FEDERICA COGNOLA
MÒCHENO LEFT PERIPHERY

1 Introduction

In this article I focus on the high left periphery of Mòcheno[1], a Tyrolean dialect spoken in the Fersina valley in Eastern Trentino (North of Italy).

In Cognola (2007) I gave a first approximation of the structure of the left periphery in this language, showing that it can be analysed as a V2-language of old Romance type with a split-CP whose structure is the one proposed by Benincà (2001, 2006), Poletto (2002), Benincà/Poletto (2004) and given in (??).

(1) $[_{HT}][_{SceneS}][_{ForceP}[_{SpecForce}\mathbf{XP}_{foc}][_{Force0}\mathbf{V}_{fin}]][_{Topic}][_{Topic}][_{OpP}[_{SpecOP}\mathbf{wh}][_{Op0}\mathbf{V}_{fin}]]$

As is to be seen in the structure above, V2 is triggered in OpP (to be found in the Focus field of Benincà/Poletto) by interrogative wh-elements and themes, whereas contrastive focalised XPs have to move further up to SpecForceP and are therefore incompatible with Topics to their left. The same conclusions are reached by Poletto (2002) for the Rhaetoromance dialect of San Leonardo.

In this work I will develop my analysis further and I will examine in detail the two operator projections found in the CP of Mòcheno in relation to the Topic positions available above them. New data collected in recent field work hint straight at the fact that the structure given above in (??) can be further refined, in particular that i) inside the area dedicated to interrogative wh-elements, there exist dedicated positions for wh-elements with different syntactic function, a phenomenon known for Slavic languages (among others Cinque/Krapova 2004); ii) the OperatorP hosting focalised XPs is to be found immediately below hanging topics.

As far as the first point is concerned, that is the structure of the wh layer, I will show that: two big areas are to be found: a lower one activated by simple wh-elements and a higher one activated by wh-phrases (Munaro 1994, Obenauer 1994). Inside one and the same area different wh-elements – direct object (from here on DO), indirect object (IO), subject and temporal – move

---

to dedicated positions activating different Topic projections on their left, as is to be seen in the structure below:

$[_{Topicfield} [_{TopP} \textbf{XP}]] [_{OpP} \textbf{wh2}]/\text{-} [_{Topicfield} [_{TopP} \textbf{XP}] [_{TopP} \textbf{XP}]] [_{OpP} \textbf{wh1}]$

All Topic sublayers activated by one wh-element end up with a frame composed by a projection for temporal XPs (scene setters, PPs) and a projection for other non-argumental PPs.

$[_{Frame}[_{TempP} \textbf{XP}] [_{LocP} \textbf{XP}]]$

In the second part of the work I will deal with the OperatorP hosting focalised XPs showing that, differently from what concluded in Cognola (2007), a focalised XP is actually compatible with an XP on its left, which displays though the syntactic characteristics of a hanging topic. Data hint very clearly that the XPs preceding a contrastively focalised XP are not necessary only bare DPs, but can be PPs as well; a similar conclusion was reached also for Fiorentino by Garzonio (2004). In this sense the hanging-topic projection is not to be considered a single projection, but rather a field composed of positions dedicated to different types of elements.

The article is organised as follows: in section 2 I will take into consideration the wh-elements *bos*, *ber* and *benn* reconstructing the Topic field activated by them and trying to determine their relative order. In 2.1.4 I will examine one wh-phrase, showing that is activates a different Topic field and occupies a different (probably higher) position with respect to other wh-elements. In 3.3 and 3.4 I will come to the Operator position dedicated to contrastively focalised XP. In 3.5 I sum up the conclusions reached in the section and give the structure of Mòcheno left periphery reconstructed so far.

2 Wh-main interrogative clauses

Before examining in detail the characteristics of the topic field activated by the different wh-elements, it is worth saying two words on topicalization of arguments in Mòcheno.

As is to be seen in the examples in (**??**) below, subject and DO are always resumed by a clitic pronoun in Mòcheno (**??**a,b), whereas IOs are not obligatory resumed (**??**c).

(2)   **a.** *Gester der Mario bos hot-*(er) kaft en de boteig?*

yesterday the Mario what has-SUBJ CL bought in the shop

'What did Mario buy in the shop?'

b. *Gester der Nane ber hot-*(en) zechen?*

yesterday the John who has-ACC CL seen?

'Who saw Mario yesterday?'

c. *Gester en de Maria bos hoso-(en) trog?*

yesterday to the Mary what have-SUBJ CL-DAT CL brought

'What did you bring Mary yesterday?'

