Root Contrastiveness and V2: A Supra-Informational Status The Case of Two North-Eastern Italian Dialects

Simone De Cia

simone.decia@manchester.ac.uk

The University of Manchester

Abstract: In the literature on Romance and Germanic V2, the fronted XP in the preverbal field is generally described as pragmatically salient, tacitly implying a crucial relationship between the V2 phenomenon and information structure. The degree to which discourse-pragmatics is pervasive in the V2 syntax is subject to cross-linguistic variation; nevertheless, the discussion of the phenomenon is often marginal in the literature. This paper sheds more light on the interaction between the V2 constraint and information structure by investigating two North-Eastern Italian dialects, Lamonat and Sovramontino, whose V2 constraint is solely linked to the unpackaging of discourse-pragmatic information. V2-motivated T-to-C movement ensures: (i) adjacency of the verb to the pragmatically salient element that, hence, receives discourse prominence; and (ii) the correct interpretation of contrastive elements, which are structurally realised in the preverbal field. The investigation of contrastive XPs suggests that contrastiveness should be regarded as an independent discourse-pragmatic status that supersedes topic and focus. In this respect, contrastiveness should not be considered a categorical notion, but a continuum in which the degree of contrastiveness is determined by the properties of the set containing the contrastive element.

Keywords: V2, Contrastiveness, Northern Italian Dialects, Topic, Focus

1. Introduction

The literature on Romance and Germanic V2 (Holmberg 1986, Holmberg & Platzack 1995, Vikner 1995, Vilkuna 1995, Poletto 2002, Benincà 2006 a. o.) hints at a crucial relationship between the V2 phenomenon and information

structure, whereby the fronted XP is pragmatically salient by virtue of encoding some specific discourse-pragmatic function. The discussion of the phenomenon is nonetheless often marginal in the literature[1] and more research is needed to formalise the interaction between the V2 constraint and information structure. This paper offers a step in that direction by investigating two North-Eastern Italian dialects (henceforth NEIDs), Lamonat and Sovramontino. These Romance varieties exhibit residual V2 constituent order, which serves the sole purpose of unpackaging discourse-pragmatic information. Through Rizzi's (1997) left periphery, I will show that the formalisation of this type of interface phenomenon not only allows us to acquire a better understanding of the mechanisms at the basis of the syntax-pragmatics interface, but also to uncover the primitive discourse-pragmatic functions that are valued by the syntax-pragmatics interface itself. In fact, in Lamonat and Sovramontino, V2 does not interact with any pragmatically salient XP, but specifically with contrastive XPs, suggesting that the syntactic-pragmatic realisation of contrastiveness is a key language component in the dialects under investigation.

Lamonat and Sovramontino hence depart from most Romance languages as they retained Medieval Romance V2 (see Benincà 1983) as a crucial strategy for the realisation of contrastive XPs, lending support to the claim that a pivotal bidirectional relation between information structure and the V2 constraint is indeed in place. V2-motivated T-to-C movement ensures: (i) adjacency of the verb to the pragmatically salient element that, hence, receives discourse prominence; and (ii) the correct interpretation of contrastive elements, which are realised in the preverbal field. In this paper, I will focus on the latter point. The value of the present research, in fact, lies in this particular aspect of the syntax-pragmatics interface: even though discourse-pragmatics seems to be a pervasive component of language, syntax is crucial to enforce the right mapping between the surface position of a constituent and its semantic-pragmatic interpretation. In Sovramontino and Lamonat, the displaced verb functions as a boundary that marks different discourse functions; in particular,

---

[1] See Hinterhölzl and Petrova (2010) for the discussion of the development and interaction of V2 and information structure in German.

it sharply sets the boundary between contrastive vs. non-contrastive informational units (see Kuno 1976, Kiss 1998).

1.1 Contrastiveness and V2: An Overview

In due course, I will provide a fine-grained definition of contrastiveness; for now, an XP is contrastive when it specifically refers to an informational unit that is contrary to the corresponding interlocutor's presuppositions (Kiss 1998). In this respect, contrastiveness can apply orthogonally to different informational units that exhibit either focal or topical characteristics. Contrastiveness is nonetheless traditionally considered a property of foci. A considerable amount of research has shown that contrastive focal elements receive a different treatment than regular or informational foci at the syntactic level. There is general agreement in favour of two separate dedicated structural positions that encode either contrastive or informational focus (Kiss 1998, Rizzi 1997, Belletti 2001, 2004, Benincà & Poletto 2004, Bianchi & Francarelli 2010, Bianchi & Bocci 2012, Cruschina 2012, Bocci 2013, Rizzi & Bocci 2017 and many others). There is also mounting evidence that, contrastiveness is independent of focus and also extends to topics: topics can also bear a contrastive reading and occupy a specialised syntactic position (Szabolcsi 1981, Gundel 1988, Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl 2007, Lopez 2009, Neeleman et al. 2009, Bianchi & Francarelli 2010). Erteschik-Shir (2007) points out that cross-linguistically: (i) sentence initial topics tend to represent so-called contrastive or switch topics and consist of a specific type of topic that has focus-like properties, and (ii) sentence initial foci tend to represent restrictive or contrastive foci consisting of a specific type of focus that has topic-like properties. In other words, contrastiveness seems to have the ability of superseding topic or focus status. The NEIDs under investigation, Lamonat and Sovramontino, strictly obey this typological trend, syntactically exhibiting a sharp distinction between contrastive and non-contrastive elements. A constituent bearing contrastiveness is banned from the TP layer and must be realised in the left-peripheral space. Contrastive elements, be they topics or foci, are limited to one occurrence per sentence and must

surface clause-initially [2]. I argue that the preverbal position occupied by contrastive XPs is filled through the activation of the V2 constraints: more specifically, I argue that, in the two NEIDs under investigation, the [+EGDE] feature that, in Medieval Romance V2, was responsible for the presence of an overt XP in the specifier position of the C° targeted by the moved verb, has undergone pragmatic specialisation and become [+CONTRASTIVE], being only active in case a contrastive element bearing a matching [+CONTRASTIVE] feature enters the derivation. My analysis of contrastive elements will treat contrastive topics and foci as occupying the same highest structural position in the clause in the SpecCP position of the C° hosting the moved verb. The present paper hence adopts a unitary syntactic analysis of this discourse-pragmatic category in the two Romance varieties under investigation. The present investigation suggests that contrastiveness should therefore be regarded as an independent discourse-pragmatic status that supersedes topic and focus. In this respect, I will show that contrastiveness should not be considered a categorical notion, but a continuum, in which the degree of contrastiveness is determined by the properties of the set containing the contrastive element.

1.2 A Unified Treatment of Contrastive XPs: Cross-linguistic Evidence

Before delving into the analysis of the syntactic-pragmatic behaviour of contrastive elements in Lamonat and Sovramontino, let us look at cross-linguistic evidence in support of a unified treatment of contrastiveness as an independent informational status. In several languages, contrastive elements are morpho-syntactically encoded irrespectively of their informational nature as foci or topics, providing evidence in favour of the supra-informational nature of contrast with respect to the topic-focus divide. One such language is Finnish: Vilkuna (1995) argues that contrastive topics and foci target the same dedicated structural position in the C-domain. She claims that, in Finnish, contrast must

---

[2] They can be preceded by a frame-setting element. Frame-setters are base-generated elements that occupy a dedicated clause-external syntactic position, namely FrameP (see Haegeman 2000, 2006, 2007). In section 4, I argue that A-topics (Bianchi & Frascarelli 2010) are also licensed in FrameP and hence behave like frame-setting elements.

be analysed as a property of topicality and focusing, but independent from either informational status. Contrastiveness therefore enjoys special status and, in Finnish, is encoded at the syntactic level through a designated high structural position. Nevertheless, syntax is not the only way in which a language can highlight the special discourse-pragmatic status of contrastive elements: other languages encode contrastiveness through different strategies. For example, as for the familiar case of English, contrastiveness is encoded at the prosodic level and the constituent bearing a contrastive reading receives sentential stress. The same is true for Italian: in case a contrastive element is not realised in the C-domain, but in the TP layer, it receives sentential stress which distinguishes the contrastive focal element from its non-contrastive focal counterpart, as shown respectively in (1) and (2):

(1) CONTEXT: Did you give a T-shirt to the winner?   (Italian)
No.   Gli   abbiamo   dato   **UNA MEDAGLIA**
NEG   DAT.CL   have.1PL   give.PTCP   a   medal
'No. We gave him a medal.'

(2) CONTEXT: What did you give to the winner?
Gli   abbiamo   dato   UNA MEDAGLIA
DAT.CL   have.1PL   give.PTCP   a   medal
'We gave him a medal'

In a language like Italian that arguably does not draw a sharp syntactic distinction between contrastive and non-contrastive elements, prosody seems to be the only means to draw this distinction. Note that contrastive focus will be represented in **CAPITAL BOLD** (cf. 1) and informational focus in CAPITAL (cf. 2). Different languages of the world, to different degrees, seem to adopt different strategies to mark contrastiveness as an independent informational status, like, for instance, the use of specialised syntactic configurations or prosodic patterns (Selkirk 2002, Molnár 2002). Another means of encoding contrastiveness as a supra-informational status is through morpho-syntax, as in the case of Japanese (see Shimojo 2011). Kuno (1973) notes that certain instances of use of the Japanese topic marker *-wa* is ambiguous between a topic and a focus reading, claiming that the common pragmatic reading suitable for both elements is a contrastive one.

Cross-linguistic evidence suggests that contrastiveness is specially marked in several languages of the world and, in some cases, can supersede the notion of focus and topic. In such cases, the same linguistic strategy marks the target constituent as contrastive regardless of the topic-focus divide: in Lamonat and Sovramontino, this common strategy translates into the activation of the V2 constraint.

1.3 North-Eastern Italian Dialects and Data Collection

The data that will be presented throughout the paper were collected as part of a wider project that aims to investigate the interaction between information structure and syntax across NEIDs. Four relatively lesser-studied varieties were chosen: Friulian, Fornese, Sovramontino and Lamonat. Despite the misleading name, NEIDs are sister languages of Italian and direct continuations of Latin (Clackson 2016, Wright 2016). In this paper, I will only consider Lamonat and Sovramontino as they systematically exhibit a 'pragmatically motivated V2 system' [3]. Lamonat and Sovramontino are respectively spoken by approximately 2000 and 1000 speakers in the mountainous municipalities of Lamon and Sovramonte in the Italian province of Belluno. They are closely related and belong to supra-dialectal area of Bellunese[4]. The overall data collection featured several field trips between 2015 and 2017, in which approximately 35 hours of interviews were recorded. Data were collected from 32 speakers between the age of 60 and 78. Note that all patterns found through elicitation were also attested in natural occurring speech. No corpora exist of these (exclusively) spoken varieties. This greatly limits the possibility to conduct sound quantitative research, which would have surely strengthened some of the claims put forward in this paper.

---

[3] I will show that Medieval Romance V2 is maintained as a means to license specific discourse-pragmatics readings: namely narrow informational focus and/or contrastive XPs. Nonetheless, if these discourse-pragmatic functions are not expressed, Lamonat and Sovramontino exhibit SVO constituent order.

[4] See Munaro (1998) and Poletto & Pollock (2004) for a brief description of Bellunese.

