

**ON FACTIVITY:
SPECULATIONS ON THE SPLIT-CP IN UPPER SOUTHERN ITALIAN DIALECTS ***

Valentina Colasanti (vc314@cam.ac.uk)

1. INTRODUCTION

In his classification of complementiser systems in southern Italian dialects, Rohlfs (1969: 190) differentiates the varieties spoken in the extreme South (i.e. extreme southern Italian dialects, henceforth ESIDs) from the ones spoken in the upper South (i.e. upper southern Italian dialects, henceforth USIDs). In the ESIDs, we see dual complementiser systems: *ca* (< Lat. QUIA; cf. 1a) and *mu/ma/mi* (< Lat. MODO; cf. 1b) or *cu* (< Lat. QUOD; cf. 1c). While *ca* introduces declarative complements (traditionally marked with the indicative), *mu/ma/mi* (Calabria and Sicilia regions) and *cu* (Salento) introduce irrealis complements (usually marked with the subjunctive).

- (1) a. *pensu ca vèni*¹
I-think that s/he-come.3SG.IND
'I think that s/he will come' southern Calabria (Rohlfs 1969: 190)
- b. *ògghiu mi mancia*
I-want that s/he-eat.3SG.SUBJ
'I want that s/he should eat' Messina (Rohlfs 1969: 190)
- c. *tie comu faci cu lu sai?*
You how do that SCL you-know.2SG.IND
'How do you know that?' Lecce (Rohlfs 1969: 190)

On the other hand, the USIDs are said to exhibit only dual complementiser systems, in which *ca* (< Lat. QUIA; cf. 2a) introduces indicative complements in realis/declarative contexts and *chə/che/chi* (< Lat. QUID; cf. 2b) selects subjunctive complements in irrealis/volitive contexts (cf. Rohlfs 1969, 1983; Ledgeway 2000, 2003 *inter alia*).

- (2) a. *chəsta sə nə pənti ca i era pətutə chəllə*
this-one self CL repented that CL she-was asked that
'She regretted having asked her for it'
- b. *i risse n'auta vota chə se fussedə rəcurdata*
CL he-said another time that CL she-was reminded
'He told her again that she should not forget' Arpino (Battisti 1914: 102)

This research is funded by the *Graduate Scholars' Scholarship*, St John's College, Cambridge (October 2015-September 2018). I would like to thank Adam Ledgeway for his extremely helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper. I am also grateful to Craig Sailor for his very helpful suggestions and feedback on this paper. Any errors are the responsibility of the author.

¹ In this paper, translations of examples are provided only when the meaning is not understandable from glosses.

Following Rizzi's (1997; see also Benincà and Poletto 2004) postulation of the fine structure of the left periphery, data from southern Italian dialects have been crucial for mapping the articulated structure of the clausal domain (see among others Ledgeway 2000, 2003, 2005; Paoli 2003, 2007; Vecchio 2006; Damonte 2006, 2008; Cruschina 2012).

In this paper, I present new data from earlier and modern varieties of the USID of Ferentino (henceforth Ferentines)² which exhibit a triple complementiser system,³ contradicting earlier classifications of USIDs as uniformly employing dual systems (Rohlf's 1969: 190; Tekavčić 1980: 446).

Four particular factors prove to be significant in capturing the distribution of different complementisers in Italo-Romance: the semantics of the selecting matrix verb (i.e. declarative vs. volitive vs. factive), mood (i.e. an overt morphological expression of modality; e.g. indicative/subjunctive opposition), modality (i.e. realis, irrealis and factive) and the fine structure of the complement clause's left periphery. Below, I show how each of these factors bears on the composition of Ferentinese's triple complementiser system. Finally, assuming a rich and articulated left periphery of the sentence I will show how specific kind of modality can be encoded in specific functional heads.

2. MODALITY

2.1. Morphosyntactic modality encoding within the split-CP

In order to explore the hypothesis that complementisers in Ferentinese (and more generally in Italo-Romance) are distributed on the basis of modality marking within the CP, we briefly present below relevant terms, labels, and definitions relating to our understanding and discussion of modality.

Modality is related to the speaker's judgement of the proposition, including a qualification of the action expressed by the predicate, which itself can be realis, factive or irrealis (Colasanti in prog.).

In fact, within propositional modality (Bybee & Fleischmann 1995) or the 'semantics of embedding' (Kratzer 2013) it has been demonstrated that the grammatical labels realis and irrealis are insufficient (Palmer 1986). In what follows we will assume another type of propositional modality, namely factive modality, which is related to the speaker's judgement/perspective on the truth value of the proposition.

Following Palmer (1986, 2001), realis modality is based on the speaker's belief about the reality of the proposition and does not particularly commit him/her to the truth of the proposition. Irrealis modality indicates that a certain situation or action has not happened at the time of utterance. Factive modality is linked to the speaker's judgement about the truth of the proposition (Palmer 2001:8). Finally, Palmer (1986) argues that the declarative denotes factivity. *Pace* Palmer (1986, 2001; see also Bybee 1985), in this paper factivity is not taken to be a part of the meaning covered by realis modality. This is because it shows different morphosyntactic behaviours: e.g., factive verbs/complements behave differently from declarative verbs/complements, and different complementiser forms expressing different modalities occupy different syntactic positions within the split-CP in Ferentinese.

² Data from modern Ferentinese were elicited by the author in 2015 through questionnaires (grammaticality judgments, translations and free speeches). Data from earlier Ferentinese are taken from eight texts written during the 19th and 20th centuries (see *Textual Resources*, p. 15).

³ See also early Salentino in Ledgeway 2005:367-77.

The general idea here is that modality can be grammatically encoded in different languages in different ways and within different domains (e.g. the clausal and verbal domains). We will assume that modality can be marked in Romance not only within the verbal domain (i.e. grammatical mood) but also within the discourse domain (i.e. CP). In embedded contexts modality marking in Romance can be shared between the matrix verb, the complementiser and the embedded predicate. In this paper an interaction between the clausal domain and the verbal domain in terms of modality marking will be assumed. However, specific morphosyntactic mechanisms involved in modality marking will be not taken into consideration (for a more detailed analysis see Colasanti, in progress). In this paper we will focus mainly on the morphosyntactic encoding of modality within the CP. Specifically, modality seems to play a significant role in complementiser selection in Italo-Romance.

