Nicola Munaro
Università Ca' Foscari Venezia[*]

LOCALIZING CONDITIONAL CLAUSES IN THE LEFT PERIPHERY: EVIDENCE FROM MULTIPLE COMPLEMENTIZER CONSTRUCTIONS IN ROMANCE

1. INTRODUCTION

Adopting a cartographic approach to the structure of the left-periphery along the lines of Rizzi (1997), in this article I explore the distribution of conditional clauses in multiple complementizer constructions in Old Italian and early Italo-Romance as well as in modern Ibero-Romance. I argue that this kind of adverbial clauses could occupy in early varieties more than one specifier position within the left periphery of embedded clauses; this possibility has been lost over the centuries and is no more attested in modern Italian, where conditional clauses target just one specifier position, namely the specifier of a high functional projection within the Topic field. Modern Ibero-Romance, where complementizer doubling is still attested, patterns instead with early Italo-Romance. The discussion of the data will lead to the conclusion that in multiple complementizer constructions the function of the highest complementizer is to lexicalize the subordinating head Force°, while the lower occurrences of the complementizer mark the boundary of the two Topic subfields into which the Topic layer can be split, in the spirit of Benincà and Poletto (2004);[1] moreover, it will be argued that whenever an embedded clause is introduced by a single complementizer, this invariably lexicalizes Force°, the highest functional head of the left-periphery, the optionality in the lexicalization being limited to the lower Topic heads.

The article is structured as follows: in section 2, I present empirical evidence from modern Italo-Romance varieties in favour of the splitting of the Topic field into two distinct subfields, the higher of which hosting preposed adverbial clauses, the lower one hosting non-clausal topicalized constituents. In section 3, I discuss the distribution of conditional clauses with respect to the phenomenon of complementizer doubling and tripling in early Italo-Romance, pointing out that the preposed adverbial clause could target more than just one left-peripheral specifier position. In section 4, I take into account some cases of complementizer iteration from modern Ibero-Romance, arguing that the function

---

of the lower complementizers is the delimitation of the boundary of the two main Topic subfields. Section 5 concludes the paper with some summarizing remarks.

2. TWO TOPIC SUBFIELDS

As discussed extensively in Munaro (2010), there are sound empirical reasons to postulate that the left-peripheral Topic field should be split into at least two distinct Topic subfields, the higher of which is dedicated to host topicalized clausal adjuncts, while the lower one hosts topicalized non-clausal phrasal constituents.

This hypothesis seems to be supported by the fact that a topicalized inverted conditional clause tends to precede a topicalized non-clausal constituent of the embedded clause, as witnessed by the following examples from modern standard Italian; both in (1a) and in (2a), which are fully grammatical, the inverted conditional clause precedes the left-dislocated internal argument of the emdedded predicate, while (1b) and (2b), where the linear order is reversed, are very marginal:

(1) a) *Credo   che, fosse Gianni venuto alla festa, Mario, avremmo dovuto invitarlo*.
      believe that, were John   come to-the party, Mario, have-cond must   invite-him
      'I believe that, had John come to the party, Mario, we should have invited.'
  b) ??*Credo che Mario, fosse Gianni venuto alla festa, avremmo dovuto invitarlo*.
      believe that Mario, were John   come to-the party, have-cond must invite-him
      'I believe that Mario, had John come to the party, we should have invited.'

(2) a)
Credo   che, avesse Gianni rifiutato la nostra proposta, con   Mario, avremmo   dovuto parlare.
believe t hat, had   John   rejected the our   proposal, with Mario, have-cond must   speak
'I believe that, had John rejected our proposal, with Mario, we should have spoken.
    b)
??*Credo che con Mario, avesse Gianni rifiutato la nostra proposta, avremmo   dovuto parlare.*
believe   that with Mario, had   John   rejected the our   proposal, have-cond must   speak
'I believe that with Mario, had John rejected our proposal, we should have spoken.'

The grammaticality contrast is somewhat less evident, but still clearly perceivable, when the preposed conditional clause is introduced by the hypothetical complementizer *se*:

(3) a)
Credo   che, se si sono incontrati prima della   riunione, della tua   collega, ne abbiano parlato.
believe that, if refl-are met   before of-the meeting, about your colleague cl-have   spoken
'I believe that, if they met before the meeting, about your colleague, they have spoken.'
    b)
?*Credo che della tua collega, se si   sono incontrati prima della   riunione, ne abbiano parlato.*
believe that about your coll.   if refl-are met   before of-the meeting, cl-have   spoken
'I believe that, about your colleague, if they met before the meeting, they have spoken.'

