On Triple Complementation in Southern Italian Dialects

Valentina COLASANTI[1]

Southern Italian dialects are traditionally claimed to use a dual finite complementiser system. In these varieties it is possible to distinguish between a complementiser derived from QUIA (>ca), which introduces propositional indicative complements, and a complementiser derived from QUID (>che, chə, chi), MODO (>mu, ma, mi), or QUOD (>cu) heading irrealis subjunctive complements (Rohlfs 1969: 190; Ledgeway 2000: 70-74; 2005, 2009, 2012; 2016; Manzini & Savoia 2005, I: 455-501, 650-76; Colasanti 2015a, b). However, in this paper it will be shown that in the southern Italian dialect of Ferentino (Frosinone province) is displayed a triple complementiser system (i.e. ca (<QUIA), chə (<QUID) and cu (<QUOD)), which is not only synchronically productive, but is also diachronically documented.

Key words: *morphosyntax, Italo-Romance, Romance complementation.*

1. Introduction

Complementation in Southern Italian Dialects (henceforth SIDs) has made an important contribution to our understanding of the discourse domain. Both the varieties of the upper South and the extreme South of Italy are reported to make use of dual complementiser systems. Rohlfs (1969: 190) observes the presence of dual complementiser systems in the extreme South, in which it is possible to find a distinction between *ca* (<QUIA; 1a), *mu/ma/mi* (<MODO; 1b) and *cu* (<QUOD; 1c). While *ca* introduces declarative complements (traditionally marked with the indicative), *mu/ma/mi* (Calabria and Sicilia regions) and *cu* (Salento) introduces irrealis complements (usually marked with the subjunctive).

1. (a) Pensu **ca** vèni.[2]
 I.think that come.IND.3SG
 'I think that s/he will come.' (southern Calabria; Rohlfs 1969: 190)

 (b) Ògghiu **mi** mancia.
 I.want that eat. SBJV.3SG
 'I want that s/he should eat.' (Messina; Rohlfs 1969: 190)

---

[1] University of Cambridge (UK), St John's College, vc314@cam.ac.uk
[2] In this paper, translation of examples will be provided only when the meaning is not understandable from glosses.

(c) Tie   comu faci **cu** lu   sai?
    You how do   that S.CL know.IND.2SG
    'How do you know that?'   (Lecce; Rohlfs 1969: 190)

Similarly, traditional descriptions report the presence of dual complementiser systems in Upper Southern Italian Dialects (henceforth USIDs). Specifically, semantico-functional factors (viz. realis/declarative = *ca* and irrealis/volitives = *chə/che/chi*) seem to influence the distribution of the two complementisers *ca* (<QUIA; 2a) and *chə/che/chi* (<QUID; 2b) (Rohlfs 1969, 1983; Ledgeway 2000, 2003; *i.a.*).

2. (a) Chəsta   sə nə pəntì   **ca** i   era   pətutə chəllə.
       This.one CL CL repented that CL she.was asked that
       'She regretted having asked her for it.'

   (b) I   risse   n'auta vota **chə** se fussə   rəcurdata.
       CL he.said another time that CL she.was reminded
       'He told her again that she should not forget.'
                                           (Arpino; Battisti 1914: 102)

After the postulation of a rich left periphery structure by Rizzi (1997; see also Benincà and Poletto 2004), different varieties from the Italian peninsula have been shown to be crucial in mapping the structure of the clausal domain (see among others Ledgeway 2000, 2003, 2005; Paoli 2003, 2007; Vecchio 2006; Damonte 2006, 2008; Cruschina 2012). However, in this respect, data from Southern Lazio dialects (USIDs) have not yet been fully considered (cf. Colasanti 2015). As shown in (3)-(5), different varieties from the Southern Lazio area still display two distinct finite complementisers (*ca* in 3a, 4a, 5b vs *chə* in 3b, 4b, 5b), which have been gone more or less unnoticed and unanalysed so far.