In what follows I will assume that the presence of a specific complementiser form is related to a specific functional C head that can host different kind of features (e.g. finite, non-finite) but most importantly for our discussion, modality features (i.e. realis, factive, irrealis). On the basis of data from Earlier Ferentinese triple complementiser system, the three complementiser forms can be linked, for instance, to three different kind of modality: realis (*che*), factive (*ca*) and irrealis (*cu*).

2.2. Distinguishing three types of modality

With these fundamental specifications in place, on the basis of morphosyntactic evidence especially from Romance but also from other languages (cf. Modern Greek, Calabrian Greko, etc.), we shall make clear certain facts which are linked to the postulation of different kinds of modality presented above. Specifically, we will (i) link different types of modality to three different kinds of matrix verbs (i.e. SAY-verbs, REGRET-verbs and WANT-verbs) and three different modality features (i.e. realis, factive and irrealis); (ii) highlight that modality marking is shared between the matrix verb, the complementiser and the embedded verb on the basis of diachronic (e.g. Latin, early Italo-Romance) and synchronic evidence (e.g. Modern Greek, Romanian); (iii) show the difference between factive and declarative complements in Ferentinese.

First, we link the different kinds of modality above (i.e. realis, factive, irrealis) to specific kinds of sentence-types (i.e. declarative, factive, volitive), which also strongly dependent on the semantics of the matrix verb (i.e. SAY-verb, REGRET-verb, WANT-verb types). Declarative clauses are expression of realis modality, namely when the action expressed by the proposition is considered by the speaker real but does not particularly commit him/her to the truth of the proposition. The verbs related to declarative clauses are SAY-verbs such as *say*, *believe*, *assert*, *think*, etc. (see Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1970; Hooper & Thompson 1973 1975). Volitive sentences express irrealis modality, namely when the action expressed by the proposition is not considered realised by the speaker. These sentences rely on specific WANT-predicates, such as *want*, *desire*, etc. Factive sentences are linked with the factive modality and convey truth values or speaker knowledge about the proposition. These sentences are introduced by REGRET-verbs such as *regret*, *know*, *like*, etc. More generally, a factive predicate presupposes the truth of its complement, according to Kiparsky & Kiparsky's (1970) classification (see also Hooper & Thompson 1973 for the difference between true factives and semi-factives). In many languages, then, we might conclude that there is more than one sentential complement type, which is usually related to a specific selecting matrix verb.

Table 1. Three types of modality

| Matrix verb-type | Sentence-type | Modality-type |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| SAY-verbs (e.g. <i>say, believe, think, assert, etc.</i>) | declarative | realis |
| REGRET-verbs (e.g. <i>regret, know, like, etc.</i>) | factive | factive |
| WANT-verbs (e.g. <i>want, wish, desire, etc.</i>) | volitive | irrealis |

Secondly, in Romance the contrast between indicative and subjunctive mood is linked to different kinds of modality. Following Noonan (2007; see also Quer 2009, 2016) while declarative and factive verbs usually select a sentential complement which contains indicative morphology, volitive verbs usually embed complements with subjunctive morphology. Indicative and subjunctive forms are said to differ in mood. Indicative-subjunctive distinctions in complementation are attested in a number of language families. For instance, in Romanian, both the mood of the embedded clause (viz. indicative vs. subjunctive) and the complementiser (viz. *că* and *să*) can differ (3). As we can see different languages show different strategies of modality marking, which are mainly shared between the matrix verb, the complementiser and the embedded verb.

- (3) a. Spune **că** citește o carte
I-say that I-read the book
b. Vrea **să** citească o carte
I-want that we-read.SUBJ the book Romanian

Moreover, many other languages (like Earlier Ferentinese) show the presence of a specific complementiser restricted to introducing factive complements. For instance, in Modern Greek, factive complements are introduced by *pu* (4a), declaratives are introduced by *oti* (4b), and irrealis complements by *na* (cf. 4c; see Roussou 1992, 2010; Nicholas 1998):

- (4) a. thimame **pu** se sinandisa stin aghora
remember-1SG that you-met.1SG at the-market
'I remember that I met you at the market'
b. pistevo **oti** elise to provlima
believe.1SG that solved.3SG the problem
'I believe that he solved the problem'
c. thelo **na** ertheis
I-want that you-come
'I want that you come' Modern Greek

The postulation of three different kinds of modality also has historical motivations. For example, Latin shows only limited use of overt complementisers (Maiden 1995; Salvi 2004; Ledgeway 2012), whereas a more complete complementiser system developed with the rise of the Romance languages. Leaving aside infinitival complementation, in Late Latin there were at least three finite complementisers, namely QUOD, QUIA and UT (with negative counterpart NE). The latter occurs with verbs of ordering, causing, avoidance or prevention, whereas the former was originally a relative pronoun meaning 'the fact that', 'with regard to the fact that', and hence 'because'. In addition to QUOD, QUIA 'because' was also employed as a complementiser but only in late varieties of Latin. UT is extinct in Romance, and in Late Latin was already being supplanted by QUOD, which in turn is supplanted in most Romance varieties

by reflexes of QUID such as Italian *che*, Castilian/French *que* (Maiden 1995:206). As witnessed in (5) it seems that in Late Latin the complementiser QUIA is selected by SAY-verbs such as *credo* ‘to believe’ (5a), QUOD by REGRET-verbs such as *doleo* ‘to hurt’ (5b) and UT by WANT-verbs, such as *volo* ‘to want’ (5c):

- (5) a. Dixi **quia**_{realis} mustella comedit
I-said that the weasel ate (them)
b. Doleo **quod**_{factive} fecit male
I-regret that he-did damage
c. Volo **ut**_{irrealis} venias
I-want that you-come
- Latin

Moreover, it is important here to take into consideration the first written attestation of Italo-Romance (leaving aside the *Indovinello veronese*), namely the *Placito* (960):

- (6) Sao **ko** kelle terre, per kelle fini que ki contene, trenta anni le possette
I-know that those lands for those confines that here contains thirty year them possessed
parte sancti Benedicti
party saint.OBL Benedict.OBL
'I know that, those lands, within those borders which are contained here [in the document/map before me], have belonged for thirty years to the part [= monastery] of St. Benedict [of Montecassino]'

As argued by Ledgeway (2009: 864), strangely the matrix predicate *sao* ‘I-know’ selects an indicative clause introduced by the complementiser *ko*, which is not a reflex from QUIA, as we expected, but from QUOD, which was confused and used interchangeably along with reflexes from QUID (Rohlf's 1969: 188; 1983: 148). However, *sao* is a factive matrix predicate and maybe the distribution of the complementiser *ko* is not so surprising. In fact, it seems that the REGRET-verb *sao* ‘to know’ is exactly selecting the expected factive complementiser *ko* (< QUOD_{factive}; cf. 5b). *Pace* Rohlf's (1969:188) it seems that in the *Placito* reflexes from QUIA have been not confused. Reflexes from QUOD_{factive} should be, in fact, expected in factive contexts, namely selected by REGRET-verbs.