In what follows we will see that the presence of the resumptive clitic with IOs is only apparently optional, in particular: i) IOs with and without clitic display different syntactic properties; ii) IOs without resumption are possible only with the wh-element *bos*; iii) verb arguments with resumptive clitic show up above IOs without resumption in positions dedicated to Topics with resumption.

In the following subsections I will take into consideration three different simple wh-elements: *bos*, 'what', *ber*, 'when' and *benn*, 'when' and on type of wh-phrase describing their occurrences with Topics.

2.1 Bos

Bos allows for a IO to be topicalised above it without resumptive clitic (**??**a) and is also compatible with a scene setter and a subject on its left (**??**b) and with non-argumental PPs showing up in their basic constituent order (**??**c,d).

(3)   **a.** *En de Maria bos hoso trog?*

to the Mary what did-SUBJ CL brought

'What did you bring Mary?'

b. *Der Nane en de Maria bos hot-er trog?*

the John to the Mary what has-SUBJ CL brought?

'What did John bring Mary yesterday?'

c. *Om 3 nomitto vour de kirch bos hoso gem en Nane?*

at three o'clock in front of the church what have-SUBJ CL given to John

d. **Vour de kirch om 3 nomitto bos hoso gem en Nane?*

'What did you give John at three o'clock in front of the church?'

Let's examine the properties of the Topic position located immediately above the wh-element *bos*.

As is to be seen in (**??**) a IO can be combined with a non-argumental PP but their order is IO - PP and cannot be changed.

(4)   **a.** *En de Maria om 2 nomitto bos hoso trog?*

to the Mary at two o'clock in the afternoon what have-SUBJ CL brought

b. **Om 2 nomitto en de Maria bos hoso trog?*

'What did you bring Mary at two o'clock in the afternoon?'

IO$_{-res}$ - PPtemp

*PPtemp - IO$_{-res}$

In principle it could be possible to have more than one non-argumental PP below the IO in a sentence like (??a) but crucially the order of these PPs a) cannot be changed (??a,b) and b) corresponds to the one found below in the area above VP (Schweikert 2004, Cinque 2006) where they show in the same fixed order with no possibility of changing (??c,d).

(5)   **a.** *En de Maria om 2 nomitto vour de kirch bos hoso trog?*

   to the Mary at two o'clock in front of the church with-the Luca what-SUBJ CL brought

   b. **En de Maria vour de kirch om 2 nomitto bos hoso trog?*

   'What did you bring Mary at two o'clock in front of the church?'

   c. *En de Maria bos hoso trog om 2 nomitto vour de kirch?*

   d. **En de Maria bos hoso trog vour de kirch om 3 nomitto?*

Even if the first impression is that there are two positions for Topics above *bos*, the higher one for IO$_{-res}$ and the lower one for non-argumental PPs, I think that the pattern found in (??a) has to be analysed in terms of movement of IO to the Spec position of a projection immediately above *bos*, together with a chunk containing the non-argumental PPs.

This seems to find confirmation in the following example (??) in which I take into consideration also a subject: it cannot in any case follow IO. The position immediately above *bos* is a position for remnant VP[2].

(6)   **En de Maria der Nane bos hot-er trog?*

   yesterday to the Mary the John what has-SUBJ CL brought

   'What did John bring Mary?'

*IO$_{-res}$ - SUBJ

SUBJ - *IO$_{-res}$

What we have seen so far leads me to the conclusion that the projection found immediately above *bos* can only host remnant, as shown in the structure below:

[$_{GroundP}$ **rem.VP**] [$_{OpP}$ **bos**]

---

[2]Following Poletto/Pollock (2004 and subsequent work) I label this position *GroundP*.

Let's come now to the case in which also a scene setter is present in the interrogative clause.

We saw above in (**??**b) repeated below as (**??**) that a non-argumental PP cannot precede a IO not resumed by a clitic.

(7)   *Om 2 nomitto en de Maria bos hoso trog?

        at two o'clock in the afternoon to the Mary what did you bring

        'What did you bring Mary at two o'clock in the afternoon?'

If a scene setter is present a non-argumental PP is actually forced to precede a verb argument (**??**a,b).

(8)   **a.** *Gester vour de kirch en de Maria bos hoso trog?*

        yesterday in front of the church to the Mary what-SUBJ CL brought

        b. **Gester en de Maria vour de kirch bos hoso trog?*

        'What did you bring Mary yesterday in front of the church?'

This is to be found also in the case a topicalised subject is present in the sentence (**??**a,b).

