

## TopicPs and Relativized Minimality in Mòcheno left periphery

Federica Cognola  
 University of Padua  
*federica.cognola@unipd.it*

### 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

In this work, starting out from the study of the left periphery of the Tyrolean dialect Mòcheno, I will propose that there exist three types of TopicPs according to the type of constituent they can host:

- unspecialised TopicPs;
- TopicPs specialised for one category of constituents;
- TopicPs specialised for one constituent (SUBJ, DO...).

This finding represents the final result of the cartography of TopicPs in this language and constitutes a refinement of the cartography of the Topic field in the spirit of the work initiated by Benincà/Poletto (2004) on Italian.

The identification of these different TopicPs can help shed new light on the special nature of topics with respect to Relativized Minimality (RM, Rizzi 1990, 2004): it will be shown that an analysis in terms of features is not sufficient in order to make sense of the lack of RM violations between Operators and topics, but also a restriction on the nature of TopicP has to be posited. Only specialised TopicPs do not give rise to RM violations with Operators, whereas unspecialised ones can.

RM (Rizzi 2004): RM effects can arise only among XPs belonging to the same featural class (1).

- (1)
  - a. **Argumental**: person, number, gender, case...
  - b. **Quantificational**: wh-, neg, measure, focus...
  - c. **Modifier**: evaluative, epistemic, Neg, frequentative...
  - d. **Topic**

The modification of the conditions under which RM effects arise allows to make sense of empirical facts noted in the literature (Koster 1978, Cinque 1999) pointing out that an adverb can cross another adverb base-generated above in the structure if it has a focus interpretation, as in (2).

- (2) *RAPIDAMENTE i tecnici hanno risolto probabilmente il problema, non lentamente*  
 quickly the technicians have solved probably the problem, not slowly  
 'It was quickly that the technicians solved probably the problem, not slowly'

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Paola Benincà and Cecilia Poletto who read and commented this abstract and have followed my work in these years. Special thank to my informant Leo Toller for his endless patience and to Chiara Zanini for discussion of several topics of this work.

Topics are special in two ways:

- Topics form a featural class on their own since they do not give rise to RM effects with XPs of other featural classes;
- in Romance no RM violations are to be found among topics (3).

- (3) a. *Domani a Luca il libro<sub>i</sub> lo<sub>i</sub> porto io*  
tomorrow to Luca the book ACC-CL bring I  
b. *Domani il libro<sub>i</sub> a Luca lo<sub>i</sub> porto io*  
'I am bringing Luca the book tomorrow'

In the first part of the talk I will take into consideration foci and wh-element showing that:

- belonging to different featural classes is not enough for RM violations not to arise since in Mòcheno RM violations are to be found between a topic and a focus;
- TopicPs specialised and unspecialised for categories of constituents will be identified;
- RM effects between a topic and a focus arise only if the TopicP is unspecialised.

In the second part I will take into consideration the occurrences of topics with wh-elements showing that:

- different wh-elements activate a dedicated Topic field;
- different wh-elements (with their Topic fields) occupy different OpPs ordered one respect to the other (Krapova/Cinque 2008);
- the detailed structure obtained in this way and composed by specialised TopicPs can help make sense of TopicP free order in Romance.

## 2. Mòcheno left periphery

Mòcheno is a V2 language showing a left periphery similar to the one of Old Romance (Beninca' 2006) varieties, that is it allows for XPs to show up before the one triggering subject-verb inversion. As is the case of other Old Italian varieties (see in particular Poletto 2002 on the Retoromance dialect of S. Leonardo), it shows a split concerning the position of Operators. As shown in (3a), a wh-element can be preceded by several XPs, whereas a focus is not grammatical if preceded by more XPs (3b).

- (3) a. *[Gester][der Luca<sub>i</sub>][en de Maria] bos hot-er<sub>i</sub> trog?*  
yesterday the Luca to the Mary what have-SUBJ CL brought  
'What did Luca bring Mary yesterday?'
- b. *\*[Gester][der Luca<sub>i</sub>] EN DE MARIA hot-er<sub>i</sub> trog s puach, ont net en Nane*  
yesterday the Luca to the Mary has-SUBJ CL brought the book and not to John  
'It was to Mary that Luca brought the book yesterday, not to John'

The position of Operators in Mòcheno left periphery can be summed up in the structure in (4); I

label the positions hosting the two operators simply lowOpP and highOpP, whether they correspond respectively to a position in the Focus field and to ForceP (Rizzi 1997, Benincà/Poletto 2004) will not be pursued in this work.