Finally, it seems that diachronic evidence from Late Latin and early Italo-Romance demonstrates that there is a strong relation between the semantics of the matrix verb and complementiser selection. In Late Latin can be highlighted three different kind of modality (i.e. realis, irrealis and factive), which corrisponds to three different complementiser forms, namely QUIA_{realis}, QUOD_{factive}, UT/NE_{irrealis}. This matches exactly what happens in the Southern Lazio variety of Earlier Ferentinese.

2.2.1. Factive vs. declarative complements in Ferentinese

In order to analyse how factivity works in Ferentinese it is important to demonstrate that, while *dì* ‘to say’, *pensà* ‘to think’, *credà* ‘to believe’ can be considered declarative verbs in Ferentinese (hence SAY-verbs), *sapè* ‘to know’, *dispiacersà* ‘to regret’, *ricordà* ‘to remember’ can be considered factive verbs (hence REGRET-verbs). From a syntactic point of view REGRET-verbs behave differently from SAY-verbs (Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1970).

First of all, while the the truth of the embedded proposition cannot be negated (cf. 7b), the truth of declarative ones can (cf. 7a):

- (7) a. So dittu / pensatu / credutu ca gliu palazzu era cadutu, ma n' era veru
 I-am said thought believed that the building was fallen but not was true
 b. *So saputu / mu dispiaci / mu su recurdatu ca gliu palazzu era
 I-am known to-me I-regret to-me I-am remembered that the building was
 cadutu, ma n' era veru
 fallen but not was true

Every REGRET-verb has the possibility of introducing its complement directly or by means of a NP/DP *gliu fattu* 'the fact' (cf. 8b). This is not possible for SAY-verbs (cf. 8a):

- (8) a. * Dicu/pensu/mu credu gliu fattu ca Gianni a rubbatu
 I-say think to-me I-believe the fact that John has stolen
 b. Sacciu/mu dispiaci / mu recordu gliu fattu ca Gianni a rubbatu
 I-know to-me I-regret to-me I-remember the fact that John has stolen

It is well-known that in several languages (e.g. English; 9) complement clauses selected by factive verbs are considered to be islands with respect to some extraction phenomena (cf. a.o. Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1970; Cinque 1990; De Cuba 2007; Haegeman & Ürögdi 2010). Modern Ferentinese behaves the same way: while extraction of complements from declarative predicates is generally allowed (cf. 10), extraction from factive complements is not always allowed (cf. 11). Moreover, we can see the generalisation of the complementiser *ca* in Modern Ferentinese to factive and declarative sentences, as I show below.

(9) English

- | | | |
|----|--|------------|
| a. | What do you think (that) John stole __? | COMPLEMENT |
| b. | Where do you think John came from __? | COMPLEMENT |
| c. | Who do you think __ stole the cookies? | SUBJECT |
| d. | Why do you think that John stole the cookies __? | ADJUNCT |
| e. | What do you remember/deny that John stole __? | COMPLEMENT |
| f. | Where do you remember/deny that John came from __? | COMPLEMENT |
| g. | * Who do you remember/deny __ stole the cookies? | SUBJECT |
| h. | # Why do you remember/deny that John stole the cookies __? | ADJUNCT |

(10) Extraction from declaratives is generally allowed in Modern Ferentinese:

- | | | |
|----|---|------------|
| a. | Chə stai a dì ca Gianni s' a rubbatu? who stay to say that John CL has stolen | COMPLEMENT |
| b. | 'Ndà 'ndò dici ca Giuagni uè? from where you-say that John came-from | COMPLEMENT |
| c. | Chi dici ca s' a rùbbàtu gli biscotti? who you-say that CL has stolen the cookies | SUBJECT |
| d. | Purché stai a dì ca Giuagni a rubbatu gli biscotti? why you-stay to say that John has stolen the cookies | ADJUNCT |

(11) Only complements can be extracted from factives in Modern Ferentinese:

- | | | |
|----|---|------------|
| a. | Chə nnù sài ca Gianni a rubbatu? what CL you-know that John has stolen | COMPLEMENT |
|----|---|------------|

- | | | |
|----|--|------------|
| b. | Da ndò sai ca Gianni uè? | COMPLEMENT |
| | from where you-know that John come-from | |
| c. | * Chi sai ca rubbatu gli biscotti? | SUBJECT |
| | who you-know that stolen the cookies | |
| d. | # Purché sai ca Gianni a rubbatu gli biscotti? | ADJUNCT |
| | why you-know that John has stolen the cookies | |

In Modern Ferentinese, argument fronting is generally allowed in declaratives (cf. 12a, a') but disallowed in factives (12b, b').

- (12) a. Giuagni su credu ca stu libbru Maria a lettu
 John CL believe that this book Mary has read
- a'. Ie dicu ca stu filmu 'nu gli uogli più udè
 I say that this film not CL want never see
- b. # Giuagni sa ca chigli libru Maria a lettu
 John knows that that book Mary has read
- b'. * Giuagni ci dispiaci ca chigli libbru Maria a lettu
 John CL regret that that book Mary has read

As shown in (10)-(12) factive verbs have different structural behaviour compared with declarative verbs in Ferentinese. We conclude then that not only realis vs. irrealis modality, but the opposition between realis vs. irrealis vs. factive modality should be taken into consideration while explaining Italo-Romance complementation, as it will be demonstrated below by data from Ferentinese.