1.4 Structure

In section 2, I will highlight the special syntactic behaviour of contrastive elements in Lamonat and Sovramontino with respect to other NEIDs. In section 3, I will account for the pragmatically motivated V2 nature of Lamonat and Sovramontino, paying particular attention to its V2 typology. In section 4, I will focus on discourse-pragmatic contrastiveness and provide a suitable description of the phenomenon that best captures the data from the two NEIDs under investigation. I will compare and contrast contrastive foci and contrastive topics, pointing out that, despite their identical surface position, they still exhibit morpho-syntactic characteristics typical of their respective informational status. Finally, in section 5, I will investigate the behaviour of d-linked wh-elements and discuss how they fit into the proposed analysis, reaching the conclusion that they are discourse-pragmatically contrastive elements.

2. The Data: Contrastive XPs in Lamonat and Sovramontino

NEIDs show a non-homogeneous behaviour with regard to the expression of contrastiveness. Lamonat and Sovramontino are much stricter in encoding contrastiveness than, for example, Friulian and Fornese. Let us start by considering contrastive topics in Friulian (3) and Lamonat (4):

(3) CONTEXT: Did you see my parents yesterday?   (Friulian)
Iar   **to pari** lu   ai   viodût   tal   bosc, [to mari e jere a cjase]
yesterday your father OCL   have.1SG   see.PTCP   in-the woods
'As for you father, I saw him in the woods yesterday, your mother was at home.'

(4) CONTEXT: Did you see my parents yesterday?   (Lamonat)
Ier   **to pare** l   è   vedù   an tel bosc, [to mare l era fora casa]
yesterday your father OCL have.1SG   seen.PTCP   in-the woods
'As for you father, I saw him in the woods yesterday, your mother was at home.'

In (3) and (4) the relevant contrastive topic is in **bold face**. It is a topic as it is resumed by the third person singular object clitic *l/lu* in the TP space: clitic left dislocation is traditionally considered a diagnostic of topicality across Romance (Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1997). The constituent *to pare/to pari* is contrastive in nature as it is framed in a contrastive relationship with *to mare/to mari*. In both Lamonat and Friulian, the frame-setter *iar/ier* appears in a higher position than the contrastive topic *to pari/to pare.* Frame-setters are circumstantial in

nature and modify the propositional content of the main clause: typically, they are adjuncts that provide temporal and/or modal restrictions to the circumstances of evaluation of the proposition expressed by the main clause (see Greco & Haegeman 2016). In the two NEIDs, despite the identical surface position of the contrastive XP, I argue that the underlying constituent order is fundamentally different. In Lamonat, *to pare* surfaces in the specifier position of the C° targeted by V2-motivated T-to-C movement and is licenced by the contrastive nature of the XP itself. In Friulian, this is not the case, as shown in the proposed labelled bracketing of (3) and (4), in (5) and (6) respectively:

(5) [FrameP Iar [TopP to pari [TP *pro* [T′ [T lu ai] [VP viodût tal bosc]]]]]]

(6) [FrameP Ier [ForceP to pare [Force′ [Force l è vedù] [TP *pro* [T′ [T l è vedù] [VP vedù an tel bosc]]]]]]]

    In the rest of the paper, I will show that this analysis well-captures the marked constituent orders found in Lamonat and Sovramontino along with their syntactic requirement on the left-peripheral realisation of contrastive XPs. If the proposal in (5) and (6) were truthful, speakers would be able to insert an overt subject between the contrastive XP and the verb in Friulian, but would not be able to do so in Lamonat. The prediction is borne out, as shown in (7) and (8):

(7) CONTEXT: Did you see my parents yesterday?   (Friulian)
Iar   **to pari**   jo lu   ai   viodût   tal   bosc, [to mari …]
yesterday your father   I   OCL have.1SG   see. PTCP   in-the woods
'As for you father, I saw him in the woods yesterday, your mother was at home.'

(8) CONTEXT: Did you see my parents yesterday?   (Lamonat)
  a. *Ier   **to pare**   mi l   è   vedù   an tel bosc, [to mare …]
    yesterday   your father   I   OCL have.1SG   seen. PTCP in-the woods
    'As for you father, I saw him in the woods yesterday, your mother was at home.'

  b. Ier   **to pare**   l   è   vedù   mi   an tel bosc, [to mare …]
    yesterday   your father   OCL have.1SG seen. PTCP   I   in-the woods
    'As for you father, I saw him in the woods yesterday, your mother was at home.'

    In Lamonat, the subject, if overt as background information (G-topic in the sense of Bianchi & Frascarelli 2010), must be placed post-verbally (cf. 8b): nothing can intervene between the contrastive XP and the verb cluster. As I will

show in section 3, this constituent order is typical of languages exhibiting the V2 constraint.

Further evidence that, in Lamonat and Sovramontino root clauses, contrastive XPs must be realised in the C-domain is provided by the behaviour of contrastive foci. Let us consider examples (9) and (10):

(9) CONTEXT: Did you give a T-shirt to the winner?   (Friulian)

Po   no no! Iar   **UNE MEDAE**   o   vin   dât   al   vincitôr
EXCL NEG yesterday a   medal   1PL.SCL have.1PL give.PTCP   to-the winner
'No. We gave a medal to the winner yesterday.'

(10) CONTEXT: Did you give a T-shirt to the winner?   (Sovramontino)
No. Ier   **NA MEDAJA**   ghe   on   dat   al   vincitor
NEG yesterday a   medal   DAT.CL   have.1PL   give.PTCP to-the winner
'No. We gave a medal to the winner yesterday.'

In (9) and (10), the focal element *une medae/na medaja* corrects the interlocutors presuppositions, hence this type of C-focus is corrective in nature. In (9) and (10), the same linear constituent order is in place, but the underlying constituent order is profoundly different. In Sovramontino, focal contrastive XPs must surface in the C-domain, whereas, in Friulian, contrastive elements can also surface *in-situ* in the TP layer, as shown respectively in (11) and (12):

(11) CONTEXT: Did you give a T-shirt to the winner?   (Friulian)
Po   no!   Iar   o   vin   dât   **UNE MEDAE**   al   vincitôr
EXCL NEG yesterday 1PL.SCL have.1PL give.PTCP a   medal   to-the winner
'No. We gave a medal to the winner yesterday.'

(12) CONTEXT: Did you give a T-shirt to the winner?   (Sovramontino)
#No. Ier   ghe   on   dat   **NA MEDAJA**   al   vincitor
NEG   yesterday DAT.CL   have.1PL give.PTCP a   medal   to-the winner
'No. We gave a medal to the winner yesterday.'

The sentence in (12) is pragmatically infelicitous. It would be a felicitous answer to the question 'what did you give to the winner?', suggesting that the post-verbal focal position is associated with informational focus. The fact that contrastive elements must surface in the C-domain in Sovramontino further suggests that different requirements are in place for the satisfaction of different

discourse-pragmatics functions in the two NEIDs, hence the proposed labelled bracketing analyses of (9) and (11), in (13) and (14) respectively:

(13) [FrameP Iar [FocP une medae [Foc′ [Foc o vin] [TP *pro* [T′ [T o vin] [VP dât une medae al vincitôr]]]]]]

(14) [FrameP Ier [ForceP na medaja [Force′ [Force ge on dat] [TP *pro* [T′ [T ge on dat] [VP dat na medaja al vincitor]]]]]]

The proposed labelled bracketing in (13) and (14) captures what seems a strong adjacency requirement across all NEIDs between the verb and the focal XP: it is in fact not only a characteristic of Lamonat and Sovramontino's pragmatically-motivated V2 system, but is also found across all NEIDs under investigation[5]. This is however not surprising, as focal elements often require adjacency to the verb cluster to ensure that focal prominence is associated with them (see Cruschina 2012, 2016 for further discussion). What makes Lamonat and Sovramontino remarkably different from the other NEIDs is the sharp distinction between contrastive and non-contrastive elements, as further shown in Lamonat vs. Fornese, in (15) and (16):

(15) CONTEXT: Did you dink *grappa*?   (Lamonat)

    a. #No.   É   beù   **VIN**, no   sgnapa!

       NEG   have.1SG drink.PTCP wine NEG grappa

       'No. I drank wine, not grappa!'

    b. No. **VIN**   è   beù,   no   sgnapa!

       NEG wine   have.1SG drink.PTCP NEG grappa

       'No. I drank wine, not grappa!'

(16) CONTEXT: Did you dink *grappa*?   (Fornese)

    a. No.   I   ai   bivût   **VIN**, no   sgnapa!

       NEG   1SG.SCL have.1SG drink.PTCP   wine, NEG grappa

       'No. I drank wine, not grappa!'

---

[5] Allegedly, as a reflex of their diachronic V2 nature. T-to-C movement associated with operator positions (root interrogatives and narrow focus adjacency) is fairly common across NIDs. The is general agreement in considering these phenomena residual V2 properties (see Rizzi 1996, Salvi 2016).

b. No. **VIN** i   ai   bivût,   no   sgnapa!

    NEG   wine 1SG.SCL   have.1SG   drink.PTCP, NEG grappa

    'No. I drank wine, not grappa!'

Fornese, the same as Friulian and Italian, allows C-foci to appear in the TP layer, if they are marked with a special prosodic pattern. In Lamonat and Sovramontino, this is not possible. The contrastive element cannot appear in the TP layer and must surface at the left-edge position of the clause. Note that frame-setters are hereby considered clause-external elements (see Haegeman 2006, 2007). As for contrastive topics, the same distinction is not found. In fact, their inability to occur in the TP layer is a characteristic of all NEIDs under investigation. This suggests that C-topics are intrinsically associated with the C-domain. By adopting Rizzi's (1997) split CP model, I argue that the position contrastive topics occupy in the C-domain is subject to variation across the NEIDs under investigation. In Lamonat and Sovramontino, this position is higher than in Friulian and Fornese, namely ForceP. In the next section, I will explain why ForceP is the projection targeted by contrastive elements in Lamonat and Sovramontino: the explanation is tightly linked to the pragmatically V2 nature of these two NEIDs.

In sum, the evidence from cross-dialectal comparison shows that Lamonat and Sovramontino syntactically encode contrastiveness in a stricter way than Friulian and Fornese. The latter group encodes contrastiveness in a similar fashion as Italian, the former, instead, exhibit the following characteristics: a contrastive element, be it a topical or focal constituent, (i) must surface at the left-edge of the clause, and (ii) can never be realised *in-situ* in the TP layer. Cross-dialectally, C-topics and C-foci retain the hallmarks of their respective informational status. For instance, C-foci must be adjacent to the verb and, if they are arguments of the verb, C-topics must be resumed by an agreeing pronominal clitic. Ultimately, Lamonat and Sovramontino differ from the other NEIDs with respect to how contrastive elements are realised syntactically.