3. (a) M   ao   ditto **ca** ve   addemane.
       To.me they.have told that comes.IND.3SG tomorrow

   (b) ɛra   meʎʎo **chə** li   ɛravɛmo fatto.
       It.was better that them= I-are   done   (Sonnino; M&S 2005)[3]

4. (a) M   avə   diccə **ca** tu ve   addumanə.
       To.me they.have told   that you come tomorrow

---

[3] Manzini and Savoia (2005).

(b) ε   mmεʎʎə **chə**   mmə nə vavə.
    It.is better   that   I=   CL go.IND.1SG   (Pontecorvo; M&S 2005)

5. (a) Dichə   **ca** Mariə vè.
        I.say   that Mario come. IND.3SG

    (b) Vogliə **chə** Maria vè.
        I.want   that Maria come. IND.3SG   (Ceprano; Colasanti 2015)

   In what follows, I will introduce and analyse new data from USIDs, especially from the USID of Ferentino (Southern Lazio). This variety displays not only a synchronically productive triple complementiser system (viz. *ca*<QUIA, *chə*<QUID and *cu*<QUOD)[4] but also an attested diachronic one (viz. *ca* <QUIA, *che*<QUID and *cu*<QUOD).[5] The unique Ferentinese triple complementiser system will be investigated with the aim of introducing new data and testing traditional and current assumptions about the distribution of multiple complementiser systems in SIDs. In particular, complementation in Ferentinese seems to be sensitive not only to the semantics of the matrix predicate, to mood (viz. the morphological overt expression of modality), modality, and the structure of the left periphery (cf. Ledgeway 2003, 2009), but it also offers more dimensions of microvariation (e.g. factivity selection).

2. Ferentinese triple complementiser system

In this paper, only earlier and modern Ferentinese will be taken into consideration. While for earlier Ferentinese we have few attestations between the late 19th and the

---

[4] As observed by Rohlfs (1969: 785), the archaic complementiser *cu* (<QUOD) is attested in 'modern' Italo-Romance only in the variety of Gallo Matese (Caserta province) on the Campanian Apennines (cf. 1), which appears to be geographically isolated but not so far from Southern Lazio.

(1)   (a) Vogliə cu   bbivə.
         I.want that   you.drink
         'I want you to drink.'

     (b) So   tre bbòtə cu bbé   a nnioga.
         be.IND.PRES.1SG three times that come.IND.3SG to us
         'He has been three times to our (house).'   (Gallo Matese; Rohlfs 1969: 188)

[5] In this paper, the complementiser forms from the Latin QUID are *chə* in modern Ferentinese and *che* in earlier Ferentinese. In the case of earlier Ferentinese, I am respecting the ortography used in the texts underlying that in Italo-Romance there is no specific grapheme for [ə] that is usually represented with the grapheme <e>. Hence, I consider *chə* and *che* as two different representations of the same lexical item.

20th century,[6] data from modern Ferentinese have been elicited by the author, through questionnaires, grammaticality judgements, translations from Italian to Ferentinese, and free speeches.[7]

  The distribution of the triple complementiser systems of earlier (§2.1) and modern Ferentinese (§2.2) will be described below. Four variables, which proved to be significant in describing Italo-Romance complementation so far, will be considered; namely, the *semantics* of the selecting matrix verb (i.e. declarative, factive,[8] volitive), *mood* (i.e. indicative/subjunctive), *modality* (i.e. realis, factive, irrealis), and fine structure of the *left periphery* (cf. Rizzi 1997, 2001, 2004; Benincà and Poletto 2004).

2.1. Earlier Ferentinese

Earlier Ferentinese shows a triple complementiser system. According to traditional descriptions (Rohlfs 1969: 190), the distribution of *ca* (<QUIA), *che* (<QUID) and *cu* (<QUOD) is influenced by the semantics of the selecting matrix verb (i.e. declarative, volitive, factive). In earlier Ferentinese, after factive verbs, such *sapere* 'to know', in the matrix clause, it is possible to find the complementiser *ca,* after verbs like *dire* 'to say', it is possible to find *che,* and after verbs that express a desire or a wish, such as *volere* 'to want' and *sperare* 'to hope', the complementiser *cu* is found.

