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1. Introduction

The clausal left periphery of Spanish displays a complex system of complementizers, oftentimes masked by the fact that default complementizers are lexically realized as que, with the notable exception of interrogative si ‘if.’ Drawing on Rizzi’s seminal work on the left periphery (cf. Rizzi 1997 et seq.), this paper focuses on medial and low que complementizers, which, given their homophony (/kel/) and their apparently identical distribution in certain contexts, have often been treated in the literature as the same item. The minimal pair in (1) illustrates the context in which the two complementizers with which this paper is concerned, namely recomplementation/secondary que and “jussive/optative” que, are prima facie indistinguishable.

(1)

a. Recomplementation que
Me dijeron que si llueve, (que) viene Guillermo.
cl. said that if rains that come3.SG-Ind. William
‘They said that if it rains, William will come (here).’
b. “Jussive/optative” que
Me dijeron que si llueve, *(que) venga Guillermo.
cl. said that if rains that come3.SG-Subj. William
‘They demanded that William come (here) if it rains.’

However, closer inspection reveals that the underlined que complementizers in (1a) and (1b) constitute distinct functional heads and exhibit radically different distributional and syntactic behavior. In fact, the pair in (1) highlights two crucial differences between the two complementizers: whereas recomplementation que is optional and typically appears in indicative clauses (1a), “jussive/optative” que is mandatory and is intimately associated with the subjunctive mood (1b).

This paper has three major goals:

(i) to characterize previously unacknowledged differences between medial and low complementizers in Spanish, namely recomplementation que and “jussive/optative” que;
(ii) to provide empirical evidence relevant to the study of the clausal left periphery; and
(iii) to confirm the need for a highly articulated structure of the Spanish left periphery.

The first goal of this paper is crucial, since the previous works on Spanish complementizers have generally failed to draw the necessary distinction between the two complementizers illustrated in (1a) and (1b). The second goal is also important in that the empirical evidence to be presented in this paper will be pivotal to the analysis of the Spanish left periphery, which, as the third goal indicates, necessarily requires appealing to a cartographic approach (cf. Rizzi 1997 et seq.).

After careful examination of the distinct behavior and distribution of the two complementizers that constitute the object of study of this paper, the conclusion drawn is that the data strongly support a split-CP analysis of the Spanish left periphery, along the lines of Rizzi’s (1997, 2001, 2004) system. More specifically, the conclusion of this paper is that recomplementation que lexicalizes Topº and “jussive/optative” que lexicalizes Finº.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the two complementizers, as well as the analysis; Section 3 is devoted to a systematic comparison of the two types of que in Spanish, which will confirm the account proposed in the paper and, more generally, of the Spanish left periphery; Section 4 concludes the paper. For the sake of
clarity, in the examples provided throughout the paper I mark recomplementation *que* with an underline and “jussive/optative” *que* with a dotted underline.

2. Recomplementation *que* and “jussive/optative” *que*

In this section, I present the two complementizers in turn, namely recomplementation *que* and “jussive/optative” *que*, and the analysis I pursue for each of the two complementizers.

The double-complementizer construction, often referred to as *recomplementation* (Higgins 1988), is attested in a number of languages, including Old English (Higgins 1988), present-day colloquial English (Casasanto and Sag 2008, Haegeman 2011, McCloskey 2006, and Radford 2011, among others), Medieval Castilian (Fontana 1993; Wanner 1996, 1998), and in present-day Romance varieties such as Catalan (González i Planas 2010), Galician (Gupton 2010, Uriagereka 1995a), Portuguese (Barbosa 2000, Mascarenhas 2007), and Spanish (Campos 1992; Demonte and Fernández-Soriano 2007, 2009; Escrivano 1991; Etxepare 2010; López 2009; Martín-González 2002; Rodríguez-Ramalle 2003; and Villa-García, forthcoming, *inter alia*). The existence of double-complementizer configurations in certain Italian dialects has been reported by Paoli (2003, 2006), Poletto (2000), and in a number of works by Adam Ledgeway (e.g., Ledgeway 2005), among others. In this paper, I focus on data from Iberian Spanish, although I also present data from other Romance varieties when appropriate. The reader should bear in mind, however, that secondary complementizers do not work in exactly the same way in all of the aforementioned linguistic varieties (see Villa-García, forthcoming).

Recomplementation, which is a phenomenon characteristic of spoken Spanish, occurs when a topic/left-dislocated (LD) constituent is sandwiched between overt complementizers, the second of which can be absent without apparent semantic effect, as illustrated by the Spanish data in (2).

1 In addition to the examples provided in the main text, dislocations in Spanish can be preceded and followed by a pause with and without the secondary complementizer, as shown by the following examples, where pauses are represented by means of commas:

(i) a. Susi dice *que*, *a los alumnos*, *que* les van a dar regalos
Susi says that DAT the students that cl. go to give presents
b. Susi dice *que*, *a los alumnos*, les van a dar regalos
Susi says that DAT the students les va a dar regalos
Both: ‘Susi says that they are going to give the students presents.’
Several accounts of the phenomenon of recompensation have been proposed in the literature to date. For instance, Fontana (1993) and Manzini and Savoia (2011), *inter alia*, have pursued a CP-recursion account of the phenomenon, while Uriagereka (1995a) has proposed that secondary *que* heads FP (for “point of view”), which is situated between CP and TP. Within the influential cartographic (split-CP) analysis of Rizzi (1997 *et seq.*), i.e., ForceP > (TopicP$_{recursive}$) > (FocusP) > FinitenessP, Brovetto (2002), Demonte and Fernández-Soriano (2007, 2009), and López (2009), *mutatis mutandis*, among others, have claimed that secondary *que* in examples like (2a) heads FinitenessP. Martín-González (2002), for his part, has argued that secondary *que* is located in (Doubled)ForceP, a category projected between TopicP and FocusP. I will not review the existing analyses here for reasons of space, but the reader is referred to Villa-García (forthcoming, in preparation) for extensive discussion of the different proposals. Instead, I will pursue the view championed by Mascarenhas (2007), Paoli (2006), Rodríguez-Ramalle (2003), and Villa-García (forthcoming) that the secondary complementizer of recompensation patterns in Spanish lexicalizes Topº, the head of TopicP in Rizzi’s (1997 *et seq.*) analysis, with the sandwiched dislocate being hosted in the specifier of TopicP. Although the arguments for the TopicP account of recompensation can be found in Villa-García (forthcoming), additional supporing evidence for this analysis will be provided in this paper. The TopicP account of recompensation is provided in the labeled bracketing in (3):

Similarly, see Villa-García (forthcoming, in preparation) for the type of dislocates that can occur in the position sandwiched between *ques*.