3. The V2 Nature of Lamonat and Sovramontino

The two NEIDs under investigation, namely Lamonat and Sovramontino, are pragmatically motivated V2 systems: more specifically, conservative

continuations of V2 Medieval Romance (see Benincà 1983, 2006, Salvi 2016) in which the V2 constraint has been reinterpreted as a tool to encode specific discourse-pragmatic functions, namely contrastiveness and/or narrow informational focus. The V2 system in place therefore differs both from that of Medieval Romance and that of contemporary reasonably closely related NIDs (see Poletto 2002): the pre-finite position can only be occupied by an XP bearing discourse-pragmatic contrastiveness. This means that even if the verb undergoes V2-motivated T-to-C movement, an XP will not move in front of it, unless it bears a contrastive reading, hence, a matching [+CONTRASTIVE] feature. This is important as T-to-C movement also takes place to accommodate narrow focus in Lamonat and Sovramontino. T-to-C movement assures linear adjacency between the narrow focal element and the verb cluster as shown in (17):

(17) CONTEXT: What did Maria do to her husband?   (Sovramontino)

La	ge	a	dat	NA SCHAFA	Maria	al	so	om
3SG.F.SCL	DAT.CL	have.3SG	give.PTCP	a slap	the his wife	to-the	her	husband

'Maria gave a slap to her husband'

V2-motivated T-to-C movement only occurs to accommodate for these two discourse pragmatic configurations, hence the label 'pragmatically motivated V2 system'. The V2 constraint does not seem to be active in clauses featuring broad focus (Lambrecht 1994). Note that in this paper I will only discuss contrastive XP, narrow focal elements deserve a separate discussion.

In the next section, I want to address the following: (i) define the V2 typology of Lamonat and Sovramontino, more specifically, by identifying which left peripheral projection is targeted by the V2 constraint (see Wolfe 2016), and (ii) show that Lamonat and Sovramontino qualify as V2 languages in those occurrences when the V2 constraint is activated.

3.1. Lamonat and Sovramontino: A High-V2 System

Since Benincà (1983) diachronic linguistic research has shown that Medieval Romance languages were V2 systems (Salvi 2016, Benincà 2006 a.o). In particular, Old Venetian, allegedly the main contact language with Lamonat and Sovramontino diachronically, exhibited a full-fledged V2 system (see Wolfe 2016 and references within). Synchronically, several Rhaeto-Romance varieties,

more specifically some Romansh and Ladin dialects (Haiman & Benincà 1992, Poletto 2000, 2002 a. o.) still exhibit V2 constituent order. Benincà (1994) argues that the retention of the Medieval V2 constraint in the Rhaeto-Romance family is due to sustained language contact with German varieties. In the case of Lamonat and Sovramontino, however, I claim that this is not the case, as no German is spoken in the neighbouring areas. I believe, these two Romance varieties retained this trait due to their isolated mountainous geographic location. As Salvi (2016) points out, the V2 system in place in some Romansh and Ladin varieties is different from that of Medieval Romance. The same is true for Lamonat and Sovramontino's V2 system. The 'new' V2 system in place can be characterised as follows: (i) the V2 constraint has been reinterpreted as the lexicalisation of a functional head in the C-domain in a restricted set of discourse-pragmatic domains, and (ii) the traditional pre-finite position can only host an XP bearing a contrastive reading. Lamonat and Sovramontino's V2 system therefore differs from that of Medieval Romance as the latter could host any pragmatically salient constituent in pre-finite position (see Benincà 2006); furthermore, it also differs from that of Ladin Badiotto (see Poletto 2000, 2002) as (i) no subject clitic inversion takes place in Lamonat and Sovramontino, and (ii) Badiotto allows constituents other than pragmatically contrastive ones in pre-finite position. Following Wolfe's (2016) V2 typology, the synchronic data from Lamonat and Sovramontino would suggest that these two varieties were once full-fledged *High-V2* or *Force-V2* systems. Making reference to in Rizzi's (1997) split CP model, V2-motivated T-to-C movement targeted the highest left peripheral head, namely Force°, and it was accompanied by A'-movement of another constituent in its specifier position. In contemporary Lamonat and Sovramontino, verb movement to Force° is still in place in clauses that feature an XP bearing narrow focus and/or a contrastive XP, but the generalised A'-movement of a constituent preverbally has been lost. It nonetheless has been mandatorily retained for a reduced set of pragmatically salient elements: contrastive foci, contrastive topics and any other XP that bears a contrastive reading but does not neatly fall in either category. Note that this last point will become clearer in section 4 while discussing contrastiveness as a discourse-pragmatic notion.

In support of this claim, let us look at some data that suggest that T-to-C movement in Lamonat and Sovramontino targets a left-peripheral head much higher that FinP, which is traditionally considered the locus of V2. This head is indeed ForceP, making Lamonat and Sovramontino *High-V2* languages. Lamonat and Sovramontino exhibit apparent *wh-in-situ* (see Munaro 1998; Munaro, Poletto & Pollock 2001; Poletto & Pollock 2004, 2009, 2015; Manzini & Savoia 2005, 2011), in which the wh-element appears post-verbally in the order verb, wh-element and subject (if overt), as shown in (18b):

(18)   a. *AONDE se-tu   ndà   ti?   (Lamonat)
               where   be.2SG-2SG.SCL go.PTCP   you
               'Where have you been?'
          b. Se-tu   ndà   AONDE   ti?
               be.2SG-2SG.SCL go.PTCP   where   you
               'Where have you been?'

Wh-in-situ in Lamonat and Sovramontino can be resolved by postulating that the verb cluster crosses the fronted wh-element in FocusP/IntP by moving as high as Force° due to the V2 constraint, as shown in the proposed analysis in (19):

(19) [ForceP se-tu ndà [IntP/FocP aonde [TP ti [T' [T te se ndà] [VP ndà aonde]]]]]

Fronting the wh-element proves plain ungrammatical in the varieties under investigation (c.f. 18a). Rizzi (1996, 2001), in his discussion of the wh-criterion, argues that, in Romance, evidence of previous V2 systems is indeed often found in verb movement in questions. Along the same lines, Salvi (2016) points out that, in Romance, V2 residues are often found in the constituent order of interrogative sentences, especially among NIDs. In this respect, in Lamonat and Sovramontino, our analysis of *wh-in-situ* is in line with Poletto and Pollock (2004) with the crucial difference that there is no need for stipulating *remnant movement,* as discourse-pragmatic needs determine T-to-C movement. In fact, by assuming that wh-elements are constituents in narrow focus, carrying both a [FOC] and a [WH] feature (see Bianchi 1999), we find that apparent *wh-in-situ* mirrors the generalised behaviour of constituents in informational narrow focus as shown in (20a) and its corresponding labelled bracketing representation in (20b):

(20) CONTEXT: What did Mario give to Toni?   (Sovramontino)

a. L   ge   a   dat   DO   UVI   Mario a Toni
   3SG.M.SCL   DAT.CL   have.3SG   give.PTCP   two   eggs   Mario to Toni
   'Mario gave two eggs to Toni.'

b. [ForceP l ge a dat [FocP do uvi [TP Mario [T' [T l-ge a dat] [VP dat do uvi a Toni]]]]]

In case of informational focus, as in (20), the constituent in narrow focus must always be shielded by the verb. The same underlying mechanism as for wh-elements is in place: (i) the element in narrow informational focus moves to the C-domain, under FocusP and (ii) the verb cluster moves to Force° to satisfy the V2 constraint, giving rise to the marked constituent orders in (18b) and (20). Note that, in the data shown, the preverbal field is empty; if it were to be lexically filled, the lexicalised preverbal element would by default assume a contrastive reading.

3.2. V2 Diagnostics

In his seminal work for German and Dutch, den Besten (1983) identifies three syntactic aspects that characterise the V2 phenomenon: 1) subject inversion; 2) the linear restriction on preverbal constituents that determines the inflected verb V2 position and 3) a root vs. embedded asymmetry, whereby the V2 phenomenon is solely found in root clauses. In the next subsections, I will present further data in support of the claim that Lamonat and Sovramontino are, synchronically, V2 languages, whose V2 system is tightly linked to the realisation of pragmatically salient XPs, above all contrastive elements.

3.2.1. What Moves? The preverbal XP and the Clitic Status of Auxiliaries

The V2 constraint involves the movement of the inflected verb to the C-domain accompanied by the movement of a pragmatically salient XP in preverbal position. Let us now see what happens in Lamonat and Sovramontino. Their V2 system is sensitive to discourse-pragmatics: it is a means to assure the right syntactic-pragmatic configuration to convey contrastiveness and assure discourse prominence. The verb moves to the C-domain, but an XP is only licensed in preverbal position, if and only if it bears a contrastive interpretation, as shown in (21) and (22) below:

(21) CONTEXT: When do you go picking up mushrooms?   (Lamonat)

a. Vag   DE SABO   mi a   fong
    go.1SG   of Saturday   I   to mushrooms
    'On Saturdays I go picking up mushrooms.'

b. **#DE SABO**   vag   mi a   fong
    of Saturday go.1SG   I   to mushrooms
    'On Saturdays I go picking up mushrooms.'

(22) CONTEXT: Do you go picking up mushrooms on Fridays?

a. **DE SABO**   vag   mi a fong,   no   de viendre
    of Saturday   go.1SG I to mushrooms NEG of Friday
    'On Saturdays I go picking up mushrooms, not on Fridays.'

b. #Vag   DE SABO mi a fong,   no   de viendre
    go.1SG   of   Saturday I   to mushrooms NEG of Friday
    'On Saturdays I go picking up mushrooms, not on Fridays.'

In (22), the preverbal position is filled because the preverbal XP, *de sabo*, is in a contrastive relationship with *de viendre*. If a contrastive XP is not available, the specifier position of the C° targeted by the verb remains empty. This a clear difference between Germanic V2 and Medieval Romance V2. In fact, in Medieval Romance V2 varieties, the preverbal XP position could be left empty (see Beninicà 2006, Ledgeway 2008) in line with Lamonat and Sovramontino V2. This is due to the pragmatic specialisation of the [+EGDE] feature that, in V2 languages, is responsible for the presence of an overt XP in the specifier position of the C° targeted by the moved verb: In Lamonat and Sovramontino, the preverbal constituent has been reinterpreted as bearing contrastiveness and the [+EDGE] feature has consequently become [+CONTRASTIVE], being only active in case a contrastive element bearing a matching [+CONTRASTIVE] feature enters the derivation.

The preverbal XP position in Lamonat and Sovramontino can thus only be filled by an element bearing a contrastive reading. V2-motivated verb movement, on the other hand, takes place every time a pragmatically salient constituent (narrow focal or a contrastive XP) enters the derivation, assuring its correct syntactic-pragmatic configuration. In V2 languages, T-to-C movement concerns the inflected verb that lexicalises T°. In Lamonat and Sovramontino, this is also true, as shown in (21) and (22) above, where the inflected verb *vag* is

moved to the C-domain. However, this is not always the case: a key difference between canonical V2 languages and Lamonat and Sovramontino is that what undergoes movement is not only the inflected verb, but the whole *verb cluster*, as shown in (23) below:

(23) CONTEXT: When did Mario kill the dog?   (Lamonat)

L	a	copà	SABO	PASAA	Mario	el	can
3SG.M.SCL	have.3SG	kill.PTCP	Saturday	past	Mario	the	dog

'Mario killed the dog last Saturday.'

