

## **1. Introduction**

This collection of articles is a spin-off the first Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax Meeting (CIDSM), held at Downing College, University of Cambridge, 22–23 April 2005. This now annual event and the present volume it spawned bear witness to the fact that, over recent decades, researchers working on the syntax of the dialects of Italy have figured heavily in much of the generative literature, coming to assume a central role in setting and shaping the research agenda through their investigations of such topics as auxiliary selection, subject and object clitics, negation, *wh*-movement, and the functional architecture of the clause. One only need think of the pioneering work of such linguists as Paola Benincà, Anna Cardinaletti, Richard Kayne, Michele Loporcaro, Rita Manzini, Nicola Munaro, Cecilia Poletto, Leonardo Savoia, Nigel Vincent and Raffaella Zanuttini, to name just a few, who have shown how the dialects offer fertile, and often virgin, territory in which to profitably study, among other things, parametric variation. While neighbouring dialects tend to be closely related to each other, manifestly displaying in most cases a high degree of structural homogeneity, they do nonetheless often diverge minimally in significant and interesting ways which allow the linguist to isolate and observe what lies behind surface differences in particular parametric settings across a range of otherwise highly homogenized grammars. By drawing on such microvariation, it is possible to determine which phenomena are correlated with particular parametric options and how such relationships are mapped onto the syntax.

Furthermore, many of the dialects boast rich and long literary traditions (dating back as early as the late tenth century) which, coupled with an abundance of diachronic and synchronic variation, offer the historical linguist a rare opportunity to explore the structural evolution of a vast number of lesser known Romance varieties. The historical evidence of the dialects has therefore often been subject to in-depth study in recent years (cf. research by, among others, Benincà, Cennamo, La Fauci, Loporcaro, Parry, Vanelli, Vincent), insofar as it affords the historical linguist an invaluable body of data to investigate many of the mechanisms involved in language change.

Besides their role in shaping and informing theories of generative syntax and language change, it is also widely recognized that, with such a profusion of variation concentrated into so limited a geographical area, the dialects constitute a remarkable observatory for synchronic and diachronic variation in all aspects of linguistic structure. As such, the dialects have a valuable role to play in investigating and testing typological variation, frequently revealing how the extent of structural variation within Romance, and indeed even within Indo-European and further afield, can prove to be considerably greater than is traditionally assumed.

From the above, it is therefore clear that Italy's unique *patrimonio dialettale*, although frequently overlooked in the past, has a great deal to contribute to research into such areas as linguistic theory, historical linguistics and typological variation. Nonetheless, the syntax of the dialects still represents a relatively poorly understood area of Italian dialectology, to the extent that there still remains a considerable amount of fieldwork to be done in recording and cataloguing the linguistic diversity within the Italian territory, as well as in bringing such facts to the attention of the wider linguistic community as part of a more

general endeavour to bridge the gap between the familiar data of standard Romance and those of lesser known Romance varieties. With this in mind, the present volume offers a number of valuable insights into the syntax of the dialects, including those of the South which historically have tended to be eclipsed by the dialects of the North (cf. Ledgeway 2007a), highlighting how the dialect data present the linguist with a fertile test-bed in which to investigate, challenge and test orthodox ideas in the literature about language structure, language change and language variation.

In particular, the book brings together a rich and varied collection of essays on a number of topics in Italian dialect syntax written by leading researchers in the field of Italian dialectology and, in many cases, also in the field of syntactic theory. The 17 essays, which fall into three thematic areas of the nominal domain, the verbal domain and the left periphery of the clause, present data from the dialects of northern, central and southern Italy, as well as the islands (Sardinia, Sicily), that directly bear on a range of diachronic and synchronic issues and problems. While admittedly the individual approaches to the three thematic areas often embrace a number of quite different perspectives, ranging from the purely descriptive to the more formal (including enlightening analyses of novel dialectal data in terms of such frameworks as Minimalism, Optimality Theory, Cartography and Relational Grammar), this variety of approaches duly reflects the extraordinary breadth and diversity of interests that issues in Italian dialectology hold for the wider linguistic community. It is thus our firm conviction that such eclecticism should not be viewed as a weakness of the present volume but, rather, as a strength, insofar as it illustrates how clear and systematic descriptions of the dialect data can consistently be exploited to yield and test

empirically robust generalizations, as well as profitably inform and challenge a rich and diverse set of theoretical assumptions.

By way of an introduction to the volume, we sketch below a general overview of the state of the art in Italian dialect syntax according to the three thematic areas identified above, outlining the principal aspects of diatopic, diachronic and typological variation, as well as a critical assessment of the role of Italian dialect data in informing and shaping recent developments in linguistic theory.

## **2. The pronominal domain: DP-NP structure, clitics and null subjects**

### **2.1. Introduction**

Here I will concentrate on clitic pronouns in particular, as well as the silent pronoun that has been proposed as central to the analysis of null subjects. I will not discuss nominalizations or complex nominals. Throughout, I adopt the DP-hypothesis, and briefly speculate on the internal phasal structure of DP.

The study of clitic pronouns in generative grammar takes its lead from Kayne's (1972; 1975) work on French. Kayne (1975) analyzed the 'special' positioning of French complement clitics (in the sense of Zwicky 1977), and proposed a movement account of this which had the important property of obeying the Specified Subject Condition (SSC), one of the conditions on transformations proposed in Chomsky (1973). Thus, clitic-movement cannot move across the null PRO subject of the subordinate clause in examples such as (1):<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In this respect, northern Italian dialects behave like French (Benincà 1994c: 130-35; Poletto 1997: 142):

1 a \*Paul la veut [ PRO manger (la) ]

Paul it= wants eat.inf. it

‘Paul wants to eat it’

b \*Paul l’ a décidé d’ [PRO acheter (l’)].

Paul it= has decided of buy.inf. it

‘Paul has decided to buy it’

Rizzi (1976; 1978)<sup>2</sup> observed that Italian complement clitics differ from their French counterparts in not obeying the SSC when contained in the complement of a lexically defined class of verbs. This class of verbs includes *volere* ‘to want’, but excludes *decidere* ‘to decide’; hence Italian shows the contrast in (2), while, as (1) shows, French does not distinguish these examples:

2 a Paolo la vuole mangiare.

Paul it= wants eat.inf.

b \*Paolo l’ ha deciso di comprare.

Paul it= has decided of buy.inf.

---

i Koñéde ve regolèr

you-must youselves= dress.inf.

‘You must get dress’ (Fas., Benincà 1994c: 134)

<sup>2</sup> The latter republished as Rizzi (1982: ch. 1) and Rizzi (2000a).

Rizzi proposed a ‘restructuring rule’ for the infinitival complements of verbs of the *volere* class, which effectively voided the effects of the SSC in just these cases.

Kayne (1972) analysed French subject clitic pronouns as part of his general analysis of the various subject-inversion phenomena found in French: subject-clitic inversion, complex inversion and stylistic inversion. The three types of inversion are illustrated in (3):

- 3 a Quand est-il arrivé? (subject-clitic inversion)  
when is=he arrived  
‘When did he arrive?’
- b Quand ton père est-il arrivé? (complex inversion)  
when your father is=he arrived  
‘When did your father arrive?’
- c Quand est arrivé ton père? (stylistic inversion)  
when is arrived your father  
‘When did your father arrive?’

Kayne distinguished these types of inversion on a number of grounds. For example, stylistic inversion can apply in indirect questions, while subject-clitic and complex inversion cannot, and stylistic inversion cannot occur in yes/no questions (direct or indirect), while subject-clitic and complex inversion can. Most importantly, stylistic inversion cannot affect clitics, but subject-clitic inversion and complex inversion must:

- 4 a \*Quand est arrivé-t-il?

when is arrived=he ?

b \*Quand est ton père arrivé?

when is your father arrived

Standard Italian lacks a series of atonic subject pronouns comparable to the French *je*-series. Correspondingly, Italian appears to lack an obvious counterpart to subject-clitic inversion and complex inversion. Both subject clitics and subject-clitic inversion (and, much more rarely, complex inversion) are attested in northern Italian dialects, though, as we shall see in §2.3.