(9)   **a.** *Gester vour de kirch der Nane en de Maria bos hot-er trog?*

        yesterday in front of the church the John to the Mary what have-SUBJ CL brought

        b. **Gester der Mario vour de kirch en de Maria bos hot-er trog?*

        'What did Mario bring Mary yesterday in front of the church?'

Basing on the data seen so far, I conclude that in the case a scene setter, that is if the frame is activated, a locative PP has obligatory to show in the frame and cannot follow a IO$_{-res}$.

$[_{Frame}$ $[_{TempP}$ **Gester** $]$ $[_{LocP}$ **vour de kirch**$]]$ $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{TopP}$ **SUBJ** $]$ $[_{GroundP}$ **rem. VP** $]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **bos**$]$

In the structure I sketched in the introduction I said for Mòcheno that Topics with or without resumption occupy different positions in CP. If this idea is correct it is to be expected that a) IO can show up also with a resumptive clitic; b) in this latter case it admits Topics below it.

As is to be seen in (**??**) both predictions are borne out. If a IO resumed by a clitic is followed by two PPs the order of the latter can be inverted, which was ruled out in the case no clitic was not present[3].

---

[3]For the moment I do not make precise what positions are occupied by the PPs showing up below IO; this point will be made clear at the end of the section dedicated to wh-elements.

(10)   **a.** *En Nane om 3 nomitto vour de kirch bos hot-er-en trog?*

to John at three o'clock in front of the church what has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL brought

b. *En Nane vour de kirch om 3 nomitto bos hot-er-en trog?*

c. **En Nane vour de kirch om 3 nomitto bos hot-er trog?*

'What did he bring John at three o'clock in the afternoon in front of the church?'

A IO resumed by a clitic is always compatible with a subject in the case of *bos*. Though, their order is always subject - IO (**??**a,b) and they both have to show up below the frame (**??**c,d).

(11)   **a.** *Gester der Mario en de Maria bos hot-er-en trog?*

yesterday der Mario to the Mary what has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL brought

b. **Gester en de Maria der Nane bos hot-er-en trog?*

'What did Mario bring Mary at three o'clock in the afternoon in front of the church?'

SUBJ - IO$_{+res}$

*IO$_{+res}$ - SUBJ

c. *Gester om 3 nomitto vour de kirch der Mario en Nane bos hot-er-en trog?*

yesterday at three in the afternoon in front of the church the Mario to John what has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL brought

d. **Gester der Mario en Nane om 3 nomitto vour de kirch bos hot-er-en trog?*

'What did Mario bring Mary yesterday at three o'clock in the afternoon in front of the church?'

FRAME - SUBJ - IO$_{+res}$

*SCENE SETTER - SUBJ - IO$_{+res}$ - PP

As far as the structure of the topic field activated by the wh-element *bos* is concerned, I have shown so far that IOs without resumption are moved above the wh-element through remnant movement to a position for remnant (GroundP) to be found immediately above *bos*. IOs with resumption, on the contrary, occupy a dedicated position when showing up in the Topic field of *bos* to be found above GroundP. In this sense it cannot be said anymore that with IOs the presence of the clitic doubler is optional: its presence or absence is linked to two different positions in the Topic field. I showed then that the Topic field activated by *bos* ends with a frame containing two projections for XPs setting the action in time and space; below it two dedicated position for subject and IO with resumption are to be found.

The structure we can derive is the following one given in (**??**)[4]:

---

[4]I label the projection dedicated to the subject *SubjP*, which has nothing to see with the one proposed by Cardinaletti (2004) and to be found in the IP layer.

(12) $[_{Frame}$ $[_{TempP}$ **XP** $]$ $[_{LocP}$ **XP**$]]$ $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{SubjP}$ **SUBJ** $]$ $[_{IOP}$ **IO**$_{+res}$ $[_{GroundP}$ **rem. VP**$]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **bos**$]$

2.2 Subject ber

As is to be seen in (**??**a), it is impossible to have a topicalised IO without resumptive element above *ber*, whereas a non-argumental PP is perfectly grammatical above it (**??**b).

(13)   **a.** **En de Maria ber hot kaft a puach?*

to the Mary who has bought a book

'Who bought Mary a book?'

b. *Gester om 3 nomitto ka Trient ber hot kaft a puach en de Maria?*

yesterday at three o'clock in the afternoon in Trento who has bought a book to the Mary
'Who bought Mary a book in Trento yesterday at three?'

*IO$_{-res}$ **- ber**

FRAME - ber

Above the wh element *ber* a IO is incompatible also if it shows up together with a PP: both orders IO - PP (**??**a) and (**??**b) are in fact ungrammatical.