---

2 Note that under all the cartographic analyses, the high *que* that appears in embedded clauses and that precedes any left-peripheral material is assumed to head ForceP (see Villa-García, in preparation, for discussion of the obligatoriness of this high *que*).
The secondary que of recomplementation configurations heads TopicP in Spanish

\[ \text{[ForceP [Force' que [TopicP LD [Top' que [FinitenessP [Fin' [TP ...]]]]]]]}} \]

The other complementizer discussed in this paper is found in exhortative and desiderative root and embedded clauses characterized by the obligatory presence of the overt complementizer and subjunctive morphology on the verb, as illustrated in (4). This pattern includes both exhortative/jussive (4a) and desiderative/optative (4b) sentences. By way of illustration, the speaker who utters (4a) is telling his/her interlocutor about an order or command that affects a third party. The speaker who utters (4b), on the other hand, does not need an interlocutor, since he or she is just expressing his/her desire that something happen to the person he or she is talking about (RAE 2009). As shown in (1b), this pattern is also possible in embedded contexts.

(4)

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{¡*(Que) se vaya!} & \text{[exhorative/jussive]} \\
& \text{that cl. go}^{0,3,\text{SG-Subj.}} & \text{‘I demand that he or she go away.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{¡*(Que) sea muy feliz!} & \text{[desiderative/optative]} \\
& \text{that be}^{3,\text{SG-Subj.}} \text{ very happy} & \text{‘May he or she be very happy.’} \\
\end{align*} \]

Demonte and Fernández-Soriano (2007, 2009), Ledewegway (2005), Paoli (2003, 2006), and Villa-García (in press, in preparation) argue that the mandatory complementizer with a dotted underline in examples like (1b), (4a), and (4b) is the lexical realization of the subjunctive mood, and thus it heads Finº, the lowest left-peripheral projection of Rizzi (1997), which Rizzi independently argues is the locus of mood and finiteness features. As the discussion below illustrates (see §§ 3.4 and 3.5), this analysis is further substantiated by a number of arguments, including the empirical observation that “jussive/optative” que cannot be followed by left-peripheral material. I will assume, therefore, that “jussive/optative” que heads Finº in Rizzi’s system, as shown in (5).

---

3 For the connection between the CP layer and the subjunctive mood, the reader is referred to the work of Paula Kempchinsky (e.g., Kempchinsky 2009).

4 Following Rizzi (1997), I assume that in the absence of left-peripheral material (e.g., in the examples involving root clauses in (4)), ForceP and FinitenessP appear as a conflated projection, ForceFinitenessP/CP, as shown in (5b), with
(5) “Jussive/optative” que heads FinitenessP

a. Embedded contexts (cf. (1b))
   \[
   (\text{ForceP}\ [\text{Force'}\ que\ [\text{TopicP}\ LD\ [\text{Top'}\ [\text{FinitenessP}\ [\text{Fin'}\ que\ [\text{TP} \ldots]]]]]])
   \]

b. Root contexts (cf. (4))
   \[
   (\text{ForceFinitenessP}\ [\text{ForFin'}\ que\ [\text{TP} \ldots]])
   \]

In what follows, I provide a systematic comparison of recomplementation que and “jussive/optative” que in terms of a number of properties, namely their (non-)dependence on the appearance of a dislocated phrase, their optionality vs. obligatoriness, their (in)ability to license ellipsis, their distribution with respect to left dislocations and foci, their bearing on clitic placement possibilities in Asturian, their (im)possibility to iterate, and their ability to co-occur in the same sentence. The empirical evidence to be presented indicates that the two complementizers are radically different in their behavior and distribution. Thus, I show that analyzing recomplementation que as the head of TopicP (cf. (3)) and “jussive/optative” que as the head of FinitenessP (cf. (5)) correctly predicts the different behavior and distribution of recomplementation que and “jussive/optative” que. Put differently, the two complementizers, which are superficially identical in certain contexts (e.g., (1)), are indeed distinct elements, which strongly suggests that a different account of each complementizer is necessary (cf. (3) and (5)). The following discussion therefore lends further credence to the analyses proposed in (3) and (5).

3. The different behavior and distribution of recomplementation que and “jussive/optative” que

3.1. The (non-)dependence of complementizers on left dislocations: root and embedded contexts

An important difference between recomplementation que and “jussive/optative” que is that whereas the former is contingent on the appearance of a left-dislocated topic, the latter is not. Needless to say, this difference is obscured in embedded contexts like (1b), where the low “jussive/optative” complementizer can only appear if dislocated material occurs between the high complementizer and the low one; otherwise only

[\text{ForceFiniteness}^9/C^9 \text{ in effect being a composite force/finiteness head (though see Radford 2011 for a dissenting view.)}]}
one complementizer can occur (see below). However, I show that the low “jussive/optative” complementizer appears in embedded contexts only if dislocated material occurs, because the presence of left-peripheral material causes the left periphery to split into multiple projections, with TopicP being projected between ForceP and FinitenessP, whose head hosts “jussive/optative” que.

As shown in (6), recomplementation que requires at least one dislocated phrase to its left, both in embedded contexts (cf. (6a,b)) and in root sentences introduced by quotative que (Etxepare 2010) (cf. (6c,d)).

(6)

a. Pedro dice que con ella (que) no van a venir.
   Peter says that with her that not go to come
   ‘Peter says that they are not planning to come with her.’

b. *Pedro dice que que no van a venir con ella.
   Peter says that that not go to come with her

A similar root construction which may not exactly involve recomplementation que is illustrated by the following interaction, which shows that only a default nominative, DP/NP hanging topic doubled by a resumptive can occur in this context; a full-fledged dislocated PP is ungrammatical in this environment:

(i) A: ¿Qué pasó? ¿Por qué estás triste?
   what happened for what are sad
   ‘What happened? Why do you look so sad?’

   B: a. Mi madre, que dependen todos de ella económicamente
      my mother that depend all of her economically
   b. *De mi madre, que dependen todos económicamente
      of my mother that depend all economically
      ‘What happened? Everybody relies on my mother for money.’

As shown in Villa-García (forthcoming), however, recomplementation que differs from the que exemplified in (i) in that it can be preceded by both hanging topics and full-fledged dislocated phrases/Clitic Left-Dislocations (CLLDs). (For further discussion of the puzzling construction exemplified in (i), see Villa-García, in preparation).

