Towards a Hierarchy of Clause Types

Nicola Munaro
University of Venice

0. Introduction

As is well known, a considerable number of North-Eastern Italian dialects display the morphosyntactic phenomenon traditionally defined as *interrogative inversion*: it consists in the encliticization of a pronominal subject onto the inflected verb.

In this article, I will try to determine the range of possible interpretations which can be associated with sentences whose predicate has the relevant verbal features. The analysis will turn out to shed light on the hierarchical articulation of the left periphery.[1]

Within the relatively recent line of research adopting a split-CP approach (see Rizzi (1997) and Benincà (2001) among many others), it will be proposed that the presence of subject clitic inversion is the reflex of a syntactic process; more precisely, that it entails raising of the inflected verb to one of the functional projections of the CP-field which are argued to encode different aspects of the speaker's representation of the propositional content expressed.

The article is organized as follows: in section 1 the existence of an independent series of enclitic subject pronouns is briefly argued for and the possible contexts of use of non-assertive subject clitics in Friulian are presented. Section 2 is devoted to identify the crossdialectal variation attested in some Veneto dialects with respect to the range of the interpretive implications associated with inversion. In section 3 I sketch an analysis of the ordering restriction constraining the relative order of protasis and apodosis when the former displays inversion between subject and inflected verb, on the basis of data from standard Italian and some North-Eastern Italian dialects. I will thereby try to account for the fact that conditional clauses containing inversion must precede the main clause, speculating in section 4 on the possible landing site of preposed adjunct conditional clauses in a split left periphery. In section 5 I provide a finer semantic characterization of the relevant functional projections making up the upper portion of sentence structure, discussing their relative hierarchical ordering. Section 6 concludes the paper with a few summarizing remarks.

1. The enclitic paradigm of subject pronouns

1.1. Two independent paradigms

This section addresses the question of the status of the subject pronouns showing up in inversion contexts. In many North-Eastern Italian dialects, the verbal conjugation displays a different agreement paradigm in assertive and in interrogative clauses; the assertive and interrogative inflectional paradigms of the present indicative of Paduan and Agordino (a Central and a Northern Veneto variety) are reported in (1) and (2) respectively:

Nicola Munaro

(1)　a.　1. magno b.　1. magno(*i*)
　　　　2. *te* magni 　　2. magni-*to*
　　　　3. *el/la* magna 　　3. magne-*lo/la*
　　　　4. magnemo 　　4. magnémo-(*i*)
　　　　5. magnè 　　5. magnè-*o*
　　　　6. *i/le* magna 　　6. magne-*li/le*

(2)　a.　1. varde b.　1. varde
　　　　2. *te* varde 　　2. varde-*to*
　　　　3. *el/la* varda 　　3. varde-*lo/la*
　　　　4. vardon 　　4. vardon-*e*
　　　　5. vardé 　　5. vardé-*o*
　　　　6. *i/le* varda 　　6. varde-*li/le*

As one can easily see, the proclitic subject pronouns appearing in the assertive paradigms in (1a) and (2a) differ from the enclitic ones of (1b) and (2b) both in number and in form; notice, however, that the verbal form remains unchanged. [2]

In Renzi & Vanelli (1983), one of the earliest investigations of subject clitics in the Northern Italian domain, the authors formulate the two following descriptive generalizations: (a) if a variety forms interrogatives through the inversion of the pronoun, then the number of the persons constantly displaying a pronoun is the same or superior with respect to the number of persons with pronoun in assertive contexts; (b) in most cases the enclitic pronoun of interrogatives is different from the proclitic one appearing in assertives in the corresponding person. On the basis of these two arguments, the paradigm of subject clitics appearing in interrogative contexts is regarded as largely independent from the one appearing in assertive contexts.

Moreover, as pointed out by Poletto (1993), in some Northern Italian varieties a proclitic subject can cooccur with an enclitic one, as exemplified in (3a) with the Piedmontese variety of Turin and in (3b) with Western Friulian:

(3)　a.　lon ch' *a l'* a-*lo*　fait? b.　cui　*a* compri-*al* il pan?
　　　　what that scl-scl-has-scl done 　　who scl-buys-scl　the bread?
　　　　'what has he done?' 　　'who buys the bread?'

---

[2]. Only some functional verb forms are affected, as for example in Paduan the second person singular of the verb *'want' te voi* becomes *vuto* in the interrogative form.

In (3a), unlike in (3b), the inflected verb (with the enclitic pronominal subject *lo*) is preceded not only by the vocalic subject clitic *a*, but also by the agreement proclitic morpheme *l*.

Furthermore, if a dialect displays an enclitic series of pronominal subjects, these must be obligatorily used in main interrogatives, as shown by the contrast in grammaticality between (4a) and (4b) in Friulian:

(4)   a. ce fas-*tu*?   b. *ce (*tu*) fas?
           what (scl) do   what do-scl
           'what are you doing?'   'what are you doing?'

Interestingly, the occurrence of the enclitic series of pronominal subjects seems to be limited to the structures in which the inflected verb raises higher than the agreement field, that is, in main contexts where the head C° is free, as in (4a), but not in embedded interrogatives, where that position is presumably occupied by the complementizer *che*, as witnessed by the contrast between (5a) and (5b) in Bellunese:

(5)   a. no so   cossa che *l* 'à comprà   b. *no so   cossa che à-*lo* comprà
           not know what that scl-has bought   not know what that has-scl bought
           'I don't know what he has bought'   'I don't know what he has bought'

In light of the these data, the following will be adopted as a diagnostic paradigm to discriminate between a proclitic and an enclitic series of subject pronouns:[3]

(6)   a. different number of persons in the verbal paradigm displaying pro- vs enclitic
           pronouns
       b. (partially) different morphological shape of pro- vs enclitic pronouns
       c. possibility of cooccurrence in some varieties

---

[3]. A slightly different version of (6) is proposed by Poletto (2000), who claims that subject clitic inversion implies raising of the inflected verb to a (low) position of the CP-layer, basing her assumption on arguments from various Northern Italian dialects; she also analyzes the role of subject clitic inversion in optative, counterfactual and disjunctive clauses with respect to complementizer deletion phenomena, showing that, at least in some cases, an analysis in terms of verb raising to the C-domain is viable.

The data discussed in this section suggest that enclitic pronominal subjects should be distinguished from proclitic ones and, more precisely, be analyzed as bound morphemes selecting the inflected verb: I will assume that the verbal form displaying encliticization of the subject pronoun is realized through left-adjunction of the verb to the clitic. Furthermore, I propose that the structural position inside which the finite verb merges with the enclitic subject is a relatively high functional head of the functional architecture of the clausal structure that will be identified more precisely below.[4]

1.2. The contexts of use of enclitic subject pronouns: subject clitic inversion in Friulian

On the basis of a wide crosslinguistic survey, Sadock & Zwicky (1985) identify three basic sentence types that seem to be present in most languages: *declaratives*, *interrogatives* and *imperatives*; interestingly, the syntactic distribution of clitic subject prononus with respect to the inflected verb varies depending on the three basic sentence types; the subject clitic precedes the verb in declarative clauses, follows the inflected verb in interrogative clauses, and is missing in imperative clauses, as exemplified in (7a-c) with Bellunese respectively:

(7) a. *te* magna   b. magne*tu*?   c. magna!
     'you are eating'   'are you eating?   'eat!'

---

[4]. In Munaro (1997) I located this position at the edge of IP (that is, at the border between the inflectional and the complementizer layer of the extended functional structure of the sentence) and labelled it *Type°* to express the fact that it is crucially involved in the determination of the sentential type (as will become clear from the data discussed in section 2). The head position inside which the subject clitic merges with the inflected verb is identified with *IntForce°* in Munaro, Poletto & Pollock (1998), *AgrC°* in Poletto (2000), *AgrS°* in Hulk (1993).

Note that the discussion of the interpretive values expressable by subject clitic inversion developed in the following sections is compatible with an approach analyzing the subject pronoun as a maximal projection first merged in [spec,IP] and viewing inversion as the result of (remnant) phrasal movement, such as the one proposed by Pollock (2000) and subsequently adopted by Poletto & Pollock (2004) and Munaro & Pollock (2005); for ease of exposition, though, I will adopt an analysis in terms of head movement of the verbal head.

These distributional properties can be interpreted as indicating that *enclitic subject pronouns can have the function of marking a specific class of clause types, exactly as particles do in other languages* [5]. In the remainder of this section I will further develop this intuition.

The encliticization of the pronominal subject to the inflected verb has been labelled *interrogative inversion* in the descriptive literature on the topic, as it obtains primarily in main interrogative clauses – as witnessed by (7b). However, in the North-Eastern Italian dialects displaying this morphosyntactic phenomenon, it is by no means limited to interrogatives, but is attested in a wide variety of syntactic contexts, suggesting that the template with enclisis in (7b) covers in fact a wide range of clause types, among which the interrogative one is simply the most frequently attested in a crosslinguistic perspective.

These contexts have been described by Benincà (1989) in her analysis of central Friulian; the different instances of subject clitic inversion include the cases listed here and exemplified with Friulian:

- main interrogative sentences, including both *wh*-questions focussing on a constituent (8a) and *yes/no* questions (8b):

(8)   a. cui vegni-*al*?   b. vegni-*al*   Toni?
         who comes-scl   comes-scl Toni
         'who's coming?'   'is Toni coming?'

- sentences structurally resembling interrogatives but having the pragmatic force of exclamatives, through which the speaker expresses an emotionally salient attitude; (9) expresses the speaker's dismay for what he's forced to see:

(9)   ce   mi toci-*al*   di vjodi!
         what me must-scl of see
         'what I'm forced to see!'

- sentences where inversion is preceded by a negation, expressing the speaker's negative presupposition with respect to the propositional content, which is presented as

---

[5]. This idea was expressed in Munaro (1997). Among minor clause types the most frequently found – according to Sadock & Zwicky (1985)– are *exclamatives* and *optatives*.

Nicola Munaro

unexpected; in (10) the speaker realizes to his surprise that, against his expectations, he has to pay the fine:

(10) no mi toci-*al*   di pajà la   multe!
      not me must-scl of pay the fine
      'I even have to pay the fine!'

- optative sentences expressing the speaker's wish, in which the realization of a counterfactual propositional content is hoped for; in (11) the speaker expresses the wish he had told the truth:

(11) ti   vess-*jo* dit   la veretàt![6]
      you had-scl told the truth
      'had I only told you the truth!'

- *if*-clauses of conditional sentences, defining the condition under which the event expressed by the main clause can be realized; in (12) the speaker considers the consequence of the potential arrival of a given person:

(12) vinisi-*al* tjo   pari,   o   podaresin là
      came-scl your father, scl-could   go
      'if your father came, we could go'

---

[6]. A further instance of encliticization of the subject pronoun to the subjunctive of the verb *be* is identified by Benincà (1989); this construction can express the exhortative-desiderative passive of transitive verbs, as shown by the following examples taken from Vicario (1998), who similarly observes that in this case the pronoun encliticizes to the inflected form of the verb *jessi*:

(i) a. sedis-*tu* benedet, Signor Diu di dut il mont   b. fossis-*tu* brusade, tu e   la to golate!
        be-scl   blessed, Lord God of all the world   were-scl burnt,   you and the your throat
        'may you be blessed, Lord God of the whole world'   'I wish you were burnt, you and your

                                                                 wretched throat!'

The interpretation of this particular syntactic context, being very close to the optative reading exemplified in (11), will be subsumed under it in the present discussion.