(14)   **a.** **En de Maria ka Trient ber hot kaft a puach?*

to the Mary in Trento who bought a book

b. **Ka Trient en de Maria ber hot kaft a puach?*

'Who bought Mary a book in Trento?'

*IO$_{-res}$ **- PP - ber**

To sum up:

- *ber* is incompatible with a IO without resumption, that is it does not display of the position for remnant VP which I called GroundP;

- *ber* occupies a higher position in comparison to *bos*:

$[_{Frame}$ $[_{TempP}$ **XP** $]$ $[_{LocP}$ **XP**$]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **ber**$]$$[_{GroundP}$ **rem. VP**$]$ $[_{OpP}$ **bos**$]$

7

As it was the case of *bos*, the wh-element *ber* is compatible with resumed Topics on its left; in (**??**) I give the cases of DO and IO.

(15)   **a.** *Gester der Luca ber hot-en zechen?*

yesterday the Luca who has-ACC CL seen

'Luca by whom was he seen?'

b. *Gester en Luca ber hot-*(en) gem a puach?*

yesterday to Luca who has-DAT CL given a book

'Who gave Luca a book yesterday?'

Resumed Topics are to be found again in the same area as above, that is below the frame field.

(16)   **a.** *Gester vour de kirch der Luca ber hot-en zechen?*

yesterday in front of the church the Luca who has-ACC CL seen

b. **Gester der Luca vour de kirch ber hot-en zechen?*

'Who saw Luca in front of the church yesterday?'

c. *Gester vour de kirch en de Maria ber hot-en gem a puach?*

yesterday in front of the church en de Maria who has-DAT CL given a book

d. **Gester en de Maria vour de kirch ber hot-en gem a puach?*

'Who gave Mary a book yesterday in front of the church?'

As far as the relative order of DO and IO is concerned, it seems that both orders are admitted in the case of *ber*; this suggests that the projection above *ber* are to be considered unspecialised Topic projection which can possibly host any argument.

(17)   **a.** *Gester s puach en de Maria ber hot-z-en gem?*

yesterday the book to the Mary who has-ACC CL- DAT CL given

b. *Gester en de Maria s puach ber hot-z-en gem?*

'Who gave Mary the book yesterday?'

Sentences in (**??**) are extremely interesting as far as the position of the sublayer activated by *ber* is concerned, since they hint at the fact that *ber* is not only higher as GroundP, but also as SubjP and IOP that we found above *bos*.

The structure seen so far is given in (**??**).

(18) $[_{Frame} [_{TempP} \textbf{XP}] [_{LocP} \textbf{XP}]] [_{Topicfield} [_{TopicP} \textbf{XP}] [_{TopicP} \textbf{XP}]] [_{OpP} \textbf{ber}]/ [_{Topicfield} [_{SubjP} \textbf{SUBJ}] [_{IOP} \textbf{IO}_{+res}] [_{GroundP} \textbf{rem. VP}]] [_{OpP} \textbf{bos}]$

8

2.3   Benn/om biavle

As is to be seen in (**??**), any argumental XP preceding *benn* has to be resumed by a clitic pronoun, which hints very clearly at the fact that this wh-element occupies a different position in comparison to *bos*[5].

(19)   **a.** *Gester der Mario benn hot-*(er) zechen der Nane?*

yesterday the Mario when has-SUBJ CL seen the John

'When did Mario see John yesterday?'

b. *Gester der Mario benn hoso-*(en) zechen?*

yesterday the Mario when have-SUBJ CL-ACC CL seen

'When did you see Mario yesterday?'

c. *Gester en de Maria benn hoso-*(en) gem a puach?*

yesterday to the Mary when have-SUBJ CL-DAT CL given a book

'When did you give Mary a book yesterday?'

In the case also a non-argumental PP is present the order is again rigid in the sense that the PP has to precede verb arguments (**??**a,b,c,d); the only exception to this pattern is represented by the behaviour of the subject (**??**e,f) which can show up before or after the PP.

(20)   **a.** *Gester vour de kirch der Mario benn hoso-en zechen?*

yesterday in front of the church the Mario when have-SUBJ CL-ACC CL
seen

b. **Gester der Mario vour de kirch benn hoso-en zechen?*

'When did you see Mario in front of the church yesterday?'

c. *Gester vour de kirch en de Maria benn hoso-en gem a puach?*

yesterday in front of the church to the Mary when have-SUBJ CL-DAT
CL given a book

d. **Gester en de Maria vour de kirch benn hoso-en gem a puach?*

'When did you give Mary a book in front of the church?'

e. *Gester vour de kirch der Mario benn hot-er pakemmt der Nane?*

yesterday in front of the church the Mario when has-SUBJ CL met the
John

f. *Gester der Mario vour de kirch benn hot-er pakemmt der Nane?*

'When did Mario meet John in front of the church yesterday?'