As (6b) shows, adjacent homophonous complementizers are ungrammatical. Ill-formed contiguous sequences (i.e., *que que) have been ruled out by proposing a haplology (i.e., antihomophony) constraint banning adjacent homophonous forms (e.g., Napoli 1976, Bošković 2002, McCloskey 2006, Demonte and Fernández-Soriano 2009, among many others). Haegeman (2011) cites unpublished work by Luigi Rizzi where he appeals to an economy principle blocking the reduplication of functional or lexical heads except in special structural environments.
c. Que con ella (que) no van a venir.\(^7\)
   that with her that not go to come
   ‘Somebody says they are not planning to come with her.’

d. *Que que no van a venir con ella.
   that that not go to come with her

By contrast, “jussive/optative” que can appear in root contexts without a dislocate to its left, as shown by (4a,b) and (7).

(7) \(¡(A\ \text{la fiesta,})\) que no vayan!
   to the party that not go\text{3.PL-Subj.}
   ‘I demand that they not go (to the party).’

Note, incidentally, that “jussive/optative” que can also appear inside of a quotative construction, much like re-complementation que:

(8) Que a la fiesta, que no vayan.
   that to the party that not go\text{3.PL-Subj.}
   ‘Somebody ordered that they not go (to the party).’

Examples (4) and (7) indicate that the complementizer intimately associated with the subjunctive mood, namely “jussive/optative” que, does not need to appear with an attending dislocated phrase, contrary to re-complementation que. This difference suggests that whereas re-complementation que is licensed by left-dislocated material, “jussive/optative” que is not. This follows immediately under the account pursued in this paper: re-complementation que heads TopicP (cf. (9a)), which must have a constituent in its specifier. Hence, que and the dislocate are in the same projection, which explains the dependence of re-complementation que on the occurrence of a dislocate (see § 3.3 for additional evidence).\(^8\) “Jussive/optative” que, on the other hand, heads FinitenessP (cf. (9b)), which is not associated with left-dislocated topical

---

\(^7\) As shown by Extepare (2010), the high que that appears in quotative constructions is not optional, since it is a marker of hearsay (i.e., (6c) means “somebody says X”).

\(^8\) See Villa-García (in preparation) for discussion of why re-complementation que requires a high que. As is well known, embedded topicalization generally requires a high complementizer. In this regard, it is important to emphasize that re-complementation que, which depends on a topic appearing to its left, is characteristic of embedded clauses (sentences introduced by quotative que (cf. (6c)) behaving much like embedded clauses).
phrases, nor does it host a left-dislocated topic in its specifier. Thus, “jussive/optative” *que* is not conditional upon a dislocated phrase.

(9)

a. \[ \text{ForceP} \ 	ext{[Force' que TopicP LD [Top' que FinitenessP [Fin' ...]]]} \]

b. \[ \text{ForceP} \ 	ext{[Force' que TopicP LD [Top' [FinitenessP [Fin' que ...]]]]} \]

I now return to the question of why in embedded contexts (and in quotative cases like (8)), “jussive/optative” *que* occurs only if dislocated material precedes it (cf. (1b/9b)). Following Rizzi (1997 and subsequent work), I assume that if no left-peripheral material occurs in the CP layer, economy considerations require that the CP layer not be split into different projections. In other words, in the absence of CP-related constituents such as left dislocates, a syncretized CP is projected (CP, or a conflated ForceFinitenessP projection) (see fn. 4). This, I argue, is what happens in cases like (4), when “jussive/optative” *que* is not preceded by left-dislocated material. The highly simplified derivation of sentences like those in (4) is shown in (10).

(10) \[ \text{[ForceFinitenessP [ForFin' que ...]]} \]

However, in cases like (1b), where “jussive/optative” *que* follows dislocated material in embedded contexts, a split left periphery with ForceP, TopicP, and FinitenessP projections occurs. In this case, ForceP and FinitenessP can no longer be conflated, and the “jussive/optative” *que* complementizer realizes the low head Finitenessº, as shown in (9b). The apparent dependence of “jussive/optative” *que* on the presence of a dislocate in embedded contexts is the result of FinitenessP being projected only if dislocated material occurs (i.e., if TopicP is projected). Note that the analysis in (10) is also the structure assumed for cases of embedding without dislocation:

(11)

a. Pedro dice que no vienen.
   Peter says that not come\text{3,PL-Ind.}
   ‘Peter says that they are not coming.’

b. Pedro dice que no vengan.
   Peter says that not come\text{3,PL-Subj.}
   ‘Peter demands that they not come.’
The sentences in (11a) and (11b) again constitute a minimal pair in that the difference in mood (indicative vs. subjunctive) crucially changes the meaning, much like in (1). Since no left-peripheral material occurs in the sentences in (11), a syncretic ForceFinitenessP (cf. (10)) is projected, with the head of ForceFinitenessP being the locus of both force and finiteness features, lexicalized by one single instance of *que*.

The evidence adduced in this subsection points to the conclusion that whereas reacomplementation *que* is contingent on a dislocate in its specifier, “jussive/optative” *que* is not. This difference is accounted for under the proposed analysis (cf. (3)/(9a) and (5)/(9b)), which is further supported by the evidence to be presented in the following subsections.

### 3.2 Optionality vs. obligatoriness

As mentioned in the introduction, a property that helps differentiate reacomplementation *que* and “jussive/optative” *que* is that the former is typically optional (cf. (12)), whereas the latter is obligatory (cf. (13)).

---

9 There is direct evidence from Spanish suggesting that a single complementizer *que* can sometimes realize different functions simultaneously (i.e., it can be the lexical realization of the head of a conflated projection). The sentence uttered by interlocutor C as part of the following dialog is headed by *que*, which serves a double function, since it is both a quotative marker (see fn. 7) and the (mandatory) lexical realization of the subjunctive mood (C is an exhortative sentence).

(i) A: ¡Vete!
   \(\text{g}^0_{2,\text{SG-Imper.}}\)
   ‘Go!’

B: ¿Qué dijo A?
   what said A
   ‘What did A say?’

C: ¡*(Que) te vayas!
   that cl. \(\text{g}^0_{2,\text{SG-Subj.}}\)
   ‘A ordered that you go away.’

10 For some speakers, the lower *que* is obligatory only in third-person cases in embedded “jussive/optative” *que* contexts, but optional for other persons (although the preferred option is still to have an overt *que* in all “jussive/optative” environments):

(i) Dicen que a la fiesta, \(\%\text{(que)}\) vayamos
   say that to the party that \(\text{g}^0_{1,\text{PL-Subj.}}\)
   ‘They demand that we go to the party.’