3. TRIPLE COMPLEMENTISER SYSTEMS OF FERENTINESE

3.1. Earlier Ferentinese

In Earlier Ferentinese, the distribution of three complementisers – *ca*, *che*, and *cu* – is influenced by the semantics of the selecting matrix verb. In particular, REGRET-verbs such as *sapé* 'to know' select *ca* (13a), SAY-verbs such as *dì* 'to say' select *che* (13b), and WANT-verbs such as *volé* 'to want' select *cu* (13c):

- | | | |
|---------|---|---------------|
| (13) a. | Sacci ca tu nun si 'na bbona pezza | [factive] |
| | I-know that you not are.PRES.IND a good patch | |
| b. | Curi mu dissu, dacciforte, che tu si magnatu lu pane | [declarative] |
| | Curi to-me he-said with-power that you are.PRES.IND eaten.PTP the bread | |
| c. | Vuria cu gli vénto m' annariàsse | [volitive] |
| | I-want.COND that the wind to-me areate.IMP.SUBJ | |

Earlier Ferentinese

Moreover, complementation in Earlier Ferentinese seems to be sensitive to morphological mood (i.e. indicative vs. subjunctive opposition in the embedded complement) and modality (i.e. realis, factive, and irrealis). It is worth noticing that in (13a) and (13b), both in the matrix and the embedded clauses, we find verbs with indicative inflection, whereas in

(13c) we find conditional in the matrix clause and subjunctive in the embedded clause. Mood choice thus seems to be linked, together with complementiser selection, to the modality of the whole sentence, namely factive (13a), realis (13b) and irrealis (13c). Modality is morphologically encoded, then, through mood, but complementiser selection and the semantics of the matrix predicate also play a role (see §2).

Evidence for a richer articulated structure of the CP (a “split-CP”: Rizzi 1997, 2001; 14) can be found in varieties spoken within the Italian peninsula. As shown in the minimal pair in (15), in Italian there is a distinct behaviour of the finite and non-finite complementisers *che* ‘that’ and *di* ‘of’ (cf. 16), which can be shown to occupy distinct positions within the articulated CP (Rizzi 1997: 288; Ledgeway 2012: 10, 2017: 1014). Specifically, whereas finite *che* precedes topics and foci (16a), occupying the leftmost position within the left periphery of the sentence (i.e. Force), non-finite *di* can only follow them (16b), occupying a lower position in the left periphery (i.e. Fin).

(14) Force *Top Int *Top Foc Fin [IP...]]]]] (Rizzi 1997, 2001)

- (15) a. Credo **che** il tuo libro, loro lo apprezzerebbero molto
I.believe that the your book they CL appreciate.COND much
'I believe that they would value your book a lot'
- b. Credo, il tuo libro, **di** apprezzarlo molto
I.believe the your book of appreciate.INF.CL much
'I believe I value your book a lot'
- Italian

(16) [CP Force (**che**) [Top [Foc [Fin (**di**) [IP ...]]]]]

We might ask whether there is evidence for richer CP structure within Earlier Ferentinese, as well. In fact, the Earlier Ferentinese corpus of written texts does not contain sentences in which the complementisers are spelt out after topics/foci in declarative and factive contexts, but only in volitive contexts. It seems that topics/foci cannot be spelt out before the complementiser in both declarative (17a) and factive contexts (17b). In volitive contexts the irrealis complementiser *cu* appears to be spelt out after topics/foci, e.g. *eccu* ‘here’ (17c). Hence, in Earlier Ferentinese the realis complementisers *che* and the factive complementiser *ca* lexicalise the higher Force head and the irrealis complementiser *cu* lexicalises the lower Fin head, as sketched in (17d).

- (17) a. Gli frintinenisi voto dici **che**_{Force} biastema fiacca, è pu
The-inhabitants-of-Ferentino sometimes say.3SG that swear softly is for
'ssi santi du 'ss atri paesi [declarative]
those saints of these other towns
- b. So sicuro **ca**_{Force} subbitu partaria diretto a Novajorca [factive]
I.am sure that now leave.COND.3SG directly to New York
- c. Je vulessu eccu **cu**_{Fin} tu dicu radduvuntà
I want.SUBJ.1SG here that you say.IND.2SG become-again.INF
pu ‘nu minutu sulu uttru [volitive]
for one minute only child
- d. [CP Force (**che/ca**) [Top [Foc [Fin (**cu**) [IP ...]]]]] Earlier Ferentinese

3.2. Modern Ferentinese

In Modern Ferentinese, there is no exact correspondence between the semantics of the matrix verb/modality and the choice of a specific complementiser. Similarly to Earlier Ferentinese, Modern Ferentinese complementation is sensitive to the semantics of the matrix verb (i.e. declarative, factive, volitive). The pattern is different, however. In particular, while the complementiser *ca* (<QUIA) is selected by SAY-verbs, such as *di* ‘to say’, and REGRET-verbs, such as *credə* ‘to believe’ (18a), both complementisers *chə* (<QUID) and *cu* (<QUOD) are found after WANT-verbs, such as *volé* ‘to want’ (18b, c):

- (18) a. Peppu dicə\sa **ca** Angilu pò unì a casa [declarative]
 Peter say\know.IND.3SG that Angelo can come at home
 'Peter says/knows that Angelo can come at home'
- b. Maria ulessu\ularia **chə** Peppu laora sempre [volitive]
 Mary want.SUBJ\want.COND.3SG that Peter work.IND.3SG always
 'Mary would like that Peter would always drink'
- c. Giuagni ulessu **cu** ie nə ci issi alla festa [volitive]
 John want.SUBJ.3SG that I not CL go.SUBJ.3SG to-the party
 'John would like that you wouldn't go to the party' Modern Ferentinese

What governs the choice between *chə* vs. *cu*, then, if it is not strictly the semantics of the embedding predicate (since both can appear under the WANT-verb *volé* ‘to want’; cf. 18b,c)? The contrast between the examples (18b) and (18c) shows that there is a strong correlation between the use of the subjunctive inflection in the embedded clause and complementiser selection, namely *cu*+SUBJ vs. *chə*+IND_{irrealis}.

The distribution of *ca*, *cu* and *chə* is influenced then by mood (i.e. indicative/subjunctive distinction) and modality (i.e. realis, factive, irrealis). As expected, in realis and factive sentences, the mood of both the matrix and the embedded predicate is indicative (18a). However, in the case of volitive sentences the situation is different from the one found in Earlier Ferentinese. In fact, in (18b) in the place of the expected morphological subjunctive inflection in the embedded clause we find a predicate with indicative inflection (i.e. *laora* ‘work.PRES.IND.3SG’).