However, standard Italian (and, as far as I am aware, all central and southern Italo-Romance dialects) allows a finite sentence with no surface subject present to be interpreted as if it has a definite pronominal subject, unlike French:

5 a Je mange la pomme.

I= eat the apple

b Mangio la mela

I-eat the apple

(5b) illustrates what has become known as the ‘null-subject’ property of standard Italian. There is a long-standing intuition that languages like Italian mark the pronominal subject ‘in the verb’, namely by the person-number agreement inflection on a finite verb. In this connection, Roberts and Holmberg (2008) quote Jespersen (1924: 213):

In many languages the distinction between the three persons is found not only in pronouns, but in verbs as well... in Latin ... Italian, Hebrew, Finnish, etc. In such languages many sentences have no explicit indication of the subject, and *ego amo*, *tu amas* is at first said only when it is necessary or desirable to lay special stress on the idea I, thou.’

The idea here is that, since a pronominal subject can be expressed ‘in the verb’ in languages such as Italian, there is no general requirement to pronounce the subject separately as a nominative pronoun. Languages like French, and English, on the other hand, lack the inflectional means to express the subject ‘in the verb’, and so subject pronouns must appear in the relevant environments. There is a sense, then, in which the Italian counterpart of French *je* in (5a) is the ending *-o*. This notion persists in the many recent analyses of null subjects.<sup>3</sup> Northern Italian dialects, many of which appear to exhibit some ‘null-subject’ phenomena while requiring the presence of subject clitics in many contexts as well, clearly present an interesting challenge to this view (see §2.3 below, and Cardinaletti and Repetti this volume).

Perlmutter (1971) linked the possibility of null subjects to another important syntactic property, the possibility of moving a subject from a position immediately following an overt complementizer by means of an operation such as *wh*-movement:

---

<sup>3</sup> See, among others, Fassi Fehri (1993), Barbosa (1995; in press), Nash and Rouveret (1997), Ordoñez (1997), Pollock (1997), Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998), Platzack (2004), Manzini and Savoia (2005; 2007), Holmberg (in press).



- 6 a \*Who did you say that – wrote this book?  
 b \*Qui as-tu dit qu’ – a écrit ce livre?  
 c Chi hai detto che – ha scritto questo libro?  
 who have.2sg.(=you) said that – has written this book

In null-subject languages, as Perlmutter observed, it appears that ‘complementizer-trace effects’ of the kind shown in (6a-b) are not found. Rizzi (1982: ch. 4) relates this to the much greater availability of postverbal subjects in declaratives in null-subject languages:

- 7 a Hanno telefonato molti studenti  
 b \*Ont téléphoné beaucoup d’ étudiants.  
 Have telephoned many (of) students.  
 ‘Many students have telephoned’

Once again, evidence from northern Italian dialects has proven essential to the theoretical and typological debate here.

The early work of Kayne, Perlmutter and Rizzi on clitics and null subjects was extremely influential, both in comparative Romance syntax and in syntactic theory more generally. Accordingly, I will concentrate my discussion on these topics here. In §2.2 I discuss complement clitics; in §2.3 I turn to subject clitics and the null-subject parameter. Finally, in §2.4 I will consider the relation between the ‘microparametric’ approach to comparative syntax that naturally lends itself to the analysis of closely related systems such as the Italian dialects, and the ‘macroparametric’ approach that, arguably, was the earlier

approach in principles-and-parameters theory (and is well exemplified by Rizzi 1982), and whose validity has recently be defended by Baker (2008a,b). Drawing on proposals sketched in Roberts and Holmberg (2008), I will suggest a link between the two.

## 2.2. Complement clitics

The principal motivation for a movement analysis of the position of clitic pronouns in most Romance varieties comes from paradigms like the following from Neapolitan:

- 8 a *Giuanne faceva 'a pizza*  
Giuanne was-making the pizza  
'Giuanne was making the pizza'
- b *Giuanne 'a faceava*  
Giuanne it= was-making  
'Giuanne was making it'
- c \**Giuanne 'a pizza faceva.*  
Giuanne the pizza was-making
- d \**Giuanne faceva 'a*  
Giuanne was-making it

(8a) illustrates the VO order, the usual neutral order in all contemporary Romance varieties where the object is a non-pronominal DP. In (8b), however, we observe that a clitic object must move to an immediately preverbal position. The ungrammaticality of (8c)

shows us that comparable movement of a non-pronominal DP is impossible, and (8d) shows that non-movement of the clitic is impossible.

However, examples such as (9) show us that clitics are sensitive to the argument structure of the verb. An intransitive like Neapolitan *rurmì* ‘to sleep’ cannot take a direct object. Hence, as (9a) shows it cannot take a non-pronominal object, and, as (9b) shows, it cannot take a clitic object:

- 9 a \*Giuanne    *rurmiva*    'a    notte  
          Giuanne    was-sleeping the    night
- b \*Giuanne    'a    *rurmiva*  
          Giuanne    it=    was-sleeping

There is a clear sense in which (9a-b) reflect a single property of *rurmì*; namely, that it cannot take a direct object. The simplest way to capture this is to posit that 'a and 'a notte both originate in the same structural direct-object position in (9). This position is not sanctioned by *rurmì*,<sup>4</sup> but is by a transitive verb like *fà* ‘to do’ in (8); hence the grammaticality, *modulo* clitic-movement, of (8) as opposed to (9). Let us suppose, then, that there is a stage of the derivation where the order of (8b) is like that in (8d). The clitic-placement rule moves the complement pronoun to the immediate left of the verb. This

---

<sup>4</sup> This idea can be expressed in a variety of partially redundant ways: by s-selection, c-selection, subcategorization or  $\theta$ -role-assignment. I will leave the details aside here. Note however that I am assuming that grammatical functions are structurally instantiated, in fact structurally defined; see Chomsky (1965: ch. 2; 1981: 10).

operation also applies to other kinds of complement, as shown in (10) taken from Neapolitan:

- 10 a Piero m' ha rato €5  
Piero me= has given €5  
'Piero gave me €5'
- b Piero ce ha miso 'o libro  
Piero there= has put the book  
'Piero put the book there'

Further support for the idea that clitic placement is a genuine movement operation comes from the fact that it is subject to conditions on movement, such as the SSC, as illustrated in (1) and (2) above.<sup>5</sup>

Let us now review some of the other properties of (Italo-)Romance complement clitics. First, complement clitics strongly tend to be attracted to the verb. In finite clauses, they are typically attracted to the left of the verb, while there is much more variation in placement in non-finite clauses (in standard Italian and Spanish, for example, enclisis is usual in non-finite clauses). There are Italian dialects, however, in which complement clitics can appear

---

<sup>5</sup> In recent versions of generative theory, the SSC is superseded by a condition requiring movement, and other relations, to be maximally local. In examples like (1), the lower clause will always contain a target for the object-clitic movement which is closer to the initial position of the object than any target in the higher clause, and hence the locality condition requires the clitic to stay in the lower clause. 'Clitic-climbing', as in the Italian (2a), requires the assumption that the lower target is missing and that there is a higher one in the main clause.

to the right of the verb, separated from it by a low adverb. Tortora (2002; this volume) gives examples such as the following from Borgomanerese (NO):<sup>6</sup>

11 a I porti mi- lla

scl I-bring neg. =it

‘I’m not bringing it’

b I vangumma già- nni da dū agni

scl we-see already =us from two years

‘We’ve already been seeing each other for two years’

In standard Italian, French and Spanish clitics cannot be separated from the verb except by another clitic:

12 a \*Gianni la, penso, mangia.