I will leave this issue open here, offering only some speculations. Third-person *que* + subjunctive constructions form a natural class in not having a root counterpart displaying true imperative morphology, hence their structure is identical in root
(12)
a. Repitió que a la fiesta, *(que) vengan mis padres.
   repeated that to the party that come_3.PL-Subj. my parents
   ‘S/he insisted again that they come to the party.’
b. Que a la fiesta, *(que) vengan mis padres.
   that to the party that come_3.PL-Subj. my parents
   ‘I insist again/somebody demands that my parents come to
   the party.’

(13)
a. Repitió que a la fiesta, *(que) vengan mis padres.
   repeated that to the party that come_3.PL-Subj. my parents
   ‘S/he insisted again that they come to the party.’
b. (A la fiesta,) *(que) vengan mis padres.
   to the party that come_3.PL-Subj. my parents
   ‘I demand that my parents come (to the party).’
c. Que a la fiesta, *(que) vengan mis padres.
   that to the party that come_3.PL-Subj. my parents
   ‘I insist again/somebody demands that my parents come to
   the party.’

The current analysis successfully captures the optionality of recomplementation *que* and the obligatoriness of “jussive/optative” *que*:

and embedded clauses. It may be that in cases other than the third-person, the subjunctive morphology is the embedded counterpart of the true imperative morphology exhibited in root cases (see González i Planas 2010), whereas third-person cases invariably involve subjunctive morphology in root and embedded environments. It may also be that cases involving persons other than the third-person have a different syntax for the speakers who accept sentences like (i), without the low *que*.

11 A question arises as to whether the obligatoriness of the lower complementizer *que* in embedded “jussive/optative” constructions (cf. (13a)) is limited to communication verbs such as decir ‘to say’ or repetir ‘to repeat,’ which do not inherently subcategorize for an embedded clause with a verb in subjunctive, or whether the low complementizer is also mandatory with predicates like pedir ‘to ask’ or ordenar ‘to order,’ which always take subjunctive complements with exhortative value and thus may not require realizing a lower *que* in order to lexicalize the subjunctive mood and mark the sentence as exhortative/desiderative. The judgments are not totally clear in this regard, though the version with lower *que* is still preferred in all cases.

(i) Pidió que a la fiesta *(que) vengan
   requested that to the party, that come_3.PL-Subj.
   ‘S/he demanded that they come to the party.’
on the one hand, recomplementation *que* functions as an optional topic marker heading TopicP (see § 3.3 and, especially, Villa-García forthcoming, in preparation, for evidence that recomplementation *que* can be deleted in PF). On the other hand, “jussive/optative” *que* is the lexical realization of the subjunctive mood in the head of FinitenessP, which is responsible for encoding finiteness and mood features. In this sense, note that for many speakers of English, complementizers in subjunctive sentences are obligatory (Hegarty 1992, *inter alia*):

(14)

a. The University requires *that* all students pay on time.

b. *The University requires all students pay on time.*

A final difference regarding the optionality vs. obligatoriness of the two complementizers at issue involves coordination structures. As the contrast between (15a) and (15b) shows, coordination at the level of recomplementation *que* does not require overt instances of *que* in the second and third conjuncts (cf. (15a)). By contrast, there is a strong preference for *que* to be present also in non-initial conjuncts in the case of “jussive/optative” patterns (cf. (15b)), which confirms that “jussive/optative” *que* lexically supports the subjunctive mood.

(15)

a. Dice que a él *(que)* lo llama, *(que)* le pica a la puerta

   says that him that cl. calls that cl. knocks to the door

   y *(que)* lo halaga.

   and that cl. flatters

   ‘S/he says that s/he calls him, knocks on his door, and flatters

   him.’

b. Dice que a él * *(que)* lo llamen, *(que)* le piquen a la

   says that to him that cl. call_{Subj.} that cl. knock_{Subj.} to the

   puerta y *(que)* lo halaguen.

   door and that cl. flatter_{Subj.}

   ‘S/he orders that they call him, knock on his door, and flatter

   him.’

In the next subsection, I discuss the different behavior of the two complementizers with respect to ellipsis possibilities, which in turn

---

12 See Fontana (1993: 234) and Wanner (1996, 1998) for evidence that recomplementation *que* was the unmarked option in Spanish texts from the 13th century to the 16th century.
supports the analysis currently pursued whereby recomplementation \textit{que} lexicalizes Topº and “jussive/optative” \textit{que} lexicalizes Finº.

### 3.3 Ellipsis

The novel data provided in this subsection point to a further difference between recomplementation \textit{que} and “jussive/optative” \textit{que}. Whereas the complement of recomplementation \textit{que} can be elided (cf. (16)), the complement of “jussive/optative” \textit{que} cannot, as shown in (17) (ellipsis is only licensed in (17) provided that no low \textit{que} occurs in the second conjunct. I return to this issue in due course).

(16) Me dijeron que si llueve (que) se quedan aquí, y que si nieva (que) también.

‘They told me that they are going to stay here if it rains or snows.’

(17)

a. ¡El tenedor,*\textit{(que)} lo cojan, y el cuchillo,*\textit{(que)} también!

‘I demand that they grab the fork, and the knife too.’

b. Dice Juana que el tenedor,*\textit{(que)} lo cojan, y que el cuchillo,*\textit{(que)} también.

‘Juana demands that they grab the fork, and the knife too.’

Lobeck (1990), Saito and Murasugi (1990), and Bošković (2008), among others, observe that functional heads can only license ellipsis of their complement when they undergo Spec-Head agreement (i.e., feature-checking), provided that other conditions on ellipsis are met. This generalization is illustrated for English by (18), where a non-split CP has been used for ease of exposition.
(18)

a. John liked somebody but I don’t know who.
   \[ \ldots [\mathcal{C} \text{ who}_1 (C^0 \text{ John liked who})] \checkmark \]

b. *John believes that Peter met you but I don’t think that.
   \[ \ldots [\mathcal{C} \text{ that}\text{ Peter met you}]] \times \]

