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- Fine structure of the left periphery (Rizzi 1997): much work on the split-CP.

- Italo-Romance: high degree of microvariation crucial in mapping structure of clausal domain (see a.o. Ledgeway 2003; 2005; 2012; Damonte 2006; Vecchio 2006; D’Alessandro & Ledgeway 2010; Ledgeway & Lombardi 2014).

1 Ferentinese triple complementiser system

Ferentino (FR) shows triple complementiser system: ca (<QUIA), cha (<QUID)\(^1\) and cu (<QUOD).

- synchronically productive in modern Ferentinese (cf. 1)
- diachronically documented in early Ferentinese (cf. 2)

Ferentinese complementation sensitive to:

(i) semantics of selecting verb (i.e. declarative/non-factive, factive, volitive):

(1) Modern Ferentinese

- Peppu dici/credi ca/*cha/*cu Angilu po’ unì a casa.
  Peter say/believe.IND.3SG that Angelo can come home
  ‘Peter says/believes that Angelo can come home.’ [factive/non-factive]

- Maria uléssu/ularà cha/*ca/*cu Peppu laora sempre.
  Mary want.SUBJ/COND.3SG that Peter work.IND.3SG always
  ‘Mary would like it if Peter would always drink.’ [volitive]

- Giuagni uléssu cu/*ca/*cha i na ci issi alla festa.
  John want.IND.3SG that I not CL go.SUBJ.3SG to-the party
  ‘John would like it if I didn’t go to the party.’ [volitive]

\(^1\) The complementiser forms from the Latin QUID are cha in modern Ferentinese and che in earlier Ferentinese. In the case of earlier Ferentinese I am respecting the orthography used in the texts underlying that in Italo-Romance does not exist a specific grapheme for \(\varepsilon\) that usually is represented with the grapheme \(<e>\). Hence, I consider cha and che as two different representations of the same lexical item.

* I am grateful to Alessandro Pompeo, Alberto Volponi, Simona Leonetti and her family for their native grammaticality judgements on Ferentinese. Unless otherwise indicated, examples are from the author’s own field notes.
** I would like to thank: Adam Ledgeway for his extremely helpful comments on this paper; Luigi Rizzi and Enoch Aboh for their feedback. Any errors are the responsibility of the author.
(2) Early Ferentinese

   a. Sacci ca tu nun si ‘na bbona pezza.
      ‘I know.IND that you not are a good patch
      [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 věnto m’ annariàsse.
      ‘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 diʃi/sa ca/*chɔ/*cuForcε Angilu addumanu (*ca/*chɔ/*cuFin)
      Peter say/know.IND.3SG that Angelo tomorrow that
      po’ uni a casa.
      can.IND.3SG come.INF to home
      ‘Peter says/knows that Angelo can come home tomorrow.’

   b. [ForcP ca [TopP [FocP [FinP Fin ... [IP ...]]]]]

(4) Modern Ferentinese

   a. Maria uléssu addumanu cuFin Giuagni unéss.
      Mary want.SUBJ.3SG tomorrow that John come.SUBJ.3SG
      ‘Mary would like it if John would come tomorrow.’

   b. ‘Ndoni uléssu la filgia allocu chɔFin ‘n ci uà piÌu.
      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. [ForcP Force [TopP [FocP [FinP chɔ/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 Ferentinese

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


- *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*\_\text{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*\_\text{NON-FACTIVE} that CL beat.IND.1PL in chest
      ‘Then you say that it beats in our chest.’
   c. [*\text{ForceP} \text{che}/ca* [*\text{TopP} [*\text{FocP} [*\text{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?


\[^{2}\text{Cf. Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970)’s classification of factive and non-factive predicates.}\]

\[^{3}\text{See Appendix 1 for different behaviour of factive vs non-factive verbs in Ferentinese.}\]
(6) a. $\text{Force}^{\emptyset} = \text{Declarative by default (unspecified for features; cf. 7)}$

b. $\text{Force}^{[+\text{f}]} = \text{Non-declarative (specified for features; i.e. factive; cf. 8)}$

(i) unspecified Force overtly lexicalised by complementiser $\text{che}$ selected by non-factive verbs in declarative clauses:

(7) Early Ferentinese

a. $\text{[IP} \text{[VP} \text{V-non-factive}^{\emptyset} \text{]} \text{[ForceP} \text{che}^{\emptyset} \text{]} \text{[TopP *TopP} \text{FocP} \text{[FinP ØÉ [IP ...]]}]$)

b. $\text{[IP Gli frintinési si voto [VP diciP ForceP che^{\emptyset}]}$

The inhabitants-of-Ferentino sometimes say.IND.3SG that

$\text{[FinP Ø [IP biastéma fiacca è pu ’ssi santi du ’ss’ àtri paesi]]}$

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$^{[+\text{fact}]}$ lexicalised by complementiser $\text{ca}$ selected by factive verbs in non-declarative clauses:

(8) Early Ferentinese

a. $\text{[IP} \text{[VP} \text{V-factive}^{[+\text{fact}]} \text{]} \text{[ForceP} \text{ca}^{[+\text{fact}]} \text{]} \text{[TopP *TopP} \text{FocP} \text{[FinP ØÉ [IP ...]]}]$)

b. $\text{[IP S’ CL era be.IND.IMP.3SG [VP saputu^{[+\text{fact]}]} [ForceP ca^{[+\text{fact}]}] [TopP gli Mo ri CL be.IND.IMP.3SG know.PAST.PART that the Moors camminennu pulla via Latina [FinP Ø [IP s’ avvicinaunu sempru du walking.GER for-the street Latina CL get-close.IND.3PL always of più a Frintinu]]]]}$

more to Ferentino

- **declarative clauses**: non-factive verb selects complementiser $\text{che}$ (no factive features), hence extraction and fronting possible in modern Ferentinese because $\text{che}$ has no $^{[+\text{fact}]}$ feature.

- **non-declarative clauses**: $^{[+\text{fact}]}$ verb selects $^{[+\text{fact}]}$ $\text{ca}$ 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 ⇒ **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 ⇒ morphologically spelt out in Comp $\text{ca}$ vs $\text{che}$

> **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.
  
  #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 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.
  
  ‘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 / 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. Cha stai a di' ca Gianni s' a rubbatu? who stay to say that John CL has stolen 'What do you say that John stole?'

b. 'Ndà 'ndò dici ca Giuagni uè? from where you-say that John come-from 'Where do you say that John came from?'

c. Chi dici ca s' a rubbà tu glie biscotti? who you-say that CL has stolen the cookies '*Who do you say that stole the cookies?'

d. Purché stai a di' ca Guagni a rubbatu glie biscotti? 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. Cha nnù sai ca Gianni a rubbatu? what CL you-know that John has stolen 'What do you know (that) John stole?'

b. Da ndò sai ca Gianni uxè? from where you-know that John came from 'Where do you know John came from?'

c. *Chi sai ca rubbatu glie biscotti? who you-know that stolen the cookies 'Who do you know stole the cookies?'

d. Purché sai ca Gianni a rubbatu glie biscotti? 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 donOt 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
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