- disjunctive structures with a concessive interpretation in which two alternative possibilities are taken into account and evaluated as irrelevant to the realization of the event expressed by the main sentence; in (13) the speaker evaluates the subject's financial condition as irrelevant:

(13) sedi-*al* pùar o sedi-*al* sior, no m'   impuarte[7]
       be-scl   poor or be-scl rich, not to-me matters
       'whether he's rich or poor, I do not care'

On the whole, *the contexts exemplified here are non-veridical as they* convey a subjective (re)presentation of the propositional content; *they are characterized by the fact that the speaker takes a particular stance with respect to the propositional content expressed*, in the sense that the event is not presented objectively, as a matter of fact, like in assertive contexts, but *subjectively, that is somehow related to the speaker's particular observational perspective*.[8]

---

[7]. In (13) the disjunctive clause involves two auxiliary verbs, but the disjunction of two lexical verbs is equally well-formed:

(i) veni-*al*   o no veni-*al*,   o   prepari instèss
    comes-scl or not comes-scl, scl-prepare the-same
    'whether he comes or not, I prepare in any case'

[8]. As a final descriptive remark, let me point out that - at a relatively high stylistic level - inversion between auxiliary and nominal subject is grammatical in standard Italian in the same syntactic contexts, as witnessed by (i):

(i) a. Avrebbe Gianni potuto aiutarci?
        'Could John have helped us?'
    b. Quanti libri è Gianni riuscito a leggere!
        'How many books John has succeeded in reading!'
    c. Fosse Gianni arrivato in tempo!
        'Had John arrived in time!'
    d. Fosse Gianni arrivato in tempo, tutto questo non sarebbe successo
        'Had John arrived in time, all this would not have happened'
    e. Fosse Gianni arrivato in tempo o meno, saremmo partiti in ogni caso
        'Had John arrived in time or not, we would have left in any case'

Nicola Munaro

2. The range of crosslinguistic variation

In this section I will carry out a comparative survey of the crossdialectal variation detectable among some Venetan varieties with respect to the possible interpretations which can be associated with enclisis of the pronominal subject onto the inflected verb.[9]

In all of these cases, inversion between nominal subject and inflected auxiliary is in complementary distribution with an overt complementizer – *che* or *se* – followed by a preverbal subject:

(ii) a. *Se* Gianni avrebbe potuto aiutarci? [uttered as an echo question to (ia)]

    'If John could have helped us?

  b. Quanti libri *che* è riuscito a leggere Gianni!

    'How many books [that] John has succeeded in reading!'

  c. *Se* Gianni fosse arrivato in tempo!

    'If only John had arrived in time!'

  d. *Se* Gianni fosse arrivato in tempo, tutto questo non sarebbe successo.

    'If John had arrived in time, all this would not have happened'

  e. *Che* Gianni fosse arrivato in tempo o meno, saremmo partiti in ogni caso.

    'Whether John had arrived in time or not, we would have left in any case'

(Some of) the instances of inversion listed in (i) have been analyzed by Rizzi (1982) in terms of raising of the auxiliary verb to Comp°. In the same vein, Poletto (2000) analyzes subject-clitic inversion in these cases as a consequence of verb raising to (a low head position of) the CP field to check a [-realis] feature, thereby inhibiting the realization of the complementizer.

On the hypothesis that the enclitic subject pronoun is generated within a functional head of the CP field see also Munaro, Poletto & Pollock (2001).

[9]. Let me mention, just for the sake of completeness, that the pattern of central Friulian described in the previous section is also attested in the Venetan variety spoken in country hinterland of Venice, where inversion (which is fully productive only in the third person singular) seems to be compatible with all the relevant readings:

(i) a. vegni-*lo*?   a'. cossa magne-*lo*?

  b. quanti libri no ga-*lo* leto?!

  c. no ga-*lo* magnà tuto!

  d. rivasse-*lo* in tempo, almanco!

  e. fusse-*lo* vegnùo anca Mario, gavaressimo podùo dirghelo

  f. magne-*lo* o no magne-*lo*, mi preparo lo stesso

2.1. Subject clitic inversion in Venetan dialects

Let us start by considering the situation attested in various dialects of Central and Southern Veneto - exemplified here with Paduan - where the only context in which inversion produces ungrammaticality is the disjunctive concessive structure in (14f):

(14) a. vien-*lo*?   a'. cossa magne-*lo*?

        comes-scl   what eats-scl

        'is he coming?'   'what does he eat?'

    b. quanti libri no ga-*lo* leto?!

       how many books not has-scl read

       'how many books he read!'

    c. no ga-*lo* magnà tuto!

       not has-scl eaten   everything

       '(surprisingly,) he ate everything!'

    d. rivàsse-*lo* in tempo!

       arrived-scl in time,   at least

       'if only he arrived in time!'

    e. fùsse-*lo* vignù anca Mario, gavarìssimo podùo dirghelo[10]

       were-scl come also Mario, could been able tell-him-it

       'if Mario had come too, we could have told him'

---

[10]. As pointed out to me by Paola Benincà, in Paduan the presence of inversion in *if*-clauses (that is, with a hypothetical reading) is in general less acceptable with a simple tense, as in (ia); the structure can be rescued by adding an element (such as the adverb *putacaso*, like in (ib)), whereby the remoteness of the realization of the event expressed by the conditional clause is emphasized:

(i) a. ?vignisse-*lo* (to papà), podarìssimo partire

     came-scl   (your father,) could leave

  b. vignisse-*lo* putacaso (to   papà), podarìssimo partire

     came-scl   suppose (your father), could leave

     'came your father, we could leave' 'suppose your father came, we could leave'

The same restriction holds for the Friulian example in (12), which suggests that this structure obligatorily conveys a counterfactual entailment. A recent analysis of the notion of counterfactuality aiming at investigating how the meaning of clauses interpreted counterfactually can be derived as a conversational implicature is provided by Iatridou (2000).

   f. *magne-*lo* o no magne-*lo*, mi parécio istésso

     eats-scl   or not eats-scl, I   prepare the same

     'whether he eats or not, I prepare in any case'

A different distributional pattern is found in the central Veneto variety spoken in Carmignano di Brenta (situated between Padua and Vicenza), where inversion is not accepted in hypothetical and disjunctive concessive contexts, but is in optatives, exclamatives and interrogatives:

(15) a. vignì-o?   a'. cossa magni-to?

      b. quanti libri (no) ga-lo leto?!

      c. no ga-lo magnà tuto!

      d. rivàsse-lo in tempo, 'na volta![11]

      e. *fusse-lo vignùo anca Mario, gavarìssimo podùo dirghelo

      f. *magne-lo o no magne-lo, mi parècio istésso

Still different is the distribution attested in the dialect of Illasi (spoken in the Western Veneto province of Verona), where the presence of subject clitic inversion gives rise to ungrammatical outcomes in optative, hypothetical and disjunctive concessive structures, as shown in (18):

(16) a. ven-*lo*?   a'. sa magne-*lo*?

      b. quanti libri no à-*lo* leto?!

      c. no a-*lo* magnà tuto!

      d. *rivésse-*lo* in tempo!

      e. *fosse-*lo* vegnù anca Mario, avaressimo podù dirghelo

      f. *magne-*lo* o no magne-*lo* mia, mi preparo istésso

This brief comparison among some of the North-Eastern Italian dialects displaying subject clitic inversion reveals a remarkable range of crosslinguistic variation in the set

---

[11]. According to my informant, in order to obtain full acceptability, the optative structure exemplified in (17d) requires the addition of some lexical material at the end of the clause, such as the adverbial '*na volta*' ('for once').

of possible interpretations associated with structures displaying the enclisis of the pronominal subject.[12]

2.2. Splitting up the host: the two subfields

Let us now try to ouline our findings more precisely: in Friulian subject clitic inversion displays the whole set of readings, Paduan lacks only the disjunctive concessive reading, the dialect of Carmignano lacks the hypothetical and the disjunctive reading, while the dialect of Illasi lacks the optative, the hypothetical and the disjunctive reading. The pattern of variation resulting from the data is summarized in the following synoptic chart:

---

[12]. Notice that in the variety of Pieve d'Alpago (spoken in the Northern Veneto province of Belluno), we find a somewhat puzzling pattern, as inversion is compatible with the disjunctive, the exclamative and the interrogative reading, but not with the optative and the hypothetical one, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (id-e):

(i) a. vien-*lo*?   a'. magne-*lo* che?

    b. quanti libri no à-*lo* ledést?!

    c. no à-*lo* magnà tut!

    d. *rivésse-*lo* in temp!

    e. *fùsse-*lo* vegnést anca Mario, se avarìa podést dirghelo

    f. màgne-*lo* o no màgne-*lo*, mi parècie instéss

It is noteworthy that in this dialect an example corresponding to (13) above, where the pronominal subject encliticizes onto a subjunctive form of the verb *èser*, is ungrammatical, as shown in (iia); however, this does not seem to depend on the use of an auxiliary verb, as shown by the grammaticality of (ib) where an indicative form is used:

(ii) a. *sìe-*lo* sior o sìe-*lo* puarét, no me intarèsa   b. é-*lo* sior (o) é-*lo* puarét, no me intarèsa

    be-scl rich or be-scl poor, not me interests   is-scl rich (or) is-scl poor, not me interests

    'I don't care whether he is rich or poor'   'I don't care whether he is rich or poor'

The ungrammaticality of (iia) should probably be attributed to an incompatibility of the enclitic subject with the subjunctive mood.

(17)

	Central Friulian	*Central-Southern Veneto*	*Central-Western Veneto*	*Western Veneto*
interrogatives	+	+	+	+
pseudo-questions	+	+	+	+
presuppositional exclamatives	+	+	+	+
optatives	+	+	+	-
if-clauses	+	+	-	-
disjunctive concessives	+	-	-	-

As can easily be observed, what we find across the dialects considered is not a random variation, as inversion is invariably associated to interrogative, pseudo-interrogative and exclamative contexts; whenever a given variety lacks some instances of inversion, the missing cases always belong to the subset including optative, hypothetical or disjunctive contexts.

A straightforward account of the particular distribution of subject clitic inversion observed above relies on the assumption that the inflected verb with enclisis of the pronominal subject can occupy more than one structural position, that is, that the attested crossdialectal variation depends on verb raising to different functional heads of the upper portion of the clausal skeleton, as a result of the incremental loss of verb movement.

More precisely, the fact that inversion is invariably compatible with the interrogative and exclamative readings provides evidence for a first splitting into two subfields, as shown in (18):

(18) *Concessive-Hypothetical-Optative > Presuppositional-Exclamative-Interrogative*

On the other hand, the relevant contexts listed in (8)-(13) can be split in a different way according to whether we have to do with a monoclausal or with a biclausal structure; (8)-(11) are monoclausal structures in which the enclitic subject merges with the inflected part of the main predicate; (12)-(13) are biclausal structures in which subject clitic inversion obtains inside the adjunct clause which functions are circumstantial

modifier to the main clause. According to this second criterion, we obtain the following split, with the optative reading included in the second bunch of readings:

(19) *Concessive-Hypothetical > Optative-Presuppositional-Exclamative-Interrogative*

By comparing (18) and (19) we can get to the plausible tripartition in (20), which sets off a lower layer including *Presuppositional-Exclamative-Interrogative* and a higher layer including *Concessive-Hypothetical*, with the optative reading stacked inbetween the two layers:

(20) *Concessive-Hypothetical >>> Optative >>> Presuppositional-Exclamative-Interrogative*

The functional hierarchy informally presented here will be analyzed in greater detail in section 4.