---

[5]I give here only examples beginning with *gester* in order to avoid the hanging Topic construction.

- $[_{Frame}$ $[_{TempP}$ **XP/SUBJ**] $[_{LocP}$ **XP**]] $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**]] $[_{OpP}$ **benn**]

Above *benn* and below the frame there is only one projection for Topics in which in turn verb arguments can show up. This is to be seen in the examples in (**??**), in which any combination of subject, DO and IO below a non-argumental PP is ruled out; also sentences with the subject following the scene setter and an argument below would be ungrammatical.

(21)   a.   *Gester vour de kirch der Nane de Maria om biavle hot-er-za zechen?*

   yesterday in front of the church the John the Mary at what time has-SUBJ CL-ACC CL seen
   *FRAME - SUBJ - DO

   b.   *Gester vour de kirch de Maria der Nane om biavle hot-er-za zechen?*

   *FRAME - DO - SUBJ

   'Yesterday at what time did John see Mary in front of the church?'

   c.   *Gester om 3 nomitto der Nane en de Maria om biavle hot-er-en gem a puach?*
   yesterday at three o'clock in the afternoon the John to the Mary at what time has-SUBJ CL-ACC CL given a book
   *FRAME - SUBJ - IO

   d.   *Gester om 3 nomitto en de Maria der Nane om biavle hot-er-en gem a puach?*
   *FRAME - IO - SUBJ

   'Yesterday at what time did John give Mary a book?'

- $[_{Frame}$ $[_{TempP}$ **XP**] $[_{LocP}$ **XP**]] $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**]] $[_{OpP}$ **benn**]

To sum up:

- The layer of Topics found with the wh-element *benn* is built up in the higher part by the frame and in the lower one by one position for one argumental XP with clitic doubler.

As far as the position of *benn* and its Topic is concerned one could think that they occupy a position between the two Topic positions above *ber*. For the moment I leave the problem open and in (**??**) I give the structure identified so far.

(22) $[_{Frame}$ $[_{TempP}$ **XP**] $[_{LocP}$ **XP**]]/ $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**]] $[_{OpP}$ **benn**] $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**] $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**]] $[_{OpP}$ **ber**]/ $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{SubjP}$ **SUBJ**] $[_{IOP}$ **IO**$_{+res}$ $[_{GroundP}$ **rem. VP**]] $[_{OpP}$ **bos**]

2.4 Wh-phrases

As is to be seen in (**??**) both arguments showing up before the direct object wh-phrase *biavle piacher* are to be resumed by a clitic pronoun.

(23)   **a.** *En de Maria biavle piacher hoso-*(en) kaft?*

     to the Mary how many books have-SUBJ CL-DAT CL bought

     'How many books did you bring Mary?'

     b. *Der Nane s beil dierndel hot-*(er) trog?*

     the John the which girl has-SUBJ CL taken

     'Which girl did John take to the party?'

- ***IO$_{-res}$ - wh-praseDO**

- **IO$_{+res}$ - wh-praseDO**

This last example is enough proof in favour of the claim that wh-phrases with accusative case (DOs) do not move to the same projection as simple wh-elements since they do not allow for the remnant VP; my claim is that they move higher up (as already noticed in the literature, among others Munaro 1997, Obenauer 1994, 2004).

Notice that with wh-phrases the resumptive element is obligatory even in the case of topicalization of a PP which generally does not require resumption.

(24)   *Gester petn Nane biavle piacher hoso kaft *(pet im)*

     yesterday with-the John how many books have-SUBJ CL bought with him

     'How many books did you buy John yesterday?'

- **SCENE SETTER - PP$_{+res}$ - wh-praseDO**

In the case a PP is present in the sentence it has to obligatory precede the verb argument; notice that even the subject cannot precede the PP[6].

(25)   **a.** **Der Nane en fest s beil dierndl hot-er trog?*

     the John to the party the which girl has-SUBJ CL taken

     b. *En fest der Nane s beil dierndl hot-er trog?*

     'Which girl did John take to the party?'

     c. **En de Maria vour de kirch biavle piacher hoso-*(en) trog?*

---

[6]This last observation raises again the question of the possibility of having a subject in the Spec position of the hanging Topic projection.

to the Mary in the shop how many books have-SUBJ CL-DAT CL brought

d. *Vour de kirch en de Maria biavle piacher hoso-*(en) trog?*

'How many books did you buy Mary in the shop?'