(4)  $[_{HIGH-OPP} [XP^{+foc}] [V_{+fin}] [_{TOPICFIELD} [XP] [XP] [XP] [_{LOW-OPP} [wh] [V_{+fin}]]]]$

In what follows I will take into consideration the characteristics of the high OperatorP hosting the Focus.

## 2.1 The high OperatorP

The high OpP is the one dedicated to foci. As shown in (5a) a focus can be preceded by an XP on its left; the only ban is on the number of XPs before the focus, which can only be one.

- (5) a. *[En de Maria<sub>i</sub>] A PUACH hone-en<sub>i</sub> kaft, ont net a penna*  
 to the Mary a book have-SUBJ CL bought and not a pen  
 'It was a book that I bought Mary, and not a pen'  
 b. *\*[Der Mario<sub>i</sub>][en de Maria<sub>i</sub>] A PUACH hot-er<sub>i</sub>-en<sub>j</sub> kaft, ont net a penna*  
 the Mario to the Mary a book has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL bought and not pen  
 'Mario bought Mary a book and not pen'  
 c. *\*[Gester] [en de Maria<sub>i</sub>] A PUACH hone-en<sub>i</sub> kaft, ont net a penna*  
 yesterday to the Mary a book have-SUBJ CL bought and not a pen  
 'Yesterday I bought Mary a book and not a pen'

We can modify the structure of the Mòcheno left periphery given above adding one projection above focus, that for the moment I call TopicP.

(6)  $[_{TOPIC} [XP]][_{HIGH-OPP} [XP^{+foc}] [V_{+fin}] [_{TOPICFIELD} [XP] [XP] [XP] [_{LOW-OPP} [wh] [V_{+fin}]]]]$

### 2.1.1 Characteristics of the position above high OperatorP

- Resumption is obligatory (7a,c); resumption is not always obligatory with a wh-element (7b,d).

- (7) a. *Petn Luca<sub>i</sub> A PUACH hone kaft \*(pet im<sub>i</sub>), ont net a penna*  
 with-the Luca a book have-SUBJ CL bought with him  
 'With Luca I bought a book and not a pen'  
 b. *Petn Luca<sub>i</sub> bos hoso kaft (pet im<sub>i</sub>)?*  
 with-the Luca what-SUBJ CL bought (with him)  
 'What did you buy with Luca?'  
 c. *En de Maria<sub>i</sub> A PUACH hone-\*(en<sub>i</sub>) kaft, ont net a penna*  
 to the Mary a book have-SUBJ CL bought and not a pen  
 'I bought Mary a book and not a pen'  
 d. *En de Maria<sub>i</sub> bos hoso-(en<sub>i</sub>) kaft?*  
 to the Mary what have-SUBJ CL-(DAT CL) bought  
 'What did you buy Mary?'

XPs not allowing for resumption cannot show up in this position (8a), except for scene setters (8b).

- (8) a. *\*Vour de kirch A PUACH hone trog en de Maria ont net a penna*  
 in front of the church a book have-SUBJ CL brought to the Mary and not a pen  
 'In front of the church I brought Mary a book and not a pen'  
 b. *Gester A PUACH hone trog en de Maria ont net a penna*  
 yesterday a book have-SUBJ CL brought to the Mary and not a pen  
 'Yesterday I brought Mary a book and not a pen'

- From a pragmatic point of view, the XP showing up in the position above low OperatorP has to be already introduced in the conversation and corresponds to an aboutness Topic (Reihnard, Frascarelli).
- The last point is the unspecialised character of the projection; as shown in (9) verb arguments (9a), comitative PPs (9b) and scene setters (9c) can show up in this position.

- (9) a. *En de Maria A PUACH hone-\*(en) kaft, ont net a penna*  
 to the Mary a book have-SUBJ CL bought and not a pen  
 'I bought Mary a book and not a pen'  
 b. *Petn Luca A PUACH hone kaft \*(pet im), ont net a penna*  
 with-the Luca a book have-SUBJ CL bought with him  
 'With Luca I bought a book and not a pen'  
 c. *Gester A PUACH hone kaft, ont net a penna*  
 yesterday a book have-SUBJ CL bought and not a pen  
 'Yesterday I bought a book and not a pen'

To sum up:

- the position is not recursive;
- only aboutness topics can show up in the position;
- only XPs with resumption (verb arguments and comitative PPs) and scene setters can show up in the position;
- the position is unspecified for the category of XP.