2.3. Additional evidence from standard French

The limits of the crosslinguistic range of variation is confirmed by a quick look at the distribution of subject clitic inversion in contemporary standard French, where inversion is compatible with most of the readings attested in the North-Eastern Italian domain:

(21) a. vient-*il*?   a'. où   va-t-*il*?
      comes-scl   where goes-scl
      'is he coming?'   'where is he going?'
  b. quel   tour de cochon ne   m' a-t-*il*   pas joué!
     which turn of pig   neg me-has-scl not played
     'what a dirty trick he played to me!'
  c. (je pensais que rien d'interessant ne m'arriverait...)
     (ne)voilà-t-*(i(l))*pas   que Naomi Campbell me téléphone!!
     (neg)seethere-(scl)not that Naomi Campbell me calls
     '...(surprisingly,)Naomi Campbell rings me up!!'
  d. puisse-t-*il*   venir!   d'. plût-*il*   a Dieu qu' il pût   venir
     can-subj-scl come   like-subj-scl to God that he could come
     'if only he could come!'

e. (Marie) viendrait-*elle* que je serais surpris
(Mary) would-come-scl that I would-be surprised
'if Mary/she came I would be surprised'

f. ???viendrait-*il* ou ne viendrait-*il* pas je partirai de toute façon
would-come-scl or neg would-come-scl not I will-leave of all way
'whether he comes or not, I'm going to leave in any case'

The distributional pattern found in standard French is the same as the one displayed in Paduan and is compatible with the variation range resulting from (17): as witnessed by the marginality of (21f) the only structure incompatible with inversion is the disjunctive concessive one. The example in (21f) has a grammatical counterpart in which the subject clitic appears in preverbal position and the two members of the disjunction are introduced by the complementizer *que*.[13]

---

[13]. In the instance of subject clitic inversion exemplified in (21c) the cluster *-t-il pas* is enclitic on the defective verbal form *voilà*, as witnessed again by (i):

(i) ...ne voilà-*t-il* pas que le loup revient
neg seethere-scl not that the wolf comes back
'...and here the wolf returns'

The range of presuppositional implications expressed by the construction with *tu-pas* attested in Quebec French has been examined by Vinet (1998); more recently, Vinet (2000) has sketched an analysis of –*tu(pas)* in terms of feature composition: -*tu* is analyzed as a Force operator identified in the CP domain at LF licensing certain types of illocutionary force structures with a finite tense; she also points out that some of the features of -*tu* as a mood force indicator can also be found with the -*t-il* form and its variants in standard French. According to Roberts (1993a), *tu* in *tu-pas* can be analyzed as a phonological variant of *t-il* in standard French (or *ti* in many varieties of colloquial French); furthermore, Roberts (1993b) claims that in some dialects of contemporary Valdotain postverbal subject pronouns are developing into *ti*-morphemes and that this phenomenon is a consequence of the loss of inversion in interrogatives; if his hypothesis is correct, it looks plausible to relate structures like (i) to erstwhile inversion structures where the verb used to raise to the relevant head position.

3. On the distribution of conditional and concessive clauses

In this section I present some evidence suggesting that the main clause must follow the associated adjunct - conditional or concessive - clause whenever inversion between the subject and the inflected verb obtains inside the latter.

As anticipated above - and proposed in recent work of mine (Munaro (2002), (2005)) - I analyze the presence of subject (clitic) inversion inside the adjunct clause as resulting from the raising of the inflected verb to some head position of the CP field; as will become clearer below, I take verb raising inside the adjunct clause to target an appropriate C° head in order to satisfy a clausal typing requirement.

3.1. Ordering restrictions on conditionals

In discussing the distributional properties of adjunct conditional clauses with respect to the main clause, in light of the data presented in the previous section, I will introduce a distinction between conditionals with an optative flavour, mostly containing a compound tense, where the speaker emphasizes his regret for the fact that a given situation did not take place, and standard counterfactual conditionals, where the unrealized condition expressed by the protasis is presented by the speaker more objectively, and can therefore be expressed by a simple tense.

3.1.1. Optative conditionals

In some North-Eastern Italian varieties, among which Friulian, the protasis can convey an optative reading expressing the speaker's regret for an unfulfilled condition, which is emphasized by the use of the exclamation mark; in this case there seems to be a rather rigid ordering restriction between the main clause and an optative conditional clause:

(22) a. Vèss-jo korùt, no varès pjerdùt il treno in ke olte!
      b. *No varès pjerdùt il treno in ke olte, vèss-jo korùt!
         [Had-scl run] not would-have missed the train in that time [had-scl run]
         '[I wish I had run], I would not have missed the train on that occasion, [I wish I had run]!'

(23) a. Foss-jo làt, al sarès stàt dut plui bièl!

      b. *Al sarès stàt dut plui bièl, foss-jo làt!

        [Were-scl gone] scl-would have been all more beautiful [were-scl gone]

        '[I wish I had gone], everything would have been better, [I wish I had gone]!'

(24) a. Vèss-jo volùt studià, o varès podùt fa il profesor!

      b. *O varès podùt fa il profesor, vèss-jo volùt studià!

        [Had-scl wanted to study] scl-could have done the professor [had-scl wanted to study]

        '[I wish I had felt like studying] I could have become a professor [I wish I had felt like studying]!'

The adjunct clause expressing the speaker's unfulfilled wish and containing subject clitic inversion must precede the main clause in order to guarantee a grammatical outcome.

3.1.2. Counterfactual conditionals

More generally, the protasis of a conditional cluster expresses the unrealized condition under which the event expressed by the main clause might take or might have taken place.

In a North-Eastern Italian dialect like Paduan a conditional clause expressing a counterfactual entailment can either precede or follow the main clause if it is introduced by the complementizer *se*:

(25) a. Garissimo podùo dirghelo, se el fusse vignù

        Could have told-him-it, if scl-were come

        'We could have told him, if he had come'

      b. Se el fusse vignù, garissimo podùo dirghelo

        If scl-were come, could have told-him-it

        'If he had come, we could have told him'

The contrast between (26a) and (26b) clearly indicates that, unlike what happens in *if*-conditionals (where the relative order of main and embedded clause is irrelevant), the conditional embedded clause containing inversion has to precede the main clause:

(26) a. *Garissimo podùo dirghelo, fùsse-*lo* vignù

     Could have told-him-it, were-scl come

     'We could have told him, had he come'

   b. Fusse-*lo* vignù, garissimo podùo dirghelo

     Were-scl come, we could have told-him-it

     'Had he come, we could have told him'

As is clear comparing (25) and (26), the subordinating complementizer *se* introducing the conditional clause is in this case in complementary distribution with subject clitic inversion; this suggests that in structures like (26b) raising of the inflected verb inside the adjunct clause inhibits the realization of *se* in the same head (and triggers raising of the whole embedded clause across the main clause).

The same ordering restriction between main clause and conditional adjunct clause is attested in standard Italian:

(27) a. Saremmo potuti uscire, se tua sorella fosse arrivata in tempo

     'We could have gone out, if your sister had arrived in time'

   b. Se tua sorella fosse arrivata in tempo, saremmo potuti uscire

     'If your sister had arrived in time, we could have gone out'

(28) a. *Saremmo potuti uscire, fosse tua sorella arrivata in tempo

     'We could have gone out, had your sister arrived in time'

   b. Fosse tua sorella arrivata in tempo, saremmo potuti uscire

     'Had your sister arrived in time, we could have gone out'

Again, whenever verb raising obtains inside the adjunct clause - witnessed in (28) by inversion between subject and auxiliary and by the absence of the subordinating complementizer - the conditional clause obligatorily precedes the main clause.

3.2. Ordering restrictions on concessive conditionals

Similar conditions seem to constrain the relative order of a main clause with respect to an associated adjunct clause with a concessive reading. In this case too I will deal separately with two types of concessives, namely ordinary concessive clauses, expressing a condition whose realization is evaluated as irrelevant to the realization of

the propositional content expressed by the main clause, and alternative concessive conditional clauses, where two alternative and – with respect to truth value- opposite eventualities are taken into account and judged irrelevant for the event expressed by the main clause.

3.2.1. Ordinary concessives

In addition to the readings listed in section 1.2 above, subject clitic inversion can also occur –for example in Paduan– in adjunct clauses with a concessive value, provided that the inflected verb is either preceded or followed by *anca*:[14]

(29)   a.   Anca gavesselo telefonà, cossa garissimo podùo dirghe?
         b.   Gavesselo anca telefonà, cossa garissimo podùo dirghe?
            '[Even] had-he [even] phoned, what could we have told him?'

Alternatively, the concessive adjunct can be introduced by *anca ben*, which however, unlike simple *anca*, cannot follow the inflected verb with inversion:[15]

(30)   a.   Anca ben vegnisselo, cossa podarissimo dirghe?
         b.   *Vegnisselo anca ben, cossa podarissimo dirghe?
            '[Even if] came-he, what could we tell him?'

As observed above, the concessive adjunct contaning inversion cannot follow the main clause:

(31)   a.   *Cossa garissimo podùo dirghe, anca gavesselo telefonà?
         b.   *Cossa garissimo podùo dirghe, gavesselo anca telefonà?
            'What could we have told him,[even] had-he [even] phoned?'

---

[14]. Note that while the adjunct clause of (29a) is only interpretable as a concessive, in (29b) it is ambiguous, as *anca* is amenable to an interpretation as intensifier, so that in this case the interpretation of the adjunct clause can be something like *if he had also phoned (beside writing)...*

[15]. On the possibility for *ben* to develop a concessive reading across Romance, see Hernànz (this volume).

(32) *Cossa podarissimo dirghe, anca ben vegnisselo?
      'What could we tell him, [even if] came-he?'

No such restriction is attested when the concessive adjunct is introduced by *anca se*, and no subject clitic inversion obtains:

(33) a. Cossa garissimo podùo dirghe, anca se el gavesse telefonà?
         'What could we have told him, even if he had phoned?'
      b. Anca se el gavesse telefonà, cossa garissimo podùo dirghe?
         'Even if he had phoned, what could we have told him?'

3.2.2. Alternative concessive conditionals

The two alternatives expressed by a concessive conditional adjunct are evaluated by the speaker as irrelevant for the realization of the propositional content expressed by the main clause.