- **FRAME - TOPIC$_{+res}$ - wh-praseDO**

As far as the order of arguments above the wh-phrase is concerned it is to be seen in (**??**) that the subject has always to precede the IO; as it was the case of *bos*, dedicated positions for the subject and IO are to be found above it.

(26)   **a.**   *Gester vour de kirch der Mario en Luca s beil dierndl hot-er-en vourstellt?*
yesterday in front of the church the Mario to the Luca the which girl has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL introduced
       b.   **Gester vour de kirch en Luca der Mario s beil dierndl hot-er-en vourstellt?*
'Which girl did Mario introduce into John in front of the church?'

SUBJ - IO

*IO - SUBJ

In **??** I give the structure seen so far.

(27) $[_{Frame}$ $[_{TempP}$ **Gester** $]$ $[_{LocP}$ **vour de kirch**$]]/$ $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{SubjP}$ **SUBJ** $]$ $[_{IOP}$ **IO**$_{+res}]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **biavle piacher**$]/$ $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**$]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **benn**$]/$ $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**$]$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**$]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **ber**$]/$ $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{SubjP}$ **SUBJ** $]$ $[_{IOP}$ **IO**$_{+res}$ $]$ $[_{GroundP}$ **rem. VP**$]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **bos**$]$

The structure of the wh-field composed by the two areas activated by simple wh-elements and wh-phrases is to be seen in (**??**):

(28) $[_{whphrases}$ $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{TopP}$ **XP** $]$ $[_{TopP}$ **XP**$]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **wh**$]$ $[_{wh}$ $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**$]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **wh**$]/$ $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**$]$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**$]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **wh**$]$

3   The focus sublayer

In Cognola (2007) I concluded, following Rizzi (1997) and Poletto (2002), that focalised XPs in Mòcheno do not occupy the same Spec position as wh-elements but have to move higher up in the structure to the Spec position of a projection I called FrameP, to be found below scene setters.

(29) $[_{HT}]$ $[_{SceneS}]$ $[_{ForceP}$ $[_{SpecForce}$ **XP**$_{foc}]$ $[_{Force0}$ **V**$_{fin}]]$ $[_{Topic}]$ $[_{Topic}]$ $[_{OpP}$ $[_{SpecOP}$ **wh**$]$ $[_{Op0}$ **V**$]]$

This conclusion was reached basically on the basis of the impossibility of having a topicalised XP preceding a focalization (**??**a,b), which is though compatible with a scene setter (**??**c).

(30)   **a.** **Petn Nane A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hone kaft*

with-the John a book and not a pen have-SUBJ CL bought

b. *A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hone kaft petn Nane*

'I bought a book and not a pen with John'

c. *Gester A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hone kaft petn Nane*

yesterday with-the John a book and not a pen have-SUBJ CL bought

'Yesterday I bought a book and not a pen with John'

*TOPIC - FOCUS

In what follows I would like to present new data which allow to implement my previous hypothesis on Mòcheno and in particular I will show that a focalised XP is actually compatible with a topicalised XP on its left under certain conditions:

- the XP is always resumed in IP;

- only verb arguments (not necessary bare nouns) and semi-argumental PPs can occupy this position;

- this position is ruled out for the subject.

3.1   XPs compatible with focus

As we saw in the previous section, a focalised XP is incompatible with a topicalization (**??**).

(31)   **a.** **Petn Luca OLLBE klofft der Mario*

with-the Luca always speaks the John

'John speaks of Luca all the time'

b. **En de Maria A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hone trog*

to the Mary a book and not a pen have-SUBJ brought

'To Mary I brought a book and not a pen'

*TOPIC - FOCUS

As is to be seen in (??), however, if the XPs on the left of the focus are resumed the sentences become grammatical; my claim is that the XPs showing up before the focalised constituent are to be found in the hanging-Topic projection.

(32)   **a.** *Petn Luca OLLBE klofft der Mario *(pet im)*

with-the Luca always speaks the John with him

'John speaks of Luca all the time'

b. *En de Maria A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hone-*(en) trog*

to the Mary a book and not a pen have-SUBJ CL DAT CLIT brought

'To Mary I brought a book and not a pen'

I analyse the XP preceding the focalised item as a hanging Topic:

HANGING TOPIC - FOCUS - VERB - SUBJECT

In what follows I will give three arguments in favour of the claim that a focalised XP can be preceded only by a hanging Topic and what is more, that the hanging-Topic projection is exclusive only for bare DPs.