In fact, the indicative/subjunctive mood opposition in southern Italian varieties is not always transparent anymore because of the loss subjunctive inflection. However, the subjunctive morphology has not been completely eradicated (see Ledgeway and Lombardi 2014). As we can see in the contrast between (18b) and (18c), the subjunctive morphology is still maintained in Modern Ferentinese, but only in a particular context. In (18b), the verb of the embedded sentence is a present indicative, which has a subjunctive grammatical value due to the fact that the sentence is irrealis (due also to the matrix selecting WANT-verb, which is intrinsically irrealis). Hence, the event described in the sentence has not happened at the time of the utterance. In this sentence, the complementiser is obligatorily *chə*. In (18c), the irrealis sentence presents an subjunctive inflection which is selected by an irrealis WANT-verb in the matrix clause. In that specific case where the subjunctive inflection is retained, the only available complementiser is *ca*.

In short, it is not strictly the semantics of the matrix predicate that dictates the choice of a specific complementiser in modern Ferentinese (as opposed to earlier Ferentinese); rather, the choice of a specific complementiser is also sensitive to the mood inflection of the embedded predicate (cf. 18b-c). Basically, it seems that a modern Ferentinese can employ more than one strategy for morphologically expressing the difference between the complement clause in (18b) vs. (18c). Modality marking it is shared between the discourse and the verbal domains.

Modern Ferentinese complementiser selection is also sensitive to the structure of the CP. Specifically, in declarative and factive clauses, *ca* can only precede topics/foci (i.e. *Angilu* ‘Angelo’ and *addumanu* ‘tomorrow’ in 19a), suggesting it is in Force, schematised in (19b). However, we see in (20a,b) that *cu* and *chə* must follow topics/foci, and thus occupies Fin, as schematised in (20c).

- (19) a. Peppu dicə/sa **ca**_{Force} Angilu ADDUMANU
 Peter say/know.IND.3SG *ca* Angelo tomorrow
 **ca* pò unì a casa [declarative/factive]
ca can.IND.3SG come.INF to home
 'Peter says/knows that Angelo can come at home tomorrow'
- b. [_{CP} Force (**ca**) [Top [Foc [Fin ... [IP ...]]]]] Modern Ferentinese
- (20) a. Maria ulessu ADDUMANU **cu**_{Fin} Giuagni unesse [volitive]
 Mary want.SUBJ.3SG tomorrow *cu* John come.SUBJ.3SG
 'Mary would want that tomorrow John would come'
- b. 'Ndoni ulessu la figlia ALLOCU **chə**_{Fin} 'n ci ua più [volitive]
 Antony want.SUBJ.3SG the daughter there *chə* not CL send.IND.3SG anymore
 'Antony wants that his daughter wouldn't go there anymore'
- c. [_{CP} Force [Top [Foc [*Fin* (**cu/chə**) [IP ...]]]]] Modern Ferentinese

At least in volitive contexts, then, Modern Ferentinese behaves like Italian in providing evidence of a richer and more articulated clausal left periphery.

3.3. Comparing Earlier and Modern Ferentinese

Comparing Earlier and Modern Ferentinese, we can see that four factors seem to play a role in the distribution of the three complementisers: (i) the semantics of the matrix predicate; (ii) mood (viz. an overt morphological expression of modality); (iii) modality; and (iv) the structure of the left periphery. However, the influence of each factor differs in each variety, hence the distribution of *ca*, *chə*, and *cu* is different from Earlier to Modern Ferentinese. As illustrated in Table 2, in Earlier Ferentinese the distribution of the three complementisers mirrors exactly three different kind of modality (viz. realis, irrealis, factive) and the three classes of matrix selecting verbs (viz. SAY-verbs, WANT-verbs, REGRET-verbs).

Table 2. Complementiser distribution in Earlier and Modern Ferentinese

| Variety | Matrix verb type | Sentence type | Modality | Mood | Complementiser | Position in the CP |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------|----------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Earlier Ferentinese | SAY-verbs | declarative | realis | indicative | <i>che</i> | Force |
| | WANT-verbs | volitive | irrealis | subjunctive | <i>cu</i> | Fin |
| | REGRET-verbs | factive | factive | indicative | <i>ca</i> | Force |
| Modern Ferentinese | SAY-verbs | declarative | realis | indicative | <i>ca</i> | Force |
| | WANT-verbs | volitive | irrealis | subjunctive | <i>cu</i> | Fin |
| | WANT-verbs | volitive | irrealis | indicative [irrealis] | <i>chə</i> | Fin |
| | REGRET-verbs | factive | factive | indicative | <i>ca</i> | Force |

In Earlier Ferentinese, *che* introduces declarative/irrealis clauses, *cu* volitive/irrealis clauses and *ca* factive clauses (cf. §3.1). However, in Modern Ferentinese, there is no exact correspondence between the semantics of the matrix verb/modality and the choice of a specific complementiser. In fact, in Modern Ferentinese the complementiser *ca* is selected in declarative/realis clauses and factive clauses, and both *chə* and *cu* are found in volitive contexts depending on the embedded mood (viz. morphological indicative which substitutes a morphological subjunctive; see §3.2). Hence, there is no dedicated factive complementiser in Modern Ferentinese anymore.

Structurally speaking, the complementiser *che/chə* occupies the highest position in the split-CP (Force) in Earlier Ferentinese, whereas lexicalises the lowest position in the Modern Ferentinese split-CP (Fin). What has not changed from Earlier to Modern Ferentinese is the selection of the complementiser *cu*, which is still selected in volitive/irrealis clauses preceding an embedded subjunctive (which do not appear to be yet interchangeable with the indicative in the Earlier variety of Ferentinese).

Finally, in the passage from Earlier to Modern Ferentinese, we witness a diachronic change highlighted by the different distribution of the three complementisers *ca*, *cu* and *che/chə* (cf. 3.3; see Colasanti 2016 for a diachronic account). More generally, although dedicated factive complementisers are found in different languages of the world, e.g. Modern Greek and Italo-Greek varieties, none have been previously identified within Romance. This novel dimension of parametric variation within Romance opens up new questions about the nature of modality and its encoding within the CP. Data from Earlier and Modern Ferentinese are therefore essential if we are to know more about modality marking in Romance and the different kinds of modality which can be found in Romance clausal complementation.