As witnessed by the contrast between (34) and (35) in Friulian, the relative order of main clause and adjunct clause is immaterial whenever the subordinating complementizer is overtly realized, while in the presence of subject inversion the first position of the adjunct clause is mandatory:[16]

---

[16]. The same restriction holds for the disjunctive structure from Northern Veneto reported in (if) in footnote 12, and expressing an alternative concessive conditional reading:

(i) a. Màgne-*lo* o no màgne-*lo*, mi parècie instéss
     b. *Mi parècie instéss, màgne-*lo* o no màgne-*lo*
        'Whether he comes or not, I prepare in any case'

Interestingly, the same dialect displays mandatory preposing of disjunctive embedded *yes/no* questions with inversion:

(ii) a. No so dirte se'l gnen o se no'l gnen
        Not know tell-you whether scl-comes or whether not scl-comes
        'I can't tell you whether he comes or not'

b. Gnenlo (o) no gnenlo, no so dirte	b'. *No so dirte, gnenlo o no gnenlo
Comes-scl (or) not comes-scl, not know tell-you	Not know tell-you, comes-scl or not comes-scl
'Whether he comes or not, I can't tell you'	'I can't tell you whether he comes or not'

Nicola Munaro

(34) a. C'al sedi rivat o ca no'l sedi rivàt, jo o voi vie istés

    b. Jo o voi vie istés, c'al sedi rivat o ca no'l sedi rivàt

       [That scl-be arrived or that not-scl-be arrived] I scl-go away the same [that scl-be arrived or that not-scl-be arrived]

       '[Whether he has arrived or not] I'm going in any case [whether he has arrived or not]'

(35) a. Sedi-al rivàt o no sedi-al rivàt, jo o voi vie istés

    b. ??Jo o voi vie, sédi-al rivàt o no sédi-al rivàt

       [Be-scl arrived or not be-scl arrived] I scl-go away the same [be-scl arrived or not be-scl arrived]

       '[Whether he has arrived or not] I'm going in any case [whether he has arrived or not]'

Once more, standard Italian confirms the relevant restriction:

(36) a. Che tua sorella fosse venuta o meno/non fosse venuta, noi saremmo andati lo stesso

       'Whether your sister had come or not, we would have gone in any case'

    b. Noi saremmo andati (lo stesso), che tua sorella fosse venuta o meno/non fosse venuta

       'We would have gone (in any case), whether your sister had come or not'

(37) a. Fosse tua sorella venuta o meno, noi saremmo andati lo stesso

       'Whether your sister had come or not, we would have gone in any case'

    b. ??Noi saremmo andati (lo stesso), fosse tua sorella venuta o meno

       'We would have gone (in any case), whether your sister had come or not'

Summing up, the relative order of the main clause and an adjunct (conditional or concessive) clause is irrelevant when the latter is introduced by a complementizer, while the main clause must follow the adjunct clause whenever this displays inversion between the subject and the inflected verb. In other words, verb raising to the CP field inside the adjunct clause, producing subject inversion, induces a rigid order between the

---

It is not implausible that the fronting of the embedded interrogative targets the specifier of the projection *Int(errogative)P* argued for by Rizzi (2001a).

two clauses. In the following section I will explore the possibility that the observed restriction on the linear order of the two clauses results from the compulsory fronting of the adjunct clause to a dedicated specifier of the left periphery of the main clause. The hypothesis that the attested order is produced by preposing the adjunct clause relies on the tacit assumption that in the basic order the main clause precedes the adjunct; empirical evidence that this is indeed the case is provided by Haegeman (2002), who develops a detailed analysis of the difference between event conditionals and premise conditionals. [17]

3.3. On the trigger of adjunct clause preposing

3.3.1. Preposed conditional adjuncts as clausal topics

The informational status of an *if*–clause with respect to its topic-focus nature plays a role in determining the respective order of the two clauses. [18]

---

[17]. The two types of conditional clauses are exemplified in (ia) and (ib):

(i) a. If it rains we will all get terribly wet and miserable

b. If - as you say - it is going to rain this afternoon, why don't we just stay at home?

Haegeman (2002, this volume) proposes that event conditionals are more closely integrated with the associated clause than premise conditionals on the basis of scope effects induced by scope bearing elements in the associated clause (such as tense, epistemic modality, adverbials, focus and quantifiers/bound pronouns); in particular, she argues that the structural integration of the former in the domain of the associated clause depends on their being generated in a position (right-)adjoined to the matrix vP or to a functional projection between vP and the surface subject position; the example in (iia) is assigned the structural representation in (iib):

(ii) a. John will buy the book if he finds it

b. [$_{CP}$ [$_{IP}$ John [$_{I°}$ will] [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ buy the book][$_{CondCP}$ if he finds it]]]]

From the interpretive viewpoint, event conditionals form a complex predicate with the matrix vP, which places them within the c-command domain of operators in the matrix CP.

[18]. For example, von Fintel (1994) points out that *if*-clauses can either be topical (more commonly) or express new information, depending on the context, as highlighted by the contrast between (i) and (ii); the conditional clause can precede the main clause only when it conveys known information (like in (i)), functioning informationally as a topic:

Conditional adjuncts with inversion – which, as we have seen in the previous section, must precede the main clause – can optionally be resumed by the connector *(al)lora* both in standard Italian and in Paduan:

(38) a. Fosse Mario arrivato in tempo, (*allora*) avremmo potuto partire
     b. Fùsselo Mario rivà in tempo, (*lora*) garissimo podùo partire
        Were-scl Mario arrived in time, (then) could have left
        'Had Mario arrived in time, (then) we could have left'

In the case of preposed alternative concessive conditionals, the insertion of an appropriate resumptive element in the main clause is almost obligatory, as exemplified with Italian and Friulian:

(39) a. Sia Antonio arrivato o meno, io me ne vado *comunque/in ogni caso/lo stesso*
        Be Anthony arrived or less, I cl-cl-go *anyhow/in any case/the same*
     b. Sédial rivàt o no sédial rivàt, jo o vai vie *istés*
        Be-scl arrived or not be-scl arrived, I scl-go away the same
        'Whether [Anthony] has arrived or not, I'm going away *anyhow*'

(i) a. What will you do if I give you the money?
     b1 If you give me the money, I'll buy this house
     b2 #I'll buy this house if you give me the money

(ii) a. Under what conditions will you buy this house?
     b1 #If you give me the money, I'll buy this house
     b2 I'll buy this house if you give me the money

He assimilates conditional clauses as correlatives, proposing that in *if-then* conditionals the preceding *if*-clause is left dislocated and *then* functions as a resumptive element: the correlative structure *if-then* confers a topical status to the dislocated *if*-clause, which means that alternatives to the antecedent must be conceivable. An example like (iiia) is assigned the structural representation in (iiib):

(iii)a. *Wenn es regnet*, *dann* werden wir zu Hause bleiben
     'If it rains, then we will stay at home'
  b. [CP Wenn es regnet [CP dann [C° werden] [IP wir zu Hause bleiben]]]

However, the possibility of being resumed by a resumptive form is shared by all preposed conditional clauses, irrespectively of whether they contain inversion subject or are introduced by a complementizer.

More distinctive features of conditionals with inversion, revealing their intrinsically topical nature, are the following. First, unlike conditionals introduced by *se* or *che*, they cannot be used in isolation, for example as an answer to a question, as witnessed by Paduan (40) and Friulian (41):

(40) a. In che caso garissito podùo partire?
             'In which case could you have left?'
      b1. Se (Mario) el fusse rivà in tempo.
             'If (Mario) had arrived in time'
      b2. *Fùsselo (Mario) rivà in tempo.
             'Had (Mario) arrived in time'

(41) a. In ce câs vâtu vie?
             'In which case are you going away?'
      b1. C'al sédi rivàt o c'a no'l sédi rivàt.
             'Whether he has arrived or not'
      b2. ??Sédial rivàt o no sédial rivàt.
             'Has-he arrived or not

Moreover, unlike ordinary conditionals, inverted conditionals cannot be focussed or modified by focussing elements:

(42) a. SE EL VEGNISSE, podarìa dirghelo, no se el telefonasse.
      b. *VEGNISSELO, podarìa dirghelo, no telefonasselo.
             '[If he came] I could tell him, not if he phoned'

(43) a. S*olo/proprio/parfin* se el vegnisse, podarìa dirghelo.
      b. **Solo/proprio/parfin* vegnisselo, podarìa dirghelo.
             '[Only/just if he came], could I tell him'

Iatridou & Embick (1994) point out that in English inverted conditionals are subject to similar restrictions; they suggest that the function of inversion is to establish a

connection to previous discourse and, consequently, to indicate that the truth-value of the proposition in the antecedent is old or known information.[19]

Some recent analyses - e.g. Bayer (2001) among others – propose that a node responsible for informational packaging is available exclusively in main clauses, and not in (some types of) embedded clauses. In particular, Haegeman (2002) argues that adverbial clauses – among which event conditionals – not being selected by the main predicate, are part of the speech act of the main clause; more precisely, in this kind of clauses the node encoding illocutionary force is missing, and therefore there is straight connection path linking them to the speaker, and their force remains unanchored.

If the syntactic process of topicalization is dependent on force in the sense that it expresses what is topic from the speaker's perspective, the preposing of conditionals might be traced back to the necessity of getting in a local relation with the matrix node encoding a speech act feature.[20]

3.3.2. Topicalization inside conditional topics: on the structural deficiency of conditionals

As anticipated above, Haegeman (2002) distinguishes *event conditionals* from *premise conditionals*.

Based on the observation that in English only adjuncts can undergo topicalization internally to a conditional, as witnessed by the contrast between (44a) and (44b), Haegeman modifies Rizzi's (2001b) proposal reported in (45a), and proposes that event conditionals lack both a Topic and a Focus projection, as represented in (45b):

---

[19]. Their descriptive generalization is based on the following evidence: first, both in English and Dutch, unlike *if*-conditionals, inverted conditional antecedents may not be modified by adverbs like *even/only*; secondly, unlike regular *if*-clauses, verb initial adjuncts may not be clefted; thirdly, unlike conditional antecedents introduced by *if*, inverted conditionals may not be used as answers to questions. The authors propose that these contrasts result from a more general property of inverted conditional adjuncts, namely, that they can not be focussed, and suggest assessing a correlation between inverted antecedents and old information. They also observe that - crosslinguistically - antecedents with counterfactual inversion are less restricted in their distribution than their indicative counterparts, as they may follow the main clause more frequently.

[20]. For recent proposals on the syntactic encoding of speech act and clausal type the reader is also referred to Portner & Zanuttini (2002) and Speas & Tenny (2002).

(44) a. *If the final exams you don't pass, you won't obtain the degree

     b. If with these precautions you don't succeed, you should try again next week

(45) a.   Force   *Topic Focus*   Mod   Fin

     b. Event-conditionals: Force/Sub   Mod   Fin

Adopting the structure in (45a), she suggests that topicalized adjuncts target the specifier of the lower projection *ModP*.

Internal topicalization is generally possible in standard Italian in conditional clauses introduced by the subordinating complementizer *se*. However, the possibility to topicalize a constituent internally to a conditional adjunct is subject to restrictions: topicalization inside an ordinary conditional is felicitous only when the *if*-clause precedes the main clause, that is, when it has itself been topicalized to the left periphery of the main clause, as witnessed by the contrast between (46b1) and (47b2):[21]

(46) a. Cosa sarebbe successo se io non avessi superato gli esami finali?

        'What would have happened if I hadn't passed the final exams?'

     b1. Se gli esami finali tu non li avessi superati, non avresti ottenuto il diploma

---

[21]. A similar constraint is discussed by Bayer (2001) with respect to the phenomenon labelled *emphatic topicalization* in Bavarian; contrasts such as the one between (ia) and (ib) show that the topicalization of the subject is licit only when the *if*-clause precedes the main clause:

(i) a. Da Xaver wenn hoam kummt kriagt-a wos z'essn

        'As for Xaver, if he comes home, he will get something to eat'

    b. *Da Xaver kriagt wos z'essn der wenn hoam kummt

        'As for Xaver, he will get something to eat, if he comes home'

More generally, it is possible to topicalize the subject of the embedded clause only when it precedes the main clause; following the spirit of Bayer's (2001) account, I will assume that internal topicalization is made possible by fronting of the adjunct clause to [*Spec,CounterfP*] of the matrix clause. Note however that in (ia) the position occupied by the topicalized constituent is external to the conditional clause, as it precedes the subordinating complementizer. On the interpretive properties of the preposed constituent in the Bavarian construction see also Guidolin (this volume).

For an analysis of a similar constraint in Bangla the reader is referred to Bhattacharya (2001).