### 2.1.2 RM violations between a topic and a focus

Surprisingly under the definition of the conditions under which RM applies given in (1), RM violations arise between a Focus and a Topic. This is illustrated in the following examples using verb arguments. RM effects between a focused and a topicalised argument arise starting out from the underlying structure: [<sub>TOPIC</sub> [<sub>FOCUS</sub> [... [<sub>FP</sub> **SUBJ** [<sub>FP</sub> **IO** [<sub>FP</sub> **DO** ]]]]]]. As shown in (10a,b), a focused DO can be preceded by both topicalised arguments being the lowest one of the three.

- (10) a. *En de Maria<sub>i</sub> A PUACH hot-er-en<sub>i</sub> kaft (ont net a penna)*  
 to the Maria-IO a book-DO has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL bought (and not a pen)  
 'He bought Mary a book and not a pen'

- b. *Der Nane<sub>i</sub> A PUACH hot-er<sub>i</sub> kaft en de Maria (ont net a penna)*  
 the John-SUBJ a book-DO has-SUBJ CL bought to the Mary and not a pen  
 'It was a book that John bought Mary, not a pen'

In the case it is the IO to be focalised, it can only be preceded by a topicalised subject (11a) and not by a DO (11b), as predicted by the underlying order of the arguments given above.

- (11) a. *Der Nane<sub>i</sub> EN DE MARIA hot-er<sub>i</sub> kaft s puach (ont net en Luca)*  
 the John-SUBJ to the Mary-IO has-SUBJ CL bought the book (and not to Luca)  
 'It was for Mary that John bought a book, and not for Luca'  
 b. *\*A puach<sub>i</sub> EN DE MARIA hot-er-z<sub>i</sub> kaft (ont net en Luca)*  
 a book-DO to the Mary-IO has-SUBJ CL-ACC CL bought (and not to Luca)  
 'It was for Mary that he bought a book, and not for Luca'

The last prediction made from the order of the arguments given above is that a focused subject cannot be in any case preceded by any topicalised argument.

- (12) a. *\*Z puach<sub>i</sub> DER MARIO hot-z<sub>i</sub> kaft (ont net der Nane)*  
 the book-DO the Mario-SUBJ has-ACC CL bought (and not the John)  
 b. *\*En de Maria<sub>i</sub> DER MARIO hot-en<sub>i</sub> kaft a puach (ont net der Nane)*  
 to the Mary-IO the Mario-SUBJ has-DAT CL bought a book (and not the John)  
 'It was Mario who bought Mary a book, and not John'

These data are very straightforward and show that in this language RM violations arise between a topic and a focus. We can add this point to the characteristics of the TopicP position seen above:

- the position is not recursive;
- only aboutness topics can show up in the position;
- only XPs with resumption (verb arguments and comitative PPs) and scene setters can show up in the position;
- the position is unspecified for the category of XP;
- RM effects with the focused XP.

The claim I want to make is that the presence of RM effects between a topic and a focus depends on one property of the TopicP above focus, namely its being unspecified for the constituent category.

Evidence in favour of this claim will be provided looking at the characteristics of TopicPs showing up with wh-elements that are where no RM are to be found:

- multiple;
- specialised for constituent categories;
- strictly ordered.

## 2.2 The lower OperatorP

We saw above that wh-elements show up in a different, namely lower, OpP in comparison to foci. This was concluded looking basically at the occurrences of wh-elements and foci with topics; as repeated below in (13) a wh-element can be preceded by several topicalised items

(13a), whereas a focus cannot (13b).

- (13) a. *Gester der Luca<sub>i</sub> en de Maria bos hot-er<sub>i</sub> trog?*  
yesterday the Luca to the Mary what have-SUBJ CL brought  
'What did Luca bring Mary yesterday?'
- b. *\*Gester der Luca<sub>i</sub> EN DE MARIA hot-er<sub>i</sub> trog s puach, ont net en Nane*  
yesterday the Luca to the Mary has-SUBJ CL brought the book and not to John  
'It was to Mary that Luca brought the book yesterday, not to John'

No RM violations arise between a wh-element and a topic. This is illustrated in (14): in (14a) a wh-element with thematic role of IO can be preceded by both topicalised SUBJ and DO, and in (14b) a wh- with the thematic role of a SUBJ can be preceded by DO and IO. RM violations arise in the same conditions if the operator is a focus (14c,d).