Gianni it= I-think eats

b Gianni gliela dà

Gianni him=it= gives

‘Gianni gives it to him’

---

<sup>6</sup> European Portuguese and Galician allow for enclisis of complement clitics to finite verbs under complex conditions relating to the nature of the initial (topicalized) constituent. This appears to be a distinct phenomenon from the Piedmontese one illustrated in the text.

Clearly this is not the case in the Piedmontese variety shown in (11). Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005) also show that this is not the case in Cosentino, where orders such as the following are found:

13 a un vi mancu parranu

not you= not-even they-speak

‘In any case they won’t speak to you’

b Rosina purtroppu ci sempre fatica

Rosina unfortunately to-it=always works

‘Rosina is unfortunately always working on it

In nearly all Romance varieties, clitics cluster in a fixed order, which varies somewhat cross-linguistically:

14 a \*Jean lui l’ a donné

John him=it= has given

b Gianni gliel’ ha dato

John him=it= has given

‘John has given it to him’

15 a Ils me le donnent

they me= it =give

b Me lo danno

me= it= they-give

c U mi ðanu (S.Nicolao (Corsica), Manzini and Savoia 2005, II: 172)

it= me= they-give

‘They give it to me’

Furthermore, clitic pronouns tend to be marked (to some extent at least) for morphological case, at least in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person. Hence in standard Italian, we can distinguish the (historically) dative 3sg. clitic *gli* from the (historically) accusative *lo*, for example, and similarly in French, Spanish and many dialects (e.g. Calvello (PZ) dative *l’* vs accusative *lu*). Whether this historical residue of the case system has any synchronic significance, however, is hard to say.

Finally, Romance clitics are subject to a number of constraints, most of them first pointed out for French by Kayne (1975: 81f.). Complement clitics cannot be conjoined or appear in isolation in elliptical contexts:

16 a \*Gianni lo e la vedrà  
Gianni him and her will-see

b Chi hai visto? \*Lo  
who you-have seen him

Clitics also lack word stress, although they can bear phrasal stress, as in many southern Italian imperative forms such as Papisidero (CS) *mangiatillu!* eat.imp.=yourself=it (‘eat it!’).

In contrast, tonic or disjunctive pronouns in most Romance varieties have many of the properties clitics seem to lack. First, they do not undergo clitic-placement:

16 Gianni ha visto lei

John has seen her

(Note also that the clitic must have an animate interpretation here; *lei* cannot pick out a grammatically feminine inanimate referent such as ‘pizza’ or ‘car’; see Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) for an interesting discussion and analysis of this). These forms also appear in isolation:

17 Chi hai visto? Lui

who you-have seen him

‘Who did you see? Him’

These forms are typically reflexes of historically dative forms, but their form does not change as a result of their position or grammatical function; in other words, they do not inflect for case.

Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) propose a tripartite division of pronouns into strong, weak and clitic. The division boils down to a structural distinction between a ‘full’ category – strong pronouns – and then two degrees of ‘structural deficiency’, with weak pronouns lacking the highest layer of structure and clitics a further layer. Cardinaletti and Starke treat strong pronouns as full DPs and clitics as the nominal equivalent of the IP. One way to



think of this, in terms of Chomsky’s recent proposals regarding phases, is to take the nominal to have at least following structure:

$$18 \quad [_{DP} D \quad [_{\phi P} \phi \quad [_{nP} n \quad [_{NP} N \dots ]]]]$$

This parallels the simplest version of clause structure, as assumed in Chomsky (2000; 2001) and elsewhere:

$$19 \quad [_{CP} C \quad [_{TP} T \quad [_{vP} v \quad [_{VP} V \dots ]]]]$$

Both structures divide into two phases (the basic unit of cyclic derivation; see Chomsky 2001; 2008): a ‘lexical’ phase nP/vP, and an ‘inflectional’ phase CP/DP. The n/v head controls the realization of the lexical argument structure of the lexical head (which may have no intrinsic category; Marantz 1997), while D/C controls the interaction between the whole category and external forces (case, agreement, selection properties, along with discourse (speech act, definiteness) properties).<sup>7</sup> Returning to clitics, we can think that

---

<sup>7</sup> Of course, the familiar tension arises between the adoption of simplified structures like those in (18) and (19) and the evidence from cartographical work on both DP and CP for considerably more complex structures (see in particular §4 of this Introduction for an indication of the nature of the full, cartographic structure of CP). What we may need to allow for is iteration of each part of the structure in (18)-(19), forming a ‘field’ of the abstract form ... [ X [ X [ X [ X ... (X ∈ {C, T, v, D, φ, n})]. This is the cartographic structure without the addition of specific labels individuating and ordering the functional heads in each field. This idea is similar, but not identical, to Chomsky’s (2006) speculation that the cartographic structure represents ‘the

some pronominals lack the ‘lexical phase’, and so have the structure  $[_{DP} D [_{\phi P} \phi ]]$ ; this may be the case for weak pronouns, for example. Clitics, following Cardinaletti and Starke, may then lack the D-layer, being simply  $\phi$ -elements. This and similar ideas are developed by Déchaîne and Wiltschko (2002), Harley and Ritter (2002) and Roberts (to appear). Although the details differ, there is some consensus on the fact that clitics are structurally or featurally deficient in some way; in different ways, this idea is pursued in the present volume by Manzini and Savoia, Savoia and Manzini, Egerland (for the diachrony of indefinite pronouns), and Cardinaletti and Repetti.

If clitic-placement is movement, what kind of movement is it? A number of analytical possibilities are made available in current and recent syntactic theory. Since clitics are deficient in structure, a natural suggestion is that clitic-movement is head-movement. This approach was influentially developed for the analysis of clitic-climbing by Kayne (1989b). The basic difficulty with it, if no further assumptions are made, comes from the fact that head-movement is usually thought to be subject to the Head Movement Constraint (HMC), which requires head-movement to target the closest c-commanding head.<sup>8</sup> Assuming that in a typical example like (8b) *'a* is merged as the sister of V in VP, then V is the closest head. Leaving aside the question of what might trigger such a movement (only functional heads are thought to trigger movement in most versions of contemporary theory), clitic-climbing as in (2a), as well as clitic-movement to the auxiliary in a compound tense as in (10), appear to fall foul of the HMC. One possibility is to relativize, or simply abandon, the

---

linearization of features of phase heads’ (of course, what remains completely unclear is why the linearization is as it is, i.e. why the heads are ordered as they are).

<sup>8</sup> This can be seen as a version of the general locality condition alluded to in note 5 above.

HMC, at least with reference to clitics (see Roberts (1994) on the former and Roberts (to appear) on the latter). If this can be done in a principled way, and a satisfactory account of the trigger for clitic-movement developed, then this approach may be viable.

Chomsky (2001: 37-38) suggests that head-movement is not part of narrow syntax, but perhaps part of the morphological component. If so, we might see clitic-movement as morphological or phonological movement. Since clitics are phonologically defective, we could try to relate the obligatory movement to their defectivity. This, however, is very difficult to achieve in practice. French, for example, has a radically different prosodic system from the rest of Romance, and yet its complement clitics are not dramatically different in their behaviour from those of Italian or Spanish. On the other hand, European Portuguese and Galician have a very different clitic system from most of the rest of Romance, including Spanish, and yet are prosodically quite similar. Similarly, 'repair' strategies which are sometimes invoked in the analysis of Scandinavian object shift, for example, have no obvious role to play in relation to Romance clitics, in that clitics disrupt the usual 'shape' of the Romance clause. If clitic-placement is head-movement, then, it is likely to be syntactic head-movement.