Nicola Munaro

b2. Se tu non avessi superato gli esami finali, non avresti ottenuto il diploma
'If [the final exams] you hadn't passed [the final exams], you wouldn't have
got the certificate'

(47) a. In quale caso non avrei ottenuto il diploma?
'In which case wouldn't I have obtained the certificate?
b1. Non avresti ottenuto il diploma se non avessi superato gli esami finali
b2. #Non avresti ottenuto il diploma se gli esami finali tu non li avessi superati
'You wouldn't have obtained the certificate if [the final exams] you hadn't
passed [the final exams]'

Interestingly, internal topicalization is impossible in conditionals displaying subject inversion:

(48) a. Cosa sarebbe successo se tua sorella non avesse superato gli esami finali?
'What would have happened if your sister hadn't passed the final exams?'
b1. Non avesse (mia sorella) superato gli esami finali, (allora) avrebbe potuto
ritentarli.
b2. ??Non li avesse, gli esami finali, (*mia sorella) superati, (allora) avrebbe
potuto ritentarli.
b3. *Gli esami finali non li avesse (mia sorella) superati, (allora) avrebbe potuto
ritentarli.
'If my sister hadn't passed the final exams, (then) he could have tried again'

As will be discussed more in detail below in section, the impossibility to topicalize a constituent inside a protasis with inversion witnesses verb movement to the relevant head of the CP area inside the adjunct clause.

If, on the other hand, standard Italian allows for topicalization in conditionals introduced by *se,* we must conclude that a landing site must be available for internally topicalized constituents; following Benincà (2001), I will assume that, at least in standard Italian, no topic position is available below *FocusP*, and that, consequently, in event conditionals topicalized phrases do indeed target the specifier of a *TopicP*.

The hypothesis that adverbial clauses lack a *FocusP* is supported by the fact that in Italian both concessive and conditional clauses resist internal focalization of a constituent, independently of the respective order of the two clauses and of the presence of subject inversion:

(49) a. *Tua sorella non sarebbe partita, (anche) se IL MIO MESSAGGIO avesse
       ricevuto

b. *(Anche) se IL MIO MESSAGGIO avesse ricevuto, tua sorella non sarebbe
       partita

'[Your sister would not have left] (even) if MY MESSAGE she had received
[your sister   would not have left]'

(50) a. (Anche) avesse Antonio ricevuto il mio messaggio, tua sorella non sarebbe
       partita

b. *(Anche) IL MIO MESSAGGIO avesse Antonio ricevuto, tua sorella non
       sarebbe partita

c. *(Anche) avesse IL MIO MESSAGGIO Antonio ricevuto, tua sorella non
       sarebbe partita

'(Even) if Anthony had received my message, your sister would not have left'

This restriction can be easily captured by the assumption that the CP layer of adjunct
clauses is deficient in that it lacks a Focus projection. In light of the alleged absence of
both a *FocusP* and a node encoding information about the speech act, adverbial clauses
can be viewed as structurally deficient as they have a reduced left periphery, as
proposed by Haegeman (2002).[22]

4. On the landing site of preposed adjunct clauses

An analysis of the ordering restriction discussed in the previous section in terms of
movement leads to a precise determination of the position targetted by preposed adjunct
clauses. In this section I will try to identify the relevant landing sites with respect to the
functional projections which have recently been argued to make up the richly articulated
structure of the left periphery of the sentence.

---

[22]. Adopting this perspective, one could try to account for the obligatory displacement of the protasis
under Cardinaletti & Starke's (1999) theory of structural deficiency, according to which structurally
poorer constituents tend to appear displaced from their base position to a higher site. So, the ordering
restriction on inverted conditionals would be derivable from an independently motivated formal condition
predicting that structurally poorer constituents appear higher in sentence structure, which drives the
widespread movement operation displacing unfocussed material to the left.

4.1. Embedding clausal adjuncts in a split left periphery

The functional skeleton of the split left periphery has been outlined by Rizzi (1997) as in (51), a proposal that has been revised and further expanded by Benincà (2001) as in (52):

(51) [ForceP [TopP [FocP [TopP [FinP]]]]]

(52) [*DiscP* Hanging Topic [*ForceP* Excl-*wh* [*TopP* Left Disl [*FocP* Interr-*wh*/Focus [*FinP*]]]]]

I will try to determine the relative order of preposed conditional/concessive clauses with respect to the different kinds of constituents that can appear in the left periphery on the basis of the sequence in (52).

As shown by the following data from Paduan, in interrogative clauses containing a topicalized constituent a preposed conditional or concessive clause must precede both the left-dislocated constituent, and the *wh*-item along with the inflected verb:

(53) a. Fùsselo vegnùo anca Mario, a to sorèla, cossa garissito podùo dirghe?
     b. ??A to sorèla, fùsselo vegnùo anca Mario, cossa garissito podùo dirghe?
     c. *A to sorèla, cossa, fùsselo vegnùo anca Mario, garissito podùo dirghe?
     d. *A to sorèla, cossa garissito, fùsselo vegnùo anca Mario, podùo dirghe?
        Were-scl come also Mario, to your sister, what have-cond-scl been able tell her?
        'If Mario had came as well, what could you have told your sister?'

(54) a. Anca ben vegnissela, a chi podarissito presentarghela?
     b. ??A chi, anca ben vegnissela, podarissito presentarghela?
     c. *A chi podarissito, anca ben vegnissela, presentarghela?
        Even well came-scl, to whom could-scl introduce-her?
        'Even if she came, to whom could you introduce her?'

This suggests that the landing site of the adjunct clause is higher than FocusP, standardly viewed as the target of *wh*-items, and higher than TopP, the landing site of left-dislocated constituents.[23]

Furthermore, a preposed adjunct clause precedes the *wh*-item even in exclamative clauses, as witnessed again by Paduan, again showing that the landing site is higher than ForceP, identified by Benincà (2001) as the landing site of complex *wh*-phrases in exclamatives:

(55) a. Vegnisselo putacaso anca Mario, quante robe no podarissito contarghe!
     b. *Quante robe, vegnisselo putacaso anca Mario, no podarissito contarghe!
     c. *Quante robe no podarissito, vegnisselo putacaso anca Mario, contarghe!
         [How many things], came-scl suppose also Mario, [how many things] not could-scl tell him!
         'Suppose Mario came as well, [how many things] you could tell him!'

(56) a. Anca ben fùsseli rivai in tempo, quante robe che i se gavarìa desmentegà!
     b. *Quante robe, anca ben fùsseli rivai in tempo, che i se gavarìa desmentegà!
     c. ??Quante robe che, anca ben fùsseli rivai in tempo, i se gavarìa desmentegà!
         [How many things], also well were-scl arrived in time, [how many things] that they scl-have-cond forgotten!
         'Even if they had arrived in time, how many things they would have forgotten!'

Interestingly, the preposed clause must follow a constituent functioning as hanging topic, which has an obligatory pronominal resumption inside the main clause:

---

[23]. As witnessed by standard Italian, a preposed (alternative concessive) conditional clause precedes both a focalized constituent and a left dislocated constituent:

(i) a. Fossero arrivati in ritardo (o meno), IL PANE avrebbero dovuto comprare
     b. *IL PANE, fossero arrivati in ritardo (o meno), avrebbero dovuto comprare
         '[THE BREAD], had they arrived late (or not), [THE BREAD] they should have bought'

(ii) a. Fossero arrivati in ritardo (o meno), il pane, avrebbero dovuto comprarlo
     b. ??Il pane, fossero arrivati in ritardo (o meno), avrebbero dovuto comprarlo
         '[The bread], had they arrived late (or not), [the bread], they should have bought'

(57) a. Mario, (anca) gavesseli telefonà in tempo, no garìssimo dovùo dirghelo
    b. ??(Anca) gavesseli telefonà in tempo, Mario, no garìssimo dovùo dirghelo
       '[Mario], (even) had-scl phoned in time, [Mario], not have-cond must tell-him'
       'Mario, (even if) had they phoned in time, we shouldn't have told'

We must conclude that the movement operation preposing a conditional or concessive clause targets a specifier position inside the left periphery of the main clause which is located between ForceP and DiscP, the position allegedly occupied by preposed phrasal constituents functioning as hanging topics establishing a link to a previous discourse.

4.2. Two different targets

As pointed out by Iatridou (2000), crosslinguistically, the morphological features of the verb in a counterfactual *if*-clause are the same as the ones found in the complement of a counterfactual wish, according to the template in (58) - where *M* indicates verbal morphology - exemplified with standard Italian in (59):

(58) a. if....M1...then...M2...
    b. want-M2 that...M1...

(59) a. Se *venisse*, me ne *andrei*   b. *Vorrei* che *venisse*
     'If he *came*, I would go'   'I wish he *came*'
    c. Se *venisse*!
     'If only he came!'

However, as witnessed by (59c), optative clauses generally surface as main clauses and so it could a priori be expected for them to be compatible with a conditional clausal adjunct.[24] As shown by the following examples from Paduan, full ungrammaticality

---

[24]. Indeed, as observed above in section 3.1.1, conditional adjunct clauses can express a desiderative reading; however, when they function as apodoses they can marginally precede the *if*-clause, while the two clauses are more clearly incompatible in the reverse order, that is, when the *if*-clause precedes, as shown by the following contrast in standard Italian:

(i) a. ?Trovasse almeno il coraggio di parlarle, se venisse anche lei!
    'If only he dared to speak to her, if she came too!'

arises when both clauses display subject clitic inversion, irrespective of their relative order:

(60) a. *Vegnisse-lo putacaso anca Mario, gavessela modo de parlarghe!
      b. *Gavessela modo de parlarghe, vegnisse-lo putacaso anca Mario!
          [Came-scl suppose also Mario], had-scl way of speaking-him, [came-scl suppose also Mario]!
          'Suppose Mario came, I wish she could speak to him!'

This incompatibility already strongly suggests that the interpretive features responsible for the optative and hypothetical readings are encoded in one and the same functional projection of the left periphery; moreover, considering the morphosyntactic and semantic closeness of the two readings, it is highly plausible that they are both expressed by a functional head labelled here – for the sake of transparency – *Counterf(actual)P*.

So, while the optative reading of (11) is triggered by verb raising to (the head) *Counterf°*, the hypothetical reading of (12) involves preposing of the conditional clause to the specifier of *CounterfP*; the two derivations are represented in (61):

(61) a. [$_{\text{CounterfP}}$ [$_{\text{Counterf°}}$ [ti vessjo]$_x$ [$_{\text{ForceP}}$ [$_{\text{TopP}}$ [$_{\text{FocP}}$ [$_{\text{FinP}}$ ...t$_x$...dit la veretàt...]]]]]!
      b. [$_{\text{CounterfP}}$ [$_{\text{CP}}$ vinisial tjo pari]$_x$ [$_{\text{Counterf°}}$] [$_{\text{ForceP}}$ [$_{\text{TopP}}$ [$_{\text{FocP}}$ [$_{\text{FinP}}$ ...o podaresin là...t$_x$]]]]]!

Starting from the assumption that in main optatives the inflected verb raises itself to the head *Counterf°* for clausal typing purposes, the incompatibility witnessed by (60) can be traced back to a constraint on checking preventing the activation of both the specifier and the head of the same projection, as long as they encode slightly different interpretations.[25]

---

    b. ??Se venisse anche lei, trovasse almeno il coraggio di parlarle!
        'If she came too, I wish he dared to speak to her!'

[25]. Under a strictly cartographic approach, the pattern attested in Carmignano di Brenta and reported in (15) would force us to a further splitting, distinguishing a *Counterf(actual)°* proper, encoding the hypothetical/counterfactual interpretation, from a structurally lower *Opt(ative)°*, responsible for the

Unlike ordinary conditionals, alternative concessive conditionals are compatible with optative clauses; either clause can contain subject clitic inversion, as witnessed by Paduan and Friulian in (62) and (63) respectively:

(62) a. Che'l vegna o che no'l vegna, telefonasse-lo almanco!
        that scl-come or that not-scl-come, phoned-scl at least
     b. ??Telefonasse-lo almanco, che'l vegna o che no'l vegna!
        phoned-scl at least, that scl-come or that not-scl-come
        'Whether he comes or not, I wish he called at least!'