In (18a), the null C head enters into a feature-checking relationship with who in its specifier (see Fukui and Speas 1986). Consequently, C° can license ellipsis (i.e., sluicing/TP-ellipsis) of its complement. However, in (18b), that does not have any constituent in its specifier with which to establish a Spec-Head agreement relationship, hence preventing it from licensing ellipsis of its complement. Given the Spec-Head agreement requirement on ellipsis, the analysis currently pursued straightforwardly explains the different behavior of recombination que and “jussive/optative” que with regard to ellipsis. Recomposition que in Top° enters into a Spec-Head relationship with the sandwiched dislocate in its specifier (i.e., Spec, TopicP). The two entities establish a feature-checking relationship and therefore ellipsis of the complement of secondary que can be effected, as shown in (19).

\[(19) \ldots y [\ldots \text{Force’ que } [\text{TopicP si nieva } [\text{Top’ que } \text{ se quedan aquí también}]]] \text{ (cf. (16))} \]

On the contrary, “jussive/optative” que is located in Fin°, whose specifier is empty, and therefore que does not establish an agreement relationship with any element in its specifier (i.e., Spec, FinitenessP). Not surprisingly, the complement of “jussive/optative” que cannot be elided, since the Spec-Head-agreement relationship requirement on ellipsis is not satisfied, as shown in (20), which includes relevant aspects of the derivation of (17a).

\[(20) *\ldots y \ldots [\text{TopicP el cuchillo } [\text{Top’ } \emptyset [\text{FinitenessP } [\text{Fin’ que } \text{ lo cojan también}]]]]] \]

Under any analysis that treats recombination que and “jussive/optative” que as the same item (e.g., as the head Fin°), the ellipsis facts brought to light in this paper would remain shrouded in mystery.

A possible question to ask at this juncture is why it would not be possible to have a derivation for sentences like (16) wherein the sandwiched dislocate establishes feature-checking with a lower left-peripheral head (e.g., Fin°), which would ultimately license ellipsis, and
then the sandwiched dislocate further moves and lands in Spec, TopicP. This analysis would in principle be compatible with recomplementation que heading FinitenessP:

\[(21) \ldots y [\ldots \text{For} \text{ } \text{que} [\text{TopP si llueve}_{i} \text{ [Top}\text{ } \emptyset [\text{FinP si llueve}_{i} \text{ Fin' que} \text{ se quedan aquí si llueve, también}]])]

However, the derivation in (21) cannot be the correct analysis of recomplementation sentences. First, in Villa-García (forthcoming, in preparation) I show that dislocates in recomplementation environments are derived by base-generation in their surface position, rather than by movement, since sandwiched dislocates do not exhibit reconstruction effects, unlike their counterparts without secondary que; and, in fact, secondary que induces an island/barrier for extraction (i.e., only constituents derived by base-generation can appear higher than the secondary complementizer). Second, if the dislocate si llueve first checked features with the head Fin⁰, it would be frozen in place, given the freezing effect of feature checking/criterial freezing (i.e., once a constituent establishes feature-checking, it is no longer available for further movement, since it is no longer active) (Bošković 2008, Rizzi 2006).¹³ Lastly, if the derivation in (21) were correct, the impossibility of eliding the complement of “jussive/optative” que would remain unaccounted for, since under the analysis in (21), FinitenessP que enters into a Spec-Head-feature-checking relationship with the moving constituent in its specifier. Thus, the account in (21), which treats recomplementation que and “jussive/optative” que as one and the same element (i.e., as the head of FinitenessP), makes the prediction that ellipsis of the complement of “jussive/optative” que should be possible on a par with ellipsis of the complement of secondary que. As shown in (17), however, this prediction is not borne out. More generally, the analysis in (21), which assumes that any low complementizer heads Fin⁰, fails to explain the various differences between the two complementizers presented in this paper.

The ellipsis facts just reviewed therefore further substantiate the conclusion that the complementizers in question are in fact different elements: recomplementation que lexicalizes the head position of TopicP and “jussive/optative” que lexicalizes the head position of FinitenessP. Before I conclude this subsection, a note regarding the possibility of ellipsis with null complementizers is in order. As shown by the optionality

¹³ See Bošković (2007) for evidence that successive-cyclic movement does not involve intermediate feature checking.
of recomplementation \textit{que} in (16), ellipsis is also possible if recomplementation \textit{que} is absent:

(22) Me dijeron que si llueve \(\emptyset\) se quedan aquí, y que si cl. said that if rains cl. stay here and that if nieva \(\emptyset\) también.
snows too
‘They told me that they are going to stay here if it rains or snows.’

Under the analysis currently pursued, (22) follows straightforwardly, since the null Topic head establishes a Spec-Head agreement relationship with the dislocate \textit{si nieva} in its specifier, as shown in (23).

(23) \ldots y [\ldots \text{Force} \textit{que} \left[ \Top \emptyset \textit{si nieva} \Top \emptyset \textit{se quedan aquí también} \right]]

The example in (22) confirms the claim made in § 3.2. that recomplementation \textit{que} is optional. In Villa-García (forthcoming, in preparation), I show that the null complementizer in (22) is the non-overt counterpart of recomplementation \textit{que}, which is deleted in PF, along the lines of Chomsky and Lasnik’s (1977) account of optional \textit{that} in English, according to which \textit{that} has been deleted when it does not surface in examples such as \textit{John thinks Bill is smart}. Given this, ellipsis is licensed by the same element in both (16) and (22), namely overt (\textit{que}) or null (\(\emptyset\)) recomplementation \textit{que}.¹⁴ Turning now to the possibility of ellipsis with null complementizers in the case of “jussive/optative” clauses, the “jussive/optative” examples in (17) become grammatical if the low \textit{que} is absent in the second conjunct, as shown by example (24), which is the counterpart of (17a) without the low \textit{que} in the second conjunct.

¹⁴ Note that ellipsis in the context at hand is not limited to adjuncts such as \textit{si llueve}; it can also be effected with unambiguous accusative/direct object topics (i.e., cases of CLLD, resumed by a clitic), with and without recomplementation \textit{que}, as illustrated in (i).

(i) Dice que a María, (que) no la llamaron, y que a Valentín, (que) tampoco says that Mary that not cl. called, and that Valentín that neither ‘S/he said that they didn’t call either Mary or Valentín.’
(24) ¡El tenedor, *que, lo cojan, y el fork that cl. grab_3.PL-Subj. and the cuchillo, también!
      knife too
      ‘I demand that they grab the fork, and the knife too.’

This example can be accounted for under the analysis proposed in this paper, since the null Topic head enters into a Spec-Head agreement relationship with el cuchillo (in much the same way as in (22)), which enables it to license ellipsis of its complement (which happens to include “jussive/optative” *que), as illustrated in (25).

