

(2) Early Ferentinese

- a. Sacci **ca** tu nun si ‘na bbona pezza.
I-know.IND that you not are a good patch
‘I know that you are not a good person.’ [factive]
- b. Curi mu disso, dacciforte, **che** tu si magnatu lu pane.
Curi to-me he-said with-power that you are eaten the bread
‘Curi said to me, of course, that you have eaten the bread.’ [declarative/non-factive]
- c. Vurìa **cu** gli vénto m’ annariàsse.
I-want.COND that the wind to-me areate.SUBJ.IMP
‘I would like it if the wind would areate me.’ [volitive]

(ii) **the fine structure of the left periphery** (cf. 3, 4);(iii) **modality** (viz. factive vs realis vs irrealis; cf. 4).

(3) Modern Ferentinese

- a. Peppu difi/sa **ca/*chə/*cu_{Force}** Angilu ADDUMANU (***ca/*chə/*cu_{Fin}**)
Peter say/know.IND.3SG that Angelo tomorrow that
po’ unì a casa.
can.IND.3SG come.INF to home
‘Peter says/knows that Angelo can come home tomorrow.’
- b. [_{ForceP} **ca** [_{TopP} [_{FocP} [_{FinP} Fin ... [IP ...]]]]]

(4) Modern Ferentinese

- a. Maria uléssu ADDUMANU **cu_{Fin}** Giuagni unéssə.
Mary want.SUBJ.3SG tomorrow that John come.SUBJ.3SG
‘Mary would like it if John would come tomorrow.’
- b. ‘Ndoni uléssu la figlia ALLOCU **chə_{Fin}** ‘n ci uà più.
Antony want.SUBJ.3SG the daughter there that not CL go.IND.3SG anymore
‘Antony would like it if his daughter wouldn’t go there anymore.’
- c. [_{ForceP} FORCE [_{TopP} [_{FocP} [_{FinP} **chə/cu** [IP ...]]]]]

➤ Triple complementiser system in *early* and *modern* Ferentinese: different distribution of complementisers.

Main focus of this talk: account for factivity *selection* in Ferentinese.

2 Factivity selection in Ferentinese

Dual complementiser distribution in SIDs: *strongly* depends on semantics of matrix verb.

- Southern Italian Dialects: *declarative* vs *volitive* selection
- Ferentinese: *factive* vs *declarative/non-factive* vs *volitive* selection (cf. 2)

Table 1: Declarative and non-declarative/factive complementiser distribution in Ferentinese²

Semantics of the matrix verb	Sentence type	Selected complementiser in early Ferentinese	Selected complementiser in modern Ferentinese
Non-factive <i>dire</i> ‘to say’, <i>credere</i> ‘to believe’, <i>supporre</i> ‘to suppose’, etc.	Declarative	<i>che</i>	<i>ca</i>
Factive <i>sapere</i> ‘to know’, <i>comprendere</i> ‘to comprehend’, etc.	Non-declarative/factive	<i>ca</i>	<i>ca</i>

Syntactic and semantic behaviour of sentential complement clauses under factive vs non-factive verbs widely analysed (see Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1970; Ross 1970; Zuber & Zuber 1983; Jackendoff 1985; 2007; Rizzi 1990; Cinque 1990; Acquaviva 1990; Giorgi & Pianesi 1997; Schulz 2003; De Cuba 2007; De Cuba & Ürögdi 2009; Colonna Dahlman 2015; Kastner 2015 and many others).³

- *early* Ferentinese: specific complementiser selected only by *factive* verbs (viz. *ca*/**che*).
- *modern* Ferentinese: generalisation of the use of the complementiser *ca* for both factive and non-factive verbs.

➤ *Factivity* selection: another pattern of microvariation found in Italo-Romance (Colasanti 2015a).

➤ **Question:** Why does Ferentinese (overtly) mark *factivity* in the CP?

3 Proposal: factivity selection as phase edge phenomenon

- What is position of *ca* and *che* in Ferentinese left periphery?