(63) a. Fossj-al vignùt o no fossj-al vignùt, s'al véss almancul clamàt!
        were-scl come or not were-scl come, if-scl-had at least phoned!
     b. ??S'al véss almancul clamàt, fossj-al vignùt o no fossj-al vignùt!
        if-scl-had at least phoned, were-scl come or not were-scl come
        'Had he come or not, if only he had phoned!'

Moreover, alternative concessive conditionals are compatible with *if*-clauses and tend to precede them, as shown again by Paduan and Friulian:[26]

(64) a. Che piova o che no piova, rivàsse-lo subito, podarissimo partire
        That rain or that not-rain, arrived-scl soon, could leave
     b. ??Rivàsse-lo subito, che piova o che no piova, podarissimo partire
        Arrived-scl soon, that rain or that not-rain, could leave
        'Whether it rains or not, if he arrived soon, we could leave'

---

desiderative reading. This hypothesis will be viewed as essentially correct, awaiting further empirical evidence to substantiate it.

[26]. The same pattern is attested in standard Italian, as exemplified in (i) and (ii):

(i) a. (Che) venga o (che) non venga, se telefonasse, potremmo dirglielo
    b. ??Se telefonasse, (che) venga o (che) non venga, potremmo dirglielo
       'Whether he comes or not, if he called, we could tell him'

(ii) a. ?(Che) venga o (che) non venga, telefonasse, potremmo dirglielo
     b. *Telefonasse, (che) venga o (che) non venga, potremmo dirglielo
        'Whether he comes or not, called he, we could tell him'

(65) a. Fossj-al vignùt o no fossj-al vignùt, s'al véssi clamaat, avaréssin podùt dìgilu

   Were-scl come or not were-scl come, if-scl-had called, could have told-him-it

    b. ??S'al vessi clamaat, fossj-al vignùt o no fossj-al vignùt, avaréssin podùt dìgilu

   If-scl-had called, were-scl come or not were-scl come, could have told-him-it

   'Had he come or not, if he had called, we could have told him'

These data clearly point to the postulation of a different (and higher) position as landing site for the alternative concessive conditionals, which I take to be the specifier of a functional projection labelled *Conc(essive)P*.

Adapting the analysis of coordinated structures suggested by Kayne (1994) – revising a proposal by Munn (1993) – the two members of the disjunctive cluster can be taken to occupy the specifier and the complement position of a *Disj(unction)P* headed by the disjunction *o*, as represented in (66b); subject clitic inversion inside the two clausal members is a reflex of verb raising to the head *Conc°*, as a consequence of which the disjunctive cluster raises as a whole to the specifier of *ConcP* located in the left periphery of the main clause; the structural representation of an example like (13) would then be like in (66c):

(66) a. Sedi-*al* pùar o sedi-*al* sior, no m'impuarte

    b. [$_{DisjP}$ [$_{CP}$ sedial pùar][$_{Disj°}$ *o*][$_{CP}$ sedial sior]]

    c. [$_{ConcP}$[$_{DisjP}$ sedial pùar o sedial sior]$_x$[$_{Conc°}$] [$_{CounterfP}$ [$_{ForceP}$ [$_{TopP}$ [$_{FocP}$ [$_{FinP}$ ...no m'impuarte...t$_x$]]]]]]]!

As for ordinary concessives with inversion, it seems that they are incompatible with an alternative concessive conditional, independently of their relative order:

(67) ??Gavésselo telefonà o no gavésselo telefonà, anca ben fùsselo   vignùo a

   Had-scl phoned or not had-scl phoned, also well were-scl come to

   trovarne, no garìssimo podùo   dirghe   gnente

   find-us,   not have-cond been-able tell-him nothing

(68) *Anca ben fùsselo vignùo a trovarne, gavésselo telefonà o no gavésselo
       also   well were-scl come to find-us,   had-scl   phoned or not had-scl
       telefonà, no garìssimo podùo   dirghe   gnente
       phoned,   not have-cond been-able tell-him nothing
       'Had he phoned or not, even if he had come visit us, we couldn't have told him
       anything'

The ungrammaticality of (67) and (68) can be interpreted as showing that only one
concessive clause can precede a main clause, in other words, that the projection
ConcessiveP is not recursive.

I would like to suggest that the reading of an ordinary concessive adjunct clause
employs both layers, along the following lines:

(69) a. [ConcP *anca (ben)* [Conc°] [CounterfP [Counterf° *vignisselo*]......
      b. [ConcP [Conc° [*vignisselo*]x] [CounterfP *anca* [Counterf° t*x*]......

So the inflected verb can raise either to *Counterf°* or to *Conc°*, while *anca* can occupy
the specifier of either projection, producing the two grammatical orders.[27]

5. On the hierarchical ordering of the relevant projections

Based on the ordering restrictions discussed in the previous sections, by embedding
preposed adverbial clauses in the layered left periphery in (52) we obtain the following
outline of functional projections of the CP field, hierarchically organized in a fixed
order, where the two projections *ConcessiveP* and *CounterfactualP* should be regarded
as encoding specific instantiations of clausal type:[28]

---

[27]. In the ungrammatical sequence, one might imagine that the verb raises to a head higher than Conc°,
crossing over *anca ben* located in the specifier of ConcP:

(i) *[XP [*vegnisselo*]x [ConcP *anca ben* [Conc° tx] [CounterfP [Counterf° tx]......

[28]. Given the sequence in (73), we can now get back to the issue addressed in section 3: if protases, as
proposed, do indeed have a *TopicP*, internal verb raising to *Counterf°* implies raising through the lower
head positions, including *Top°* (and excluding *Foc°*, if the adjunct clause indeed lacks a Focus
projection); the activation of the head *Top°*, a side effect of verb raising, results not only in blocking the

(70) [DiscourseP [*ConcessiveP* [*CounterfactualP* [Force=ExclamativeP [TopicP [Focus/InterrP [FinP]]]]]]]

By carefully dissecting the identified sequence and excorporating from it the positions relevant for clausal typing, we obtain the hierarchy in (71):[29]

(71) *Concessive > Counterfactual >>> Exclamative > Interrogative*

As for the precise location of the sequence of projections in (71), following the well-motivated standard assumption that the projection encoding the interrogative interpretation is situated within the CP-field, we are forced to the conclusion that the other projections considered here, being hierarchically higher, belong to the same structural layer. In this sequence each head can be seen as the syntactic encoding of the

---

access to [*Spec,Top*] (thereby excluding internal topicalization, as we have seen) but also in marking the whole clausal constituent as a topic; on the other hand, if topicality is codified in relation with a force node, which is missing in the adjunct clause, this will trigger its compulsory preposing to target an appropriate specifier ([*Spec,CounterfP*] or [*Spec,ConcP*]) of the matrix CP field, thereby determining the order in (ib):

(i) a. *Saremmo potuti partire puntualmente, fosse tua sorella arrivata in tempo

 b. Fosse tua sorella arrivata in tempo, saremmo potuti partire puntualmente

  'Had your sister arrived in time, we could have left punctually'

Only in the landing site inside the main left periphery does the adjunct clause enter a local relation with the matrix node responsible for informational organization.

[29]. The correctness of the relative order between *CounterfactualP* and *InterrogativeP* in this sequence, that is, of the hypothesis that the former occupies a structurally higher position, is confirmed by Iatridou and Embick's (1994)crosslinguistic generalization according to which languages exhibiting counterfactual/ conditional inversion display inversion in interrogatives as well; they also point out that the set of languages allowing indicative inversion - not addressed here - constitutes a proper subset of those allowing counterfactual inversion. Furthermore, they observe that in some syntactic environments the verb movement to C° associated with conditional inversion is differentiated from other cases of verb movement.

speaker's typical mental attitude with respect to the propositional content expressed by the clause containing the verb with enclisis of the pronominal subject.[30]

More precisely, taking into account Benincà's (2001) refinement of Rizzi's (1998) layout, where the projection hosting exclamative wh-phrases is identified with ForceP (the highest of Rizzi's CP-layers), the projections *ConcessiveP* and *CounterfactualP* could be regarded as specific instances of the Force layer, codifying different realizations of sentential type.[31]

Taking into account the two extreme projections, the lowest *Interrogative* and the highest *Concessive*, such a sequence can be made sense of if interpreted as reflecting a from right to left increasing degree of assertivity force, which is inversely related to a (from right to left) decreasing degree of salience for the speaker of the truth value of the event expressed by the clause: starting from the rightmost position encoding the interrogative reading, one can assume that the degree of the speaker's involvement gradually decreases to the minimal extent expressed by the concessive reading, whereas

---

[30] . That the occurrence of enclisis of an inflectional morpheme on the finite verb may express a peculiar relation of the speaker with the propositional content is further suggested by data from other North-Eastern Italian dialects: as pointed out by Benincà (1996b), in some varieties of this area in the first and second plural person of verbal tenses characterized by a [-real] modality (like imperfect indicative and subjunctive and present conditional) an enclitic morpheme surfaces on the right of the inflected verb, even in the assertive conjugation; I suggest that this peculiarity of verbal morphology may be due to the fact that these two persons, by their intrinsic semantics, entail a reduced commitment by the speaker in asserting the truthfulness of his statement. On the one hand, unlike a singular one, a plural subject implies by definition a plurality of referents, hence requiring a higher level of knowledge of the world, which may induce the speaker to warn the addressee of the potentially reduced degree of objectivity of his statement; on the other hand, unlike with 3rd person subjects (whose referents are assumed to be absent form the discourse in the unmarked case), in the 1st-2nd plural person the speaker's subjective representation of the event can in principle be questioned by the other co-referent subjects, which again may weaken the speaker's self-confidence. If this interpretation of the data is on the right track, these inflectional endings represent a class of morphemes with interpretive properties similar to the ones of the enclitic pronominal subjects analyzed above.

[31] . An analysis in terms of incremental reduction of verb movement such as the one proposed here entails of course the crucial assumption that the whole set of functional layers defining this hierarchical ordering is projected in syntax even when it is devoid of content.

the intermediate positions express different ways of relating a given state of things to the speaker's individual perspective.

Let us consider now more closely the interpretive properties of each specific layer.

5.1. The phrasal constituent area

As observed above, a feature distinguishing Exclamative and Interrogative clause types from the two higher ones is that they are expressed through monoclausal structures, as a consequence of the fact that the specifier of the relevant projections involved can be the target of a phrasal constituent moving from inside the clause. Typically, the moved constituent belongs – or is introduced by an element belonging – to the paradigm of *wh*-items. Still, despite this similarity, we can split this lower area into two subparts characterized by particular properties.

5.1.1. The *identificational* layer

The genuinely interrogative reading, intended as real request for new information, is associated with/expressed by *InterrogativeP*, the lowest projection of our hierarchy, and most likely coinciding with the FocusP projection of Rizzi (1997) (and therefore to be clearly distinguished from Rizzi (2001)'s *IntP* , which is located higher in the left periphery). The raising of the inflected verb to the relevant position triggers a yes/no question; the corresponding specifier can be filled by a *wh*-item, to trigger a constituent question. The structural representation proposed for such cases is the following:

(72) $[_{ConcP} [_{CounterfP} [_{EvalP} [_{IntP} (cossa) [_{Int°} magne lo_x][_{Agr-SP} pro [_{Agr-S°} t_x]...]]]]]$?