This kind of linear restriction seems to hold crosslinguistically, as also in Paduan, a dialect spoken in the North-Eastern Italian region of Veneto, a preposed inverted conditional clause must precede both a left-dislocated constituent and a *wh*-phrase, as shown by the following examples; the only grammatical sequence is (4a), where the conditional clause precedes both the indirect object *a to sorèla* and the *wh*-item *cossa*, while the alternative orders in (4b) and (4c) give rise to ungrammaticality:

(4) a)
Fùsselo vegnùo anca Mario, a to   sorèla, cossa garissito podùo   dirghe?
were-cl come   also Mario, to your sister, what   have-cond been-able tell-her
'If Mario had come as well, to your sister, what could you have told?'
   b)
??*A to sorèla, fùsselo vegnùo anca Mario, cossa garissito   podùo   dirghe?*
to your sister, were-cl come   also Mario, what have-cond been-able tell-her
'To your sister, if Mario had come as well, what could you have told?'
   c)
 A to sorèla, cossa, fùsselo vegnùo anca Mario, garissito podùo   dirghe?
to your sister,   what, were-cl come   also Mario, have-cond been-able tell-her
'To your sister, what, if Mario had come as well, could you have told?'

On the other hand, in Paduan the adverbial clause must follow a hanging topic constituent, as witnessed by the examples in (5), where the indirect object *Mario* functioning as hanging topic is not accompanied by the preposition and is obligatorily resumed by the pronominal clitic *ghe*; the full grammaticality of (5a), where *Mario* precedes the preposed concessive clause, suggests that the latter indeed belongs to the Topic field:

(5) a)
Mario, anca gavesseli telefonà in tempo, no garìssimo podùo   dirghelo.
Mario, also had-cl   phoned in time,   not have-cond been-able tell-him-it
'Mario, even if they had phoned in time, we couldn't have told.'
   b)
??*Anca gavesseli telefonà in tempo, Mario, no garìssimo podùo   dirghelo.*
also   had-cl   phoned in time,   Mario, not have-cond been-able tell-him-it
'Even if they had phoned in time, Mario, we couldn't have told.'

Adopting Benincà and Poletto's (2004) decomposition of the Topic field into a Frame and a Thematization subfield, we can identify the landing site of topicalized adverbial clauses in the specifier of the SceneSettingP belonging to the Frame subfield, while clitic left-dislocated constituents would target the specifier of the lower LeftDislP belonging to the Thematization subfield, as represented in (6):

(6) [ForceP [Force°][TopicP-SceneSettP conditional clause [SS°][TopicP-LeftDislP
    topicalized constituent [LD°] …]]]

As far as embedded clauses are concerned, in modern Italian a preposed conditional clause associated to the embedded clause follows the subordinating complementizer *che*, as witnessed by the contrast between the full grammaticality of (7a) and the marginality of (7b):

(7) a)
Credo che, se il tuo collega non verrà alla riunione, dovremo parlare con Gianni.
believe that, if the your coll. not will-come to-the meeting, must-fut speak with John
'I believe that, if your colleague will not join the meeting, we will have to speak with John.'
  b)
??*Credo, se il tuo collega non verrà alla riunione, che dovremo parlare con Gianni.*
believe, if the your coll. not will-come to-the meeting, that must-fut speak with John
'I believe, if your colleague will not join the meeting, that we will have to speak with John.'

This same ordering was attested in Old Italian, where the conditional clause usually followed the subordinating *che*:

(8) …*pensando che se sarà compagno di Dio nelle passioni,*
    …thinking that if will-be companion of God in-the passions,
    Ø sarà suo compagno nelle consolazioni.
    will-be his companion in-the consolations
    '…thinking that if he will be God's companion in the sufferings, he will be his companion in the consolations.'

<div align="right">Bono Giamboni, Libro, chap.7, par.12</div>

We can schematically represent the structure of (7a) and (8) as in (9), where the subordinating complementizer lexicalizes the head Force°, while the preposed adverbial clause targets the specifier of a Topic projection whose head is phonetically empty:

(9) Main clause [ForceP [Force° *che*] [TopicP conditional clause [Topic° Ø] …]]

However, as we will see in the next section, this was not the only option in Old Italian.