4. MODALITY FEATURES AND THE SPLIT-CP

In what follows, we consider only the selection of the complementiser in Ferentinese in order to demonstrate that the different complementiser forms found in Ferentinese can lexicalise different positions in the CP. Assuming a rich and articulated left periphery of the sentence we will show how different modality types can be encoded in specific functional heads.

4.1. Realis modality is encoded in Force

Assuming that different complementiser forms spell out different modality features, as shown in §3 in both Earlier and Modern Ferentinese, in declarative contexts (after SAY-verbs) the realis complementisers *che* (Earlier Ferentinese; 21) and the realis complementiser *ca* (Modern Ferentinese; 22) lexicalise the highest position in the left periphery of the sentence, namely Force. As we can see in example (21), in Earlier Ferentinese we do not have topics/foci before and after the realis complementiser *che*. Hence, the complementiser *che*, which is selected by the realis SAY-verb *di'* 'to say', lexicalises Force. In (22a) we can see in Modern Ferentinese we have the presence of topics/foci (i.e. *Robbertə* 'Robert', *ADDUMANU* 'tomorrow') after the realis complementiser *ca*. However, as we can see for Modern Ferentinese⁴ in (22b), the SAY-verb *di'* 'to say' is unable to select the other two complementisers available in Modern Ferentinese, i.e. irrealis *cu/chə*.

⁴ We are not able to test directly if the sentence in (23) would be ungrammatical with the selection of the other two complementisers present in the complementiser system of earlier Ferentinese, i.e. factive *ca* and irrealis *cu*, because our data come only from a written corpus.

- (21) po' dici_[realis] [_{ForceP} **che**_[realis] [_{TopP} Top [_{FocP} Foc [_{FinP} Fin [_{IP} ci batte 'n pett]]]]]
then you.say that CL beat.INF.3SG in chest
- (22) a. Peppu dici_[realis] [_{ForceP} **ca**_[realis] [_{TopP} Robbertə [_{FocP} ADDUMANU [_{IP} pò udè a Maria]]]]
Peppu says that Robert tomorrow can.IND.3SG see.INF to Maria
- b. * Peppu dici_[realis] [_{ForceP} **cu/chə**_{[irrealis]/ca}_[factive] [_{TopP} Robbertə [_{FocP} ADDUMANU [_{IP} pò
udè a Maria]]]]
see.INF to Maria

The general mechanism involved in both Earlier and Modern Ferentinese is that the SAY-verb *di* 'to say' hosts a [realis] selectional feature⁵ (Adger 2003:83ff), hence it is able to select only a CP which is headed by a C head which hosts a modality feature which is [realis], i.e. the *ca*_[realis] which lexicalises Force. The selection of different complementisers is then explained in terms of modality features that can be hosted by the head Force in a split-CP configuration. In more general terms, this means that the highest position Force is not only able to encode clause type information but also the speaker's judgement of the proposition that describes the event, namely modality (Palmer 2001).

4.2. Factive modality is encoded in Force

In factive contexts under REGRET-type verbs the factive complementiser *ca* in both Earlier (23) and Modern Ferentinese (24) lexicalises the highest position in the CP, namely Force. As shown in the example in (23), in Earlier Ferentinese topics/foci must follow the factive complementiser *ca*. The same holds in Modern Ferentinese as well (24a). Hence, both complementisers occupy the highest position of the left periphery of the sentence, i.e. Force. However, as we can see in the example (24b), in Modern Ferentinese (see footnote 4 for Earlier Ferentinese), the REGRET-verb *credə* 'to believe' is unable to select the irrealis complementisers *cu*_[irrealis] and *chə*_[irrealis], or the realis complementiser *ca*_[realis].

- (23) S'era saputu_[factive] [_{ForceP} **ca**_[factive] [_{TopP} gli Mori camminenu pulla via Latina [_{FinP} Fin [_{IP} CL be.IND.IMP.3SG know.PAST.PTP that the Moors walking.GER for-the street Latina
s'avvicinaunu sempru du più a Frintinu]]]]
CL get-close.IND.2PL always of more to Ferentino
- (24) a. Peppu credi_[factive] [_{ForceP} **ca**_[factive] [_{TopP} ADDUMANU [_{FinP} Fin [_{IP} Giuagni po' i alla casa
də Maria]]]]
Peppu believe that tomorrow John can go.INF to-the house of Maria
- b. * Peppu credi_[factive] [_{ForceP} **cu/chə**_{[irrealis]/ca}_[realis] [_{TopP} ADDUMANU [_{FinP} Fin [_{IP} Giuagni
Peppu believe that tomorrow John
po' i alla casa də Maria]]]]
can go.INF to-the house of Maria

As shown for realis modality (cf. §4.1.), assuming Adger's (2003:83ff) implementation of selectional features, the REGRET-verbs *sapè* 'to know' and *credə* 'to believe' host a [factive] selectional feature, meaning they are able to select only CPs which are headed by a C head bearing a [factive] modality feature, e.g. *ca*_[factive]. Given that Force is the highest projection in

⁵ Selectional features are what Adger (2003:83ff) calls categorial selectional features (or c-selectional features or subcategorisation features). A selectional feature on a lexical item does not determine the distribution of the lexical item itself; rather, it determines the category of the elements that lexical item can select.

CP, and thus is directly selected by the matrix verb, we can conclude that Force can host the [factive] modality feature.