 6. (a) Sacci   **ca** tu   nun si 'na bbona pezza.[9]
     I.know that you not are a   good   patch
     'I know that you are not a good person.'

  (b) Curi mu   disso,   dacciforte, **che** tu   si magnatu lu pane.[10]
      Curi to.me he.said with.power that you are eaten.PTP the bread
      'Curi said to me, of course, that you have eaten the bread.'

  (c) Vurìa   **cu** gli vénto m'   annariàsse.[11]
      I.want.COND that the wind to.me areate.SBJV.IMP.3SG
      'I would like it if the wind would areate me.'   (Earlier Ferentinese)

---

[6] The earlier Ferentinese corpus consists of eight texts written during the end of the 19th and the very beginning of the 20th century.
[7] Data have been collected in 2015.
[8] In this paper I will follow Kiparsky & Kiparsky's (1970) classification of factive and non-factive predicates.
[9] Bianchi (1991: 120).
[10] Bianchi (1984: 7).
[11] Bianchi (1991: 121).

At the same time, as we can also see in (6), earlier Ferentinese complementation is also sensitive to mood (i.e. indicative/subjunctive) and modality (i.e. realis, factive, irrealis). In fact, it is well-known that in Romance, the opposition between the indicative and the subjunctive mood reflects a realis (/factive) vs. irrealis expression of modality (Quer 2009, 2016). Specifically, while in (6a) and (6b), both in the matrix and the embedded sentences, we can find verbs with indicative mood, in (6c) we find an irrealis conditional in the matrix and a subjunctive in the embedded sentence. Consequently, we can also observe that mood choice is linked, together with complementiser selection, to the modality of the sentence, namely factive (6a), realis (6b) and irrealis (6c).

Concerning the structure of the C(omplementiser) P(hrase), in the case of earlier Ferentinese it is impossible for us to test if different functional heads are activated in a richer left peripheral structure (i.e. split-CP; see Rizzi 1997). In fact, the earlier Ferentinese corpus of written texts does not present sentences in which the complementisers are spelt out after topics/foci. Hence, we do not have any evidence for the presence of a split-CP (see Rizzi 1997, 2001; Benincà and Poletto 2004), as it is found in many other Italo-Romance varieties (see, among others, Ledgeway 2000, 2003, 2005; Paoli 2003, 2007; Vecchio 2006; Damonte 2006, 2008; Cruschina 2012; cf. modern Ferentinese in §2.2).

2.2. Modern Ferentinese

Modern Ferentinese displays a triple complementiser system as well. As shown for earlier Ferentinese, modern Ferentinese complementation is influenced by the semantics of the matrix verb (i.e. declarative, factive, volitive). In particular, while the complementiser *ca* (<QUIA) is selected after declarative verbs, such as *dire* 'to say' (7a), and factive verbs, such as *credere* 'to believe' (7a), both complementisers *chə* (<QUID) and *cu* (<QUOD) are found after volitive verbs, such as *volere* 'to want' (7b, c):

7. (a) Peppu diʃi/sa   **ca** Angilu pò unì   a casa.
        Peter say/know.IND.3SG that Angelo can come at home
        'Peter says/knows that Angelo can come home.'

   (b) Maria uléssu   **chə** Peppu laora   sempre.
       Mary want.SBJV.3SG that Peter work.IND.3SG always
       'Mary would like it if Peter would always work.'