- (14) a. *Gester der Mario<sub>i</sub> s puach<sub>j</sub> en bem hot-er<sub>i</sub>-z<sub>j</sub> trog?*  
yesterday the Mario the book to whom has-SUBJ CL-ACC CL brought  
'Who did Mario bring the book to yesterday?'
- b. *Gester s puach<sub>i</sub> en Nane<sub>j</sub> ber hot-z<sub>i</sub>-en<sub>j</sub> trog?*  
yesterday the book-DO to John-IO who-SUBJ has-DO CL-DAT CL brought  
'Who brought John the book yesterday?'
- c. *\*Z puach<sub>i</sub> EN DE MARIA hone-z<sub>i</sub> gem, ont net en Nane*  
the book to the Mary have-SUBJ CL-ACC CL given, and not to John  
'I gave Mary the book, and not John'
- d. *\*En de Maria<sub>i</sub> DER NANE hot-en<sub>i</sub> a puach gem, ont net der Mario*  
to the Mary the John has-DAT CL a book given, and not the Mario  
'It was John who gave Mary the book, and not Mario'

➤ No RM violations arise between a wh-element and a topic.

### 2.2.1 Structure of the Topic field above wh-elements

In this section I will show that topicalised items above wh-elements show up in a fixed order according to their constituent category.

The higher positions are specialised for the frame: time and space adverbials cannot be separated by a topicalised argument (15a,b) and an argument cannot precede them (15c,d).

- (15) a. *Gester vour de kirch der Mario<sub>i</sub> ber hot-er<sub>i</sub> zechen?*  
yesterday in front of the church the Mario who has-SUBJ CL seen
- b. *\*Gester der Mario<sub>i</sub> vour de kirch ber hot-er<sub>i</sub> zechen?*  
yesterday the Mario in front of the church who has-SUBJ CL seen  
'Who did Mario see yesterday in front of the church?'
- c. *Gester vour de kirch en de Maria<sub>i</sub> ber hot-en<sub>i</sub> gem a puach?*  
yesterday in front of the church to the Mary who has-DAT CL given a book
- d. *\*En de Maria<sub>i</sub> gester vour de kirch ber hot-en<sub>i</sub> gem a puach?*  
to the Mary yesterday in front of the church who has-DAT CL given a book  
'Who gave Mary a book yesterday in front of the church?'

Arguments occupy a higher position in comparison to other XP that can be topicalised above a wh-element such as comitative PPs.

- (16) a. *Gester der Mario<sub>i</sub> petn Luca abia hot-er<sub>i</sub> gahondelt der pustin?*  
 yesterday the Mario with-the Luca how has-SUBJ CL treated the postman  
 b. \**Gester petn Luca Mario<sub>i</sub> abia hot-er<sub>i</sub> gahondelt der pustin?*  
 yesterday with-the Luca the Mario how has-SUBJ CL treated the postman  
 'How did Mario with Luca treat the postman yesterday?'  
 c. *Verten de dai kamaroten<sub>i</sub> pet de dai muam bo hon-sa<sub>i</sub> pakemmt der Nane?*  
 last year the your friends with the your aunt where have-SUBJ CL met the John  
 d. \**Verten pet de dai muam de dai kamaroten<sub>i</sub> bo hon-sa<sub>i</sub> pakemmt der Nane?*  
 last year with the your aunt the your friends where have-SUBJ CL met the John  
 'Where did your friends with your aunt meet John last year?'

The structure of the Topic field activated by wh-elements is summarised in (17):

- (17) [<sub>FRAME</sub> [**Scene setter**] [**loc.PP**] [<sub>TOPIC-ARG</sub> [**XP**] [**XP**] [<sub>TOPIC-ADJ</sub> [**com.PP**] [<sub>OPP</sub> [**wh**]]]]]

To sum up:

- wh-elements allow for multiple TopicPs above them;
- no RM violations between wh-elements and topics arise;
- the order of TopicPs is strict according to constituent category.

### 2.3 Partial conclusions

What we have see so far is:

- foci occupy a high OperatorP and can be preceded only by one TopicP;
- this TopicP is not specialised for constituent category but can host XPs with resumption and scene setters;
- RM violation between the focussed XP and the topicalised XP arise;
- wh-elements occupy a low OperatorP and allow for several TopicPs above them;
- TopicPs above wh-elements are ordered according to the constituent category of the XPs to be topicalised;
- no RM violation arise between wh-elements and topics.