4.3. Irrealis modality encoding is shared by Force and Fin

In volitive contexts in both Earlier and Modern Ferentinese, the irrealis complementisers *cu* (Earlier Ferentinese; cf. *cu*+SUBJ in Modern Ferentinese) and *chə* lexicalise the lowest position in the left periphery of the clause, namely Fin. Specifically, in Earlier Ferentinese the irrealis complementisers *cu* (25a) and *che* (25b) are selected by the irrealis WANT-verb *vulé* ‘to want’ (cf. footnote 5):

- (25) a. *vurìa*_[irrealis] [_{ForceP} Force ... [_{FinP} **cu**_[irrealis] [_{IP} *gli vénto m’ annariàsse*<sub>[irrealis]]]]]
I-want.COND that the wind to-me areate.IMP.SUBJ</sub>
- b. *Je vulessu*_[irrealis] [_{ForceP} Force [_{TopP} ECCU [_{FinP} **che**_[irrealis] [_{IP} *tu dicu radduvuntà pu ‘nu minutu sulu uttru*]]]]
I want.SUBJ.3SG here that you say.IND become-again
for one minute only child
- Earlier Ferentinese

In Modern Ferentinese the situation is a bit more complex: as shown in §3.2, there are two different irrealis complementisers, with the choice of each dictated in part by the morphological inflection of the embedded predicate (i.e. indicative/subjunctive). Specifically, the irrealis complementiser *cu* is only found in volitive contexts in which a subjunctive inflection is present on the embedded predicate. On the other hand, the complementiser *chə* is only found when the embedded predicate bears indicative morphology, but it has an irrealis value. In (26a) the WANT-verb *vulé* ‘to want’ selects the irrealis complementiser *cu* when a predicate with subjunctive verbal inflection is present in the embedded clause. However, as we can see in (26b), the same verb *vulé* ‘to want’ selects the irrealis complementiser *chə* when there is a verb with indicative inflection in the embedded clause, which has a subjunctive value. In both the examples in (26), in terms of irrealis modality marking, we can see that both complementiser positions Force and Fin have an [irrealis] modality feature. This is because irrealis modality is spread across multiple functional heads at the same time. The possibility to have foci/topics between the complementisers *cu/chə* and the main verb makes clear that both positions have to have the [irrealis] modality feature in order to satisfy the selectional properties of the matrix selecting verb. In fact, this seems clear also from the fact the speaker’s judgement on the action expressed from the proposition is still irrealis (i.e. irrealis modality). However, it seems that irrealis modality can be shared between the two functional heads Force and Fin so the matrix WANT-verb is still able to select an irrealis complementiser form in both cases in (26).

What is interesting here is that complementiser selection seems to be influenced by the verbal morphology of the embedded predicate, otherwise there should be no reason for two different irrealis complementisers to exist in Modern Ferentinese. This is not our main concern here, but a possible explanation could be that the irrealis complementiser *cu* has a [subjunctive] selecting feature and the irrealis complementiser *chə* it has a selecting feature [indicative]. The modality of the sentence is in any case unmarked since the relevant information is encoded within the CP.

- (26) a. *Giugni ulessu*_[irrealis] [_{ForceP} Force_[irrealis] [_{TopP} ALLOCU [_{FinP} **cu**_[irrealis] [_{IP} *Maria unesse*]]]] [_{IP} *Maria unesse*]]]] [_{IP} *Maria unesse*]]]]
John want.SUBJ.3SG there that Mary come.SUBJ.3SG
- [volitive]

- b. ‘Ndoni ulessu_[irrealis] [_{ForceP} Force_[irrealis] [_{TopP} ADDUMANE [_{FinP} **chə**_[irrealis]]
 Antony want.SUBJ.3SG tomorrow that
 [_{IP} la moglia ‘n ce uà più alla casa [volitive]
 the wife not CL go.IND.3SG anymore to-the house Modern Ferentinese

Structurally speaking there is no difference between the Modern Ferentinese sentences in (26). Moreover, as evidence for the existence of a silent Force_[irrealis] head which hosts irrealis modality features, we could refer to the recomplementation structures found in other upper southern Italian dialects (see also Paoli 2003, 2007 for northern Italo-Romance varieties), e.g. Cepranese, San Donato Val di Comino (Colasanti in prog.). As we can see in (27), in Cepranese both positions in the split-CP can be lexicalised in irrealis contexts. The irrealis complementiser *ca* can lexicalise both the higher position Force and the lower position Fin when an intervening topic/focus is present. We could then hypothesise that in volitive contexts in Ferentinese the irrealis complementisers *cu* and *chə* lexicalise the position Fin, but the position Force is empty, lexicalised only in recomplementation structures in some Italo-Romance varieties (see also Ibero-Romance: Villa García 2012).

- (27) Giuvannə vularia_[irrealis] [_{ForceP} **ca**_[irrealis] [_{TopP} Sə dumanə vè zi Arduinə [_{FocP} agliə ma
 John want.COND.3SG that if tomorrow come.IND.3SG uncle Arduino to-the seaside [_{FinP}
ca_[irrealis] [_{IP} nə cə vənəssə]]]]]]]
 that not CL come.SUBJ.3SG Cepranese

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, new data from the USID of Ferentino highlighted the existence of not only dual complementiser systems but also triple complementiser systems in Italo-Romance. Traditional and more recent descriptions of complementation in Italo-Romance indicate that mood, modality and the structure of the CP are all variables which can influence the distribution of the different complementiser forms. However, the complementiser systems of Earlier and Modern Ferentinese appear to be sensitive to four variables, namely the semantics of the matrix verb, mood, modality and the structure of the left periphery of the sentence. Together, these variables affect complementiser selection which is strictly related to modality encoding. Different functional heads can be lexicalised by different complementiser forms which are strictly related to different kinds of modality. This would explain the existence of varieties of multiple complementiser systems and their direct involvement in modality marking. Assuming that modality is a grammatical category which is related to the speaker's judgement of the proposition, it is clear that it has to be expressed in the grammar. However, it can be expressed in the grammar in different ways and within different domains (i.e. CP, IP). In short, it seems that in Italo-Romance the multifunctional category of complementiser is playing a role in modality encoding.

Moreover, it seems possible that the semantics of the matrix verb selects different modality features which are related to the embedded complement (i.e. realis, irrealis and factive). A new kind of speaker's judgement on the proposition has been assumed, namely factive modality. Finally, assuming different kinds of modality and an articulated fine structure of the left periphery of the sentence, it has been demonstrated how different modality features can be encoded in specific functional heads within the split-CP.

The last more general remark is concerned with the importance of data from Italo-Romance for linguistic theory. As matter of fact, even if in recent years the significance of the Italo-Romance varieties has been increasingly recognised within the linguistic community,

Italo-Romance microvariation still represents a fertile and unique territory to study parametric variation. This case study on Ferentinese demonstrates how neighbouring varieties have in most cases a high degree of structural homogeneity. However, these varieties also differ in many other significant and interesting ways. This allows the linguist to isolate and observe what lies behind small differences in particular microparametric settings across otherwise highly homogenised grammars (Ledgeway 2002). The huge microvariation present in Italo-Romance gives us the possibility to confirm (or disconfirm) and update theoretical claims, and to pursue one of the most fruitful research agendas of modern linguistic theory, namely language diversity and identity across the languages of the world (Ritter and Wiltschko 2000), as demonstrated by this Ferentinese case study.