It has been suggested that clitic placement is a kind of A-movement, or that part of the derivation of clitics involves A-movement. One reason for this is that in normative French, standard Italian and many Italian dialects, clitic-placement triggers past-participle agreement (see also Loporcaro this volume):

20 a La table, je l' ai repeinte

the table.f.sg.I it=have repainted.f.sg.

‘The table, I’ve repainted (it)’

b la        past´    l    aÔÔ´    kPtt´/\*kwett

the.f.sg. pasta.f. it= I-have    cooked.f./cooked.m.

‘The pasta, I cooked (it)’ (Altamura, BA, Loporcaro, this volume)

According to Kayne’s (1989a) analysis of past-participle agreement, something must transit through a specifier position associated with the participle in order for movement to be triggered. This position must be an A-position since DP-movement in passives and unaccusatives triggers participle-agreement and the ultimate landing site of the DPs in these cases is the subject position, an A-position. Given the impossibility of ‘improper movement’ (A-to-A'-to-A movement), then, movement to the participle-agreement position must be A-movement; this conclusion can generalize to (this step of) clitic-movement.<sup>9</sup> A further reason to think that clitic-movement is A-movement comes from the highly local nature of participle agreement, as pointed out by Rizzi (2000b):

21 La table que tu as dit(\*e) que tu as repeinte.

The table that you have said(f.sg.)that you have repainted-f.sg.

Agreement on the lower participle under wh-movement in French is allowed, normatively preferred, but agreement on the participle in the main clause is strongly ungrammatical. Rizzi accounts for this by assuming that the first step of movement, to the

---

<sup>9</sup> The alternative analysis of past-participle agreement put forward in D’Alessandro and Roberts (2008) and summarized in §3.3.1 below does not necessarily lead us to the same conclusions.

participial specifier, is A-movement. Further A-movement directly to the higher participial specifier is impossible, as there is a closer intervening A-position, the subject position of the lower clause (this is the locality condition of note 5 again). Movement to the higher participial specifier via the lower SpecCP would be improper movement, since SpecCP is an A'-position. Hence agreement on the upper participle is impossible. A crucial step is that movement to a participial specifier must be A-movement; if this were A'-movement, there should be no ban on agreement 'all the way up' on higher participles.

The problem with taking clitic-movement to be A-movement is that this is hard to integrate with the approach to A-movement developed in Chomsky (2000; 2001). There, Chomsky proposes that movement is the combination of three operations: merge, Agree and pied-piping. Agree is a relation between two heads A and B in a local domain (determined by the locality principle in note 5), such that A asymmetrically c-commands B and each has an unvalued feature which renders it 'active'. In this situation, A is referred as the Probe and B as the Goal. Finite T, for example, asymmetrically c-commands the subject in SpecvP, and has unvalued person and number features, making it an active Probe. The subject has valued person and number features, but an unvalued Case feature, making it an active Goal. Hence T and the subject Agree, T's features are valued, as well as the subject's Case feature. Movement, construed as second merge (roughly 're-insertion') of the subject in SpecTP, will now take place as long as T has an EPP feature. The pied-piping condition is necessary in order to obtain DP-, rather than D-, movement.

This system provides an interesting analysis of A-movement but one which does not extend to clitic-movement. The difficulty lies in providing a principled distinction between clitics and other DPs. Suppose we take it that clitic-placement in compound tenses at least

involves A-movement to the participial specifier followed by a local, perhaps PF, step of head-movement to the finite auxiliary. There is no real problem in postulating some kind of  $\phi$ -feature agreement between the participle and the direct object (except, as pointed out by D'Alessandro and Roberts (2008), we then have to explain why participle agreement does not appear on *in situ* direct objects in (contemporary) standard Italian). But, in order to trigger A-movement of the clitic, something more is needed. It is very difficult to find a principled way, in terms of A-movement, to distinguish a trigger for clitic-placement from a trigger for general DP-movement. In other words, the A-movement approach seems to fail to capture the very core of clitic-placement, i.e. the fact that this kind of movement is restricted to clitics.

It is unlikely that clitic-movement is a form of *wh*-movement, or A'-movement. In general, *Wh*-movement gives the appearance of unboundedness, in particular in that movement over subjects is readily allowed (*Who did you say John saw?*). Moreover, A'-movement licenses parasitic gaps, which Romance clitic-placement does not:

22 ?\*(Chissu giornale), Gianni l' a gghjettatu senza leja

this newspaper John it= has thrown without read.inf.

'This newspaper, Gianni threw it away without reading (it)' (Cos.)

Of course, it is always possible that clitics do not move at all. One important reason to take the 'base-generation' alternative seriously is the existence of clitic-doubling. Clitic doubling is found, in Romance, with direct objects in Rioplatense Spanish (Jaeggli 1982), in Romanian and in various central-southern Italian dialects (including notably Neapolitan

(Ledgeway 2000; 37-38 in press b: §8.3.2.5), Corsican, Sardinian, Rhaeto-Romance and Romagnolo:

23 a La oían a Paca/a la niña/ a la gata  
her= they-listened A Paca/A the girl/ A the cat  
'They listened to Paca/the girl/the cat' (Rioplátense Sp.)

b t' a ppagat' a tté  
you= he-has paid to you  
'He paid you' (Lanciano, CH)

It is also found with indirect objects in all dialects of Spanish and is obligatory in most northern Italian dialects (Poletto 1997: 141). Indeed, Manzini and Savoia (2005, II: 518) show that this is extremely widespread in all Italian dialects (see also Ledgeway (in press b: 353f.) on Neapolitan):

24 ge lo dago a Toni  
to-him= it= I-give to Toni  
'I give it to Toni' (Venetan)

There are two options for analysing object-clitic doubling. On the one hand, we could treat the doubling clitics as a morphological realization of 'object agreement' (more technically, the probe  $v$ 's  $\phi$ -set). In that case, the object DP in object position would be a

null argument, where the clitic is not doubled; this is in essence proposed by Borer (1984) and Jaeggli (1982).

The problem with the Borer-Jaeggli approach is that it cannot deal with two very well-known aspects of object-clitic doubling: Kayne's generalization and specificity effects. Kayne's generalization, as formulated in Jaeggli (1982: 20), states that an object DP may be doubled by a clitic only if that NP is preceded by a preposition. As the examples in (23a-b) and (24) show, there is a preposition available here. Manzini and Savoia (2005, II: 525f.) show that a range of prepositions appear in the Italian dialects which permit object-clitic doubling. The specificity effects appear to be related to the presence of the preposition: both Spanish *a* and Rumanian *pe* show sensitivity to the semantic properties of direct objects they cooccur with, in that both show a strong preference for animate/human, definite, specific arguments; again, the Italian dialects show a similar pattern (I take Jaeggli's (1982: 45f.) view that various quantified direct objects, including *Wh*-phrases, cannot be doubled, to fall under this observation). Again, the same general tendencies are observed in the Italian dialects with doubling, although Ledgeway (in press b: 356-7) gives examples of object-clitic doubling with indefinite and negatively-quantified objects:

25 quacche cosa 'o bbuò vedé?  
some thing it= he-wants see.inf.  
'What does he want to see?' (Nap.)