A complete structure of Mòcheno left periphery identified so far is given below:

- (18) [<sub>TOPIC</sub> [**XP**]<sub>[HIGH-OPP [**XP**<sup>+foc</sup>] [**V**<sub>+fin</sub>]]</sub> [<sub>FRAME</sub> [**Scene setter**] [**loc.PP**] [<sub>TOPIC-ARG</sub> [**XP**] [**XP**] [<sub>TOPIC-ADJ</sub> [**com.PP**] [<sub>OPP</sub> [**wh**]]]]]

Given the discussion above, I conclude that RM violations are due to the nature of the TopicP above high OpP, that is not specified for any constituent category.

### 3. On apparent TopicPs free order in Italian

In this last section, starting out from findings from Mòcheno, I will try to make sense of the pattern found in Italian, and more in general in Romance, where TopicPs can show up in free order (apparent recursivity) and where no RM violations between topics are to be found.

Idea: Topics in Romance can show up in free order because there are more TopicPs specialised for the different constituent categories;

In order to prove this claim: looking at the occurrences of wh-elements and topics it will be shown that in Mòcheno wh-elements with different thematic roles show up in different OpPs activating a dedicated Topic field<sup>2</sup>;

it can be assumed that the different wh-elements (with their dedicated Topic fields) are ordered one with respect to the other just like in Slavic languages allowing for wh-fronting as Bulgarian (Krapova/Cinque 2008);

- (19)  $[_{TOPIC+ARG} [XP] [_{OP} \text{WHERE}]] / [_{TOPIC+ARG} [XP] [_{OP} \text{WHO-SUBJ}]] / [_{TOPIC+ARG} [\text{SUBJ}]] [_{OP} \text{WHO-DO}]$

if we assume that in Romance all Topic field are available and only the lowest OpP is present, we end up with a detailed map of specialised TopicPs.

#### 3.1 Wh-elements with verb argument theta role

The wh-element wh-DO allows for two arguments whose order is strictly SUBJ-IO (20).

- (20) a. *Gester vour de kirch de muam<sub>i</sub> en Luca<sub>j</sub> bos hot-sa<sub>i</sub>-en<sub>j</sub> kaft?*  
 yesterday in front of the church the aunt to Luca what has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL bought  
 b. \**Gester vour de kirch en Luca<sub>j</sub> de muam<sub>i</sub> bos hot-er<sub>i</sub>-en<sub>j</sub> kaft?*  
 yesterday in front of the church to Luca the aunt what has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL bought  
 'What did out aunt bring Luca yesterday?'

SUBJ – IO - wh-DO  
 \*IO – SUBJ - wh-DO

Also the wh-IO allows for the two arguments in the fixed order SUBJ-DO (21).

- (21) a. *Gester der Mario<sub>i</sub> s puach<sub>j</sub> en bem hot-er<sub>i</sub>-z<sub>j</sub>-en gem?*  
 yesterday the Mario the book to whom has-SUBJ CL-ACC CL-DAT CL given  
 b. \**Gester s puach<sub>j</sub> der Mario<sub>i</sub> en bem hot-er<sub>i</sub>-z<sub>j</sub>-en gem?*  
 yesterday the book the Mario to whom has-SUBJ CL-ACC CL-DAT CL given  
 'Who did Mario give the book to yesterday?'

SUBJ – DO – wh-IO  
 \*DO – SUBJ - wh-IO

2 Such a claim has already been made in the literature especially in relation with the property of +/- d-linking of wh-elements (Munaro 1997). Here I want to claim that all wh-elements move to a dedicated OpP (evidence that adjunct wh-element show up in a different position from argumental ones also in Aboch/Pfau 2008).

In the case a wh- has the SUBJ theta role, both orders of arguments are possible, as shown in (22).

- (22) a. *Gester en Nane<sub>j</sub> s puach<sub>i</sub> ber hot-z<sub>i</sub>-en<sub>j</sub> trog?*  
 yesterday to John-IO the book-DO who-SOGG has-DO CL-DAT CL brought  
 b. *Gester s puach<sub>i</sub> en Nane<sub>j</sub> ber hot-z<sub>i</sub>-en<sub>j</sub> trog?*  
 yesterday the book to John who has-DO CL-DAT CL brought  
 'Who bought John the book yesterday?'