(5) Early Ferentinese

- a. *Paro ca tuneva gli mazzosalato.*
it-seems_{FACTIVE} that hold.IMP.3SG the salt
‘It seems that he held the salt.’
- b. *Po’ dici che ci batte ’n petto.*
Then you-say_{NON-FACTIVE} that CL beat.IND.1PL in chest
‘Then you say that it beats in our chest.’
- c. [_{ForceP} **che/ca** [_{TopP} [_{FocP} [_{FinP} Fin [_{IP} ...]]]]]

Ca and *che*: lexicalise *Force* (= “facing the outside”).

Ferentinese complementiser distribution influenced by:

- semantico-functional factors (i.e. factivity);
 - structure of left periphery.
- How can these two ingredients be put together? Are both factors strongly related?

Declarative clauses: no feature in *Force* (cf. Roberts 2004:313 on absence of UG declarative feature).

² Cf. Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970)’s classification of factive and non-factive predicates.

³ See *Appendix 1* for different behaviour of factive vs non-factive verbs in Ferentinese.

- (6) a. Force_[∅] = Declarative by default (unspecified for features; cf. 7)
 b. Force_[+f] = Non-declarative (specified for features; i.e. factive; cf. 8)

(i) unspecified *Force* overtly lexicalised by complementiser *che* selected by non-factive verbs in declarative clauses:

(7) Early Ferentinese

- a. [IP [VP V-non-factive_[∅] [ForceP *che*_[∅] [TopP *Top [FocP *Foc [FinP ØÉ [IP ...]]]]]]]
 b. [IP Gli frintinési si voto [VP dici_[∅] [ForceP *che*_[∅]
 The inhabitants-of-Ferentino sometimes say.IND.3SG that
 [FinP Ø [IP biastéma fiacca è pu 'ssi santi du 'ss' àtri paesi]]]]
 swear softly is for those saints of these other towns
 'The inhabitants of Ferentino, if sometimes, say that little swears are for the saints of
 nearby towns...'

(ii) specified Force_[+fact] lexicalised by complementiser *ca* selected by factive verbs in non-declarative clauses:

(8) Early Ferentinese

- a. [IP [VP V-factive_[+fact] [ForceP *ca*_[+fact] [TopP *Top [FocP *Foc [FinP ØÉ [IP ...]]]]]]]
 b. [IP S' era [VP saputu_[+fact] [ForceP *ca*_[+fact] [TopP gli Mo ri
 CL be.IND.IMP.3SG know.PAST.PART that the Moors
 camminennu pulla via Latina [FinP Ø [IP s' avvicinaunu sempru du
 walking.GER for-the street Latina CL get-close.IND.3PL always of
 più a Frintinu]]]]]
 more to Ferentino

- *declarative clauses*: non-factive verb selects complementiser *che* (no factive features), hence extraction and fronting possible in modern Ferentinese because *che* has no [+fact] feature.
- *non-declarative clauses*: [+fact] verb selects [+fact] *ca* in *Force*, hence *Force* and T share same feature blocking any elements from passing through phase edge.

➤ **Claim:** leftward movement in factive complement blocked by Featural RM (Rizzi 1990; 2005; Starke 2001).

- (i) *Force* and T have the same factive feature \blacktriangleright *feature islandhood* condition at the phase edge
 (ii) the factive element cannot be probed by an element in the left periphery because its movement is blocked
 (iii) this explains that extraction phenomena are ruled out in the case of factive clauses (cf. Appendix 1)

Evidence: early Ferentinese factive vs non-factive \blacktriangleright morphologically spelt out in Comp *ca* vs *che*

➤ *Factivity* selection = phase edge phenomenon.

4 Conclusions

- *New pattern in Italo-Romance microvariation: factivity selection;*
- *Selection of 2 different complementisers in Ferentinese: phase edge phenomenon;*
- *Traditional descriptions of Italo-Romance dual complementiser systems: role of semantics of matrix predicate;*
- *Recent analyses: different positions of complementisers in split-CP;*
- *Traditional descriptions & recent analyses: unified through a phase edge phenomenon account.*

Appendix 1: Factive verbs behave differently from non-factive verbs in Ferentinese

➤ The complement of *factive* verbs cannot be negated:

- (1) *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
 #I knew / regretted / remembered that the building collapsed, but it didn't.'