3. ON CONDITIONAL CLAUSES AND (MULTIPLE) COMPLEMENTIZERS IN EARLY ITALO-ROMANCE

3.1 Complementizer Doubling

Beside the ordinary structure with one complementizer introducing the embedded clause, in Old Italian, by which I essentially mean 13th century Florentine, we can find numerous examples where the protasis appears sandwiched between two instances of the complementizer *che*, one preceding and one following the preposed clausal adverbial associated to the embedded clause:

(10) a)

…pe rò vi priegho in lealtade e   fede che, se ttue vuoli del mio avere, che ttu ne tolghi.

…but   you-pray   in loyalty and faith that, if you want of   my have,   that you cl-take

'…therefore I ask you in loyalty and faith that, if you want my belongings, that you take some'

Libro della distruzione di Troia, p.155, ll. 26-27

     b)

…dirai (…) che, se tuo   padre fu loro aspro, che tu   sarai loro umile   e   benigno…

…will-say   that if your father was them severe, that you will-be them humble and benign…

'…you will say that, if your father was severe to them, that you will be humble and benign to

them…'   *Novellino*, 6, ll. 37-38

     c)

…e   di quella cotale quantità siate sichuri da   lloro, sì che se'l   fatto si potesse fare,

…and of that   such   amount be   sure   from them, so that if the fact   cl-could do,

   che nnoi possiamo pagare i   denari sicuramente…

   that we   can   pay   the money surely…

'…and of such amount be ensured by them, so that if the thing could be done, that we can surely

pay the money…'   *Lettera di Consiglio de' Cerchi* II, p. 603, ll. 24-27

     d)

…ti   priego che, se egli avviene ch' io muoja, che le mie cose   ed ella

…you-pray   that, if it   happens that I die,   that the my things and she

   ti   sieno raccomandate.

   you-be   recommended

'…I ask you that, if it happens that I die, that my things and she be entrusted to you.'

Decameron, 2,7,84

Paoli (2007), discussing some cases of complementizer doubling in early Romance, takes the second occurrence of *che* to head the TopicP projection, which hosts the topicalized adverbial clause in its specifier:

(11) Main clause [ForceP [Force° *che1*] [TopicP conditional clause [Topic° *che2*] …]]

In her view, the overt realization of the complementizer in Topic° is taken to reflect a spec-head agreement relation between Topic° and the clausal constituent occupying Spec,TopicP. In the same spirit, Ledgeway (2005) – discussing the following examples of complementizer doubling from Southern Italian varieties of the 14th-15th century – interprets the first occurrence of *che* as the lexicalization of Force° and the second one as the phonetically realized trace left in the intermediate landing site Topic° by the complementizer raising from Fin° up to Force°:[2]

---

2   Also other types of adverbial clauses could appear between *che1* and *che2*, like in the following examples:
   (i) a) *…e   amava sò fforte mente che a llui sì era tutta via viso   che quando persona neuna la sguardasse,*
      …and loved so strongly   that to him so was anyway shown that when   person no   her-watched
     che inmantenente iglile   togliesse.
     that soon   he-to-her took-off
     '...and he loved so intensely that to him it was shown that, when nobody was watching, that immediately
     he would take them off her'.   *Il Tristano Riccardiano*, cap. 75, pg. 149, 25-28, from Paoli (2007)

(12) a)

…le aveva ditto che se sua maistà voleva lo stato suo che se llo venesse
…him had told that if his majesty wanted the state his that refl-it- came
a ppigliare co la spata in mano.
to take with the sword in hand
 '…he had told him that, if his majesty wanted his state, that he should come and take it with his sword in hand'. *Cronica* 148 v.1-2, from Ledgeway (2005)
 b)
omni raxun dichi ki si homu ad homu fa fallu, ki sia tinutu
all reason says that if man to man makes wrong, that be kept
a la debita satisfaccioni.
to-the necessary satisfaction
'all reason states that, if one man wrongs another, that he should remain in his debt.'
Sposizione del Vangelo della Passione secondo Matteo 44.14-5, from Ledgeway (2005)