As an alternative to the non-movement analysis, Uriagereka (1995) proposes that clitic-doubling derives from a complex DP of the following kind:<sup>10</sup>

26  $[_{DP} [ a \text{ la } \textit{ni\~{n}a} ] [_D \text{ la} ] [_{NP} \textit{pro} ] ] ]$

Taking *a* to be, as Kayne and Jaeggli supposed, just a Case-assigner, we take it to form either a PP or a KP. In this way, *a*, by Case-licensing *la niña*, ensures that the clitic is the

---

<sup>10</sup> Roberts (to appear) assumes that the double in fact constitutes (part of) the lexical phase in a DP structure like that in (18). Leaving the status of *a* aside for a moment, it is tempting to think that the noun *Paca* in an example like (23a) raises in order to be licensed as a referential phrase along the general lines described in Longobardi (1994). This idea cannot be maintained in its simplest form, however, since, as can easily be seen in (23a), full DPs can be doubled. Roberts suggests that the double corresponds to the NP root part of the phase (presumably with N-to-n raising). After N-to-n raising, nP raises to Spec $\phi$ P. Both  $\phi$  and D are occupied by a feature-bundle realized as *la* (3sg.f.), with  $la_D$  also bearing a definiteness feature. We thus have a partial structure for the clitic-doubling DP of the following form (still leaving aside *a*):

i  $[_{DP} [_D \text{ la} ] [_{\phi P} [_{nP} \textit{ni\~{n}a} ] [_{\phi} \text{ la} ] (nP) ] ] ]$

So clitic-doubling quite literally involves doubling of the formative *la*, with one occurring in D and one in  $\phi$  (although the two have a different feature composition:  $la_D$  has a D-feature in addition to its  $\phi$ -features, and  $la_{\phi}$  has an N-feature). We can encode the trigger for nP-raising featurally by assigning uninterpretable N-features and an EPP-feature to  $\phi$ ; the presence of these features constitutes the ‘strength’ of Spanish determiners, pointed out by Uriagereka. Raising of nP to Spec $\phi$ P is the exact nominal analogue of the raising of vP to SpecTP in the clause (see Biberauer 2003; Richards and Biberauer 2006; Biberauer and Roberts 2005).

closest element to the DP-external probe, *v*. The clitic is therefore the goal for *v* (see Roberts (to appear) for an account of clitic-placement in probe-goal terms).

Sportiche (1996) put forward a hybrid approach to clitic-placement and clitic-doubling. He suggests that the clitics themselves are inflections, merged in designated functional-head positions fairly high in the clause structure (Manzini and Savoia (2005; 2007) adopt a similar approach, although they posit several ‘clitic fields’ in the clause). Sportiche suggests that the argumental category corresponding to the clitic voice is attracted, either overtly or covertly, to the specifier of the clitic head. Clitic-doubling results from covert attraction of the argument to the clitic head; overt attraction gives rise to scrambling (with the head covert). Where there is no overt double, a null pronominal is present. This analysis has the major merit of relating cliticization to scrambling, but has the drawback of positing a series of designated functional elements and thereby effectively divorcing clitic-placement from the general Case-licensing/Agree system.

Given either Uriagereka’s approach or Sportiche’s, clitic-doubling is not an argument against a movement analysis of clitic-placement. Of the various movement options we have seen, all are problematic; Sportiche’s insight relating clitic-placement to scrambling is attractive, but unfortunately the nature of the movement involved in scrambling, and even whether this phenomenon involves movement rather than base-generation, remain open questions (see the overview in Richards 2004).

In conclusion, the nature of the movement operation involved in clitic-placement remains unclear. Both the A-movement and (syntactic) head-movement approaches are subject to various technical problems, as we have seen. If these problems can be overcome, then either mechanism may offer account for the phenomenon (see Roberts (to appear) for

an attempt to make a head-movement analysis work, and Boeckx and Gallego (2008) for an A-movement account).

One final phenomenon should be mentioned in connection with clitics: the Person Case Constraint. This was first observed for Spanish by Perlmutter (1971), and was also noted by Kayne (1975: 173-76) for French, who gave the following examples:

- 26 a \*Il me lui présente  
he me= to-him= introduces
- b Il le lui présente  
he him=to-him= introduces  
'He introduces him to him'
- c Il me présente à lui  
He me introduces to him.  
'He introduces me to him'

Bejar and Rezac (in press: 27) formulate the PCC as follows:

- 27 In [ $\alpha$  AGR ... DP<sub>1</sub>-oblique ... DP<sub>2</sub> ... ], where  $\alpha$  includes no other DP or AGR, DP<sub>2</sub> cannot have a marked person feature (1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup>, sometimes 3<sup>rd</sup> animate).

This captures the French paradigm in (26): 'AGR' corresponds to a target for a moved clitic in our terms, DP<sub>1</sub> is the IO-clitic and DP<sub>2</sub> is the DO-clitic.

There are many cases of the PCC reported in the literature which do not involve cliticization. Cardinaletti (2008) also points out the following example from Old Italian:

28 e    dī    come    gli        ti        se'        tutta data ...

and say how to-him= yourself= you-are all given

‘And say how you gave yourself all to him...’ (Dante, *Fiore*; 173.2)

Manzini and Savoia (2005; 2007; this volume) and Savoia and Manzini (this volume) illustrate a number of mutual exclusion patterns in clitic sequences in Italian dialects. These include cases where an apparently unmotivated (or ‘spurious’) clitic form appears, as well as cases where an expected (and interpreted) clitic form is entirely missing. For discussion and examples, see chapters 3 and 4 below.

We see that complement clitics continue to pose a number of problems. If we accept that they are always placed by movement (with the consequences seen above for doubling), then we have to integrate them into the theory of movement; it is fair to say that this has not yet been fully achieved. There are also further problems, barely touched on here: clitic-ordering in clusters, clitic climbing (briefly seen in (2a)) and ‘restructuring’ (see Cinque 2004; 2006), and the special case of clitic climbing in causative constructions. This remains, then, a central area of research in Romance syntax.

### **2.3. Subject clitics and the null-subject parameter**

One issue that has been much discussed in work on subject clitics has to do with deciding whether they are agreement markers or weak subject pronouns. This question has

implications for the null-subject parameter: if the string *scl-V* is well-formed and *scl* is a form of agreement, then the structure contains a null subject (however this is to be analyzed); if the *scl* is a pronoun then it itself is the subject and no null subject need be posited. In the Romance context, object clitics are easy to distinguish from (unmoved) objects since the languages are VO while object clitics typically precede the verb in finite contexts. Since subjects very commonly raise to SpecTP in Romance, it is harder to distinguish subject clitics cliticized to the left of T from (possibly weak) pronouns in SpecTP. In other words, in the string *scl-V* *scl* may be a weak pronoun, a clitic or a subject-agreement marker.

Rizzi (1986), building on earlier work by Renzi and Vanelli (1983) and Brandi and Cordin (1989), gave several arguments that distinguish subject-agreement markers from subject pronouns: subject-agreement markers may follow a preverbal negation, but not subject pronouns; subject-agreement markers are compatible with negatively quantified subjects, but not subject pronouns (since this would entail left dislocation of the negatively quantified subject, which is in general impossible: \**Noone, he left*); subject-agreement markers must appear in both conjuncts of a coordinate structure, while subject pronouns do not have to; subject-agreement paradigms may contain gaps and syncretisms while subject-pronoun paradigms do not. In each case, Rizzi argued, the French *je*-series act like subject pronouns while the subject clitics of Fiorentino and Trentino, for example, do not. Rizzi's arguments are developed and to some extent criticized in Poletto (2000), and, more extensively, in Manzini and Savoia (2005, I: 119ff.).

Here I will focus on the question of the relation between the verbal agreement marking and the preverbal subject element. This is really Rizzi's fourth argument, as summarized

above. While verbal inflection paradigms vary cross-linguistically from non-existent, as in East Asian languages, to extremely rich, as in Georgian (which can specify subject- direct-object- and indirect-object agreement), subject pronoun paradigms always distinguish 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular and plural in the traditional sense, with variation regarding further number specification (dual, trial) and gender marking.<sup>11</sup> The motivation for this difference between pronouns and agreement paradigms may well be functional, but it gives us a way to classify northern Italian *scls*. It may correlate with the realization of uninterpretable features (agreement) vs the realization of interpretable features (pronouns).