IO – DO - wh-SUBJ  
 DO – IO - wh-SUBJ

To sum up:

wh-DO and wh-IO allow for two topicalised arguments in fixed order (SUBJ-IO; SUBJ-DO);  
 wh-SUBJ allows for the two topicalised arguments in free order (DO-IO; IO-DO).

What can be thought about this state of affair?

- A. both wh-DO and wh-IO move to the same OpP above which two TopicPs for arguments are available and RM effects between topics arise;  
 the subject moves to a different position where more TopicPs are available.  
 B. wh-DO and wh-IO activate TopicPs specialised for one constituent;  
 wh-SUBJ activate TopicPs specialised for categories but not for constituents.

At this point of my work I prefer solution B (se no dovrei dire che ci sono tipi di topic che fanno RM ed altri no, bo)

There are three types of TopicPs:

- unspecialised (above highOpP);
- specialised for constituent categories (above low OpP);
- specialised for one single constituent (above wh-DO; wh-DO)

To sum up:

wh-elements with different theta roles show up in different OpPs and activate a dedicated Topic field;  
 we can assume that they are ordered one with respect to the other;

- (23)  $[_{TOPIC+ARG} [XP][XP] [_{OP} WH-SUBJ] / [_{TOPIC+ARG} [SUBJ][DO] [_{OP} WHO-IO] / [_{TOPIC+ARG} [SUBJ][IO] [_{OP} WHO-DO]$

### 3.2 Wh-elements with function of adjuncts

In this subsection I will show that:

wh-elements with function of adjuncts activate a different Topic field in comparison to arguments;

different wh-elements with function of adjunct occupy different OpPs.

As shown in (24) the temporal wh-element *when* does not allow for two topicalised arguments to its left:

- (24) a. \**Gester der Nane<sub>i</sub> en Mario<sub>j</sub> benn hot-er<sub>i</sub>-en<sub>j</sub> trog z puach?*  
yesterday the John to Mario when has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL brought the book  
b. \**Gester en Mario<sub>j</sub> der Nane<sub>i</sub> benn hot-er<sub>i</sub>-en<sub>j</sub> trog z puach?*  
yesterday to Mario the John when has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL brought the book  
'When did Mario bring John the book yesterday?'  
c. \**Gester der Mario<sub>i</sub> s puach<sub>j</sub> benn hot-er<sub>i</sub>-z<sub>j</sub> kaft?*  
yesterday the Mario the book when has-SUBJ CL-ACC CL bought  
d. \**Gester s puach<sub>j</sub> der Mario<sub>j</sub> benn hot-er<sub>i</sub>-z<sub>j</sub> kaft?*  
yesterday the book the Mario when has-SUBJ CL-ACC CL bought  
'When did Mario buy the book yesterday?'

Only one XP at time can show up before *when*:

- (25) a. *Gester der Nane<sub>i</sub> benn hot-er<sub>i</sub> kaft z puach?*  
yesterday the John when has-SUBJ CL bought the book  
'When did John buy the book yesterday?'  
b. *Gester en Mario<sub>i</sub> benn hot-er-en<sub>i</sub> trog z puach?*  
yesterday to Mario when has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL brought the book  
'When did he bring John the book yesterday?'  
c. *Gester s puach<sub>j</sub> benn hot-er-z<sub>j</sub> kaft?*  
yesterday the book when has-SUBJ CL-ACC CL bought  
'When did Mario buy the book yesterday?'

XP<sub>+ARG</sub> - *when*

As far as the positions for arguments are concerned, the same pattern of *when* is also found with *where*. As shown in (26), *where* cannot be preceded by two verb arguments.

- (26) a. \**Gester der Nane<sub>i</sub> en Mario<sub>j</sub> bo hot-er<sub>i</sub>-en<sub>j</sub> kaft z puach?*  
yesterday the John to Mario where has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL bought the book  
b. \**Gester en Mario<sub>j</sub> der Nane<sub>i</sub> bo hot-er<sub>i</sub>-en<sub>j</sub> kaft z puach?*  
yesterday to Mario the John where has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL bought the book  
'Where did Mario buy John the book yesterday?'  
c. \**Gester der Mario<sub>i</sub> s puach<sub>j</sub> bo hot-er<sub>i</sub>-z<sub>j</sub> kaft?*  
yesterday the Mario the book where has-SUBJ CL-ACC CL bought  
d. \**Gester s puach<sub>j</sub> der Mario<sub>j</sub> bo hot-er<sub>i</sub>-z<sub>j</sub> kaft?*  
yesterday the book the Mario where has-SUBJ CL-ACC CL bought  
'Where did Mario buy the book yesterday?'