As Ledgeway points out, particularly telling is the following example where the lower complementizer is followed by a focalized constituent, which reinforces the hypothesis that it lexicalizes a Topic° head, under the assumption that the landing site of focalized phrases follows all the topic-related projections (cf. Benincà and Poletto 2004):

(13)

Eo penso bene che, se per lo tiempo passato avessemo voluto monstrare lo nostro ardire,
I think well that, if for the time passed had wanted to show the our bravery
che DERITAMENTE avessemo mandato ad asseyare Troya.
that straightaway had sent to siege Troy
'I indeed think that, if in the past we had wanted to show our bravery, that STRAIGHTAWAY we would have gone to siege Troy.'
Libro della Destructione di Troya 140.21-3, from Ledgeway (2005)

From the data reported in this section, we can conclude that in early Italo-Romance varieties *if*-clauses – and adverbial clauses in general – were among the most plausible

---

b) *volimo et commandamote che, mantinente che per lictere nostre senteray essere nuy o a Melfe*
 want and order-you that, as soon as for letters ours will-hear to-be we or at Melfi
 o a Troya, che dige ad nuy sencza dimorancza personalimente venire.
 or at Troy, that should to us without lingering personally come
 'we want and order you that, as soon as you hear thorugh one of our letters that we are in Melfi or Troy, that you should personally come at once to us.' *Lettera del re Luigi d'Angiò-Taranto…* 12-4, from Ledgeway (2005)
c) *serrà bisogno che, dove ilo non mecte exemplo per lo quale poza bene essere intiso lo suo dicto,*
 will-be need that, where he not puts example for the which can well be understood the his word
 che eo mecta exemplo e declaracione per manifestare lo intendimento suo.
 that I put example and declaration for show the intention his
 'it will be necessary that, wherever he fails to provide as example by which his words can be clearly understood, that I give an example and declaration in order to make his intention clearly understood.'
 Libro de lu Dialagu de Sanctu Gregoriu 3.1-3, from Ledgeway (2005)

candidates to fill the position sandwiched between the two occurrences of the complementizer, the higher one heading Force°, the lower one heading a Topic projection.[3]

3.2   A higher position for conditional clauses

Another possibility attested in Old Italian, and not attested in modern Italian, is the presence of a single phonetically realized complementizer after the conditional clause associated to the embedded clause, like in the following examples:

(14) a)
…e   dico ben Ø, se 'l voler non mi muta,   ch'eo stesso li   uccidrò, que' sconoscenti.
…and say well,   if the will   not me-changes, that I myself them-will-kill, those louts
'…and I say well, if I do not change my will, that I will kill them myself, those louts'

<div align="right">Dante, Rime, 8, vv. 13-14</div>

   b)
…per ch'io son certo Ø, se ben la difendo nel dir   com'io la 'ntendo,
…for that I am certain, if well her-defend in saying how I   her-mean,
ch' Amor di sé   mi farà   grazia ancora.
that Love of himself me-will-do grace   again
 '…therefore I am certain, if I defend her well in saying how I mean her, that Love will favour me again.'   Dante, *Rime*, 30, vv. 17-19

   c)
Ma so   bene Ø, se Carlo   fosse morto, che voi ci trovereste ancor cagione…
but know well,   if Charles were dead,   that you cl-find-cond still   reason…
'But I know well, if Charles had died, that you would find new reasons…'

<div align="right">Rustico Filippi, Sonetti, 3, vv. 9-10</div>

---

3   In the few modern Italo-Romance varieties still displaying complementizer doubling (cf. Paoli 2007), conditional clauses cannot occur any more between the two complementizers. Under the present approach, the impossibility in modern Italo-Romance to sandwich a clausal adjunct between two complementizers can be interpreted as a consequence of a diachronic process of downward reanalysis to the effect that *che2*, originally lexicalizing the higher head SceneSett°, has been reanalyzed by the speakers – due to the structural ambiguity of the linear string – as the lexicalization of the lower head LeftDisl°, namely the one associated with the specifier position hosting left-dislocated phrasal constituents, as represented in (i):
(i) a) [ForceP [Force° *che1*] [SceneSettP adverbial clause [SS° *che2*] [LeftDislP [LD°]]]
       b) [ForceP [Force° *che1*] [SceneSettP adverbial clause [SS°] [LeftDislP [LD° *che2*]]]
       c) [ForceP [Force°*che1*] [SceneSettP [SS°] [LeftDislP topicalized phrase[LD°*che2*]]]
Interestingly, as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, a Slovenian dialect that has language contact with Italian still displays conditional clauses in complementizer doubling structures, like in the following example taken from Plesničar (2015):
(ii) *Koga si rekel, da če kaj   ni jasno, da naj   vprašajo?*
     who aux say   that if something not clear   that should ask
     'Who did you say that they should ask if something isn't clear?'