For *verb cluster*, I mean: i) the inflected verb (lexical or auxiliary), ii) the past participle, if present and iii) any satellite clitics that may prosodically rely on the inflected verb for their PF realisation[6] (see Pescarini 2016). This is clear in (23), in which *l a copà* is moved to the C-domain to satisfy the V2 constraint, as shown in the simplified labelled bracketing representation of (23), in (24):

(24) [$_{ForceP}$ l a copà [$_{FocP}$ DE SABO [$_{TP}$ Mario [$_{T'}$ [$_{T}$ ~~l a copà~~] [$_{VP}$ ~~copà~~ [$_{DP}$ el can [$_{PP}$ ~~de sabo~~]]]]]]]]

All the elements belonging to the *verb cluster* are structurally realised under a complex T°, forming a single phonological unit (in the sense of Frascarelli 2000). By virtue of creating a single phonological unit, the whole verb cluster undergoes T-to-C movement. The reason for such heavy T° lies in the status of auxiliary verbs in Lamonat and Sovramontino: they have clitic status and must rely on the adjacency with the past participle (the lexical verb) for their PF realisation. In Lamonat and Sovramontino, hence, V-to-T movement of the lexical verb, be it inflected or in the past participle form, always takes place. In the case of analytic tenses, the past participle must in fact

---

[6] Satellite clitics crucially include subject clitics (henceforth SCLs) as they are agreement markers that belong to T° (Poletto 1993, 2000, Goria 2004). They crucially do not share the same properties as French weak pronouns (see Brandi and Cordin 1989). In synchrony, subject clitic inversion (cf. 18b) cannot be simply attributable to the sole movement of the inflected verb to C°. Poletto and Pollock (2004) solve this problem by positing two separate sets of SCLs, a declarative and an interrogative one, and merging the interrogative SCLs directly into the C-domain. In synchrony, subject clitic inversion must hence be considered as a configuration that surfaces in a restricted set of syntactic contexts that not only involve verb movement, but also the conveyal of an extra piece of morpho-syntactic information (*i.e.* interrogative force).

be raised to T° to support the tensed clitic auxiliary which is base-generated in T°. Let us consider the examples in (25) and (26). Note that *Mario* does not bear a contrastive reading here. It belongs to a thetic sencence, encoding broad focus, whereby I assume a default *in-situ* SVO constituent order.

(25) a. Mario l   magna   despes   polenta e   conicio   (Sovramontino)
        Mario 3SG.M.SCL   eat.3SG   often   polenta and rabbit
        'Mario often eats polenta and rabbit meat.'

   b. *Mario despes l   magna polenta e   conicio
      Mario often   3SG.M.SCL eat.3SG polenta and rabbit
      'Mario often eats polenta and rabbit meat.'

(26) a. Mario l   a   magnà   despes polenta e   conicio
        Mario 3SG.M.SCL have.3SG eat.PTCP often   polenta and rabbit
        'Mario has often eaten polenta and rabbit meat.'

   b. *Mario l   a   despes magnà   polenta e   conicio
      Mario 3SG.M.SCL have.3SG often   eat.PTCP polenta and rabbit
      'Mario has often eaten polenta and rabbit meat.'

In the two NEIDs under investigation, low adverbs (see Cinque 1999) appear post-verbally after the main lexical verb. (25) shows that the inflected verb *magna* has moved passed the frequency adverb *despes* which is base-generated in the specifier position of VP, yielding V-to-T movement. Similarly, in (26) the frequency adverb *despes* appears after the past participle, signalling that the latter must have vacated its base-generated position. Nevertheless, a restricted class of low adverbs can appear between the clitic auxiliary and the past participle as shown in (27) and (28):

(27) a. Mario no   l   a   mai   magnà   polenta e   osei   (Sovram.)
      Mario NEG 3SG.M.SCL have.3SG never eat.PTCP polenta and birds
      'Mario has never eaten polenta and bird meat.'

   b. Mario no   l   a   magnà   mai polenta e   osei
      Mario NEG 3SG.M.SCL have.3SG eat.PTCP never polenta and birds
      'Mario has never eaten polenta and bird meat.'

(28) a. Mario l   a   gia   magnà   tut   (Lamonat)
      Mario 3SG.M.SCL have.3SG already eat.PTCP everything
      'Mario has already eaten everything.'

b. Mario l   a   magnà   gia   tut

   Mario 3SG.M.SCL   have.3SG eat.PTCP already everything

   'Mario has already eaten everything.'

Only this class of low adverbs can appear between the clitic auxiliary and the past participle. They are phonologically reduced and, generally, unstressed. For instance, an adverb like *despes* (often) cannot occur between the clitic auxiliary and the past participle (cf. 26b) due to its phonological weight, whereas its phonologically reduced counterpart *spes* (often) is generally found in that position. The difference in distribution suggests that those low adverbs that can be placed between the clitic auxiliary and the past participle also have clitic status. They can be stacked under the complex T° with the clitic auxiliary, the subject clitic and any other satellite clitics. Clitic adverbs cannot be focalised, behaving like weak elements in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999). Clitic auxiliaries are cross-linguistically attested and, the same as Lamonat and Sovramontino, phonologically rely on the past participle for their realisation[7].

Since the whole verb cluster contained under T° undergoes V2-motivated T-to-C movement, it impedes the availability of a fairly common structure across V2 languages: stylistic inversion of the past participle with the inflected auxiliary verb (Mailing 1980; Holmberg 1997, 2000). Hence the ungrammaticality of (29):

(29)   *Thercà   l   a   Mario la polenta, no   magnà   (Sovramontino)

       taste.PTCP 3SG.M.SCL have.3SG   Mario the polenta   NEG eat.PTCP

       'Mario has tasted, not eaten the polenta.'

(29) is ungrammatical because the auxiliary and the past participle cannot be separated: the former relies on the latter for its realisation and they

---

[7] See Bošković (2001) for a detailed account of the behavior of clitic auxiliaries in some Slavic languages (*i.e.* Macedonian and Bulgarian). A key difference with Lamonat and Sovramontino is that, in Macedonian and Bulgarian, past participle and clitic auxiliary give rise to enclisis. This is not the case in the NEIDs under investigation, as the two elements are always in a proclitic relation: it may be due to a parametric difference with respect to head directionality.

must be in a proclitic relation. (29) is ungrammatical even if the fronted constituent conveys a contrastive reading and is therefore eligible to occur in preverbal position: the PF adjacency requirement between clitic auxiliary and past participle rules out this type of construction, lending further support to the claim that the whole *verb cluster* undergoes T-to-C movement and the auxiliary cannot be excorporated from the past participle.

3.2.2. Subject Inversion

Another characterising feature of V2 languages is subject inversion with the inflected verb: the inflected verb moves to the C-domain, leaving the subject in its canonical position, namely SpecTP. In Lamonat and Sovramontino, if a constituent other than the subject bears narrow focus or is assigned a contrastive reading, the subject (when overt) appears post-verbally. As explained in the previous subsection, inversion takes place between the subject and the whole verb cluster, not just between the subject and the inflected verb. Superficially, this type of inversion distinguishes Lamonat and Sovramontino from other full-fledged V2 languages, albeit the same underlying phenomenon is in place. The non-focal non-contrastive subject (if overt) appears postverbally: (i) in the presence of informational narrow focus; and (ii) in case an element of the clause bears a contrastive reading, as shown respectively in (30) and (31):

> (30) CONTEXT: Where did Mario go?   (Lamonat)
>
> | L | è | ndà | AL | OSTARIA | Mario |
> |---|---|---|---|---|---|
> | 3SG.M.SCL | be.3SG | go.PTCP | to-the | bar | Mario |
>
> 'Mario went to the pub.'

> (31) CONTEXT: Did Mario go to church?
>
> | **AL** | **OSTARIA** | l | è | ndà | Mario, | no | in cesa |
> |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
> | to-the | bar | 3SG.M.SCL | be.3SG | go.PTCP | Mario | NEG | in church |
>
> 'Mario went to the pub, not to church.'

The high position of the verb with respect to the subject is compatible with a V2 system that is sensitive to discourse-pragmatics: in the case of informational narrow focus in (30), the verb moves higher than the focus position, leaving the subject in its clause-internal position; in (31), the verb moves to the same position, but the contrastive focal element must be realised in the specifier position of the C° hosting the moved verb, namely Force°.

It is important to note that subject inversion is not always detectable, as the subject is not always overt. In fact, in the aforementioned syntactic-pragmatic contexts, inversion of the subject and the verb cluster takes place if the subject is uttered as given background information (G-topic in the sense of Bianchi & Frascarelli 2010). Although Lamonat and Sovramontino can be considered *non-consistent null-subject languages* (see Cardinaletti & Repetti 2010) whereby they exhibit phenomena that are not entirely typical of null-subject languages[8], they are still null-subject languages and the subject can therefore be omitted. Nevertheless, the de-accented subject is often found in subject canonical position (when not pragmatically salient).

3.2.3. Linear restrictions: V1 and V3

In root clauses, Lamonat and Sovramontino exhibit V1, V2 and V3 word orders. The occurrence of the three different word orders is mainly constrained by discourse-pragmatics. More specifically, on the type of elements that can appear preverbally and the pragmatic reading that they encode. In Lamonat and Sovramontino, genuine V4 word order is not attested, suggesting that only up to two constituents can appear in preverbal position, as shown by the ungrammaticality the data in (32):

(32) CONTEXT: What did Mario give to Gianni at school?   (Lamonat and Sovramontino)

    a. *Mario a scola a Nane l   ghe   a   dat   AN LIBRO
      Mario at school to Nane 3SG.M.SCL DAT.CL have.3SG give.PTCP a   book
      'Mario gave a book to Nane at school.'

    b. *A scola a Nane Mario l   ghe   a   dat   AN LIBRO
      at school to Nane Mario 3SG.M.SCL DAT.CL have.3SG give.PTCP a   book
      'Mario gave a book to Nane at school.'

    c. *A Nane Mario a scola   l   ghe   a   dat   AN LIBRO
      to Nane Mario at school 3SG.M.SCL DAT.CL   have.3SG give.PTCP a   book
      'Mario gave a book to Nane at school.'

---

[8] This includes subject clitics, emerging expletive elements and restricted subject extraction.

As shown in (32), in Lamonat and Sovramontino, the co-occurrence of three preverbal constituents is always banned regardless of their relative orders. In the two NEIDs under investigation, constituents in preverbal position trigger specific discourse-pragmatic readings, which differ according to the syntactic-pragmatic status of the constituents that make up the clause.

By not considering V2 a superficial descriptive label (see Benincà 2006, Ledgeway 2008), we can account for V1 and V3 orders without affecting the V2 constraint. In Lamonat and Sovramontino, V2 can be understood as a requirement of the verb to rise to a C-position in the left periphery to support a pragmatically salient constituent that is also moved to the C-domain[9]. V2-motivated T-to-C movement hence determines: (i) which type of preverbal elements, in discourse-pragmatic terms, can give rise to V3 constituent order, and (ii) justifies the occurrence of V1. I will limit myself to the description of the type of elements (in discourse-pragmatic terms) that can appear in preverbal position. The crucial point that I want to highlight is that preverbal elements cannot (co-)occur randomly, but must be in a specific hierarchical order accordingly to the pragmatic reading that they bear.

In a sentence featuring a contrastive XP and exhibiting V3 constituent order, the left-most constituent can only be a frame-setting element, as shown in example (33) below:

(33) CONTEXT: Did you see my father and my mother? Where?   (Sovramontino)

Ier	**to**	**pare**	l	o	vist	AL	MARCÁ	mi,	**to**	**mare**
yesterday	your	father	3SG.M.OCL	have.1SG	see.PTCP	at-the market		I	your	mother

no	so	onde	che	la	era
NEG	know.1SG	where	that	3SG.F.SCL	be.PST.3SG

'Yesterday, I saw your father at the market. As for your mother, I did not know where she was.'

Frame-setters are circumstantial in nature and modify the propositional content of the main clause (see Greco & Haegeman 2016). In her research on V2-

---

[9] I mean assign sentence stress to the pragmatically salient constituent. In this light, in Lamonat and Sovramontino, V2 can be considered a PF phenomenon along the lines of Bošković (2001) and Richards (2016).