In the case V2 is triggered by a focus there can be only one Topic above it. As shown in (??a,b), it would not be grammatical to have in any order two PPs above focus. This projection is not recursive.

(33)   **a.** **Petn Nane en de Maria A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hone-en trog pet im*

with-the John to the Mary a book and not a pen have SUBJ CL brought with him

b. **En de Maria petn Nane A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hone-en trog pet im*

'In front of the church to Mary I brought a book'

*TOPIC - TOPIC - FOCUS - VERB - SUBJECT

The position above focus is not accessible for all XPs, but seems to be dedicated to arguments (except the subject) and semiarguments (PPs). This is to be seen in the examples in (??), a locative PP cannot show up above a focalised DO (??a,b) and the same can be said for the subject (??c).

(34)   **a.** **Vour de kirch A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hone trog en de Maria*

in front of the church a book and not a pen have-SUBJ CL brought to the Mary

b. *A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hone trog en de Maria vour de kirch*

'A book and not a pen did I bring Mary in front of the church'

c. *?/*Der Mario A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hot-er kaft*

the Mario a book and not a pen has-SUBJ CL bought

d. *A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hot der Mario kaft*

'A book and not a pen did Mario buy'

The XP showing up before focus cannot be preceded by any other XP, namely by a hanging Topic. As is to be seen in (**??**a,b), a subject in the hanging Topic projection is always ungrammatical together with the sequence XP-FOCUS.

(35)　　**a.** **Der Nane, en de Maria A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hot-er-en gem*
　　　　　the John to the Mary a book and not a pen has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL given

　　　　b. **Der Nane, en de Maria A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hot-er-en gem der sell tepp*
　　　　　the John to the Mary a book and not a pen has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL given that crook

The properties of the XP showing up before focus seen so far are listed below; notice that in the literature (Benincà 2001, 2006) these properties are assumed for hanging Topics:

- obligatory resumption;

- lack of recursivity;

- only arguments and semiarguments (PPs);

- cannot be preceded by a subject in the hanging-Topic position.

Now, if the XP preceding a focus can only be a hanging Topic even if it is not a bare noun, we have to face the problem of the position of scene setters. In what follow I will show that scene setters do not show up above focus in Mòcheno as previously thought, but below it; cases of scene setter-focus are to be thought of as cases in which the scene setter is itself in a Spec position of hanging Topic.

First of all notice that a scene setter is compatible with focus (**??**).

(36)　　　*Gester A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hot der Nane kaft*

　　　　　yesterday a book and not a pen has the John bought

　　　　　'A book and not a pen did John buy yesterday'

A scene setter cannot precede the sequence XP+focus (**??**):

(37)　　**a.** **Gester pet de Maria A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hone kaft pet ir*

yesterday with the Maria a book and not a pen have-CL PRON bought
with her

b. *Pet de Maria gester A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hone kaft pet ir*

'Yesterday with Mary I bought a book and not a pen'

c. *Gester en de Maria A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hot-en der Nane kaft*

yesterday to the Mary a book and not a pen has-DAT CL the John bought

d. *Pet de Maria gester A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hot-en der Nane kaft*

'Yesterday Luca bought Mary a book'

*SCENE SETTER - XP - FOCUS

A subject in the hanging-Topic position cannot precede a scene setter and an XP+focus (as we saw above in **??**).

(38)   *Der Nane gester A PUACH UND NET A PENNA hot-er-en gem en de Maria*
the John yesterday a book and not a pen has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL given to the Mary

*HT - SCENE SETTERS - XP - FOCUS

The structure we can derive with more than one position in hanging TopicP dedicated to different arguments is given in (**??**):

(39) $[_{HTP}\ [_{HTP1}\ \textbf{XP}][_{HTP2}\ \textbf{XP}]][_{OpP}\ [_{SpecOpP}\textbf{FOCUS}][_{Op0}\ \textbf{V}_{fin}]]$

The hanging-Topic projection, together with the operatorP where focus is to be found, can be thought of to be in the frame field (as proposed by Benincà/Poletto 2004) immediately above the projections for time and space, as is to be seen in (**??**)