According to Meszler and Samu (2010), in all these examples the conditional clause preceding *che* clearly refers to the content of the subordinate clause, and not to the matrix clause, despite appearance, so that we are obliged to assume that the clausal adjunct preceding *che* belongs indeed to the left periphery of the embedded clause; in their view, the phonetic realization of the lower complementizer makes the overt realization of the higher one superfluous. I would like to propose a different analysis for the examples in (14), suggesting that the complementizer *che* is in fact the lexicalization of Force° and that the conditional clause has raised to a higher structural position, namely the specifier of ForceP, crossing over the complementizer:[4]

(15) Main clause [ForceP conditional clause [Force° *che*] [TopicP [Topic° Ø] …]]

This alternative structural analysis allows us to formulate a generalization, namely that whenever we find an embedded clause introduced by a single complementizer, this invariably lexicalizes Force°, the highest functional head of the left-periphery, and the optionality in the lexicalization concerns exclusively the lower Topic heads.

3.3   Complementizer tripling in early Italo-Romance

In early Italo-Romance a further possibility was sporadically attested, namely the presence of three complementizers, with topicalized lexical material appearing between them. Vincent (2006) reports the following example, where a conditional clause occurs between the highest and the intermediate *che*, while a heavy topicalized constituent, the subject of the embedded clause, appears between the intermediate and the lowest *che*:

(16)
Ancora statuemo e   ordenamo che se alcuna persona de la   dita Confraria fosse maroto
still   establish and order   that if any   person of-the said Company were dead
che subitamenti quello chi saverà de quello ditto fraello maroto che ello lo debia denuntiar
that soon that   who   will-know of that   said brother dead   that he it- must tell
a lo   prior
to-the prior
'We further establish and order that, if any person of the mentioned Company died, that soon who will know about that dead brother, that he should announce it to the prior'
                              Statuti della Compagnia dei Caravana del porto di Genova, 1340

Capitalizing on the recursive nature of Topic projections postulated by Rizzi (1997), we could analyze this example as follows, namely with the second and the third instance of the complementizer lexicalizing the heads of recursive Topic projections,

---

4   I will remain agnostic here as to the trigger for the movement of the conditional clause to
     Spec,ForceP, simply suggesting that this might be a syntactic device to bring the adverbial clause
     in a local relation of spec-head agreement with the complementizer *che* sitting in Force°.

where the conditional clause occupies a specifier position higher than the one targeted by the topicalized constituent:

(17) Main clause [ForceP [Force° *che1*] [TopicP conditional clause [Topic° *che2*] [TopicP topicalized constituent [Topic° *che3*] …]]]

On the other hand, Ledgeway (2005) reports the following example of complementizer tripling where the relative order of conditional clause and heavy topicalized constituent is reversed:

(18)
Pregove, madama, per l'amor di Dio, che de chilli dinare che eo agio vostri
pray-you madam   for the love of God that of that   money that I   have yours
che si non vi   fusse troppo   sconço   che mi 'ndi impristiti una unça.
that if not you-were too-much inconvenience that me-cl- lend   an 'uncia'
'I ask of you, my lady, for the love of God, that, from that money of yours that I hold, that, if you were not to find it too inconvenient, that you should lend me an 'uncia' of it,'
                                          Lettera del tesoriere Tommasino da Nizza a Lapa Acciaiuoli, 1353

As one can clearly see, in this case the conditional clause appears between the intermediate and the lowest *che* and follows the topicalized prepositional phrase, therefore it arguably occupies the specifier of a lower Topic projection, as represented in (19):

(19) Main clause [ForceP [Force° *che1*] [TopicP topicalized constituent [Topic° *che2*] [TopicP conditional clause [Topic° *che3*] …]]]

If this analysis is on the right track, it provides evidence for a possible location of the conditional clause in a relatively low Topic position within the left periphery of the embedded clause in early Italo-Romance.