   (c) Giuagni uléssu   **cu** ie nə ci issi   alla   festa.
       John   want.SBJV.3SG that I not CL go.SBJV.3SG to.the party
       'John would like it if I didn't go to the party.'   (Modern Ferentinese)

Moreover, the distribution of *ca* (<QUIA), *chə* (<QUID) and *cu* (<QUOD) is also influenced by mood (i.e. indicative/subjunctive) and modality (i.e. realis, factive, irrealis). In both realis and factive sentences, the mood of the matrix and the embedded predicate is in indicative (7a), as we would expect. However, in volitive sentences the situation is more complex. In fact, in the example in (7b) we would expect a verb in the subjunctive mood in the embedded clause, but we find a predicate with an indicative mood (i.e. *laora* 'work.PRES.IND.3SG'). This could be explained by the fact that the indicative/subjunctive opposition in the varieties of the South of Italy is not so strong anymore because of the loss of both the present and the imperfect subjunctive. More specifically, while the present subjunctive is frequently found only in certain specific contexts (i.e. jussives, exclamatives, see Ledgeway and Lombardi 2014), the imperfect subjunctive has not been completely eradicated. As we can see in the contrast between (7b) and (7c), the imperfect subjunctive is still mantained in modern Ferentinese, but only in a precise context. In (7b), the verb of the embedded sentence is a present indicative, which has, of course, an irrealis value due to the modality of the sentence, which is irrealis (due also to the matrix volitive selecting verb, which is intrinsically irrealis). In (7b) the complementiser selected is obligatorily *chə*. In (7c), the irrealis sentence presents an imperfect subjunctive predicate which is selected by a volitive irrealis one in the matrix clause. In that specific case in which the imperfect subjunctive is retained, the only complementiser to be found is *ca*. So, it seems that there is a strong correlation between the use of the subjunctive mood in the embedded clause and complementiser selection, namely *cu*+SUBJ vs. *chə*+IND_IRREALIS. More generally, the replacement of the subjunctive with the indicative seems to be also found in early Italian texts and the question is not very new (see Rati 2016 for a detailed analysis). However, what is new here is the fact that because of the presence of a triple complementiser system in modern Ferentinese, the language is marking modality through the choice of a specific complementiser.

As already demonstrated for other Italo-Romance varieties, modern Ferentinese complementation is also sensitive to the structure of the CP. In fact, a richer articulated structure of the CP, namely a split-CP (Rizzi 1997, 2001; Rizzi and Bocci 2015; cf. 8, 9) can be found in the varieties spoken within the Italian peninsula. As shown in the minimal pair in (9), in Italian there is a strong structural parallel in the distribution of the finite and non-finite complementisers *che* 'that' and *di* 'of', which demonstrate to be able to occupy distinct positions within the discourse-domain (Rizzi 1997: 288; Ledgeway 2012: 10, 2016: 1014). Specifically, whereas finite *che* precedes topics and foci (9a), occupying the leftmost position within the left periphery of the sentence (viz. *Force*), non-finite *di* can only follow them (9b), occupying the right part of the left periphery (viz. *Fin*), as schematised in (10).

8. Force *Top Int *Top Foc Fin [_IP...]]]]]   (Rizzi & Bocci 2015)

9. (a) Credo   **che** <u>il tuo libro</u>, 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,   <u>il tuo libro</u>, **di** apprezzarlo   molto.
       I.believe the your book of appreciate.INF.CL much
       'I believe I value your book a lot.'   (Italian)

10. [_CP *Force* (*che*) [Top [Foc [*Fin* (*di*) [_IP ...]]]]]

In modern Ferentinese, for instance, in declarative or factive clauses, while
ca can be spelt out only before topics/foci (i.e. *Angilu* 'Angelo' and *addumanu*
'tomorrow' in *Force*; 11a), as schematised in (11b), *cu* and *chə* are only found after
topics/foci (hence in *Fin;* 12a, b), as schematised in (12c). Like in Italian, at least in
volitive contexts, in modern Ferentinese the activation of a richer and articulated
left periphery of the sentence is possible.

11. (a) Peppu diʃì/sa   **ca**_Force Angilu   ADDUMANU
        Peter say/know.IND.3SG ca   Angelo tomorrow
          ***ca**_Fin pò unì   a casa.
           ca   can come to home
        'Peter says/knows that Angelo can come home tomorrow.'