(25) … y [Force’ ∅ [[TopicP [el cuchillo [Top’ ∅ [[FinitenessP’ [Fin’ que] lo cojan también]]]]]]]

The question which immediately arises is why the Topic head in the second conjunct (cf. (24/25)) cannot be lexically realized. Although I will leave this issue open here, a possible explanation would be to assume that realizing recomplementation *que only in the second conjunct, but not in the first one (with “jussive/optative” *que appearing in the first conjunct), would violate the parallelism requirement on ellipsis (*… XP *que … y … XP *que …).

To summarize, the novel ellipsis facts presented here confirm the correctness of the analysis currently pursued, according to which the head of TopicP –overt or null recomplementation que– establishes a Spec-Head-agreement relationship with the sandwiched dislocate in its specifier, which enables que to license ellipsis of its complement. On the other hand, the head of FinitenessP, “jussive/optative” que, does not enter into an agreement relationship with a constituent in its specifier, which prevents que from licensing ellipsis of its complement. That recomplementation que and the sandwiched dislocate establish a feature-checking relationship (where the features involved are likely to be Topic features in the sense of Rizzi 1997) in turn further supports the conclusion reached in § 3.1 that recomplementation que (in Top*) is contingent on the appearance of a topic/dislocate in its specifier, unlike “jussive/optative” que. This conclusion will be corroborated in §§ 3.4 and 3.5, where it is shown that only topic-like elements (vs. foci) can appear in the position sandwiched between overt complementizers.

---

15 See also fn. 6 for the impossibility of *que que sequences.
3.4 The distribution of medial and low complementizers and left dislocations

The preceding discussion shows that dislocated phrases can appear higher than the complementizers under discussion (i.e., both \( \text{XP}_{\text{dislocate}} \text{que} \) and \( \text{XP}_{\text{dislocate}} \text{que} \) configurations are possible). The question arises as to whether dislocated phrases can follow the complementizers in question.

As far as recomplementation \textit{que} is concerned, the data in (26) show that dislocated phrases are licit in post-recomplementation-\textit{que} position (Martín-González 2002).

(26) Me dijeron que \textit{a la fiesta}, (\textit{que} \textit{si llueve}, no van a ir.  
\textit{cl. said} \textit{that to the party that if rains not go to go}  
\textit{‘They told me that they are not going to the party if it rains.’}

With respect to “jussive/optative” \textit{que}, however, a different picture emerges:

(27) a. ?*\textit{Que a la fiesta} no vayan mis hijos \textit{si llueve.}  
\textit{that to the party not go} \textit{3.PL-Subj. my children if rains}  
\textit{‘I demand that my children not go to the party if it rains.’}

\[\text{16}\] According to examples like (27a), there seems to be a dialectal split. Most speakers agree that (27a) is ungrammatical or at least outdated; instead, they find equivalent sentences with the constituent \textit{a la fiesta} in front of \textit{que} in (27a) perfectly grammatical. For some speakers, though, (27a) sounds unnatural, but not ungrammatical. Incidentally, as far as I can tell, most of the speakers who marginally accept sentences like (27a) are bilingual speakers of Catalan and Spanish. At this point, I am not in a position to determine whether any properties of Catalan are relevant here (see the work of Francesc González i Planas for discussion). Be that as it may, a preliminary suggestion would be that for those speakers who allow (27a), the locus of subjunctive features may be the highest projection in the split CP (i.e., ForceP), and not the lowest (i.e., FinitenessP). Another possibility is that (27a) is being interpreted as a report, and that \textit{que} is a quotative marker that is realizing multiple left-peripheral functions (see fn. 7). I leave this issue open for further research.
b. ??*Dice que a la fiesta *que si llueve no vayan mis hijos. 

‘S/he demands that my children not go to the party if it rains.’

The data in (26) and (27) indicate that while recompementation que can be preceded and followed by dislocated phrases, “jussive/optative” que can readily be preceded, but not followed, by dislocated phrases. The patterns that arise are schematized in (28).

(28)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{XP} > \text{que} > \text{XP} \\
\text{b. } & \text{XP} > \text{que} > \text{ que } > \text{XP}
\end{align*}
\]

Under the current analysis (cf. (3) and (5)), the distribution of the two complementizers follows straightforwardly. Recomplementation que is optional and heads TopicP, which Rizzi (1997) has independently argued is a recursive phrase (in fact, see § 3.7 for further evidence to this effect in light of the iteration of recompementation que). In (26), therefore, the low dislocate si llueve is in the specifier of the low TopicP, whose head is null, as shown in (29).

(29)

\[
\text{… [ForceP [Force' que [Top' que [Top' a la fiesta [Top' que [Top' si llueve [Top' que/[O] … [FinitenessP [Fin' …]]]]]]]]]
\]

“Jussive/optative” que, for its part, is the head of FinitenessP; the current analysis accounts for the fact that dislocates cannot follow “jussive/optative” que (cf. (27)), given that Finº marks the lower bound of the left periphery (i.e., there is no lower left-peripheral position capable of hosting dislocated phrases):\(^{17}\)

\(^{17}\) It would in principle be possible to assume that Spec, TP, which is projected immediately below Finº, can host dislocated phrases in its specifier, as has been argued by a number of authors (e.g., Zubizarreta 1999). However, the data at hand show that this conclusion cannot be correct, since dislocated phrases are ungrammatical below “jussive/optative” que (see also the next subsection for the impossibility of foci to occur after “jussive/optative” que). In fact, in Villa-García (in press) I show that only a genuine lexical subject can occur between “jussive/optative” que and the subjunctive verb, which strongly suggests that Spec,
In the following subsection, I discuss the distribution of the two complementizers with respect to foci.

### 3.5 The distribution of medial and low complementizers and foci

As noted in passing and as discussed in detail in Villa-García (forthcoming), secondary complementizers in Spanish induce an island/barrier for extraction. Thus, only elements derived by base-generation (rather than movement) in their surface position can appear higher than said complementizers. Consequently, only dislocated phrases, which can be derived either by base-generation or by movement (Martín-González 2002; Villa-García forthcoming, in preparation) can appear to the left of medial or low complementizers. It follows that constituents such as foci and *wh*-items, which are standardly assumed to be derived by movement, cannot precede the complementizers at issue, as the following data illustrate, where upper-case letters indicate focus.

(31)

a. *Dicen que A LA FIESTA que van (, no al circo).
   ‘They say that TO THE PARTY that go (, not to +the circus)’

b. *¡SI LLUEVE que vengan (, no si nieva)!
   ‘I demand that they come here if it rains, not if it snows.’