Summing up, in this section we have seen that in early Italo-Romance conditional clauses could occupy up to three different specifier positions within the left-periphery of the embedded clause, namely a low Topic position, like in (18), a higher Topic position, like in (16) and (10), and the specifier of ForceP, like in (14).

4. ON COMPLEMENTIZER ITERATION IN MODERN IBERO-ROMANCE

Within the Romance domain, the possibility for a topicalized constituent or an *if*-clause to intervene between two instances of *que* is robustly attested in modern Ibero-Romance, as witnessed by the following examples:

(20) a) *Acho que se lhe   ligasses que tudo se   resolveria.*
         think that if him/her called   that all   itself-solve
         'I think that if you called him/her everything would turn out fine.'

b) *Espero que a   Ana que traga o   livro.*
   hope   that the Ana that brings the book
   'I hope that Ana brings the book.' European Portuguese (from Mascarenhas 2007)

(21) a) *Me dijeron que si llueve, que viene   Guillermo.*
         me told   that if rains   that comes William
         'They told me that if it rains, William will come.'
   b) *Susi dice que, a los alumnos, que les van a dar   regalos.*
         Susi says that to the students   that cl- go   to give presents
         'Susy says that they are going to give the students presents.'
                                                    Spanish (from Villa-Garcìa 2012)

(22) a) *La secretària em va dir   que si pagava l'   import abans d'una setmana,*
         the secretary me   told that if paid   the amount before   a   week
         que encara em podia matricular.
         that still   me could register
         'The secretary told me that if I paid the amount before a week I could still
         register.'
   b) *Ha dit   que els convidats, que estan asseguts a taula.*
         has said that the guests   that stay   seated   at table
         '(S)he has said that the guests are seated at the table.'
                                                    Catalan (from Gonzàlez i Planas 2013)

According to Mascarenhas (2007), Villa-Garcìa (2012), and Gonzàlez i Planas (2013), in the complementizer doubling structures in (20)-(22) *que1* lexicalizes the Force° head, while *que2* lexicalizes a Topic° head which hosts the topicalized adverbial clause or the topicalized phrase in its specifier, as schematically represented in (23):[5]

(23)   Main clause [ForceP [Force° *que1*] [TopicP adverbial clause/topicalized con-
        stituent [Topic° *que2*] …]]

Villa-Garcìa (2012) also discusses the following example, where the conditional clause follows *que2*, and a topicalized argumental prepositional phrase appears sand-wiched between *que1* and *que2*:

(24)   *Me dijeron que a la fiesta, que si llueve, no van a ir.*
        me said   that to the party   that if rains   not go to go
        'They told me that they are not going to the party if it rains'

---

5   If we accept the correctness of this approach, then the fact that preposed protases can easily enter
     the complementizer doubling construction can be seen as an empirical argument in favour of the
     hypothesis that they belong to the Topic field of the associated (embedded) clause, as indepen-
     dently proposed by Munaro (2005). For a recent exhaustive analysis of the distributional proper-
     ties of central and peripheral adverbial clauses the reader is referred to Haegeman (2012).

According to Villa-Garcìa, the structural representation of (24) is the following, where the conditional clause occupies the specifier of the lower Topic projection (a possibility that was attested in Old Italian), whose head remains phonetically unrealized:

(25)   Main clause [ForceP [Force° *que1*] [TopicP *a la fiesta* [Topic° *que2*] [TopicP *si llueve* [Top° Ø] …]]]

Both in Spanish and in European Portuguese are also attested cases of complementizer tripling, like the following, where between each pair of complementizers appear topicalized constituents interpretively linked to the embedded clause:⁶

(26) a) *Dijo que el dinero, que a Juan, que se lo mandaban por correo.*
         said that the money that to Juan that cl-cl sent   for mail
         'He said that they were sending John the money through the mail.'
                                                        Spanish (from Escribano 1991)
      b) *Acho que amanhã   que a   Ana que vai conseguir acabar o   trabalho.*
         think that tomorrow that the Ana that will manage   to finish the assignment.
         'I think that tomorrow Ana will manage to finish the assignment.'
                                        European Portuguese (from Mascarenhas 2007)

For an example like (26b) Mascarenhas (2007) proposes that the second and the third complementizer lexicalize the heads of recursive Topic projections:

(27)   *Acho* [ForceP [Force° *que*] [TopicP *amanhã* [Topic° *que*] [TopicP *a Ana* [Topic° *que*] …]]]

Interestingly, as pointed out by Mascarenhas (2007), in European Portuguese the possibility of having four complementizers co-occurring within the same clause with three topicalized constituents appearing in the embedded left periphery is excluded, as witnessed by (28a), and slightly marginal is also the appearance of a single complementizer preceding three topicalized constituents, like in (28b):

(28) a)
??*Duvido que ontem   que o Pedro que à   Ana que lhe   tenha   telefonado.*
   doubt   that yesterday that the Pedro that to the Ana that cl.dat have   called
'I doubt that yesterday Pedro called Ana.'

---

6   The template exemplified in (26), namely the possibility of having multiple complementizers with topicalized material intervening in between each pair, is reported to be ungrammatical by Demonte and Fernàndez-Soriano (2009), who provide the following example:
     (i) *Te   pido que a tu   padre* (*que*) *en este momento* (*que*) *esa mentira* (*que*) *no se la digas.*
         you ask   that to your father   (that) at this moment   (that) that lie   (that) not cl-cl tell
     'I ask you not to tell that lie to your father at this moment.'
     This might suggest that in this case the three topicalized constituents are all contained within the same Topic subfield, arguably the lower one.

b) ?*Duvido que ontem   o Pedro à   Ana lhe   tenha   telefonado*.
   doubt   that yesterday the Pedro to the Ana cl.dat have   called
   'I doubt that yesterday Pedro called Ana.'

The deviance of (28a), as well as the fact that we do not find in early Italo-Romance any examples containing four (or more) instances of the complementizer *che*, suggests that crosslinguistically the maximal number of occurrences of the complementizers within the same clause is three.[7] This can be interpreted as indicating that, excluding the highest complementizer, which uncontroversially lexicalizes Force°, the function of the two following complementizers is to mark the lower boundary of the two main Topic subfields identified above, namely the higher one, endowed with scene setting properties, and the lower one, devoted to the thematization of argumental constituents.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on evidence from the distributional properties of preposed conditional clauses in multiple complementizer structures in Romance, in this article I have tried to argue for a splitting of the Topic field into two subfields, along the lines of Benincà and Poletto (2004); in modern Italian the higher Frame subfield, endowed with a scene setting function, is the landing site of preposed adverbial clauses or of time adverbials; the lower subfield, devoted to the thematization function, hosts primarily topicalized non-clausal argumental constituents of the embedded clause. The respective lower boundary of these two subfields could be lexicalized in early Italo-Romance by the second (and third) occurrence of the complementizer in multiple complementizer constructions, a possibility which is still attested in modern Ibero-Romance languages. From a diachronic perspective, it is possible to determine a relation between the presence of complementizer doubling on the one hand and the relative freedom of placement of conditional clauses on the other (the situation of early Italo-Romance and modern Ibero-Romance); the loss of complementizer doubling in most modern Italo-Romance

---

7   As pointed out by Mascarenhas (2007), the situation is somewhat different with the interrogative complementizer *se*, which can easily appear twice in the same clause, like in (i), but can less easily appear three times, as witnessed by the slight deviance of (iia), although (iia) sounds better than (iib), where two topicalized constituents appear sandwiched between the two occurrences of *se*:
(i) *Não sei   se o   João* (*se*) *vai chegar a horas*.
    not know if the João   if   will arrive at hours
    'I don't know if João will arrive on time'
(ii) a) ?*Não sei   se amanha   se o   Pedro se consegue entregar o   trabalho*.
        not know if tomorrow if the Pedro if manages hand in the assignment
        'I don't know if tomorrow Pedro will manage to hand in the assignment.'
    b) ?*Não sei   se amanha   o Pedro se consegue entregar o   trabalho*.
        not know if tomorrow the Pedro if manages hand in   the assignment
        'I don't know if tomorrow Pedro will manage to hand in the assignment.'
For a possible implementation of the interrogative complementizer *se* within the split left-periphery the reader is referred to Rizzi (2001).

varieties entails a gradual shift to a stricter localization of conditional clauses within the left periphery.

References

BENINCÀ, Paola/Cecilia POLETTO (2004) "Topic, Focus and V2 – Defining the CP sublayers." In: L. Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of IP and CP*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 52–75.

