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Grazie Adriana, per quello che mi hai insegnato, per avermi trasmesso la passione per la ricerca e la curiosità intellettuale. Grazie per avermi spriano ad andare avanti con il tuo entusiasmo, il tuo sostegno e le tue critiche sincere. Ti auguro uno splendido compleanno.

This paper deals with the diachrony of complementizer omission (C-omission) in Italian. C-omission is restricted to [-realis] clauses in Modern Italian (1), and to some types of declarative clauses in Modern Florentine (Cocchi & Poletto, 2005), i.e. to clauses in which the inflected verb of the subordinate clause is preceded by a functional head (e.g. negation, clitic pronoun) and no preverbal lexical subject or functional adverbial is merged, cf. (2).

(1) a. Penso (che) venga anche Pietro
Think.1SG that come.SBJV;3PL also Peter
‘I think (that) Peter is also coming’

b. Maria dice *(che) viene anche Pietro
Mary says that come.3PL all.PL

* The related article will be part of C. Contemori and L. Dal Pozzo (eds.) (to appear) Inquiries into Linguistic Theory and Language Acquisition. Papers offered to Adriana Belletti, Siena, CISCL Press.
‘Mary says that Peter is also coming’

(2) a. *Dice __ lo porta (Modern Florentine)
say.3SG ACC;3SG take.IND;3SG
‘He says he will bring it’

b. *?Dice __ porta il libro
say.3SG take.IND;3SG the book
‘He says he will bring the book’

c. *Maria m’ha detto __ Gianni un ha portato il libro
Mary DAT;1SG has said John not has.IND brought the book
‘Mary told me John has not brought the book’

[Cocchi & Poletto, 2005, 12, 13, 15]

In Old Italian, which has V-to-C in main clauses, (cf. Benincà 1984, 2006, Benincà & Poletto 2010, a.o.), C-omission is highly restricted. Instead, the complementizer che (and its variants ch’, ke, etc.) may be doubled, as in the example below (cf. Vincent 2006).

(3) Trovò che, [chi continuo mangiasse nove dì
Found C who continuously ate.SBJV nine days
di petronciani], che diverrebbe mattto
of eggplants C become.COND crazy
‘He found out that whoever ate eggplants for nine days in a row would become crazy’ [Novellino, 35, 208, 2]

C-omission is by contrast much more pervasive in the Renaissance period (Wanner 1981, Scorretti 1991) and invests basically all types of subordinate clauses. The present study concentrates on C-omission in Renaissance Italian relative clauses, which is attested in both subject, (4), and non-subject extractions, (5).

(4) …Che è faccenda ___ tocca a noi
that is issue touch.3SG to us
‘That is an issue we have to deal with’ [AMS, Wanner 1981]

(5) Se la divisione ___ fece coi viniziani di Lombardia...
If the division made.3SG with.the Venetians of Lombardy
‘If the division of Lombardy he made with the Venetians...’ [P, 4, l. 26]

A corpus study reveals that there is a quantified asymmetry in the frequency of C-omission in subject/non-subject relative clauses, which is analyzed as the result of the combination of the active/inactive alignment that characterizes both Old and Renaissance Italian (Ledgeway 2012 and ref. therein, a.o.), and the loss of V-to-C. More specifically, a closer examination reveals that C-omission in relative clauses is attested only in presence of inactive antecedents.

The active/inactive distinction is attributed to the presence of a strong (*) feature on the low-phase head, Voice*, which requires morphologically overt Merge (Chomsky 1995, Lasnik 1999, Biberauer & Richards 2006) and creates a low phase boundary in active but not in inactive structures (cf. Franco & Migliori 2014). The presence of * on Voice imposes a visibility requirement for recoverability at the
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higher phase, once the EA undergoes relativization, which explains the absence of C-less relative clauses with active antecedents.

The fact that C-omission is attested in Renaissance, but not in Old Italian, is explained in relation to another parametric change, which affects the higher phase head. Specifically, the loss of V-to-C is attributed to a parametric change from Fin* to Fin, which permits the C-form to be non-overt in contexts in which syntactic visibility is not imposed otherwise (e.g. by a requirement on Voice or on another C-head). The argument is corroborated by further comparative facts from Old Occitan and Old French. These languages, despite some microparametric differences concerning the C-forms, share the same properties of Renaissance Italian and allow for C-omission in the same (inactive) contexts.

The hypothesis presented in this paper generates some predictions with respect to the distribution of C-omission, which are borne out by facts. Specifically, C-omission is unattested (=ungrammatical) in headless relative and interrogative clauses in which C is a pronoun and has a [+human, S/A] value, as well as in headed relative clauses in which the extracted argument is [+human, S/A].
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