The “islandhood” of recomplementation *que* and “jussive/optative” *que* thus prevents a moved constituent from appearing higher than said complementizers. Note, similarly, that foci would also be ungrammatical in Spec, TopicP due to a featural mismatch (see § 3.3 for evidence that the constituent in Spec, TopicP and Topº undergo feature-checking). The next question concerns whether foci can appear below the complementizers under consideration. In much the same way as in the case of left-dislocated phrases discussed in the preceding subsection, only recomplementation *que* can be followed by foci:

---

TP is actually a dedicated subject position in Spanish, contrary to what has often been assumed in the literature.
Dicen que mañana, que SÓLO A LA FIESTA van a ir. ‘They say that tomorrow they are going only to the party.’

*¡Que SÓLO SI LLUEVE vengan! ‘I demand that they come here only if it rains.’

The distributional patterns gathered in this subsection can be summarized as follows:

(33)

a. *XP-focus > que-recomplementation > XP-focus
b. *XP-focus > que-"jussive/optative" > *XP-focus

This state of affairs is accounted for under the current analysis (cf. (34)), since recomplementation *que* heads TopicP. In Rizzi’s architecture of the left periphery, TopicP can be followed by FocusP (i.e., the position targeted by focused constituents), which captures the grammaticality of (32a). “Jussive/optative” *que*, in contrast, lexicalizes Finitenessº, which means that there is no low FocusP below FinitenessP capable of hosting focused phrases (see also fn. 17). Recall that the impossibility of having focused phrases to the left of both complementizers stems from the “islandhood” of said complementizers.

(34)

a. [ForceP[Force’ que [TopicP LD [Top’ que [FocusP FOCUS [Foc’ Ø [FinitenessP [Fin’ [TP …]))]]]]]
b. [ForceP[Force’ Ø [TopicP LD [Top’ [FinitenessP [Fin’ que [TP …))]]]]]

The data just reviewed provide additional evidence that the analysis proposed in this paper is on the right track.

---

18 The reader is referred to Villa-García (forthcoming, in preparation), among many others, for evidence that recomplementation *que* can also be followed by exclamative particles, wh-items, and interrogative complementizers, in accordance with Rizzi’s analysis, as illustrated in (i).

(i) Me preguntó que a Marfa, que cuándo la conociste cl. asked that Mary that when cl. met ‘S/he asked me when you met Mary.’
3.6 Clitic placement in Asturian

The account of the Spanish complementizer system proposed in this paper makes an interesting prediction regarding clitic placement. As is known, present-day Spanish invariably exhibits preverbal clitics (i.e., proclitics) in finite contexts, postverbal clitics (i.e., enclitics) being confined to gerundival, infinitival, and imperative forms. However, Fernández-Rubiera (2009) has shown that in Asturian, a related West Iberian Romance variety, both preverbal and postverbal clitics are attested in finite contexts. More concretely, in Asturian, clauses with embedded topicalization display enclisis (the example in (35) builds on data reported in Fernández-Rubiera 2009):

(35) Xulio cree que nes moces de Mieres enfótase tou Dios.
Julio believes that in girls of Mieres trusts+cl. all god
‘Julio believes that everybody trusts girls from Mieres.’

Following much work on clitics in Romance (cf. Benincà 2006; Fernández-Rubiera 2009; Lema and Rivero 1991; Raposo and Uriagereka 2005; Uriagereka 1995a,b; among many others), I assume that enclisis results from the verb undergoing Tº-to-Cº/Finº movement (specific technical details being immaterial to the discussion at hand), with the clitic located in a position below the final landing site of the verb, as shown in (36), which illustrates the (simplified) derivation of (35).19,20

(36) … que [TopicP LD [Top’ [FinP [Fin’ enfotai TP [T’ se enfotai …]]]]]]

Although it is not totally clear that Asturian (in particular, Conservative Asturian) displays recombination patterns (see Fernández-Rubiera 2009 for relevant discussion), as far as I can see, (37) is only slightly degraded.

19 For alternative proposals, see Barbosa (1995, 2000) and Franks (1998), inter alia.
20 As Fernández-Rubiera (2009) shows, the status of the clitic (e.g., reflexive or pronominal) has no bearing on its placement possibilities. Note also that the exact position of the clitic need not concern us here; yet, Fernández-Rubiera argues that clitics are located in CliticP, projected between Finº and TP. In the derivations furnished in the main text, I place clitics in TP for ease of exposition.
(37) ?Xulio cree que nes moces de Mieres que enfóta tou
Julio believes that in girls of Mieres that trust+cl. all
god
‘Julio believes that everybody trusts girls from Mieres.’

Under the analysis proposed in this paper, the possibility of T^o-to-Fin^o movement (i.e., enclisis) is expected, since secondary que is located in Top^o, with the low left-peripheral Fin^o head available to host the verb enfota:

(38) \[ \text{[ForceP}\{\text{Force' que [TopicP LD [Top' que [FinitenessP [Fin' enfota_i [TP [T' se enfota_i ...]]]]]]] \} \] (cf. (37))

Now, the current analysis predicts that if Fin^o is realized lexically, verb movement to the left-periphery should be impossible, since the lowest left-peripheral head would be lexically filled, prohibiting verb movement, and thus enclisis should not obtain. The relevant context is provided by “jussive/optative” sentences headed by que, which, I argue, heads FinitenessP. As shown by the Asturian data in (39), this prediction is correct.

(39)[Asturian]

a. *Nes moces de Mieres, que enfóte tou Dios.
in girls of Mieres that trust^3.SG-Subj.+cl. all god
b. Nes moces de Mieres, que se enfote tou Dios.
in girls of Mieres that cl. trust^3.SG-Subj. all god
‘I demand that everybody trust girls from Mieres.’
c. *Repítote que nes moces de Mieres, que enfóte
repeat that in girls of Mieres that trust^3.SG-Subj.+cl.
tou Dios.
all god
d. Repítote que nes moces de Mieres, que se enfote
repeat that in girls of Mieres that cl. trust^3.SG-Subj.
tou Dios.
all god
‘I insist again that everybody trust girls from Mieres.’

Examples (39a) and (39c) indicate that enclisis is banned both in root and embedded “jussive/optative” contexts in Asturian, with proclisis
occurring in both root and embedded environments (cf. (39b,d)). This state of affairs comes as no surprise under the current analysis: given that the lowest left-peripheral head (i.e., Finº) is occupied by the lexical complementizer que, the verb cannot move to the CP domain, which explains why enclisis cannot occur in (39a,c). Put differently, in “jussive/optative” constructions in Asturian, the verb has to stay in the inflectional layer, since que occupies Finº, with the resulting clitic + verb word order (cf. (39b,d)). Illustrative derivations of (*39c) and (39d) are shown in (40) and (41), respectively.

