island that were those idols'

Turning to the Tuscan texts, we find that this variety is not completely matched. The majority of the texts searched exhibit the DCC when hypothetical ((14) a, b and c), temporal ((14) d and e) and causal ((14) f) clauses intervene between the two che:

(10) a ... A queste novelle, si pensò ir re Pelleus che, se elli potesse tanto fare che Giason suo nepote volesse andare in quella isola per lo tosone conquistare, che mai non tornerebbe, e in tal maniera si diliverebbe di lui; (Distr Tr; XDIV 1, page152, 21-25) '...king Pelleus thought that, if he could do so that his nephew Giason wanted to go to that island to take that ..., that he would never come back, and so he could get rid of him'

b ... però vi priegho in lealtade e fede che, sse ttue vuoli del mio avere, che ttu ne tolghi, e di ciò che mestiere ti sia (Distr Tr; XDIV 1, page155, 26-28) '...but I pray you for your loyalty and faith that, if you want my things, that you take of them,...'

c ...Ed esso, ..., non lasciò quella pace a li Romani fare, dicendo a che, s'elli avea élla sua gioven'età servito a Roma, ch'ora élla vecchiezza sua li volesse danno fare (Con, 8:108)
‘And he ... did not allow the Romans to make that peace, telling them that God did not like that, if he had in his youth served Rome, that he now, in his old age, would want to damage it’

d ... e egli allora fue pieu innamorato de lei che non iera dapprima, e amava só fforte mente che a llui sì era tutta via viso che quando persona neuna la sguardasse, che inmantenente illile togliesse (Tr Ricc; Cap 75, page 149, 25-28)
‘...and he loved so intensely that to him it was shown that, when nobody was watching, that immediately he would take them off her’

e ... Poi a lui promectere se fe’ che, poi ch’elli averia Isocta al re Marco menata, ch’esso tornaria a lui in Sorlois, perché esso volea lui e Lancelocto insieme avere (Con, 21:155)
‘And then he got promised that after having escorted Isocta to king Marco, that he would (have) returned to him because he wanted to have together him and Lancelocto’

f ... E tanto savio bello e largo portamento ver’ de ciascuno facea, che tanti d’onre parti cavalieri trassero a llui, che per lo gran senno e valore suo e larghezza e per bona cavallaria che lui seguia, che XXVIII reami se soctomise. (Con, 21:150-151)
‘... that for his great sensibility, value and greatness and for the quality of his cavalry that followed him, that he conquered twenty nine kingdoms’

Finally, if we consider the selecting main verbs we witness, again, a fair variety. In Castilian we find ‘to say ’ and ‘to tell’; in Early Tuscan ‘to think’, ‘to pray’, ‘to be shown’, ‘to be promised’, ‘to like’, all verbs that select a ‘that clause’ as their complement.

3.2 QUE2: its function and position

The examples in (13) and (14) clearly show that the DCC is compatible with a variety of tenses in early Romance – present and imperfect subjunctive, perfect and imperfect indicative for Castilian and present and perfect conditional, present and perfect indicative and imperfect subjunctive for Tuscan. Related to this is also the type of verb in the main clause: while in Tur and Lig the choice is limited by the requirement that the embedded verb be in the subjunctive, in Early Romance the choice is rather free. These facts suggest that the function that QUE2 has in Early Romance is different from that of che2 in the two north western Italian dialects: in the former there does not seem to be any modality involved.

Wanner (1995: 421) interprets the DCC in early Romance as a strategy to give prominence to a thematised phrase. It was assumed above that the absence of instances of adjacency between QUE1 and QUE2 is a reflection of the necessary – and as we have seen also sufficient – condition for the
realisation of \textit{QUE2}: a constraint imposed by the resistance of the repetition of morphemes.