So, let us break the possible morphological patterns observed with subject clitics and verbal agreement inflection down into four possible types. The diacritic [ $\pm$ agr] denotes whether a clitic or agreement paradigm shows a full set of morphological person-number distinctions. In fact, I will allow that a ‘full’ set of distinctions may contain at most one zero exponent and one syncretism (which may be the zero exponent). Two further assumptions are (i) that a ‘pronominal’ paradigm must be a full paradigm, and (ii) if verbal inflection shows a ‘pronominal’ paradigm, then the null-subject parameter has a positive value (this idea has its origins in traditional accounts of null subjects, and is implemented in different ways in Rizzi 1982; Müller 2005; Roberts in press; and Holmberg in press).<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Neeleman and Szendrői (2007; 2008) show that in some languages pronouns may be morphologically transparent, with identifiable person and number morphemes (e.g. Mandarin).

<sup>12</sup> Unless the language is verb second. Since Haiman (1974), it has been observed that the verb-second property seems to prevent otherwise ‘rich-agreement’ systems from having null subjects. This may be the case for Icelandic, and is certainly the case for many Rhaeto-Romansch varieties (but, mysteriously, not for Old French).

In these terms we can envisage the following possibilities. Crucially, scl is in proclisis here (enclitic paradigms tend to be richer, see below) and the system is not a V2 one (see note 10):

- 29 a scl [+agr]      V[+agr] - a “fully redundant,” null-subject system  
 b scl [+agr]      V[-agr] - a non-null-subject system  
 c scl [-agr]      V[+agr] - a null-subject system  
 d scl [-agr]      V[-agr] - (usually) a complementary system

Strikingly, (29a, c, d) are clearly attested among northern Italian dialects, but not (29b).

An example of the ‘fully redundant’ system seen in (29a) is Fiorentino, as discussed in Brandi and Cordin (1989). In this variety, we see the following paradigm of subject clitics:

- 30 (E) parlo              Si parla      ‘I speak’, etc.  
 Tu parli              Vu parlate  
 E parla              E parlano  
 La parla              Le parlano

Here we see that the clitics and the verbal endings covary, both indicating the person and number of the subject, with only a small amount of syncretism: there is just one gap/syncretism in the clitic paradigm, involving 1sg./3sg.m./3pl.m. *e*, and one (complementary) syncretism in the verbal paradigm (between 3sg. and 1pl.). The occurrence of *parla/parlano* with 3sg.f. and 3pl.f. scl is not a syncretism, as no Romance

verbal inflection paradigm distinguishes gender, except possibly for the dialect of Ripatransone (AP; cf. Lüdtke 1974; 1976). Hence both the scl paradigm and the verbal inflection are pronominal. We therefore treat the subject clitics as agreement markers (more technically, they are a realization of the uninterpretable  $\phi$ -features of T). This concurs with the other evidence put forward by Brandi and Cordin.

(29b) represents a non-null-subject system. Here, by definition, the verbal inflection is unable to identify a null subject and the pronoun paradigm is fully realized. This is the situation we observe in French which has syncretic verbal inflection throughout the singular forms. Only one of the 180 Italian dialects reported by Manzini and Savoia has exactly the French pattern of partial syncretism in the verb endings and total differentiation of the subject pronouns (with the pronoun in proclisis, and leaving aside the verb-second Rhaeto-Romanisch varieties): Soglio (Manzini and Savoia 2005, I: 371). This is of course the pattern we find in non-null-subject languages such as English and German. The absence of this pattern in Italian dialects is an indication that at least the vast majority of northern Italian dialects are significantly different from French in this respect, and, along with the other patterns we observe in the dialects, suggests that they are consistent null-subject languages while French is not. Accordingly, I follow Kayne (1983) and treat French subject pronouns as weak pronouns in SpecTP.

A pattern of the kind seen in (29c) is found in the Como dialect (Manzini and Savoia 2005, I: 100):

31        dərmi    dərmum  
          ta     dərmat  dərmuf



al/la dərma dərmaŋ

This dialect has fully differentiated verbal inflection, but syncretisms and gaps in the clitic paradigm. We can certainly treat this as a null-subject system, just like standard Italian; the subject clitics are probably best treated as sporadic realizations of subject-related  $\phi$ -features.

Finally, a fairly common pattern is that where neither the subject-clitic paradigm nor the verbal-inflection paradigm alone show a full set of forms, but together they form a single complementary (or near-complementary) pattern (this was already observed by Renzi and Vanelli 1983; Poletto 2000). The forms of the Carrara dialect, given in (32) illustrate (Manzini and Savoia 2005, I: 80):

32 a dərma a durmiŋ  
tə dərma durmitə  
i/al dərma i/al dərmaənə

Looking at the verbal inflection, we observe syncretisms in the three persons of the singular, but here the three clitics are distinct. Conversely, the 1sg. and 1p.l clitics are the same, but the verbal inflection differs. So, taken together, the subject clitics and the verbal inflection provide distinct agreement marking for each person (this is true for all but three of the 180 dialects whose paradigms are given by Manzini and Savoia 2005, I: 72-117). Hence, if we treat the two as jointly instantiating T's  $\phi$ -set, we expect these to be null-subject systems. So here the subject clitics instantiate T's  $\phi$ -set, as uninterpretable features.

A further kind of subject-clitic paradigm needs to be distinguished, called by Poletto (2000) the ‘vocalic clitics’. These clitics, which usually have the form *a* or *i*, typically do not mark person distinctions, being syncretic either for both numbers of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> persons or indeed throughout the paradigm. This is illustrated by Emilian dialect of Gainago/Torrile (PR) as follows (Maria Cavalli, personal communication):

33 (a)    dormi        a    dormome  
           a t        dormi        a    dormiv  
           a l/la    dorma        i    dormen

Here *a* (and possibly *i* in the 3pl.) clearly does not instantiate distinct subject  $\phi$ -features. The verbal inflection makes five distinctions, thereby permitting null subjects, and the 2sg. subject clitic *t* is a complementary element, ‘completing’ the agreement-marking paradigm. It is very hard to tell what the *a* clitic is and what position it occupies. This element follows the subject, and it is not in complementary distribution with preverbal negation (this variety has a French-type *ne...pas* system, instantiated as *n...miga*). See Poletto (2000: ch. 2), Manzini and Savoia (2005, I: 219ff.) for differing proposals.

If a dialect has subject clitics, the possibility of French-style subject-clitic inversion arises (whether or not the system is a null-subject one). Many contemporary northern Italian dialects, especially those spoken towards the East, have subject-clitic inversion (it is likely that they all did at an earlier stage). Unlike what we observe in French, however, the subject clitics appear both in different forms and with differing distributions in inversion.

The Veneto variety of Loreo (RO) illustrates differences in form between proclitics and enclitics (taken from Poletto 2000: 54):

34	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	<i>Proclitic:</i>	a	a te	el/la	a	a	i/le
	<i>Enclitic:</i>	ia	to	lo/la	ia	o	li/le

A number of varieties show a partial paradigm in proclisis and a full paradigm in enclisis, including the Friulan dialect Vito d'Asio (Manzini and Savoia 2005, I: 361):

35	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	<i>Proclitic:</i>	∅	tu	al/a	∅	∅	a i/a s
	<i>Enclitic:</i>	jo	tu	el/e	nos	vos	ei/es

In this connection, Renzi and Vanelli's (1983) Generalization 9 is relevant:

If interrogative sentences are formed via subject inversion, (i) the number of enclitic pronouns found in interrogative sentences is equal to or greater than the number of proclitic pronouns in declarative sentences, and (ii) the subject pronouns found in proclitic position are also found in enclitic position.