    (b) [_CP *Force* (**ca**) [Top [Foc [*Fin* … [_IP ...]]]]]

12. (a) Maria uléssu   ADDUMANU **cu**_Fin Giuagni unéssə.
        Mary want.SBJV.3SG tomorrow   cu   John   come.SUBJ.3SG
        'Mary would like it if John would come tomorrow.'

    (b) 'Ndoni uléssu   la figlia   ALLOCU **chə**_Fin n' ci
        Antony want.SBJV.3SG the daughter there   chə   not CL
            ua   più.
            go.IND.3SG anymore
        'Antony would like it if his daughter wouldn't go there anymore.'

    (c) [_CP *Force* [Top [Foc [*Fin* (**cu/chə**) [_IP ...]]]]]   (Modern Ferentinese)

2.3. Comparing earlier and modern Ferentinese

Four factors seem to play a role in the distribution of the three complementisers in both earlier and modern Ferentinese: (i) the semantics of the matrix predicate; (ii) mood (viz. the morphological overt expression of modality; Quer 2009, 2016); (iii) modality; and (iv) the structure of the left periphery. However, these four factors play different roles, hence the distribution of *ca*, *chə,* and *cu* is different from earlier to modern Ferentinese. As illustrated in Table 1, 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. declarative, volitive, factive).

Table 1: Complementiser distribution in earlier and modern Ferentinese

Variety	Semantics matrix verb	Modality	Mood	Complementiser	Position in the CP
earlier Ferentinese	declarative	realis	indicative	che	*Force*
	volitive	irrealis	subjunctive	cu	*Fin*
	factive	factive	indicative	ca	*Force*
modern Ferentinese	declarative	realis	indicative	ca	*Force*
	volitive	irrealis	subjunctive	cu	*Fin*
	volitive	irrealis	indicative$_{[irrealis]}$	chə	*Fin*
	factive	factive	indicative	ca	*Force*

While *che* introduces declarative/irrealis clauses and *cu* volitive/irrealis clauses, *ca* is selected by factive verbs in factive clauses (cf. §2.1). However, in modern Ferentinese there is no exact correspondence between the semantics of the matrix verb/modality and the choice of a specific complementiser. Specifically, 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. In particular, the declarative/realis earlier Ferentinese complementiser *che* in modern Ferentinese can be selected only in volitive/irrealis contexts depending on the embedded mood (viz. morphological indicative which substitutes a morphological subjunctive; see §2.2). Hence, there is no dedicated factive complementiser in modern Ferentinese anymore because in factive contexts the complementiser selected is the declarative/realis *ca*. Moreover, structurally speaking, now the complementiser *che/chə*, which in earlier Ferentinese occupies the leftmost position in the CP (hence, *Force*), in modern Ferentinese lexicalises the rightmost position in the CP (hence, *Fin*). Comparing the two complementiser systems of earlier and modern Ferentinese, what has not changed is the selection of the complementiser *cu*, which is still selected in voltive/irrealis clauses preceding an embedded subjunctive

(which do not appear to be yet interchangeable with the indicative in the earlier variety of Ferentinese).

3. Conclusions

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. 2.3; see Colasanti 2016, 2017 for an historical account). In this paper, our main concern is to show a new pattern in Romance complementation, hence factivity selection (see Colasanti 2016 for a syntactic account of factivity selection in Ferentinese). More generally, the presence of a specific factive complementiser is shown in different languages of the world, e.g. Modern Greek, Italo-Greek varieties, but, as far as we know, it has never been highlighted in Romance before.

References

Battisti, Carlo. 1914. *Testi dialettali italiani in trascrizione fonetica.* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Benincà, Paola and Cecilia Poletto. 2004. "Topic, focus, and V2". In *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, 2,* Luigi Rizzi (ed.)*,* 52–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bianchi, Fernando. 1984. *La cummeddla du... vinaccia ovverosia lu 'nnòmmura dei ferentinati*. Ferentino: Tipografia Galassi.