In *yes/no* questions the speaker asks the addressee to assign a truth value to the propositional content, while in *wh*-questions he requires the identification of an adequate referent for the *wh*-phrase. Moreover, the specifier of FocusP can be filled by a contrastively focalized constituent in order to correct a previous incorrect information. In view of this, the interpretations expressed by this low head involve a process of identification, to be applied to the truth value, to the variable of the *wh*-item, or to the focalized constituent; these cases can be subsumed under the common label of an identificational process, so that this low area can be defined as *identificational area*.

True interrogatives therefore express very weak, if any, assertive force, and, conversely, a high degree of involvement of the speaker in the speech act.

Nicola Munaro

5.1.2. The *evaluative* layer

Recently, some authors have argued for a different landing site of *wh*-items when they occur in interrogative clauses which are not interpreted as standard questions, that is as genuine requests for information, but rather as biased questions through which the speaker intends to express his own view on a given state of things[32]. If these works are on the right track, they provide a strong empirical argument for the assumption that at least one - and most likely more than one - specifier position is available above FocusP, the one in which the standard interrogative interpretation is determined.

Furthermore, a higher and distinct landing site has been identified for *wh*-phrases in exclamative clauses, so that the *ExclamativeP* in (70) is associated with the exclamative reading.

In these cases the truth value of the event is determined contextually, and the referent of the *wh*-constituent is already known, but the event (or the degree expressed by the *wh*-word) is assigned by the speaker a certain relevance according to his (or to standard) expectations,

I propose to subsume the whole set of projections involved in these cases under the unifying label

Eval(*uative*); it is intended to cover here for simplicity the two cases exemplified in (9) and (10), namely *wh*-interrogatives having the pragmatic force of exclamatives and sentences expressing the speaker's negative presupposition with respect to the propositional content. As in both cases some form of evaluation of the speaker is entailed, I assume that in both cases raising of the inflected verb to *Eval°* is involved, with additional raising of the *wh*-item to the corresponding specifier in (73a):

(73) a. [$_{ConcP}$ [$_{CounterfP}$ [$_{EvalP}$ Ce [$_{Eval°}$ mi toci*al*$_x$][$_{IntP}$ [$_{Int°}$t$_x$][$_{FinP}$ di vjodi]]]]]?!
      b. [$_{ConcP}$ [$_{CounterfP}$ [$_{EvalP}$ [$_{Eval°}$ No mi toci*al*$_x$][$_{IntP}$ [$_{Int°}$t$_x$][$_{FinP}$ di pajà la multe]]]]]!

---

[32]. The reader is referred to Benincà (1996a) about *wh*-exclamatives, Munaro & Obenauer (1999) about *pseudo*-interrogatives, Obenauer & Poletto (2000) about rhetorical questions, and to Obenauer (1994) for a detailed analysis of different kinds of *wh*-questions. Although adopting Kayne (1994)'s antisymmetric approach and its single-specifier syntactic structure we would be led to postulate a functional head corresponding to each of the specifier positions argued for in the above mentioned studies, for the purposes of the present work the general label *Eval(uative)* is intended to cover the whole functional area hosting the projections activated in these structures.

In the second case, the compatibility of the propositional content with the speaker's personal expectations depends crucially on the presence of preverbal negation.[33]

As is intuitively clear, exclamatives and biased interrogatives convey a greater degree of assertive force than genuine interrogatives, as in these contexts the propositional content, the referent or the degree expressed by the *wh*-word, is assigned by the speaker a certain relevance according to his (or to standard) expectations; hence exclamatives and biased questions, even if they have a presupposition, do not themselves have assertive force, since their content cannot be valued in terms of truth *vs* falsity, as their function is to widen the range of alternatives under consideration, thereby enabling the speaker to express some form of evalutation on the event, which witnesses a degree of involvment of the speaker in the speech act. [34]

5.2. The clausal-constituent area

Let us consider now more closely the two positions in the upper part of the sequence in (71). As pointed out in section 2, the range of variation attested crossdialectally concerns more robustly the syntactic contexts exemplified in (11)-(13); moreover, the chart in (20) reveals a consistent solidarity between the optative and the hypothetical reading as opposed to the alternative concessive one; this provides additional evidence for splitting the upper portion of (71) into at least two different positions, which we have labelled *Counterf(actual)°* (subsuming both the optative and the hypothetical reading) and *Conc(essive)°* .

The concessive and counterfactual readings of inversion (as opposed to the others) are associated to biclausal structures; the ordering restrictions attested in these cases suggest

---

[33]. The preverbal negative marker can trigger a presuppositional implication both in *yes/no* exclamatives and in *wh*-exclamatives, as thoroughly discussed in Portner & Zanuttini (1996).According to Zanuttini & Portner (2000), Portner & Zanuttini (2002), exclamative clauses have two basic semantic properties: (a) *factivity*, as the propositional content of the exclamative is presupposed to be true; (b) *widening*, as exclamatives are always uttered against a background of a set of alternative propositions.

[34]. As observed by Sadock & Zwicky (1985:164), "exclamations are intended to be expressive, whereas declaratives are intended to be informative [...] in an exclamation the speaker emphasizes his strong emotional reaction to what he takes to be a fact [...] exclamations are, like interrogatives, non-assertive...".

that *ConcP* and *CounterfP* can be activated by raising of the embedded clause to the relevant specifier of the main clause (and presumably by verb raising inside the adjunct clause).

Looking at (70), it is easy to determine that they define a sublayer located between the lower area, the target of phrasal constituents of the main clause, and *DiscourseP*, which functions as an interface with the discourse domain; indeed, these two projections, hosting preposed adjunct clauses, can be characterized as expressing the relation between the main clause and clausal modifiers: adopting this perspective, the sequence in (70) reflects the intuition that interclausal relations are computed at a level of linguistic representation which is sandwiched between clause-internal relations and connections to the discourse.

5.2.1. CounterfactualP

The projection *CounterfP* encodes the optative and hypothetical reading exemplified in (11)-(12); if accessible, this projection conveys a counterfactual entailment, in that both optatives and protases with subject inversion have a strong counterfactual flavour, as opposed to the corresponding structure with the complementizer.[35]

---

[35]. This observation is supported by the fact that in Paduan inverted conditonal clauses with a verb in a non-compound tense full grammaticality is achieved by adding an adverb like *suppose*, as opposed to the corresponding structure with the complementizer:

(i) a. Se vignisse anca Mario, podarìssimo partire

    b. ?Vignisse-*lo* anca Mario, podarìssimo partire

    c. Vignisse-*lo* putacaso anca Mario, podarìssimo partire

       Came-scl [suppose] also Mario, could leave

       'If Mario came as well, we could leave'

More generally, in the North-Eastern Italian dialects considered here the inflected verb of inverted conditionals appears in the (imperfect or pluperfect) subjunctive. Portner (1992) states that conditionals with subjunctive antecedents implicate that their antecedents are false (and that pluperfect subjunctive tends strongly to be viewed as contrary to fact); similarly, Giorgi & Pianesi (1997) propose that subjunctive conditionals are always counterfactual and that counterfactuality requires some attitude of the speakers toward the truth of the protasis.

Moreover - as pointed out to me by Guglielmo Cinque - subject inversion in standard Italian leads to uncancelability of counterfactuality:

(ii) a. Se Gianni avesse bevuto del vino, avrebbe le guance rosse...ed infatti ce le ha

These readings are triggered by verb raising to *Counterf°* and by raising of the embedded clause to the specifier of *CounterfP* of the main clause respectively:

(74) a. [ConcP [CounterfP [Counterf°rivàsse*lo*x][EvalP [Eval°tx][IntP [Int°tx][Agr-SP *pro* [Agr-S°tx]...in tempo almanco]]]]]!

 b. [ConcP [CounterfP [fùsse*lo* vegnùo anca Mario]x[Counterf°][EvalP [IntP[Agr-SP *pro* [Agr-S° gavaressimo]...podùo dirghelo...tx]]]]]!

In optatives with inversion the speaker expresses his own hope for the realization of a situation in which the propositional content were/had been assigned a counterfactual truth value; in this sense, optatives do have an assertive force of their own as they implicitly express, by contrast, that their propositional content is (or was) contrary to fact.

In inverted conditionals, on the other hand, the speaker takes into account the potential consequences of a situation in which the event expressed by the embedded clause had been assigned a counterfactual truth value or makes the realization of the event expressed by the apodosis dependent on a situation in which the clausal content of the protasis were/had been assigned a counterfactual truth value; in this case, the assertive force is explicitly expressed through the matrix clause, which is in the unmarked case a statement.[36]

---

 b. *Avesse Gianni bevuto del vino, avrebbe le guance rosse...ed infatti ce le ha

 'If Gianni had drunk some wine, his cheeks would be red...indeed they are'

[36]. I have suggested above that subject-verb inversion entails internal raising of the inflected verb to the head *Counterf°* for clausal typing purposes; given the sequence in (70), the sharp deviance of (48b2) can be accounted for under the assumption that verb raising through *Top°* makes [*Spec,TopP*] inaccessible; independent support for this analysis comes from the fact that in English, conversely, a constituent in [*Spec,Top*] blocks verb movement to Top°, as pointed out in Haegeman & Guéron (1999):

(i) a. I promise that *on no account will* I write a paper during the holidays

 b. *I promise that *during the holidays will* I on no account write a paper

As for the ungrammaticality of (48b3), in which the topicalized phrase precedes the inflected verb, it can be attributed to the absence of a *TopP* above *CounterfP*. On the other hand, if the complementizer *se* is realized, the verb needn't raise, and [*Spec,TopP*] remains accessible to phrasal constituents, as shown by (46b1).

Nicola Munaro

5.2.2. Concessive P

Finally, *ConcessiveP* is associated with the concessive or concessive conditional reading, where the speaker takes into account either an eventuality or - in the case of a disjunctive cluster - both truth values for the same propositional content (or, alternatively, two different events) evaluating them as irrelevant for the realization of the event of the main clause.[37] The concessive reading exemplified in (13) is triggered by verb raising to *Conc°* inside the adjunct clause, followed by raising of the concessive cluster to the specifier of *ConcP* of the main clause:

(75)   [$_{ConcP}$ [magne*lo* o no magne*lo*]$_x$ [$_{Conc°}$][$_{CounterfP}$[$_{EvalP}$ [$_{IntP}$ [$_{Agr-SP}$ mi [$_{Agr-S°}$preparo]...lo stesso...t$_x$]]]]]!

The concessive conditional interpretation requires that a condition or a pair of antecendent conditions be evaluated in the structure, so that the consequent holds independently of their value; it is precisely in this sense that a concessive conditional, or, more precisely, the main clause associated with a concessive conditional, expresses

---

[37]. According to the analysis developed by Quer (1998), concessive conditionals relate a set of antecedents to a consequent either by a disjunction of a conditional and its negation - *alternative concessive conditionals* – or by a focus particle or scalar expression that modifies a conditional - *polar concessive conditionals*; the two types of concessive conditionals are exemplified by the Catalan examples in (i) and (ii) respectively:

(i) a.   Li agradi o no (li agradi), se'l prendrà

'Whether he likes-subj it or not, he will drink it'

  b.   Et posis aquì o (et posis) allà, em molestes

'Whether you come-subj stand here or you go-subj stand there, you disturb me'

(ii) a.   Fins i tot si m'ho paguessin, no hi aniria

'Even if they paid-subj it for me, I would not go'

  b.   Encara que no em convidi a la festa, li faré un regal

'Even if he does not invite-subj me to the party, I will buy him a present'

Quer points out that concessive conditionals are licensed in modal environments and involve a non veridical model of evaluation that contains a set of worlds.

the strongest degree of assertive force and the weakest degree of involvment of the speaker in the propositional content.[38,39]

---

[38]. The marginality of (21f) confirms the correctness and the crosslinguistic validity of a hierarchical order in which the concessive reading is associated with the leftmost, hence highest, structural position. As for the presence of disjunction in concessive conditionals, Higginbotham (1991) views every *or* as an *either/or*, i.e. as part of a larger constituent including *either* or its interrogative counterpart *whether*, so that (ia) is semantically equivalent to (ib):

(i) a. If you (either) marry her or don't marry her, you will regret it

    b. If you marry her, you will regret it, and if you don't marry her, you will regret that too

[39]. Under an account of the attested crossdialectal variation in terms of incremental reduction of verb movement, an obvious problem is posed by the pattern reported in footnote 12: assuming a hierarchical order such as the one sketched above, one would not expect the ungrammaticality of (id-e) involving the projection *CounterfP*, given the grammaticality of (if) involving *ConcP*. However, disjunctive structures involving two alternative values rather than the positive-negative opposition are not equally accepted:

(i) ??Magnelo ale doi o magnelo ale quattro, mi parecie instéss

    'Eats-scl at two or eats-scl at four, I prepare anyhow'

This might mean that the type of disjunction relevant for *ConcP* is the one with two alternative values, as exemplified in (13) with Friulian. If this hypothesis is correct, then the distributional pattern of inversion in this variety of Northern Veneto does not represent a counterexample to the hierarchical sequence identified.