Rhaeto-Romance dialects, Poletto (2000, 2001) shows that frame-setters anchor the speech act in terms of locative and temporal deixis, and speech participants (see also Benincà & Poletto 2004; Poletto 2002). In this regard, A-topics (see Bianchi and Frascarelli 2010) are also good candidates for the same syntactic position. In Lamonat and Sovramontino, A-topics in fact compete with frame-setters for the same syntactic position. In section 4, I will further discuss this point. In (33), *ier* functions as a frame-setter. Frame-setting elements (Frame-setters and A-topics) are clause external and responsible for V3 constituent orders (see Haegeman 2000, Holmberg 2012).

As far as the V2 constituent order itself is concerned, it occurs when a pragmatically salient constituent is fronted in the absence of a frame-setter. As previously mentioned, the preverbal constituent must carry a matching [+CONTRASTIVE] feature: it generally can be a contrastive topical element like *to pare* in (33) or a contrastive focal element like *to pare* in (34) below:

(34) CONTEXT: Did you see my mother at the market?   (Lamonat)
    No. **TO PARE** è   vedù   al   marcà,   no   to   mare
    NEG your father   have.1SG   see.PTCP at-the market   NEG   your   mother
    'I saw your father, not your mother at the market.'

Note that even though informational narrow focus and contrastive narrow focus occupy two distinct positions in the left periphery, they cannot co-occur in the same clause: only one element per clause can receive narrow focus[10] (Rizzi 2018). V3 and V2 constituent orders are sensitive to the type of element placed at the left of the moved verb. For the sake of completeness, another frequent V2 constituent order is determined by V1 preceded by a frame-setter, in this case no contrastive element appears in preverbal position.

In Lamonat and Sovramontino, V1 word order is generally found when a constituent of the clause is in informational narrow focus and a frame-setter and/or a contrastive topic is absent. A constituent in contrastive narrow informational focus, on the other hand, always generates a V2 constituent order

---

[10] See Poletto (2002), Poletto & Benincà (2004) for an account in which left peripheral focus can consist of more than one constituent; nevertheless, these constituents must be adjacent to one another (see also Bentley 2008) and form a *focus field.*

(in the absence of a frame-setter) and is therefore incompatible with V1 (cf. 33). In the presence of a constituent in informational narrow focus, V1 clearly shows that the verb cluster moves to a left peripheral position that is higher than the one occupied by the focalised element. V1 is in fact particularly frequent in the two NEIDs under investigation. The sentence in (35) exemplifies V1 in Lamonat and Sovramontino:

(35) CONTEXT: To whom did Mario give the book?   (Sovramontino)

L	ghe	l-a	dat	A GIANNI	Mario	l	libro
3SG.M.SCL	DAT.CL	3SG.M.OCL-have.3SG	give.PTCP	to Gianni	Mario	the	book

‘Mario gave Gianni the book.’

3.2.4. The Root vs. Embedded Asymmetry

Before delving into the discussion of root vs. embedded V2 in Lamonat and Sovramontino, it is important to note that not all V2 Germanic languages display a root vs. embedded asymmetry: Yiddish and Islandic, for instance, are considered generalised V2 languages in which the V2 constituent order is possible in all embedded contexts. Also, diachronically speaking, the root vs. embedded asymmetry is not found in Old Spanish (Fontana 1993), but it was in place in Old French and Medieval NIDs (Benincà 1983). In the two NEIDs under investigation, on the other hand, there is a clear root vs. embedded asymmetry, whereby pragmatically motivated V2 is only found in root clauses.

In embedded clauses, Lamonat and Sovramontino exhibit a dominant SVO constituent order as shown by (36). The VOS word order which is commonly found in root clauses when O is in informational narrow focus is ungrammatical in embedded contexts, as shown in (36b):

(36) CONTEXT: What did Maria tell you that Nani killed?   (Sovramontino)

a.
La	me	a	dit	che	Nani
3SG.F.SCL	1SG.DAT.CL	have.3SG	say.PTCP	that	Nani

l	a	copà	L	SO	GAT
3SG.M.SCL	have.3SG	kill.PTCP	the	her	cat

‘She told me that Nani killed her cat.’

b.*
La	me	a	dit	che
3SG.F.SCL	1SG.DAT.CL	have.3SG	say.PTCP	that

l	a	copà	L	SO	GAT	Nani

3SG.M.SCL   have.3SG   kill.PTCP   the   her   cat   Nani
'She told me that Nani killed her cat.'

The ungrammaticality of (36b) becomes clear, if we consider V2 as requirement on a left peripheral functional head that contains a strong feature and for that reason must be lexicalised (see Poletto 2002; Ledgeway 2008). This is done through T-to-C movement in root clauses. However, in embedded clauses T-to-C movement cannot take place as the complementiser already fills the landing position of the verb cluster. It is sensible to argue that the V2 requirement is nonetheless present in both root and embedded clauses, but in the latter case it is immediately satisfied by the presence of the complementiser itself. Interestingly, if the embedded clause is selected by *bridge verbs*, including *verba dicendi*, it is possible to find a V2 structure with an element in narrow focus as shown by (37):

(37) CONTEXT: about people who have lost weight recently   (Sovramontino)

%La   me   a   dit   che l   ghe   a
 3SG.F.SCL 1SG.DAT.CL have.3SG say.PTCP that 3SG.M.SCL DAT.CL have.3SG
dit   MASSIMO   che l   è   dimagrì   sie chili
say.PTCP Massimo   that 3SG.M.SCL be.3SG lose-weight.PTCP six kilos
'She told me that Massimo has lost six kilos.'

Embedded clauses like that in (37) are at times found in the NEIDs under investigation, suggesting that, in the clause selected by the bridge verb *dir*, 'say', the verb cluster manages to rise to the C-domain and co-occur with the embedding complementiser. In these embedded contexts, in the presence of a selecting *bridge verb*, the SVO constituent order is generally dominant, but the V2 order is still accepted by most speakers. This is not unheard of across V2 languages: in fact, *bridge verbs* may allow embedded V2 in German, mainland Scandinavian (Vikner 1995) and in the Rhaeto-Romance variety of Val Badia (Poletto 2000). Old Neapolitan also could allow V2 in those embedded clauses selected by a bridge verb (Ledgeway 2008).

A fine-grained investigation of the CP layer selected by *bridge verbs* is beyond the purpose of the present research. Nevertheless, it seems that *bridge verbs* are able to select a more articulated CP layer, which resembles that of root clauses. For instance, Poletto (2000) shows that, in Badiotto, the embedded periphery selected by *bridge verbs* tolerates scene-settings adverbs and hanging

topics[11]. These elements are generally banned in embedded contexts (unless they are contrastively focalised), being mainly a feature of root clauses (see Bianchi & Frascarelli 2010).

For our purpose, it is important to note that: (i) in Lamonat and Sovramontino, there is a clear root vs. embedded asymmetry when it comes to the realisation of V2 in relation to information structure, and (ii) this asymmetry is commonly found across V2 languages.

4. The Preverbal XP: The Contrastive Field

Besides proposing a unitary syntactic analysis of contrastive foci and contrastive topics that can account for the behaviour of contrastive elements in Lamonat and Sovramontino, I also want to shed light on the discourse-pragmatic characteristics of the XPs that are licensed in preverbal position. I will call the higher portion of the left periphery that hosts contrastive elements *the contrastive field*. Before delving into the discussion of this portion of the left periphery and the XPs that can host, let us first provide a more fine-grained definition of the notion of contrastiveness.

4.1. The Hierarchy of Contrast

I firstly defined contrastiveness by adopting Kiss's (1998) definition, which can be roughly paraphrased as follows: an element is contrastive when it specifically refers to an informational unit that is contrary to the corresponding interlocutor's presuppositions. This definition captures the immediate discourse-pragmatic context in which we would find a constituent bearing contrastiveness, but it is not adequate for a thorough description of all the instances in which we find a constituent marked as contrastive in Lamonat and Sovramontino. Referring to contrastive focal elements, Molnár (2002, 2006) argues that contrast is best described as a gradual notion. She proposes a hierarchy of contrast made of a set of salient criteria that define contrastiveness

---

[11] Spanish embedded clauses allow for recomplementation only if introduced by a *bridge verb*, more specifically a *verbum dicendi* (see Villa-García 2015). This is further cross-linguistic evidence that *bridge verbs* are able to select a more articulated CP-layer.

as a continuum, capturing the different discourse-pragmatic shades that characterise a contrastive relationship and, hence, contrastiveness:

<u>Hierarchy of Contrast</u> (Molnár 2006: 211)

Highlighting > Dominant contrast > Membership in a set > Limited

set of candidates > Explicit mentioning of alternatives

This hierarchy seems to well-capture all the cases in which a constituent would be assigned a contrastive reading in Sovramontino and Lamonat.

4.1.1. Dominant Contrast

Let us now discuss the actual discourse-functional criteria put forward by Molnár (2006). *Dominant contrast* is the most straightforward pragmatic context in which a contrastive element can appear. Consider the examples in (38) and (39):

(38) CONTEXT: Has Mario eaten?   (Lamonat & Sovramontino)

   No.   **MARIA** l   a   magnà

   NEG   Maria   3SG.F.SCL   have.3SG   eat.PTCP

   'No, MARIA has'

Contrastiveness in (38) is an example of *dominant contrast*: *Maria* is in a contrastive relation with *Mario* that has been previously mentioned in discourse. In other words, *dominant contrast* occurs if the contrasting piece of information is overt in discourse. (38) is an example of *dominant contrast* within the domain of focus: a C-focal element. Nevertheless, *dominant contrast* is also possible in relation to C-topics, as shown in (39) below:

(39) Tasi!   **Mi** son   to   mare   e   **ti**   te   se   me fiol   (Sovramontino)

   Shut-up.IMP I   be.1SG your mother and you 2SG.SCL be.2SG my son

   'Shut up! I am your mother and you are my son.'

In (39), the two stressed subject pronouns are in a dominant contrastive relationship as *mi* has an overt contrasting element in the same clause, namely *ti*. The two subject pronouns are no regular subjects, but two instances of contrastive topics. Differently to *bona fide* topical subjects, they are stressed and cannot be omitted (see Ziv 1994 for a detailed discussion of the relationship between stressed pronominal elements and contrastiveness). C-topic and C-focus occupy the same syntactic position at the leftmost clause-internal position

of the left periphery, namely the contrastive field in SpecForceP.

4.1.2. Membership in a finite set of entities

The last three discourse functions in Molnár's (2006) hierarchy of contrast, namely *Membership in a set > Limited set of candidates > Explicit mentioning of alternatives*, can be collapsed in a single salient discourse-pragmatic function: *Membership in a finite set of entities.* The pragmatic context of this revised discourse-function is one for which a contrastive element emerges from an explicit choice among a finite set of alternatives where the presupposed contrasting informational unit has not been previously mentioned in discourse (see also Kiss 1998). Let us consider the example in (40):

(40) No   sta   preocupar-te!   **MARIO** l   va   in botega   (Lamonat)
      NEG stay.INF worry.INF-2SG.OCL Mario   3SG.M.SCL go.3SG in shop
      'Don't worry! Mario will go shopping.'

