

• **Fin° vs Top°.** First, the main argument to analyze *que2* as a Topic head in the Western Romance varieties is lost for Ternois. Second, the idea that it serves to activate the Topic field cannot be maintained either, since it runs into a series of problems. One may consider that activating the higher Topic projection may activate the lower intermediate projections above Fin, and thus license a Focus position. But this would fail to account for the position of *que2* in (4), and for the fact that the order *que1-Focus-Topic-que2* is also possible in Ternois. Besides, to account for (8), one would anyway have to admit that in Ternois, *que2* can also activate its own FocusP. But this assumption would worsen the point already made by Ledgeway & D'Alessandro (2010): we are left with no explanation why three different yet homophonous instances of *que* may serve as a complementizer, and a topic and focus licenser. Their proposal for the Southern Italian dialects (that also admit both topics and, to some extent, foci, between the two complementizers) is that *que* is merged in Fin°, marking the finite property of the clause, then raises to Force° to mark its illocutionary force, probably checking on its way the Topic and Focus items. Under this view, the identity of *que1* & *que2* in Ternois is captured straightforwardly, as well as the various combinations of foci and topics in-between. But Ternois also provides an additional argument in favor of this analysis. If *que2* were merged in an information structure position, nothing would prevent it from appearing in infinitive clauses with preposed Topics, contrary to facts. If *que2* is the lower copy of the finite complementizer in Fin°, on the contrary, this fact is correctly predicted. Besides, the non-finite complementizer, *de/ed*, cannot be doubled: this is expected too, if *de* is and stays in Fin°, whether preceded by a Topic or not, as assumed in Rizzi (1997).

References

- Barbiers, S., Koenenman, O. & M. Lekakou (2008). Syntactic Doubling and the Structure of Chains. In C. B. Chang and H. J. Haynie (eds). *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA, USA, 78-86.
- D'Alessandro, R. & A. Ledgeway. (2010). At the C-T boundary: Investigating Abruzzese complementation. *Lingua* 120: 2040-2060.
- Demonte, V. & O. Fernandez Soriano. (2007). La periferia izquierda oracional y los complementantes del español. En Juan Cuartero y Martine Emsel, eds. *Vernetzungen: Kognition, Bedeutung, (kontrastive) Pragmatik*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang :133-147
- Ledgeway, A. (2005). Moving through the left periphery: the dual complementiser system in the dialects of Southern Italy. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 103:3, 339-396.
- Lemaire, Léon (1947): *Racontaches d'ain boïeu rouche: poésies et chansonnettes en patois d'Arras*. Imprimerie Centrale de l'Artois.
- Lemaire, L. (1945). *Eclats d'...patois*. Bases de textes du LESCLAP, U. D'Amiens.
- McCloskey, J. (2006): *Questions and questionning in a local English*. In: R. Zanuttini (ed): *Crosslinguistic research in syntax and semantics*, Vol. 2004. Georgetown University Press, 87-123.
- Mascarenhas, S. (2007) Complementizer doubling in European Portuguese. Unpublished Ms. Amsterdam: ILLC. <http://homepages.nyu.edu/~sdm330/>
- Paoli, S. (2007). The Fine structure of the left periphery: COMPs and subjects; evidence from Romance. *Lingua*, 117:1057-1079.
- Rizzi, L. (1997): The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed): *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwers, 281-337.
- Wanner D. (1995) Les subordinées à double complementateur en roman medieval. In G. Ruffino (ed), *Atti del XXI Congresso Internazionale di Linguistica e Filologia Romanza*, sezione 1, pp. 421-433.