Notice further that in the North-Eastern Lombard varieties displaying *do–support* in interrogatives inversion is compatible with the disjunctive reading, as exemplified in (ii) with the dialect of Monno:

(ii) a. vègn-*el*   o vègn-*el*   mia, no m'ha da 'ndà

      comes-scl or comes-scl not, we scl-have to go

      'whether he comes or not, we have to go'

   b. plö-*el*   o plö-*el*   mia, m-vol   fa ina girada

      rains-scl or rains-scl not, scl-want do a   trip

      'whether it rains or not, we go for a trip'

Given the hierarchical order identified, it is unexpected that in these varieties the disjunction can be expressed by means of subject clitic inversion rather than through the *do-support* strategy available in interrogatives; however, under the present analysis (according to which the checking of the disjunctive

6. Conclusion

Carrying out a crosslinguistic comparison among some North-Eastern Italian varieties it has been shown that clauses containing a verbal form with enclisis of the pronominal subject can be associated to different subsets of a given range of possible readings.

The various interpretations expressed by this class of enclitic morphemes can be characterized as implying a less objective representation of the propositional content than the one conveyed in assertive contexts; whenever subject clitic inversion obtains, the event is presented subjectively, that is, related to the speaker's observational perspective.

The range of variation detectable from the comparison among the different dialects examined has been traced back to precise structural conditions: it has been argued that each type of interpretation is triggered by the raising of the inflected verb to a different landing site inside the CP-layer; hence, the attested crossdialectal variation provides suggestive evidence for the existence of a few functional projections encoding some aspects of the speaker's relation to the propositional content expressed by the clause. Relying on previous work on the structural articulation of the left periphery, I have proposed that the projections devoted to clausal typing are hierarchically organized in the following sequence of layers which reflects a from right to left increasing degree of assertive force:

(76) *Concessive > Counterfactual >>> Evaluative > Identificational*

I have also argued that clausal typing can be achieved inside a conditional or concessive clause by verb raising to an appropriate head of the CP field, without a subordinating complementizer; this in turn triggers raising of the clausal adjunct to the relevant specifier of the matrix CP field in order to enter a local relation with a force node.

The movement operation affecting conditional and concessive adjuncts targets the specifier of two functional projections located in the upper portion of the CP area, *ConcessiveP* for (alternative) concessive conditionals and *CounterfactualP* for counterfactual and optative conditionals; by encoding specific instances of clausal typing, these projections also codify interclausal relations.

---

feature is performed by the embedded clause), this follows from the fact that the *do-support* strategy is in general limited to main clauses.

Following some recent proposals on the internal shape of clausal adjuncts, I have also suggested that conditional clauses have a structurally deficient CP layer in that they lack both a node encoding informational structure and a node responsible for internal focalization of phrasal constituents.

References

ASIS - Atlante Sintattico dell'Italia Settentrionale, Centro di Studio per la Dialettologia Italiana "O. Parlangèli". CNR/Dipartimento di Linguistica - Università di Padova

Bayer, J. (to appear) "Asymmetry in emphatic topicalisation". In C.Féry & W.Sternefeld (eds.), *Audiatur Vox Sapientiae*. Akademic Verlag, Berlin.

Benincà, P. 1989. "Friaulisch: Interne Sprachgeschichte I. Grammatik". In *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*. vol. III. Tübingen - Max Niemeyer Verlag, pp.563-585.

Benincà, P. 1996a. "La struttura della frase esclamativa alla luce del dialetto padovano". In P.Benincà, G.Cinque, T.De Mauro & N.Vincent (eds.), *Italiano e dialetti nel tempo. Saggi di grammatica per Giulio Lepschy*. Roma - Bulzoni, pp.23-43.

Benincà, P. 1996b. "Agglutination and Inflection in Northern Italian Dialects". In *Aspects of Romance Linguistics: Selected papers from the XXIV Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, pp.59-72.

Benincà, P. 2001. "The Position of Topic and Focus in the Left Periphery". In G.Cinque & G.Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax - Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Amsterdam - Elsevier, pp.39-64.

Bhattacharya, T. 2001. "The puzzle of Bangla Comp-internal clauses". *Snippets* 3, pp.6-7.

Cardinaletti, A. & M.Starke. 1999. "The typology of structural deficiency: on the three grammatical classes". In H. van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of*

Europe, vol. 8 of *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

von Fintel, K. 1994. *Restrictions on Quantifier Domains*. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts – Amherst.

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

Haegeman, L. 2002. "Anchoring to speaker, adverbial clauses and the structure of CP". In S. Mauck & J. Mittelstaedt (eds.). *Georgetown University Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics*, vol.2 - Fall 2002, pp.117-180.

Haegeman, L. & J.Guéron. 1999. *English Grammar: A Generative Perspective*. Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics 14, Blackwell Publishers.

Higginbotham, J. 1991. "Either/Or". *Proceedings of NELS 21*. Université du Québec à Montréal, pp.143-155.

Hulk, A. 1993. "Residual Verb-Second and the Licensing of Functional Features". *Probus* 5:127-154.

Iatridou, S. 2000. "The Grammatical Ingredients of Counterfactuality". *Linguistic Inquiry* 31.2:231-270

Iatridou, S. & D. Embick. 1994. "Conditional inversion". In M. González (ed.) *Proceedings of NELS 24*. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, pp.189-203.

Kayne, R. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. *LI* Monographs 25, MIT Press.

Munaro, N. 1997. *Proprietà strutturali e distribuzionali dei sintagmi interrogativi in alcuni dialetti italiani settentrionali*. PhD Thesis, Universities of Padua/Venice.

Munaro, N. 2001. "I correlati interpretativi dell'inversione tra verbo e clitico soggetto: la dialettologia come *scienza di confine* tra teoria e dati". In G.Marcato (ed.), *I confini del dialetto*. Padua - Unipress, pp.167-175.

Munaro, N. 2002. "Splitting up subject clitic-verb inversion". In C.Beyssade, R.Bok-Bennema, F.Drijkoningen, P.Monachesi (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2000*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp.233-252.

Munaro, N. 2005. "Computational puzzles of conditional clause preposing". In A.M. Di Sciullo (ed.), *UG and External Systems – Language, Brain and Computation*. John Benjamins – Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp.73-94 .

Munaro, N. & H.-G. Obenauer. 1999. "On Underspecified *Wh*-elements in Pseudo-interrogatives". *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 9:181-253.

Munaro, N., C.Poletto & J.Y. Pollock. 2001. "*Eppur si muove*! On Comparing French and Bellunese *Wh*-Movement". In P. Pica and J. Rooryck (eds.), *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 1*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp.147-180.

Munaro, N. & J.Y. Pollock. 2005. "*Qu'est-ce que (qu')-est-ce que*? A case study in comparative Romance interrogative syntax". In G. Cinque & R. Kayne (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative Syntax*. Oxford University Press, pp.542-606.

Munn, A. 1993. *Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Coordinate Structures*. PhD dissertation, University of Maryland

Obenauer, H.-G. 1994. *Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre. Effets d'intervention et mouvements des quantifieurs*. Thèse de Doctorat d'Etat, Université de Paris VIII.

Obenauer H.-G. & C. Poletto. 2000. "Rhetorical *Wh*-phrases in the Left Periphery of the Sentence". *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 10.1:121-151.

Poletto, C. 2000. *The Higher Functional Field*. New York - Oxford University Press.

Poletto, C. & J.Y. Pollock. 2004. "On the Left Periphery of Some Romance *Wh*-Questions". Manuscript, CNR-Padua / Université de Picardie à Amiens.

Pollock, J.Y. 2000. "Subject Clitics, Subject Clitic Inversion and Complex Inversion: Generalizing Remnant Movement to the Comp Area". Manuscript, Université de Picardie à Amiens.

Portner, P. 1992. *Situation Theory and the Semantics of Propositional Expressions*. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts – Amherst.

Portner, P. & R.Zanuttini. 1996. "The Syntax and Semantics of Scalar Negation: Evidence from Paduan". In *Proceedings of NELS 26*, pp. 257-271, University of Massachusetts – Amherst.

Portner, P. & R.Zanuttini. 2002. "Clause Types: Form and Force in Grammatical Theory". Talk delivered at the *Workshop on Syntax and Semantics of CP*, March 2002, Berlin ZAS.

Quer, J. 1998. *Mood at the Interface*. Holland Academic Graphics, The Hague.

Renzi, L. & L. Vanelli. 1983. "I pronomi soggetto in alcune varietà romanze". In *Scritti linguistici in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini*, Pisa - Pacini, pp.121-145.

Rizzi, L. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Foris, Dodrecht.

Rizzi, L. (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery", in L.Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp.281-337

Rizzi, L. (2001a) "On the position *Int(errogative)* in the left periphery of the clause", in G.Cinque & G.Salvi (eds.) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, North-Holland Linguistic Series, Elsevier, pp.287-296

Rizzi, L. (2001b) *Locality and Left-Periphery*, ms., University of Siena

Roberts, I. (1993a) *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax*, Dodrecht – Kluwer Academic Publishers

Roberts, I. (1993b) "The Nature of Subject Clitics in Franco-Provençal Valdotain", in *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, Turin - Rosenberg & Sellier, pp.319-353

Sadock, J. & A.Zwicky (1985) "Speech act distinctions in syntax" in T.Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.155-196

Speas, P. & C. Tenny (2002) "Configurational properties of point of view roles", in A.M. Di Sciullo (ed.) *Asymmetry in Grammar, Vol.1: Syntax and Semantics*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 315-345

Vicario, F. (1998) "Iussivo e ottativo: osservazioni contrastive tra friulano e italiano", *Quaderni della grammatica friulana di riferimento*, 1:109-124

Vinet, M.T. (1998) "*Tu-pas* as a Modifier of Event Relations in a Narrative Discourse" in *Studies on the Syntax of Central Romance Languages*, Universitat de Girona, pp.243-255

Vinet, M.T. (2000) "Feature Representation and *–tu(pas)* in Quebec French", *Studia Linguistica* 54.3: 381-411

Zanuttini, R. & P.Portner (2000) "The Characterization of Exclamative Clauses in Paduan", in N.Munaro (ed.) *Quaderni di lavoro dell'ASIS 3: Frasi esclamative e strutture correlate*, Istituto di Fonetica e Dialettologia – CNR, Padua