In (40), *Mario* is marked as a contrastive focal element. It is an instance of C-focus as the adjacency requirement with the verb prevents any constituent from intervening between the focal element and the verb. Note that in Lamonat and Sovramontino, subjects in informational narrow focus are generally banned from preverbal position and, in this context, a cleft would arise. On the other hand, subjects encoding contrastive focus are fully grammatical and pragmatically felicitous in preverbal position, as they satisfy the [+CONTRASTIVE] feature linked to the V2 constraint. In (40), the contrastive element *Mario* belongs to the finite set of alternatives of people that can potentially go shopping that, at least, consists of the speaker, the hearer and an absent third party *Mario*. *Mario* does not have an explicitly contrastive antecedent that has been previously mentioned in discourse, but is in a contrastive relation with the other members of the set. The same is possible with C-topics as shown by the (41) below:

(41) No   sta   preocupar-te!   **El to camp** (*da la tempesta)   (Sovramontino)
      NEG stay.INF worry.INF-2SG.OCL the your field   (by the hail)
      no   l   è   sta   ruinà   da la   tempesta
      NEG 3SG.M.SCL be.3SG be.PTCP damage.PTCP by the hail
      'Don't worry! Your field was not devastated by the hail.'

In (41), the element *el to camp* is in a contrastive relationship with the

other members of the set in which it belongs: the fields of the village. The context of (41) must be thought as if, after hailing, speaker A, who had just come back from a walk across the fields of the village, reassures speakers B, who enquires about the condition of the fields due to the hail. *El to camp* is an instance of C-topic and by virtue of occupying the contrastive field (SpecForceP): it cannot be separated from the verb cluster, as shown by the ungrammaticality generated by the intervening constituent *da la tempesta*.

Nevertheless, the discourse function *membership in a finite set of entities* easily blends in with another discourse function marking contrastiveness put forward by Molnár (2006): *highlighting*. In (41), for instance, the speaker highlights a specific field out of all the fields of the village. The crucial difference between *membership in a finite set of entities* and *highlighting* is the characterisation of the set of entities from which the contrastive element is drawn. In *membership in a finite set of entities* the set is finite and all members of the set are known to the speakers, whereas, in *highlighting*, the set of entities does not have to be finite and one of the speakers may not have immediate access to the alternatives of that set. The divide between these two functions can be indeed blurry, with *membership in a finite set of entities* which, to some extent, can be thought as a sub-function of *highlighting*.

4.1.3. Highlighting

The function of *highlighting* gives pragmatic saliency to an informational unit by picking a specific entity out of an indefinite set of alternatives that is not immediately accessible to the interlocutor. The chosen informational unit ends up being in a contrastive relationship with the other potential entities of the set, which could have been indeed highlighted. Lambrecht (1994) argues that highlighting is a sufficient condition for contrast. Nevertheless, there is general agreement that the expression of contrastiveness through highlighting generates a weak contrast (see Cruschina 2012 for a detailed discussion). This is true in Lamonat and Sovramontino, as *highlighting*, to some extent, can also be performed by informational focus, frame-setters and A-topics. Not surprisingly, the function of *highlighting* is very rarely found in association with contrastive focus. Nevertheless, it is more common with C-topics in left-edge clause position. The semantic-pragmatics of such topical elements anchors the

interpretation of following clause, which must be interpreted in light of the left-edge topical element.

A type of C-topics that seems to heavily draw from the *highlighting* discourse-function is *stage topics* (in the sense of Erteschirk-Shir 2007). Stage topics do not belong to a presupposed set of entities or have an explicit contrastive counterpart in discourse, but they are anchored to the spatio-temporal dimension of the communicative act. Gundel (1974) and Erteschirk-Shir (1997) argue that this type of informational unit refers to the particular spatio-temporal situation or setting in which it is asserted. In other words, every act of communication has a stage, in which information can be accessed, as it belongs to the here and now. Let us consider example (42):

(42) CONTEXT: The speaker is touching a rotten mushroom, which is sitting on a table

Sta brisa   l   è   mejo che no te   la   magne   (Lamonat)
this mushroom 3SG.SCL$_{expl}$ be.3SG better that NEG 2SG.SCL OCL eat.2SG
'This mushroom, it's better if you don't eat it.'

In example (42) *sta brisa* is a stage topic. It is contrastive in the sense that serves the function of *highlighting*. It does not contrast with an explicitly uttered piece of information, nor belongs to a finite set of entities that is immediately accessible to the interlocutor. Its contrastive nature can be interpreted as follows: out of all the entities present in the setting of the communicative act, the speaker highlights a specific one, *the mushroom*; therefore, the contrastive relationship in place is between that particular informational unit and all the other potential stage topics.

The contrastive element in (42) exhibits topic-like features as it is resumed by an agreeing object clitic; nevertheless, it does not identify old or given information and is prosodically marked. In Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) and Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) this type of topic closely resembles a switch or A(boutness)-topic. A-Topics newly propose or reintroduce a topic in discourse; they are generally clause-external and anchor the interpretation of the following clause, which must be interpreted in light of the left-edge A-topic. This suggests that A-topics may also be eligible candidates for the preverbal contrastive field (SpecForceP) in Lamonat and Sovramontino, since their *highlighting* function makes them *de facto* a type of contrastive element.

Nonetheless, similarly to Italian, A-topics can co-occur with *bona fide* C-topics with the A-topic preceding the C-topic (Bianchi & Frascarelli 2010) as in (43):

(43) (Sovramontino)

Le	nosele	**Titin**	l		le	ciapea	e	**Titele**	l		le	magnea

the hazelnuts Titin 3SG.M.SCL OCL pick.3SG.IMP and Titele 3SG.M.SCL OCL eat.3SG.IMP

'The hazelnuts, Titin used to pick them up and Titele used to eat them'

In (43), the A-topic *le nosele* is (re)introduced. It is resumed by an agreeing object clitic and is compatible with a reading that puts *Titin* and *Titele* in a contrastive relationship.

Similarly to A-topics, frame-setters are a particular type of topical elements that are clause external, and encode the spatio-temporal dimension of the speech act. They modify the propositional content of the main clause by providing temporal and/or modal restrictions to the circumstances of evaluation of the proposition expressed by the main clause (Greco & Haegeman 2016). In this respect, frame-setters are also good candidates for the fulfilment of the discourse-function of *highlighting*. The speaker highlights one aspect of the spatio-temporal or modal dimension of the speech act, which ends up being in a contrastive relationship with all the other potential aspects that the speaker could have highlighted of such dimension. Frame-setters, similarly to stage topics, have a scene-setting function, which anchors the speech act in terms of locative, temporal deixis and speech participants (Haegeman 2000, 2006, 2007, Benincà & Poletto 2004, Poletto 2002). Given their *highlighting* function they can be regarded contrastive in nature and, potentially, suitable candidates for the contrastive field in Lamonat and Sovramontino. Krifka and Musan (2012) also point out the pragmatically-syntactic common characteristics of contrastive topics and frame-setters, putting them in the same category as *delineators*: they express that, in the communicative act at a specific point of the discourse, the given element is only applicable to a limited portion of discourse that is anchored to the delineator.

4.2. Topical and Focal Contrastiveness: The Revised Hierarchy of Contrast

Given their distribution with respect to the discourse function they serve, we can divide contrastive elements into two general categories: *focal contrastive elements* and *topical contrastive elements*. As for focal contrastiveness, it is

encoded through contrastive focus. In Lamonat and Sovramontino, virtually all Molnár's (2002, 2006) discourse-functions can be fulfilled by a C-focal element, with the exception of *highlighting*. On the other hand, topical contrastive elements can be split into frame-setters, A-topics and C-topics. They tend to fulfil different discourse-functions within contrastiveness. Nevertheless, A-topics and frame-setters can coexist with C-topics. In those cases, they genuinely behave like clause external anchoring elements and do not occupy the contrastive field, but a higher projection, namely FrameP. Note that C-topics appear considerably more frequently than A-topics and Frame-setters in the *contrastive field*: in my data only a handful of examples contains a frame-setting element in such position. The data nonetheless seem genuine and must be accounted for. Table 1 below summarises the typology of contrastive elements that I have just illustrated:

	Highlighting	*Membership in finite set of entities*	*Dominant Contrast*
Focal Contrastiveness	N/A	C-Foci	C-Foci
Topic Contrastiveness	A-Topics Frame-setters	A-Topics C-Topics	C-Topics

Table 1. The typology of contrastive elements in Lamonat and Sovramontino with respect to Molnár's (2002, 2006) revised discourse-functions of contrastiveness.

I have previously mentioned that *highlighting* generates a weak contrast. It is not case that this function is not performed by a contrastive focal element, as C-foci are generally associated with an overt contrast in discourse that is corrective or exhaustive in nature (see Szabolcsi 1981, Cruschina 2012). This is more in line with the discourse-functions of *membership in a finite set of entities* and *dominant contrast. Dominant contrast*, especially, generates a strong contrast, in which two explicit elements are contrasted. Following Molnár's (2002, 2006)

claim that contrastiveness should be interpreted as a continuous notion, I can now place *highlighting* and *dominat contrast* at either side of the continuum, with *membership in a finite set of entities* lying in the middle. *Membership in a finite set of entities* is more similar to either *highlighting* or *dominant contrast* depending on the set of alternatives from which the contrastive element is drawn. If the set were small with explicit alternatives, the discourse function *membership in a finite set of entities* would partially overlap with that of *dominant contrast.* On the other hand, if the set were finite, but its members were not immediately accessible by the interlocutor, the function of *membership in a finite set of entities* would tend to overlap with that of *highlighting.* Table 1 suggests that focal contrastiveness serves strong contrastive discourse-functions, whereas topical contrastiveness better serves weak contrastive discourse-functions. In pragmatic terms, in Lamonat and Sovramontino, it is more common to find *dominant contrast* fulfilled by a contrastive focal element and *highlighting* fulfilled by a frame-setter or an A-topic. In this regard, *highlighting* is rarely expressed in the *contrastive field*, but more often in FrameP. Table 2 below summarises what I have just claimed as a revised version of Molnár's (2002, 2006) hierarchy of contrast:

Table 2. Revised Hierarchy of Contrast for Lamonat and Sovramontino

WEAK	*Highlighting >*	**STRONG**
CONTRAST	*Membership in finite set of entities >*	**CONTRAST**
	Dominant Contrast	

	Set of alternatives >	
TOPICAL		FOCAL
	Finite set of alternatives >	
CONTRAST		CONTRAST
	Finite set of explicit alternatives >	
	Two-way contrast	

The common denominator of focal and topical contrastive elements is indeed contrast: more specifically, different degrees of contrastiveness that are fulfilled by different discourse-functions. Lamonat and Sovramontino, in light of this common denominator, treat all contrastive elements the same at the syntax-pragmatics interface, by syntactically assigning a single surface position in the specifier position of ForceP, in a spec-head configuration with the verb cluster which is moved to Force° to satisfy the activated V2 constraint. Nonetheless, topical contrastive elements differentiate themselves from focal contrastiveness and, hence, from contrastive focus in a number of ways: i) as opposed to contrastive focus, they do not require adjacency with the inflected verb; ii) they can be externally merge, whereas contrastive focus is always associated with internal merge; iii) they are resumed by an agreeing clitic when arguments of the verb. This shows that despite the different morpho-syntactic characteristics of contrastive topics and contrastive foci, the V2 system in place forces all pragmatically salient-constituents bearing contrastiveness to surface in the contrastive field.