(40) *… [ForceP [Force’ que [TopicP LD [Top’ [FinitenessP [Fin’ que enfotei [TP [T’ se enfotei …]]]]]]]] (cf. (*39c))
(41) … [ForceP [Force’ que [TopicP LD [Top’ [FinitenessP [Fin’ que [TP [T’ se enfotei …]]]]]]] (cf. (39d))

Therefore, I conclude that the clitic placement facts in Asturian further back up the analysis defended in this paper: recomplementation que heads TopicP, which allows the verb to raise to the lower left-peripheral head Finº, and thus the clitic can appear postverbally; “jussive/optative” que, on the contrary, heads FinitenessP, which prevents movement of the verb to the CP domain, and thus the clitic has to appear preverbally. The Asturian data just reviewed actually provide crosslinguistic evidence in support of the account proposed in this paper, which is corroborated by the Spanish facts to be presented in the next subsections.

### 3.7 Complementizer iteration

Returning now to Spanish, an additional difference between recomplementation que and “jussive/optative” que is that whereas the former can iterate (i.e., there can be more than one occurrence of recomplementation que per sentence) (cf. (42a)) (Escribano 1991, Rodríguez-Ramalle 2003, Mascarenhas 2007, among others), the latter cannot (cf. (42b)) (González i Planas 2010).

---

21. It is important to emphasize that the strong ungrammaticality of (39a,c) stands in glaring contrast to the acceptability of (37).
22. The reader is referred to Fernández-Rubiera (2009: Ch. 3, fn. 20) for evidence that subjunctive complement clauses generally disallow enclisis in Asturian, consistent with the analysis pursued here.
This asymmetry between recomplementation *que* and “jussive/optative” *que* immediately follows under the analysis pursued here, since TopicP is a recursive phrase, whereas FinitenessP is not (see Rizzi 1997):

The possibility of having multiple instances of recomplementation *que* but only one instance of “jussive/optative” *que* therefore lends further credence to the TopicP analysis of recomplementation *que* and the FinitenessP analysis of “jussive/optative” *que* proposed in this paper.

### 3.8 Co-occurrence of complementizers

The analysis proposed in this paper predicts that, in principle, recomplementation *que* and “jussive/optative” *que* should be able to appear in the same sentence, since they realize distinct functional heads in the CP domain. Crucially, this prediction is borne out by the data in (44).

Dicen que, entonces, *(que)* *(TopP)* cuando llame Juan, *(que)* *(FinP)*
say that then that when calls John that
vengan Mikel y María a mi casa.
Mikel and Mary to my place
‘They demand that Mikel and Mary then come to my place when John calls.’
As (44) shows, the medial complementizer following the dislocate *entonces* can be omitted, which is consistent with it being an instance of TopicP/recomplementation *que*. However, the lowest complementizer cannot be dropped, which, coupled with the presence of the subjunctive verb and the exhortative meaning of the sentence, strongly points to the conclusion that this is an instance of “jussive/optative” *que*. The order of elements is exactly as predicted by our analysis: recomplementation *que* (in TopicP) is higher than “jussive/optative” *que* (in FinitenessP), as illustrated in (45).

\[(45) \text{[ForceP [Force' que [TopP LD [Top' que [TopP LD [Top' \emptyset [FinP [Fin' que …]]]]]]]]}\]

The data in (44) provide additional evidence for the analysis proposed in this paper, as well as for the existence of two distinct secondary complementizers in Spanish, namely medial, recomplementation *que* and low, “jussive/optative” *que*.

### 4. Conclusion

I have argued that recomplementation *que* and “jussive/optative” *que* should not be treated as the same (low) complementizer in Spanish, despite their homophony and sometimes overlapping distribution. What seem to be instances of the same element (cf. (1a,b)) actually constitute distinct complementizers occupying different left-peripheral heads and displaying different distributional and syntactic behavior. Following Rizzi’s (1997 et seq.) architecture of the CP domain, I have proposed that recomplementation *que* is a medial complementizer in the head of TopicP, and thus a topic marker, while “jussive/optative” *que* is a low complementizer in the head of FinitenessP, and thus the lexical realization of the subjunctive mood. In support of this hypothesis, I have drawn a systematic comparison between recomplementation *que* and “jussive/optative” *que*, and shown that (i) whereas recomplementation *que* depends on the presence of a sandwiched dislocate, “jussive/optative” *que* does not; (ii) whereas recomplementation *que* is typically optional, “jussive/optative” *que* is not; (iii) whereas recomplementation *que* can license ellipsis of its complement, “jussive/optative” *que* cannot; (iv) whereas recomplementation *que* can both precede and follow left-dislocated topics, “jussive/optative” *que* can follow, but normally not precede, left-dislocated topics; (v) whereas recomplementation *que* can be followed by foci, “jussive/optative” *que* cannot; (vi) whereas in Asturian,
recomplementation-que clauses allow enclisis, sentences involving “jussive/optative” que only allow proclisis; (vii) whereas recomplementation que can iterate, “jussive/optative” que cannot; and (viii) recomplementation que and “jussive/optative” que can co-occur in the same clause, with recomplementation que preceding “jussive/optative” que.

I have shown that all these differences can be accounted for, and in fact receive a uniform account, under the analysis presented in this paper, shown in arboreal form in (46). The current analysis in turn provides further support for Rizzi’s split-CP system, which accounts for the Spanish facts without further stipulation. The different behavior and distribution of the distinct complementizers brought to light in this paper argues against existing accounts of secondary complementizers that treat recomplementation que and “jussive/optative” que as heading the same projection. 23 Overall, the data presented in this paper confirm the need for a highly articulated left periphery in Spanish, and suggest that the proposed analysis may also be extendable to other Western Iberian Romance languages such as Asturian.

(46) Spanish recomplementation que and “jussive/optative” que.

\[
\text{... TopicP} \\
\text{LD} \quad \text{Top'} \\
\text{que} \quad \text{FinitenessP} \\
\text{Fin'} \quad \text{que} \\
\text{TP} \quad \text{...}
\]

23 Note that the distributional evidence adduced in this paper strongly argues even against analyses that assume different feature specifications of functional heads (with recomplementation que and “jussive/optative” que being the lexical realization of different features of the same head).
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