*Where* allows for one topicalised argument on its left, as shown below in (27).

- (27) a. *Gester der Nane<sub>i</sub> bo hot-er<sub>i</sub> kaft z puach?*  
 yesterday the John where has-SUBJ CL bought the book  
 'When did John buy the book?'  
 b. *Gester en Mario<sub>i</sub> bo hot-er-en<sub>i</sub> trog z puach?*  
 yesterday to Mario where has-SUBJ CL-DAT CL brought the book  
 'Where did he bring John the book yesterday?'  
 c. *Gester s puach<sub>j</sub> bo hot-er-z<sub>j</sub> kaft?*  
 yesterday the book where has-SUBJ CL-ACC CL bought  
 'Where did Mario buy the book yesterday?'

XP<sub>+ARG</sub> - *where*

It cannot be concluded that the two adjunct wh-elements show up in the same position, since only *where* is compatible with a comitative PP (28a), whereas *when* is not (28b).

- (28) a. *Verten de dai kamaroten<sub>i</sub> petn Luca, bo hon-sa<sub>i</sub> pakemmt der Nane?*  
 last year the your friends with-the Luca, where have-SUBJ CL met the John  
 'Where did you friends meet John with Luca last year'  
 b. *\*Vour de kirch de dai kamaroten<sub>i</sub> petn Luca benn hon-sa<sub>i</sub> zechen de Maria?*  
 infront the church the your friends with-the Luca when have-SUBJ CL seen the  
 Maria  
 'When did your friends see Maria infront of the church with Luca?'

SUBJ – comitative PP - *where*

\*SUBJ – comitative PP - *when*

The two Topic fields activated by *where* and *when* are summarised in (29); the fact that they allow for different Topics on their left is captured again assuming that they are ordered one with respect to the other together with their Topic fields..

- (29) [TOPIC+ARG [XP] [TOPIC+ADJ [com.PP][OP WHERE]]]/[TOPIC+ARG [XP] [OP WHEN]]

#### 4. Conclusions

In this work I have shown that:

- a definition of RM only in terms of features does not make sense of Mòcheno data;
- in order for RM violation between a topic and an operator not to arise the TopicP has to be specific for a constituent category;
- the analysis of the occurrences of argumental topics above different wh-elements allows to identify different layers activated by different wh-elements;
- the wh-elements (with their Topic layers) show up in different OpPs and are ordered one with respect to the other;
- assuming that in Romance only one OpP is available, namely the lowest one identified in Mòcheno, we have several TopicPs dedicated to arguments (30);

(30) [TOPIC+ARG [XP] [TOPIC+ADJ [com.PP][TOPIC+ARG [XP][TOPIC+ARG [XP][XP][TOPIC+ARG [SUBJ][DO][TOPIC+ARG][SUBJ] [IO][OP WH]

- Topic free order in Romance depends on the availability of all the specialised TopicPs and is not due to recursivity.

## References

Aboch, Enoch; Roland, Pfau (2008): “What-s a wh-word got to do with it”, available on LingBuzz,

Benincà, Paola (2006), “A Detailed Map of the Left Periphery of Medieval Romance”, in: R.Zanuttini, H.Campos, E.Herburger and P.Portner (eds.), *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics. Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture*. Georgetown University Press, Washington 2006, pp. 53-86.

/Cecilia, Poletto (2004), “Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers”, in: L.Rizzi (ed), *The Structure of CP and IP. The cartography of Syntactic Structures 3*. OUP

Frascarelli, Mara

Krapova, Ilyana; Guglielmo, Cinque (2008), “On the order of wh-phrases in Bulgarian multiple wh-fronting”, in: G.Zybatow, *Formal Description of Slavic Languages*. Peter Lang

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

Poletto, Cecilia (2002), “The left periphery of a V2-Rhaetoromance dialect: a new perspective on V2 and V3”, in: S.Barbiers et al. (eds), *Syntactic Microvariation*. Meertens Institute

Reihnard, Tania ()

Rizzi, Luigi (1997): “The Fine structure of the left periphery”, in: L.Haegeman (ed), *Elements of Grammar*. Kluwer, Dordrecht

(2004), “Relativized Minimality”, in: L.Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP*. OUP