A possible reason for why contrastiveness is a salient discourse-pragmatic feature in the two NEIDs under investigation is that it affects the *common ground* (Stalnaker 1974, Lewis 1979) of the communicative act. The common ground (CG) can be defined as the information that is mutually known and is to be shared in a communicative act. It is made of different subcomponents that characterise the conversational context, and each sentence must be interpreted as a potential update. Krifka (2007) draws an important distinction between *CG content* and *CG management*: the former concerns the truth-conditional information that has been stated up to a point in conversation, whereas the latter concerns the conversational moves of the participants involved in the communicative act. In light of the notion of the common ground, we can now propose a property shared by C-foci, C-topics, A-topics and Frame-setters: they all pertain the dimension of CG management (Bianchi & Frascarelli 2010, Krifka & Musan 2012). For instance, Krifka & Musan (2012) claim that contrastive focus signals that the CG content contains a proposition with which the current sentence must be contrasted. On the other hand, A-topics signals that a new piece of information is added or reintroduced in the CG content (Bianchi & Frascarelli 2010). Both A-topics and C-foci hence pertain to CG

management and are not strictly associated with CG content. The same is underlyingly true from Frame-setters and C-topic. I will not take this discussion on the properties of the CG any further, but I want to propose that discourse saliency in Lamonat and Sovramontino is encoded in those elements that pertain CG management rather than CG content. At the syntax-pragmatics interface, these contrastive elements are assigned the preverbal position of the V2 system in place, which effectively facilitates the flow of information exchange.

5. The Case of D-Linked Wh-Elements

In light of this analysis, d-linked wh-elements seem to be intrinsically contrastive in Lamonat and Sovramontino. They occupy the same syntactic position as *bona fide* topical and focal contrastive elements, namely the *contrastive field* in SpecForceP, being *de facto* in complementary distribution with contrastive XPs, as shown in (44) below:

(44)   *Mario **CHE CASA** a-lo   comprà?   No Toni   (Lamonat)
          Mario which house   have.3SG-3SG.M.SCL   buy.PTCP NEG Toni
          'Which house did Mario buy and not Toni?'

In (44) the d-linked wh-element *che casa* and the C-topic *Mario* cannot coexist in the same sentence, unless *Mario* is degraded to background information[12] (G-topic). D-linked wh-elements in the same way as contrastive elements must surface at the left-edge of the clause and are limited to a single occurrence.

Before examining the behaviour of d-linked wh-elements, let us first define them: the answer to a d-linked wh-element must be drawn from a set of entities that were previously introduced in discourse. The answer to a d-linked wh-question is thus in a contrastive relation with the other members of the set (see Pesetsky 1987). D-linked wh-elements indicate those wh-phrases that establish a link with the existing discourse and, more specifically, with a finite set of alternatives. In Rizzi's (1990) and Cinque's (1990) terms d-linked wh-

---

[12] *Mario* must hence be de-accented and placed clause finally in canonical subject position

elements are referential, meaning that they are associated with given information that is presupposed in discourse.

As for Molnár's (2002, 2006) revised hierarchy of contrast, I claim that d-linked wh-elements serve the *membership in a finite set of entities* discourse-function and hence qualify as contrastive elements. D-linked wh-elements must in fact be kept apart from regular wh-phrase: in Sovramontino and Lamonat, this distinction is reflected syntactically as d-linked wh-elements and regular wh-elements occupy two distinct structural positions that are not interchangeable, as shown in (45) and (46):

(45)　　　a. A-lo　　　　　　beù　　CHE Mario?　　　　　　(Lamonat)
　　　　　　have.3SG-3SG.M.SCL   drink.PTCP what Mario
　　　　　　'What did Mario drink?'

　　　　　#b. CHE a-lo　　　　　　beù　　　Mario?
　　　　　　what have.3SG-3SG.M.SCL   drink.PTCP Mario
　　　　　　'What did Mario drink?'

(46)　　　a. **CHE MAJON** a-lo　　　　　　comprà　Mario?　　　(Sovramontino)
　　　　　　which jumper   have.3SG-3SG.M.SCL   buy.PTCP Mario
　　　　　　'Which jumper did Mario buy?'

　　　　　*b. A-lo　　　　　　comprà　**CHE MAJON**   Mario?
　　　　　　have.3SG-3SG.M.SCL   buy.PTCP   which jumper   Mario
　　　　　　'Which jumper did Mario buy?'

Examples (45) and (46) show that wh-items can occupy two distinct positions in the left peripheral space depending on their informational status. Regular wh-phrases occupy the specifier position of either FocP or IntP. On the other hand, d-linked wh-elements occupy the *contrastive field*, namely SpecForceP. The position they occupy syntactically satisfies a specific discourse-pragmatic function: heralding contrastiveness. This is further confirmed by bare or prepositional wh-elements that receive a contrastive reading at the left-edge of the clause, as shown in (47) below:

(47) (Sovramontino)

　　　　　a. Laorei-tu　　　　　　CO CHI l　an　pasà?　　**Non d-linked interpretation**
　　　　　　work.PST.2SG-2SG.SCL with who the year passed
　　　　　　'With whom did you work last year?'

b. **CO CHI** laorei-tu   l   an   pasà?   **D-linked interpretation**
   with who   work.PST.2SG-2SG.SCL   the year passed
   'With whom did you work last year?'

The question in (47b) seeks the following piece of information: 'who of an already mentioned set or the people worked with you last year'. In sum, there are two distinct pragmatically motivated structural positions in Lamonat and Sovramontino for a wh-item: SpecForceP for d-linked wh-elements and SpecFocP/IntP for their non d-linked counterparts.

A similar pattern is also found in another Romance language: Romanian. Romanian has received a relatively high degree of attention, as it allows multiple wh-fronting. Nevertheless, Comorovski (1996) shows that wh-questions with multiple fronted wh-operators display a crucial property: the higher wh-elements must be discourse linked. Dobrovie-sorin (1994) and Cornilescu (2002) point out that the d-linked interpretation of the higher wh-element is necessary for the well-formedness of the question. In other words, if the leftmost wh-word is not d-linked the resulting question is ungrammatical. Having two distinct wh-positions depending on the discourse-pragmatic status of the wh-item is therefore not unattested within the Romance family. In Lamonat and Sovramontino, multiple wh-fronting, or better, in our case, the presence of two wh-elements, one d-linked and the other non d-linked, in the C-domain is ungrammatical, as shown by (48):

(48)   ***CO CHI** si-tu   ndaa   AONDE?   (Lamonat)
            with   who be.2SG-2SG.SCL go.PTCP   where?
            'With whom did you go where?'

The ungrammaticality of (48) seems to suggest that in Lamonat and Sovramontino the nature of d-linked wh-phrases is focal and hence cannot coexist with the non-d-linked focal wh-element *aonde*. Lamonat and Sovramontino in fact observe the general tendency across Romance that focal elements are limited to one single occurrence per sentence (Belletti 2004, Rizzi & Bocci 2017, Rizzi 2018).

Lastly, another key difference that sets apart non d-linked wh-elements and their d-linked counterpart is the fact that d-linked wh-elements cannot be

clefted, as shown in (49b). On the contrary, regular wh-elements can appear in a cleft, as shown in (50):

(49)   a. **CHE   CASE**   e-lo   che   i   a   vendù? (Lamonat)
            which   houses   be.3SG-3SG.SCL$_{expl}$ that   3PL.M.SCL have.3PL sell.PTCP
            'Which houses did they sell?'

         b. *E-lo   **CHE   CASE**   che   i   a   vendù?
            be.3SG-3SG.SCL$_{expl}$ which houses   that   3PL.M.SCL have.3PL sell.PTCP
            'Which houses did they sell?'

(50)   E-lo   CHI   che   a   beù   al vin?
         be.3SG-3SG.SCL$_{expl}$ who   that   have.3SG   drink.PTCP the wine?
         'Who drank the wine?'

Their syntactic distribution signals that the two different types of wh-elements belong to two distinct syntactic-pragmatic categories. The fact that d-linked wh-elements cannot appear in a cleft hence strengthens the view that these elements are intrinsically contrastive: they cannot be realised *in-situ* or in canonical focus position, but they must be moved to the edge of the C-domain where they check their matching [+CONTRASTIVE] feature in SpecForceP.

To conclude, I have shown that in Lamonat and Sovramontino, d-linked wh-elements are intrinsically contrastive and their pragmatic-syntactic behaviour is well-captured by the analysis proposed in this paper. They occupy the same syntactic position as topical and focal contrastive elements (SpecForceP) with which are in complementary distribution. In terms of Molnár's (2002, 2006) revised hierarchy of contrast, d-linked wh-elements serve the *membership in finite set of entities* discourse function and their pragmatic-syntactic behaviour seems to resemble that of contrastive foci.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, in Lamonat and Sovramontino root clauses, contrastiveness must be conceived of as a supra-informational and continuous pragmatic notion that can be encoded by both topical and focal elements. This conclusion was reached thanks to the pragmatically motivated V2 nature of Lamonat and Sovramontino, which only allow contrastive XPs in preverbal position, namely in the *contrastive field*. Given the Force-V2 system in place in

Lamonat and Sovramontino, contrastive XPs must appear at the left-edge of the clause and are limited to a single occurrence. The *contrastive field* can host different elements that serve different discourse functions and hence encode different degrees of contrastiveness: C-topics, C-foci, but also A-topics, Frame-setters, and d-linked wh-elements. C-topics, A-topics, frame-setters encode topical contrastiveness, whereas C-foci and d-linked wh-elements encode focal contrastiveness. The common denominator of focal and topical contrastive elements is the establishment of a contrastive relationship within a set of entities that can vary in size and accessibility on the part of the interlocutors: the smaller the set of entities that are contrasted, the stronger the contrast. Focal contrastiveness generally serves strong contrast, whereas topical contrastiveness serves weak contrast. Even though topical and focal contrastive elements syntactically surface in the same structural position, they exhibit the characteristics of their respective informational status. At the syntax-pragmatics interface, all contrastive elements share a [+CONTRASTIVE] feature that must be checked in the *contrastive field*. Lamonat and Sovramontino hence mark contrastiveness at the syntactic level. Ultimately, this is not uncommon across the languages of the world, which adopt different strategies to transversally mark the difference between contrastive and non-contrastive elements regardless of their informational status as topics or foci.

REFERENCES

Belletti, Adriana. 2001. Inversion as focalization. In Aafke Hulk & Jean-Yves Pollock (eds.). *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, 60-90. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Belletti, Adriana. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.). *The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Vol. 2*, 16-51. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Benincà, Paola. 1983. Un'ipotesi sulla sintassi delle lingue romanze medievali. *Quaderni patavini di linguistica* 4, 3-19.

Benincà, Paola. 1994. *La Variazione Sintattica. Studi di Dialettologia Romanza*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Benincà, Paola. 2001. The position of topic and focus in the left periphery. In Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi (eds.). *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, 39-64. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier.

Benincà, Paola. 2006. A detailed map of the left periphery of medieval Romance. In Raffaella Zanuttini (ed.). *Crosslinguistic research in syntax and semantics: Negation, tense and clausal architecture*, 53–86. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Benincà, Paola & Cecilia Poletto. 2004. Topic, focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.). *The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Vol. 2*, 52–75. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Bentley, Delia. 2008. The Interplay of Focus Structure and Syntax: Evidence from Two Sister Languages. In Robert. D. Van Valin Jr. (ed.). *Investigations of the syntax-semantics-pragmatics interface*, 263-284. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Bianchi, Valentina. 1999. *Consequences of Antisymmetry: Headed Relative Clauses*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Bianchi, Valentina & Giuliano Bocci. 2012. Should I stay or should I go? Optional focus movement in Italian. In *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics* 9.