This generalization has proven fairly robust; see Cardinaletti and Repetti (this volume) for discussion and analysis (who also conclude that these varieties are null-subject systems, but of a fundamentally different type from standard Italian).

A further possibility is that some or all persons of the putative interrogative conjugation show syncretism. Manzini and Savoia (2005, I: 564ff.) report a good number of cases of this type. Where person distinctions have been entirely lost in the enclitic, we can assume that it has been analysed as a ‘pure’ Q-morpheme. This has been proposed several times for colloquial French *tu/ti* (Roberge and Vinet 1989; Roberge 1990; Roberts 1993b); there are also a number of Franco-Provençal varieties which show this (see Roberts 1993a).

Some varieties such as Franco-Provençal Valdôtain show subject-clitic ‘inversion’ combined with a proclitic subject pronoun:

36 a Cen que dz’i dzo fe?

what that I= have =I done?

‘What have I done?’

b Dze medzo- dzòan pomma?

I= eat =I an apple

‘Do I eat an apple?’

Similar examples, from various Provençal varieties, are mentioned by Poletto (2000: 54-55), and a wide range of apparently similar cases are reported in Manzini and Savoia (2005, I: 551ff.). A possibly related phenomenon found in some (Franco)-Provençal and Piedmontese varieties (on the latter, see Parry 1994), is what Roberts (1993a: 329) calls

‘OCL-for-SCL’. Here it seems that there is just one morphological ‘slot’ for a proclitic. Where there is more than one proclitic in a compound tense, objects are enclitic to the past participle (for further examples, see Manzini and Savoia 2005, II: 442ff.):

37 Gnunc l’ a viu-me

No-one scl=has seen=me

‘Noone saw me.’ (Roberts 1993a: 330)

Finally, most northern Italian dialects show ‘free inversion’, which we expect if they are null-subject languages. It is quite common, however, for the agreement with the subject to be reduced in this case and, correspondingly, for any subject clitic to appear in a neutral form. This was in fact reported by Brandi and Cordin (1989) for Florentine, and used as support for Rizzi’s (1982) proposal that complementizer-trace violations were facilitated by free inversion in the sense that the extraction site is the freely-inverted position. The reason for this is that, where the subject of a complement clause introduced by a complementizer is questioned, the defective agreement pattern indicative of free inversion obligatorily appears. The Florentine paradigm is as follows (see Brandi and Cordin 1989: 112-27):

38 a Gli ha telefonato delle ragazze

scl= has telephoned some girls

‘Some girls phoned’

b \*Le hanno telefonato delle ragazze

scl.3pl.f. have.3pl. phoned some girls

‘Some girls phoned’

c Quante ragazze tu credi che gli abbia parlato?

how-many girls you think that scl have.3sg. talked

‘How many girls do you think talked?’

Cardinaletti and Repetti (this volume) point out, however, that the possibilities for free inversion in many dialects are somewhat more limited than they are in Standard Italian.

In conclusion, the study of the subject clitics of (mostly) northern Italian dialects has proven and will certainly continue to be of the greatest interest for comparative Romance syntax and for comparative syntax in general. Questions ranging from the correct delineation of the null-subject parameter to the characterization of inversion constructions are certainly informed, and may be determined, by answers based on data from Italian dialects.

#### **2.4. Conclusion: the nature of parametric variation**

In conclusion, I want to make a few brief remarks on what the careful study of the syntax of Italian dialects of the kind reported here may contribute to the wider theory of parametric variation. I take it that there can be absolutely no doubt as to the value of this work for Romance syntax and for finding answers to the kinds of questions entertained in the previous two sections and in the rest of this Introduction. But what of wider syntactic theory? (The following discussion relies heavily on Baker 2008a; Biberauer 2008; and Roberts and Holmberg in press).

The obvious issue that work on closely-related systems such as the Italian dialects raises concerns the nature of parameters. Kayne has argued repeatedly in favour of the benefits of the ‘microscopic’ view brought to us by, for example, the study of Italian dialects. But suppose we adopt the standard minimalist view that parametric variation is characterized by variation in the realization of formal features of functional heads. Then we are led to conclude from the discussion in the previous section that there is a parametric difference between Carrarese (in (32)) and Gainaghese (in (33)) concerning the realization or not of the vocalic clitic in the 2<sup>nd</sup> persons; Gainaghese has the positive value and Carrarese has the negative value of this parameter. This may be a very nice example of a microparameter and it may be of importance in the typology of northern Italian dialects. But one is tempted to agree with Newmeyer’s intuition (in work that is otherwise seriously misguided in many respects; see Roberts and Holmberg (in press) for criticism) that ‘we are not yet at the point of being able to “prove” that the child is not equipped with 7,846... parameters, each of whose settings is fixed by some relevant triggering experience. I would put my money, however, on the fact that evolution has not endowed human beings in such an exuberant fashion’ (2005: 83). Although, as Newmeyer implicitly admits, this is only a plausibility argument, we agree with him. It seems highly implausible that UG should specify detailed microparameters governing the nature of clitic systems or agreement systems (or classifier systems or tone systems) when so many languages lack such systems entirely. Clearly, what is needed is some structure to parameter systems, at the very least along the lines of specifying ‘if L has a clitic/agreement/tone/classifier system, then what particular kind of system does L have?’, where the consequent may break down into a further series of implicational choices.

Arguably the real issue here is the tension between descriptive and explanatory adequacy. Parameters have arguably shared the fate of 1960s-style transformations in recent years. They are very powerful formal devices that make possible, for the first time ever, the precise, theory-internal description of cross-linguistic relations (and, correspondingly, descriptions of what children must be able to acquire). However, if over-exploited, and especially in the absence of any general restrictions on their form and functioning, these devices become mere facilitators of taxonomies. As in the case of the theory of transformations in the 1970s, what is required is a theory of parameters which will constrain their form and function.

Baker (2008a) gives interesting arguments for the existence of macroparameters alongside microparameters. In particular, he gives the following statistical argument: if all variation were microvariation, we would not expect to find coarse-grained types of the ‘head-initial’, ‘head-final’ kind. If each category were able to vary freely, independently of all others, for its linear order in relation to its complement, then we would expect there to be a normal distribution of word-order variants across languages. As he says (Baker 2008a: 360), ‘there should be many mixed languages of different kinds, and relatively few pure languages of one kind or the other.’ On the other hand, if there were only macroparameters, we predict that every category in every language should pattern in one way or the other. But if we admit both macroparameters and microparameters, we expect to find a bimodal distribution: languages should tend to cluster around one type or another, with a certain amount of noise and a few outliers from either one of the principal patterns. This, Baker points out, is essentially what we find. He suggests (pp. 362-63, citing his earlier 1996 work) that the same is true regarding polysynthesis.



To this we can add a diachronic argument based on Italo-Romance. We know, and the papers in this volume attest again, that the current Italo-Romance dialects show a great deal of microvariation. However, impressive though the variation among these varieties is, a large number of features remain constant: all Italian dialects are SVO (although perhaps of slightly different subtypes; for example, in the northern Veneto there are number of V2 types (e.g. S. Leonardo) and, according to Cruschina (2008), Sicilian is a discourse configurational language),<sup>13</sup> all are prepositional, none show a systematic ergative case/agreement pattern (although some ‘split-ergativity’ is attested), none is fully polysynthetic, none shows the Chinese value of Chierchia’s (1998) Nominal Mapping Parameter (namely, in allowing a singular count noun to stand alone as an argument, giving *I saw cat*), all have definite and indefinite articles, all have moderately rich agreement systems, none has a full morphological case system, etc. On the other hand, the microparametric variation involving the kinds of phenomena studied in the papers collected here is extremely intricate.