Bianchi, Fernando. 1991. *Drént'i fòri pòrta : versi e versacci in dialetto ferentinese e con: stornelli e strambotti, ninne nanne, canzoni, cantilene, filastrocche, proverbi e detti popolari*. Roma: Tipolitograf.

Colasanti, Valentina. 2015a. *The Complementiser System of Cepranese.* M.Phil 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,* University of Bucharest, 27-28 November.

Colasanti, Valentina. 2016. "On Factivity: speculations on the split-CP in Upper-Southern Italian Dialects". Paper presented at the *1st SynCart Workshop,* University of Geneva and University of Siena, Chiusi, Italy, 11-15 July.

Colasanti, Valentina. 2017. "Feature reassignment and microparametric change in Italo-Romance". Paper presented at *45th Cambridge Romance Linguistics Seminar*, University of Cambridge, 5-6 January.

Cruschina, Silvio. 2012. *Discourse-related Features and Functional Projections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Damonte, Federico. 2006. "Complementatori e complementi congiuntivi in alcuni dialetti Sardi". In Andrea Padovan and Nicola Penello (eds.). *Osservazioni sul sardo* (Quaderni di lavoro ASIt n. 6), 71–95.

Damonte, Federico. 2008. "Matching moods. Mood concord between CP and IP in Salentino and southern Calabrian subjunctive complements". In Paola Benincà and Nicola Munaro (eds.). *Mapping the Left Periphery,* 228–256. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kiparsky, Paul & Carol Kiparsky. 1970. "Fact". In M. Bierwisch and K. E. Heidolph (eds.), *Progress in linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton, 143–147.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2000. *A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy: a Minimalist Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.

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: 339–39.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2009. *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano*. Vol. 350. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. "La sopravvivenza del sistema dei doppi complementatori nei dialetti meridionali". In Patrizia Del Puente (ed.). A*tti del II Convegno internazionale di dialettologia* - Progetto A.L.Ba, 151–76. Rionero in Vulture: Calice Editore.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2016. "Clausal complementation". In Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 1013-1028. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam and Alessandra Lombardi. 2014. "The development of the southern subjunctive. Morphological Loss and Syntactic Gain". In Paola Benincà, Adam Ledgeway and Nigel Vincent (eds.). *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy,* 25–47. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Manzini, Maria Rita and Leonardo Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa,* 3 voll. Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso.

Paoli, Sandra. 2003. *COMP and the Left-Periphery: Comparative Evidence from Romance*. PhD dissertation, University of Manchester.

Paoli, Sandra. 2007. "The fine structure of the left periphery: COMPs and subjects: Evidence from Romance". *Lingua* 117 (6). 1057–1079.

Quer, Josep. 2009. "Twists of mood: The distribution and interpretation of indicative and subjunctive". *Lingua* 119 (12). 1779–1787.

Quer, Josep. 2016. "Mood". In Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 954-966. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rati, Maria Silvia. 2016. *L'alternanza tra indicativo e congiuntivo nelle proposizioni completive*. Roma: Aracne.

Rizzi, Luigi 1997. "The fine structure of the left periphery". In Liliane Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax,* 281–337. Springer.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. "On the position 'Int(errogative)' in the left periphery of the clause", 267–296. *Current studies in Italian syntax* 14.

Rizzi, Luigi and Giuliano Bocci. 2015. "The left periphery of the clause - Primarily illustrated for Italian". To appear in the *Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Second Edition.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1968-69. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti.* 3 voll. Torino: Einaudi.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1983. "Distinzione di due congiunzioni in dialetti d'Italia (nel senso del latino ut e quod o quia)". *Studi in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini,* 147–154. Pisa: Pacini.

Vecchio, Paola. 2006. "La distribuzione dei complementatori *ka* e *ku* nel dialetto salentino settentrionale di Francavilla Fontana (BR)". In D'Alessandro Roberta, Adam Ledgeway and Ian Roberts (eds.). *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy,* , 312–322. Cambridge: Cambridge: University Press.