Bianchi, Valentina & Mara Frascarelli. 2010. Is topic a root phenomenon? *Iberia*, 2(1), 43–88.

Bocci, Giuliano. 2013. The syntax-prosody interface: A cartographic perspective

with evidence from Italian. *Linguistics Today Vol. 204*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax-phonology Interface: Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Brandi, Luciana & Patrizia Cordin. 1989. Two Italian Dialects and the Null Subject Parameter. In Osvaldo Jaeggli & Kenneth Safir (eds.). *The Null Subject Parameter*, 111-142. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Cardinaletti, Anna & Lori Repetti. 2010. Proclitic vs enclitic pronouns in northern Italian dialects and the null-subject parameter. In Roberta D'alessandro, Adam Ledgeway & Ian Roberts (eds). *Syntactic variation. The Dialects of Italy*, 119-134. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cardinaletti, Anna & Michal Starke 1999. The Typology of Structural Deficiency. A Case Study of the Three Classes of Pronouns. In Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.). *Clitics in the Languages of Europe,* 145-233. Berlin: Mouton-De Gruyter.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In Charles N. Li (ed.). *Subject and Topic*, 25–55. New York: Academic Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1994. On the evidence for partial n-movement in the Romance DP. In Guglielmo Cinque, Jan Koster, Jean-Yves Pollock, Luigi Rizzi & Raffaella Zanuttini (eds.). *Paths towards Universal Grammar. Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*, 85–110. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A'-dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Clackson, James. 2016. Latin as a source for the Romance languages. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), 3-13.

Comorovski, Ileana. 1996. *Interrogative Phrases and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Cornilescu, Alexandra. 2002. Rhematic focus at the left periphery: The case of Romanian. In Claire Beyssade, Reineke Bokbennema, Frank Drijkoningen,& Paola Monachesi (eds.). *Romance Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 77-91. Amsterdam: John Benjamins..

Cruschina, Silvio. 2012. *Discourse-related features and functional projections*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Cruschina, Silvio. 2016. Information and Discourse Structure. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), 596-608.

Den Besten, Hans. 1983. On the Interaction of Root Transfomrations and Lexical Deletive Rules. In Werner Abraham (ed.). *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*, 47-61. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dik, Simon C. 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1994. *The Syntax of Romanian. Comparative Studies in Romance*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1997. *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 2007. *Information Structure: The Syntax-Discourse Interface*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Frascarelli, Mara & Ronald Hinterhölzl. 2007. Types of topics in German and Italian. In Susanne Winkler & Kerstin Schwabe (eds.). *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form*, 87–116. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Frascarelli, Mara. 2000. *The Syntax-Phonology Interface in Focus and Topic Constructions in Italian*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Fontana, Josep. 1993. *Phrase Structure and the Syntax of Clitics in the History of Spanish*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania

Goria, Cecilia. 2004. *Subject Clitics in the Northern Italian Dialects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Greco, Ciro & Liliane Haegeman. 2016. Framesetters and the micro-variation of subject-intial V2. *lingbuzz/003226*.

Gundel, Jeanette. K. 1974. *The Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Gundel, Jeanette. K. 1988. *The Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Garland.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2000. Inversion, non-adjacent inversion and adjuncts in CP. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 98, 121–160.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2006. Argument fronting in English, Romance CLLD and the left periphery. In Rafaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger, & Paul Portner (eds.). *Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture: Cross-linguistic Investigations*, 27-52. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2007. Operator movement and topicalisation in adverbial clauses. *Folia Linguistica* 41, 279-325.

Haiman, John & Paola Benincà. 1992. *The Rhaeto-Romance Languages.* London: Routledge.

Hinterhölzl, Roland & Svetlana Petrova. 2010. From V1 to V2 in West Germanic. *Lingua*, Vol 120 (2), 315-328.

Holmberg, Anders. 1986. *Word order and syntactic features in the Scandinavian languages and English*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Stockholm.

Holmberg, Anders. 1997. Scandinavian stylistic fronting: movement of phonological features in the syntax. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 60*. Department of Scandinavian Languges. University of Lund.

Holmberg, Anders. 2000. Scandinavian Stylistic Fronting: How Any Category Can Become an Expletive. *Linguistic Inquiry 31*, 445–484.

Holmberg, Anders. 2012. Verb Second. In Tibor Kiss & Artemis Alexiadou (eds). *Syntax: an International Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Research*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter

Holmberg, Anders & Christer Platzack. 1995. *The role of inflection in Scandinavian syntax*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Kiss, Katalin. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language*, 74, 245-73.

Krifka, Manfred. 2007. Basic notions of information structure. In Caroline Fery and Manfred Krifka (eds.). *Interdisciplinary Studies of Information Structure*, 6. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.

Krifka, Manfred & Renate Musan. 2012. Information structure. Overview and linguistic issues. In Manfred Krifka & Renate Musan (eds). *The Expression of Information Structure*, 1-44. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Kuno, Susumu. 1976. Subject Raising. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.). *Syntax and Semantics* 5*: Japanese Generative Grammar*, 17-49. New York: Academic Press.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2008. Satisfying V2 in early Romance: Merge vs. Move. *Journal of Linguistics*, 44 (02).

Ledgeway, Adam & Martin Maiden (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

López, Luis. 2009. *A Derivational Syntax for Information Structure*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, David. 1979. Scorekeeping in a language game. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 8, 339-359.

Maling, Joan. 1980. Inversion in Embedded Clauses in Modern Icelandic. *Íslenskt mál og almenn málfræði 2*, 175-193.

Manzini, Maria Rita & Leonardo Savoia. 2011. Wh-in situ and wh-doubling in Northern Italian varieties: Against remnant movement. *Linguistic Analysis.*

Manzini, Maria Rita & Leonardo Savoia. 2015. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Martín-González, Javier. 2002. *The Syntax of Sentential Negation in Spanish*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.

Molnár, Valéria. 2002. Contrast in a contrastive perspective. In Hilde Hasselgård, Stig Johansson, Bergljot Behrens & Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen (eds.). *Information Structure in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 147-161. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

Molnár, Valéria. 2006. On different kinds of contrast. *The Architecture of Focus*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Munaro, Nicola. 1998. Wh-in situ in the Northern Italian Dialects. In Olga Fullana & Francesc Roca (eds). *Studies on the Syntax of Central Romance Languages*, 189-212. Girona: Universitat de Girona Convegno: III Symposium on the Syntax of Central Romance Languages.

Munaro, Nicola. 2011. Toward a hierarchy of clause types. In Paola Benincà & Nicola Munaro (eds.). *Mapping the Left Periphery*, 125-162. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Munaro, Nicola, Cecilia Poletto & Jean-Yves Pollock. 2001. *Eppur si muove*! On Comparing French and Bellunese *Wh*-Movement. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 1*, 147-180. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Neeleman, Ad, Elena Titov, Hans van de Koot & Reiko Vermeulen. 2009. A syntactic typology of topic, focus and contrast. In Jeroen van

Craenenbroeck (ed.). *Alternatives to Cartography*, 15-51. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pescarini, Diego. 2016. Clitic Pronominal Systems: Morphophonology. Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), 742-757.

Pesetsky, David. 1987. Wh -in-situ: Movement and unselective binding. In Eric J. Reuland and Alice G.B. ter Meulen (eds.). *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, 98–129. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Poletto, Cecilia. 1993. Subject clitic-verb inversion in north eastern Italian dialects. In Adriana Belletti (ed.). *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*. 204-251Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2000. *The Higher Functional Field*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2001. Complementizer deletion and verb movement. In Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi (eds.). *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, 265–86- Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2002. The left-periphery of V2-Rhaetoromance dialects: A new view on V2 and V3. In. Sjef Barbiers, Leonie Cornips and Susanne van der Kleij (eds.). *Syntactic microvariation*, 214-242. Amsterdam: Meertens Instituut.

Poletto, Cecilia. & Jean-Yves Pollock. 2004. On the left periphery of some Romance Wh-Questions. In L. Rizzi (ed.). *The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Vol. 2, The Structure of CP and IP*, 251-296. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poletto, Cecilia. & Jean-Yves Pollock. 2009. Another look at wh-questions in Romance: the case of Medrisiotto and its consequences for the analysis of French wh-in-situ and embedded interrogatives, 199-258. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Poletto, Cecilia. & Jean-Yves Pollock. 2015. Arguing for Remnant Movement. 135-178. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Prince, Ellen. 1981. Towards a taxonomy of given-new information. In Peter Cole (ed.). *Radical Pragmatics*, 223–55. New York: Academy Press.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1981. Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica* 27, 53–94.

Richards, Norvin. 2016. *Contiguity theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1996. Residual Verb Second and the Wh Criterion. In Adriana Belletti & Luigi Rizzi (eds.). *Parameters and Functional Heads*, 63-90. Oxford University Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.). *Elements of Grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. Reconstruction, weak island sensitivity, and agreement. In Carlo Cecchetto, Gennaro Chierchia & Maria Teresa Guasti (eds.). *Semantic Interfaces*, 145–176. Stanford: CSLI.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2018. Uniqueness of left peripheral focus, "further explanation", and Int. In Laura R. Bailey & Michelle Sheehan (eds.). *Order and structure in syntax I: Word order and syntactic structure*, 333-343. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Rizzi, Luigi & Giuliano Bocci. 2017. Left Periphery of the Clause. In *The Companion to Syntax*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Salvi, Giampaolo. 2016. Word Order. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), 997-1012.

Selkirk, Elisabeth. 2002. Contrastive FOCUS vs. presentational focus: Prosodic evidence from right node raising in English. In Bernard Bel & Isabelle Marlien (eds.). *Speech Prosody 2002: Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Speech Prosody*, 643-646. Aix-en-Provence, France: Laboratoire Parole et Langage.

Shimojo, Mitsuaki. 2011. The left periphery and focus structure in Japanese. In Wataru Nakamura (ed.). *New Perspectives in Role and Reference Grammar*, 266-293. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Stalnaker, Robert. 1974. Pragmatic presuppositions. In Milton K. Munitz & Peter K. Unger (eds.). *Semantics and Philosophy*, 197-214. New York: New York University Press.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1981. The semantics of topic-focus articulation. In . Jeroen Groenendijk, Theo Janssen & Martin Stokhof (eds.). *Formal Methods in the Study of Language*, 513-541. Amsterdam: Matematisch Centrum

Vilkuna, Maria. 1995. Discourse configurationality in Finnish. In Katalin. É. Kiss (ed.). *Discourse-Configurational Languages*, 244-268. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Villa-García, Julio. 2015. *The syntax of multiple-que sentences in Spanish : along the left periphery*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Vikner, Sten. 1995. *Verb movement and expletive subjects in the Germanic languages*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Wolfe, Sam. 2016. On the Left Periphery of V2 Languages. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 38, 287-310.

Wright, Roger. 2016. Latin and Romance in the Medieval Period. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), 14-23.

Ziv, Yael. 1994. Left and right dislocations: Discourse functions and anaphora. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 22, 629-645.

Simone De Cia

simone.decia@manchester.ac.uk

The University of Manchester