(40) $[_{Frame}[_{HTP}\ [_{HTP1}\ \textbf{XP}][_{HTP2}\ \textbf{XP}]][_{OpP}\ [_{SpecOp}\textbf{FOCUS}][_{Op0}\ \textbf{V}_{fin}]]$
$[_{TempP}\ \textbf{XP}\ ]\ [_{LocP}\ \textbf{XP}]]$ - $[_{Topicfield}\ [_{SubjP}\ \textbf{SUBJ}\ ]\ [_{IOP}\ \textbf{IO}_{+res}]]\ [_{OpP}$
biavle piacher]/ - $[_{Topicfield}\ [_{TopicP}\ \textbf{XP}]]\ [_{OpP}\ \textbf{benn}]/$ - $[_{Topicfield}$
$[_{TopicP}\ \textbf{XP}]\ [_{TopicP}\ \textbf{XP}]]\ [_{OpP}\ \textbf{ber}]/$ - $[_{Topicfield}\ [_{Subjp}\ \textbf{SUBJ}\ ]\ [_{IOP}$
$\textbf{IO}_{+res}\ ]\ [_{GroundP}\ \textbf{rem. VP}]]\ [_{OpP}\ \textbf{bos}]$

3.2   Conclusions

In this work I examined Mòcheno left periphery showing that:

- different wh-elements show up in different dedicated operator positions activating dedicated Topic layers different among them;

- every Topic layer ends up in the same way, that is with a frame composed by a position for an XP expressing time and an XP expressing place;

- the structure to be derived is the following one:

(41) $[_{Frame}[_{TempP}$ **XP** $]$ $[_{LocP}$ **PP**$]]$ - $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{SubjP}$ **SUBJ** $]$ $[_{IOP}$
       IO$_{+res}]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **biavle piacher**$]/$ - $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**$]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **benn**$]/$
       - $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**$]$ $[_{TopicP}$ **XP**$]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **ber**$]/$ - $[_{Topicfield}$ $[_{SubjP}$
       SUBJ $]$ $[_{IOP}$ **IO**$_{+res}$ $]$ $[_{GroundP}$ **rem. VP**$]]$ $[_{OpP}$ **bos**$]$

- focalised XPs move to a different operator position located above the frame composed by time and place expressions;

- above the projection dedicated to foci only a hanging topic can be found;

- the hanging-Topic position can host also argumental PPs and is dedicated only to bare DPs;

- the one below (**??**) is the structure of the high left periphery found above scene setters, that is the complete structure of the frame:

(42) $[_{Frame}[_{HTP}$ $[_{HTP1}$ **XP**$][_{HTP2}$ **XP**$]][_{OpP}$ $[_{SpecOp}$**FOCUS**$][_{Op0}$ **V**$_{fin}]]$
       $[_{TempP}$ **XP** $]$ $[_{LocP}$ **XP**$]]$

References

Benincà, Paola(2006): "On the Functional Structure of the Left Periphery of Medieval Romance", in: R. Zanuttini, H. Campos, E. Herburger e P. Portner (eds.), *Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture: Cross-linguistics Inverstigation.* Georgetown University Press

/Cecilia, Poletto (2004): "Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers", in: L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures.* Oxford University Press, New York

Cardinaletti, Anna (2004): "Towards a Cartography of Subject Positions", in: L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures.* Oxford University Press, New York

Cinque, Guglielmo (2006): "Complements and Adverbial PPs: Implication for Clause Structure", in: G. Cinque, *Restructuring and Functional Structure. The Cartography of Syntactic Structure, Volume 4.* Oxford University Press, New York

Cognola, Federica (2007): *Ordini delle parole e movimento wh-in Mòcheno.* Paper presented at the XIII *Giornata di Dialettologia*, University of Padua

Munaro, Nicola (1997): *Proprietà strutturali e distribuzionali dei sintagmi interrogativi in alcuni dialetti italiani settentrionali.* Ph.D. thesis, University of Padua

Obenauer, Hans Georg (1994): *Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre. Effects d'intervention et mouvemets des quantifieurs.* Thèse d'Etat, Université de Paris VII

(2004): "Nonstandard wh-questions and alternative checkers in Pagotto", in: Lohnstein, Horst; Susanne, Trissler (ed.): *The left perifery of Germanic Languages.* Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin

Poletto, Cecilia (2002): "The left periphery of V2-Rhaetoromance dialects: a new perspective on V2 and V3", in: S. Barbiers, L. Cornips e S. van der Kleij (ed.): *Syntactic Microvariation.* Meertens Institute, Amsterdam

/Jean-Yves, Pollock (2004): "On wh-clitics and wh-doubling in French and some Northern Italian dialect", in: *Probus*, 16

Schweikert, Walter (2004): "The Order of Prepositional Phrases in the Structure of the clause". PhD dissertation, University of Venice