➤ The complement of *non-factive* verbs can be negated:

- (2) 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
 'I said / thought / believed that the building collapsed, but it didn't.'

➤ *Factive* verbs can introduce its complement directly or by means of a NP/DP *gliu fattu* 'the fact':

- (3) Sacciu / mu dispiaci / mu recordu gliu fattu ca Gianni a rubbatu glie
 I-know to-me I-regret to-me I-remember the fact that John has stolen the
 biscotti.
 biscuits
 'I know / I regret / I remember the fact that John stolen the cookies.'

➤ *Non-factive* verbs can not introduce its complement directly or by means of a NP/DP *gliu fattu* 'the fact':

- (4) *Dicu / pensu / mu credu gliu fattu ca Gianni a rubbatu.
 I-say I-think to-me I-believe the fact that John has stolen
 'I say / think / remember the fact that John has stolen.'

Syntactic property of factive complements: *islandhood* (Ross 1967; see also Kiparsky&Kiparsky 1970; Cinque 1990; Rizzi 1990; De Cuba 2007; Haegeman & r gdi 2010a, b, and many others).

➤ Extraction of complements from *non-factive* is generally allowed in Ferentinese

- (5) a. Chə stai a di' ca Gianni s' a rubbatu? COMPLEMENT
 who stay to say that John CL has stolen
 'What do you say that John stole?'
- b. 'Ndà 'nd ò dici ca Giuagni uè? COMPLEMENT
 from where you-say that John came-from
 'Where do you say that John came from?'
- c. Chi dici ca s' a rubbà tu glie biscotti? SUBJECT
 who you-say that CL has stolen the cookies
 '*Who do you say that stole the cookies?'
- d. Purché stai a di' ca Giuagni a rubbatu glie biscotti? ADJUNCT
 why you-stay to say that John has stolen the cookies
 '#Why do you say that John stole the cookies?'

➤ Only complements can be extracted from *factives* in Ferentinese:

- (6) a. Chə nnù sai ca Gianni a rubbatu? COMPLEMENT
 what CL you-know that John has stolen
 'What do you know (that) John stole?'
- b. Da ndò sai ca Gianni uxè? COMPLEMENT
 from where you-know that John come-from
 'Where do you know John came from?'
- c. *Chi sai ca rubbatu glie biscotti? SUBJECT
 who you-know that stolen the cookies
 'Who do you know stole the cookies?'
- d. #Purché sai ca Gianni a rubbatu glie biscotti? ADJUNCT
 why you-know that John has stolen the cookies
 'Why do you know that John stole the cookies?'

➤ Argument fronting is generally allowed in *non-factives*:

- (7) a. Giuagni su credu ca stu libbru Maria a lettu.
 John CL believe that this book Mary has read
 'John believes that this book Mary read.'
- b. Ie dicu ca stu filmu 'nu gli uogli più udè.
 I say that this film not CL want never see
 'I say that this film I don't want to see it anymore.'

➤ Argument fronting is generally disallowed in *factives*:

- (8) a. #Giuagni sa ca chigli libbru Maria a lettu.
 John knows that that book Mary has read
 'John knows that Mary has read that book.'
- b. *Giuagni ci dispiaci ca chigli libbru Maria a lettu.
 John CL regret that that book Mary has read
 'John regrets that Mary read that book.'

Textual Sources

- Angelisanti, Alberto. 1983. *Pensieri*. Ferentino.
- Bianchi, Ferdinando. 1978. *Imbroisi figlietta*. Roma: Tipografia Roma.
- Bianchi, Ferdinando. 1991. *La serenata a figlimena*. Roma: Tipografia Roma.
- Bianchi, Fernando. 1974. *Fiuri i Fruschi. Poesie in dialetto ferentino*. Frosinone: Editrice Frusinate.
- Bianchi, Fernando. 1984. *La cummeddia du... vinaccia*. Ferentino: Tipografia Galassi.
- Bianchi, Fernando. 1991. *Drént'i fòri pòrta: Versi e versacci in dialetto ferentino e con stornelli e strambotti, ninne nanne, canzoni, cantilene, filastrocche, proverbi e detti popolari..* Roma: Tipografia Roma.
- Cedrone, Alberto. 1976. *Gli Mori attornu a Frintinu*. Frosinone: Tipografia Frosinone.
- Prosperi, Giovanni, & Bianchi, Fernando. 1980. *Rusbiglitu Frintinu!* Roma: Tipolitograf.