DEMONTE, Violeta/Olga FERNANDEZ-SORIANO (2009) "Force and finiteness in the Spanish complementizer system." *Probus* 21/1, 23–49.

ESCRIBANO, José Luis Rafael G. (1991) *Una teoria de la oraciòn*. Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo.

GONZALEZ I PLANAS, Francesc (2013) *On quotative recomplementation: Between pragmatics and morphosyntax*. Manuscript, University of Girona.

HAEGEMAN, Liliane (2012) *Adverbial clauses, main clause phenomena, and the composition of the left periphery*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

LEDGEWAY, Adam (2005) "Moving through the left periphery: The dual complementizer system in the dialects of Southern Italy." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 103/3, 339–396.

MASCARENHAS, Salvador (2007) *Complementizer doubling in European Portuguese*. Manuscript, Amsterdam ILLC/ NYU.

MESZLER, Lenka/Borbàla SAMU (2010) "Le strutture subordinate." In: G. Salvi/L. Renzi (eds), *Grammatica dell'italiano antico*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 763–782.

MUNARO, Nicola (2005) "Computational puzzles of conditional clause preposing." In: A.M. Di Sciullo (ed.), *UG and external systems*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 73–94.

MUNARO, Nicola (2010) "Towards a hierarchy of clause types." In: P. Benincà/N. Munaro (eds), *Mapping the left periphery*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 125–162.

PAOLI, Sandra (2007) "The fine structure of the left periphery: COMPs and subjects. Evidence from Romance." *Lingua* 117/6, 1057–1079.

PLESNIČAR, Vesna (2015) *Complementizer doubling around embedded clauses in Slovenian*. Abstract. http://skrabcevi-dnevi.zrc-sazu.si/Program.aspx

RIZZI, Luigi (1997) "The fine structure of the left periphery." In: L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281–337.

RIZZI, Luigi (2001) "On the position 'Int(errogative)' in the left periphery of the clause." In: G. Cinque/G. Salvi (eds), *Current studies in Italian syntax. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 287–296.

VILLA-GARCIA, Julio (2012) "Recomplementation and locality of movement in Spanish." *Probus* 24/2, 257–314.

VINCENT, Nigel (2006) "Il problema del doppio complementatore nei primi volgari d'Italia." In: A. Andreose/N. Penello (eds), *LabRomAn: Giornata di lavoro sulle varietà romanze antiche.* Padova: Università di Padova, 27–42.

Summary

LOCALIZING CONDITIONAL CLAUSES IN THE LEFT PERIPHERY: EVIDENCE FROM MULTIPLE COMPLEMENTIZER CONSTRUCTIONS IN ROMANCE

This article analyzes the distribution of conditional clauses in multiple complementizer constructions, showing that preposed adverbial clauses could occupy in early Italo-Romance varieties different specifier positions within the left periphery of embedded clauses, a possibility that has been lost with time in Italo-Romance but is still attested in modern Ibero-Romance. It is further argued that in multiple complementizer structures the highest complementizer invariably lexicalizes the head Force°, while the other occurrences of the complementizer mark the lower boundary of the main two Topic subfields.

Keywords: complementizer doubling, conditional clause, Ibero-Romance, Italo-Romance, Topic field

Povzetek

SKLADENJSKI POLOŽAJ IN RAZVRSTITEV POGOJNIH ODVISNIKOV V LEVI PERIFERIJI Z VIDIKA ROMANSKIH VEČVEZNIŠKIH STRUKTUR

Članek obravnava distribucijo pogojnih odvisnikov v večvezniških strukturah in pokaže, da so se v zgodnjih italo-romanskih jezikih predpostavljeni prislovni odvisniki pojavljali na različnih položajih znotraj leve periferije vloženih odvisnikov. Ta skladenjski pojav se v sodobnih italo-romanskih jezikih ni ohranil, vendar ga še vedno lahko opazimo v ibero-romanski jezikovni skupini. Skladenjska razčlemba večvezniških struktur pokaže, da najvišje ležeči veznik vedno leksikalizira jedro funkcijske zveze Force, medtem ko nižje ležeči vezniki označujejo mejo med glavnima nižje ležečima podpoljema funkcijske zveze Topik.

Ključne besede: podvajanje veznika, pogojni odvisnik, ibero-romanski jeziki, italo-romanski jeziki, Topikalno polje