Following Wanner’s intuition and combining it with Rizzi’s (1997) system, I would like to suggest that \textit{QUE2} is the overt realisation of Top\(^{\circ}\), the head of the projection where left dislocated phrases move to in standard Italian.

von Fintel (1994) analyses conditional clauses as correlatives: the \textit{if} clause can be considered as the left dislocated element, while the \textit{then} clause is the resumptive element\(^9\). I would also like to claim that \textit{when} \textit{then} clauses should be analysed as correlatives, and possibly also \textit{because of} \textit{then} clauses. Combining Rizzi’s (1997) and von Fintel’s (1994) contributions, I would like to conclude that the element intervening between \textit{QUE1} and \textit{QUE2} fills the Specifier position of the TopP projection. This can be extended to the DP elements intervening between the two \textit{QUE}: in the French example in (1) d the direct object \textit{ta fille Tarsienne} is resumed in the embedded clause by the clitic ‘\textit{la}’, clearly signalling its left dislocated status.

If we can claim that both adverbial and DP elements between the two \textit{QUE} in Early Romance fill the [Spec, Top] position, the conclusion that can be drawn is that \textit{QUE2} is the overt realisation of a [+Top] feature which must be matched in a [Spec, head] relation by a suitably specified phrase in its Specifier.

This would also fit in with what we know about Old Romance, being V2 and having verb movement to a split Comp domain: in main clauses there would be movement of the verb, in embedded clauses there would be a complementiser.

To summarise, in early Romance the following rule is operative:

(15) Insert \textit{QUE2} if and only if there is an intervening topicalised phrase between \textit{QUE1} and the embedded verb.

4. Conclusions

This paper has compared two similar constructions highlighting the different function that the lower \textit{che}/\textit{QUE} has, suggesting that the two are the realisation of distinct heads.

The term ‘complementiser’ is this inadequate to describe Tur and Lig \textit{che2} and Early Romance \textit{QUE2}: these are best defined as ‘subjunctive particle’ and

This in turn bears on the more sophisticated structure attributed to the CP, which should be reflected by a specialisation at the nomenclatural level.
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Abbreviations of Early Romance texts:

Con = *Conti di Antichi Cavalieri*, 13th century Tuscan Text, OVI

DistrTr = *Da un libro della distruzione di Troia*, 13th century Tuscan Text, OVI

TrRicc = *Il Tristano Riccardiano*, 13th century Tuscan, OVI


Notes
I am grateful for the comments made by the audience, in particular by Liliane Haegeman and Eric Mathieu. All mistakes are my own responsibility.

Throughout the examples in the paper the following abbreviations are used: SCL = subject clitic; L = invariable subject clitic ‘l’; pr = present indicative; 1,2,3 = first, second, third person; s/p = singular/plural; rfl = reflexive clitic; part = partitive clitic; neg = negation; subj = present subjunctive; cond = conditional; inf = infinitive; fut = future; acc = accusative; dat = dative.

The use of che2 is a matter of preference, and very few speakers nowadays do exhibit this construction. Nevertheless, its presence is totally excluded from some contexts, as we will see below, and it is on this negative evidence that I have based my observations.

Capital letters indicate contrastively focused elements.


The use of the terms realis and irrealis has been the object of very much discussion, stemming from the fact that the domains they define are too coarse grained and do not account for the complexity of the cross linguistic uses of the subjunctive. Here I will not address this issue and will simply make use of this terminology to stress the strict dependence between che2 and the subjunctive rather than the semantic import of this latter.

In the pre-split CP days, this was interpreted as the two competing for the same position. Although this interpretation is no longer acceptable within Rizzi’s (1997) system, it indicates that subject clitic-verb inversion is an instance of V-to-C movement.

Joao Costa (p.c.) has suggested that the construction is actually still found in Modern Spanish with the indicative whenever there is an intervening element between the complementiser and the verb.

That ‘if then’ clauses form a class distinct from other types of conditional clauses is not a new idea. Cf Haegeman 2002, where these clauses are referred to as ‘event conditionals’ and display particular characteristics such as a reduced CP structure.