References

- Acquaviva, Paolo. 1990. Un'analisi della complementazione dei predicati fattivi. *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 15, 3–28.
- Benincà, Paola, & Poletto, Cecilia. 2004. Topic, focus, and V2. In L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, 2. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 52–75.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A-dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- Colasanti, Valentina. 2015a, *The Complementiser System of Cepranese*. MPhil dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Colasanti, Valentina. 2015b. Dual complementiser systems in Southern Lazio dialects: a microparametric approach. Paper presented at *Romance Syntax. Comparative and Diachronic Perspectives*. 27–28 November, University of Bucharest.
- Colasanti, Valentina. 2016. On triple complementation in Upper-southern Italian Dialects: a syn-diachronic case study. Ms. University of Cambridge.
- Colonna Dahlman, Roberta. 2015. *Studies on Factivity, Complementation, and Propositional Attitudes*. Ê tudes Romanes de Lund 102. PhD dissertation, Lund University.
- Damonte, Federico. 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.
- De Cuba, Carlos Francisco. 2007. *On (non) factivity, clausal complementation and the CP-field*. PhD dissertation, Stony Brook University.
- De Cuba, Carlos, & Ürögdi, Barbara. 2009. Eliminating factivity from syntax: Sentential complements in Hungarian. *Approaches to Hungarian* 11. 29–63.
- D'Alessandro, Roberta, & Ledgeway, Adam. 2010. At the CT boundary: Investigating Abruzzese complementation, *Lingua* 120: 2040–60.
- Giorgi, Alessandra, & Pianesi, Fabio. 1997. *Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1985. Believing and intending: two sides of the same coin. *Linguistic inquiry* 16(3). 445–460.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 2007. *Language, consciousness, culture: Essays on mental structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kastner, Itamar. 2015. Factivity mirrors interpretation: The selectional requirements of presuppositional verbs. *Lingua* 164. 156–188.
- Kiparsky, Paul, & Kiparsky, Carol. 1970. Fact. In M. Bierwisch and K. E. Heidolph (eds.), *Progress in linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton, 143–147.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2003. Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: la doppia serie di complementatori, *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 27:89–147.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2005. Moving through the left periphery: the dual complementiser system in

- the dialects of Southern Italy, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 103/3:339–396.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 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, Adam, & Lombardi, Alessandra. 2014. The development of the southern subjunctive. Morphological Loss and Syntactic Gain. In P. Benincà, A. Ledgeway and N. Vincent (eds.), *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 25–47.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman, *Elements of grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*. Springer, 281–337.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2005. Phase theory and the privilege of the root. In H. Broekhuis, N. Corver, R. Huybregts (eds.), *Organizing grammar: studies in honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roberts, Ian. 2004. The C-system in Brythonic Celtic languages, V2, and the EPP. In L. Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP: the Cartography of syntactic Structures 2*. 297–328.
- Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Schulz, Petra. 2003. *Factivity: Its Nature and Acquisition*. Linguistische Arbeiten. Vol. 480. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Starke, Michal. 2001. Move dissolves into merge: a theory of locality. Doctoral dissertation, University of Geneva.
- Vecchio, Paola. 2006. La distribuzione dei complementatori ka e ku nel dialetto salentino settentrionale di Francavilla Fontana (BR). In D'Alessandro, R., Ledgeway, A. & I. Roberts, *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy*. Cambridge: University Press, 312–322.
- Zuber, Richard, & Zuber, Ryszard. 1983. *Non-declarative sentences*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.