REFERENCES

- Adger, D. (2003), *Core Syntax*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Battisti, C. (1914) *Testi dialettali italiani in trascrizione fonetica*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Benincà, P. & C. Poletto (2004) "Topic, focus, and V2", in L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Vol. 2*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 52–75.
- Bybee, J. & S. Fleischmann (1995) *Modality in grammar and discourse*, Typological Studies in Language 32, Amsterdam/New York: Benjamins.
- Cinque, G. (1990) *Types of A'-dependencies*, MIT Press.
- Colasanti, V. (2015) *The Complementiser System of Cepranese*. MPhil dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Colasanti, V. (2016) "What has and hasn't changed? Parametric change and morphosyntactic exaptation in Romance". Paper presented at *Formal Approaches to Romance Microvariation Workshop (FARM)*, University of Bucharest, Romania, 25-26 November 2016.
- Colasanti, V. (forth. a) "Towards a microparameter C-Hierarchy in Italo-Romance", in G. Pană Dindelegan, R. Zafiu, A. Dragomirescu, A. Nicolae, I. N. Paraschiv (eds.), *Romance Syntax. Comparative and diachronic perspectives*, Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Colasanti, V. (forth. b) "La doppia serie di complementatori nei dialetti del Lazio meridionale : un approccio microparametrico", *Revue de Linguistique Romane*.
- Colasanti, V. (in prog.) *A comparative approach to morphosyntactic microvariation in Italo-Romance. Data-driven analyses of Southern Lazio dialects*, PhD Dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Cruschina, S. (2012) *Discourse-related Features and Functional Projections*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Cuzzolin, P. (1994) "On sentential complementation after verba aflectuum", in J. Herman (ed.) *Linguistic Studies on Latin: Selected papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, Budapest, 23-27 March 1991, 201-210.
- Damonte, F. (2006) "Complementatori e complementi congiuntivi in alcuni dialetti Sardi", in A. Padovan & N. Penello (eds.), *Osservazioni sul sardo* (Quaderni di lavoro ASIIt n. 6), 71–95.
- Damonte, F. (2008) "Matching moods. Mood concord between CP and IP in Salentino and southern Calabrian subjunctive complements", in P. Benincà & N. Munaro (eds.), *Mapping the Left Periphery*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 228–256.
- De Cuba, C. F. (2007) *On (non) factivity, clausal complementation and the CP-field*, PhD Dissertation, Stony Brook University.

- Haegeman, L. & B. Ürögdi (2010) "Referential CPs and DPs: An operator movement account", *Theoretical Linguistics* 36, 233–246.
- Hooper J. B. & S. Thompson (1973) "On the applicability of root transformations", *Linguistic inquiry* 4, 465–497.
- Kiparsky, P. & C. Kiparsky (1970) "Fact", in M. Bierwisch & K. E. Heidolph (eds.), *Progress in linguistics*, The Hague, Mouton, 143–147.
- Kratzer, A. (2013) "Modality and the semantics of embedding". Paper presented at *Amsterdam Colloquium*, 20 December 2013.
- Ledgeway, A. (2000) *A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy: a Minimalist Approach*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Ledgeway, A. (2003a) *Linguistic theory and the mysteries of Italian dialects*, in A. L. Lepschy & A. Tosi (eds.), *Multilingual Italy: past and present*, Oxford, Legenda, 108–140.
- Ledgeway, A. (2003b) "Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: la doppia serie di complementatori", *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia*, 27, 89–147.
- 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, 339–39.
- Ledgeway, A. (2009). *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano, Vol. 350*, Tübingen, Max Niemeyer.
- Ledgeway, A. (2012) "La sopravvivenza del sistema dei doppi complementatori nei dialetti meridionali", in P. Del Puente (ed.) *Atti del II Convegno internazionale di dialettologia - Progetto A.L.Ba*, Rionero in Vulture, Calice Editore, 151–76.
- Ledgeway, A. (2017) "Clausal complementation", in A. Ledgeway & M. Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1013–1028.
- Maiden, M. (1995) *A Linguistic History of Italian*, London, Routledge.
- Manzini, M. R. & L. Savoia (2005) *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa, Vol. 3*, Alessandria, Edizioni Dell'Orso.
- Nicholas, N. (1998) *The story of pu: The grammaticalisation in space and time of a Modern Greek complementiser*, PhD Dissertation, University of Melbourne.
- Noonan, M. (2007) "Complementation", in T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. II, Complex Constructions*, Cambridge, CUP.
- Palmer, F. (1986) [2001] *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Quer, J. (2009) "Twists of mood: The distribution and interpretation of indicative and subjunctive", *Lingua* 119 (12), 1779–1787.
- Quer, J. (2016) "Mood", in A. Ledgeway & M. Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 954–966.
- Rizzi, L. (1997) "The fine structure of the left periphery", in L. Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, Springer, 281–337.
- Rohlf, G. (1969) *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti, Vol. 3*, Torino, Einaudi.
- Roussou, A. (1992) "Factive complements and wh-movement in Modern Greek", *UCL Working*, 122–147.
- Ross, J. R. (1967) *Constraints on variables in syntax*, PhD Dissertation, MIT.
- Salvi, G. (2004) *La formazione della struttura di frase romanza: ordine delle parole e clitici dal latino alle lingue romanze antiche*, Berlin, de Gruyter.
- Tekavčić, P. (1980) *Grammatica storica dell'italiano: Morfosintassi, Vol. 2*, Bologna, Il Mulino.
- Vecchio, P. (2006) "La distribuzione dei complementatori *ka* e *ku* nel dialetto salentino settentrionale di Francavilla Fontana (BR)", in R. D'Alessandro, A. Ledgeway & I. Roberts (eds.), *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 312–322.

Villa García, J. (2012) *The Spanish complementiser system: {Consequences} for the syntax of dislocations and subjects, locality of movement, and clausal structure*, PhD Dissertation, University of Connecticut.