So, we can ask, why are certain properties variable in Italo-Romance and others not? The ‘microparametric’ answer is that no theoretical significance should be attached to what varies and what does not in this particular synchronic geographically defined domain; this is attributable to a historical accident, in that the common features are due to a shared inheritance. But if we try to locate the shared inheritance in the history of these varieties, it is somewhat elusive. In Classical Latin, which must at least have been closely related to the

---

<sup>13</sup> Interestingly, this only applies to the clause. Another large rift among the dialects concerns the head parameter in the DP: in northern Italian dialects there is a tendency towards head-last (e.g. possessive / adjective / quantifier + N) whereas in southern Italian dialects and Sardinian we find the opposite setting (e.g. N + possessive / adjective / quantifier). For further discussion of the data, see Renzi (1997; 2001; 2002).

common ancestor of Italo-Romance, we find OV order, a full morphological case system, the complete absence of pronominal clitics and determiners, no (active) compound tenses, and a system of complementation in which finite clausal subordination was a minority pattern. In fact, as has often been observed, the modern Romance languages are more similar to one another than any of them are to Latin (a perusal of the first five columns of Figure 1 in Gianollo, Guardiano and Longobardi (2008: 138-39) demonstrates this). The microparametric explanation for this observation would presumably appeal to the accumulation of microparametric changes in the common ancestor language before it broke up into the dialects, namely in Late or Vulgar Latin. The question here, though, is to what extent Vulgar Latin can be regarded as a single system; the term is generally used as a cover term for the varieties of non-literary Latin spoken in Italy and elsewhere in the Roman Empire, whose written records are somewhat uniform but have been argued to form a *koiné* (Palmer 1961: 223). In this connection, Clackson (2004: 790) says: ‘the construction of a uniform “Vulgar Latin” probably oversimplifies a very complex linguistic situation. Different communities of speakers used different varieties’. If there ever was a single ‘Proto(-Italo)-Romance’ variety, it would probably have to be dated rather early, as Hall (1950) suggests on phonological grounds (proposing 250-200BC, exactly the period in which Roman rule was extended to the whole Italian peninsula). Although the Latin of this period is known to differ somewhat from Classical Latin, and to have certain ‘Vulgar’ features, it is highly unlikely that it had the syntactic characteristics of Romance rather than Classical Latin (VO rather than OV order, etc).

It seems then that the current microparametric variation either derives historically from an archaic, typologically distinct, single ancestor variety of Latin, or there is no ancestor

variety common to all the dialects. Either way, the major typological differences between Latin and (Italo)-Romance cannot be traced to a single microparametric change or series of microparametric changes in a single variety; there must have been typological drift across the varieties of Vulgar Latin. Why then, do we not find dialects which have retained a case system, or OV order, or synthetic passive forms, or which have not developed clitics, etc.? We also expect to find some dialects to have developed in the way we observe, and still others to have developed in a mixed fashion, preserving certain archaic features and innovating others. But what we find is ‘typological drift’ from OV to VO, and in the general direction of greater analyticity (as elsewhere in Indo-European). Arguably the simplest account of this kind of parallel development leads us to distinguish macroparametric from microparametric change, in postulating a small number of macroparametric changes rather than a hugely coincidental series of parallel microparametric changes (another possibility is the effects of contact, which, particularly in the case of Greek, cannot be discounted; cf. also the traditional view in Italo-Romance that the current dialect map is a rather good approximation of the distribution of the ancient peoples of Italy (Devoto 1978); see Roberts and Holmberg (in press: n. 13) for a very brief discussion).

Roberts and Holmberg conclude, with Baker, that macroparameters exist alongside microparameters. They go on to propose what they take to be a possible way to resolve the tension between explanatory and descriptive adequacy in the parametric domain. This involves retaining a formally ‘microparametric’ view of macroparameters, namely seeing macroparameters as aggregates of microparametric settings, but as proposing that these aggregate settings are favoured by markedness considerations. This proposal was made in

Roberts (2007: 274) for the Head Parameter (and is suggested as an ‘intermediate’ approach to the question of macro- vs microparametric variation by Baker 2008a: note 2).

The central idea is a markedness condition which we can characterize informally as follows:

39 Generalization of the input:

If acquirers assign a marked value to H, they will assign the same value to all comparable heads.

This markedness statement essentially says that the unmarked option for the grammatical system in relation to some feature F is ‘no F has this value’, and that the next least marked option is ‘all F have this value’. More mixed, and therefore more marked, systems may relate the possession of F to further categorial features, and the options may become progressively more specific (have longer descriptions) and more marked. For example, in relation to the head parameter, we have a cross-cutting set of options of the form (assuming, following Kayne (1994), that head-final orders are derived by movement of complements):

- 40 a Are movement-triggering features absent from all probes?  
b If not, are movement-triggering features obligatory on all probes?  
c If neither (a) nor (b), are movement-triggering features present on certain categories of probes {T, v, ...}?

- d If not (a-c), are movement-triggering features present on a subset of lexical items of certain categories of probes  $\{T, v, \dots\}$ ?
- e If not (a-d), are movement-triggering features present on a subset of lexical items of any category of probes  $\{T, v, \dots\}$ ?

The positive value of (40a) gives a rigidly, harmonically head-initial language like Welsh. The positive value of (40b) gives a rigidly, harmonically head-final language such as Japanese or Turkish. Again, (40c) breaks up into a series of microparameters, with a range of other factors enter here. The existence of this set of options, in this order, is determined by generalization of the input. The first option is the least marked and each subsequent becomes more marked, and therefore further along the learning path, cross-linguistically rarer and more prone to change. Roberts and Holmberg (in press) and Roberts (in press) show how a similar ‘parametric network’ can be set up for null arguments; this is relevant for the microparametric variation found in Italo-Romance.

Roberts and Holmberg arrive at a picture of the form of parameters as involving generalized quantification over formal features, as follows:

$$41 \quad Q(f_{f \in C}) [P(f)]$$

Here  $Q$  is a quantifier,  $f$  is a formal feature,  $C$  is a class of grammatical categories providing the restriction on the quantifier, and  $P$  is a set of predicates defining formal operations of the system (‘Agrees’, ‘has an EPP feature’, ‘attracts a head’, etc.). The longer the characterization of either  $C$  or  $P$ , the more deeply embedded in a network the parameter

will be, the more marked it will be, and the further along the learning path it will be. This maximally simple theory of parameters, also suggests an answer to the most difficult question of all: why do we have parameters at all? The format for parameters in (41), inasmuch as it allows Q to be a negative quantifier, basically states that formal features of functional heads are all in principle optional. UG says nothing more than this, which is about as little as could possibly be said (in particular, this is a more ‘minimal’ statement than either forbidding or requiring the presence of such features). Moreover, the quantificational schema is maximally liberal: it states that the formal features may be in any set-theoretic relation with any predicate defined by the theory of grammar. So parametric variation arises because UG really does not mind about the distribution of formal features in any given grammatical system. The fact that children fixate on given grammatical systems during language acquisition does not directly concern UG, however: ‘fixing’ parameters may be a facet (actually, almost a definition) of learning. So the kind of stable parametric variation we observe in adults arises from the fixation on UG-random values.

In these terms, we could ask where Italo-Romance ‘fits’ in terms of macro- and microparameters and the associated notions of markedness. Of course, it is almost impossible to give a general answer, but it is at least possible to observe that the general head-initial nature of all Italo-Romance (at least at the clausal level, see note 13) represents an unmarked macroparametric value, while the northern Italian systems of subject clitics, especially if, as suggested by Cardinaletti and Repetti (this volume), they represent ‘inconsistent’ null-subject systems, may represent quite marked, microparametrically varying systems in relation to the null-subject parameter. Something similar might apply for the central-southern varieties showing microvariation in auxiliary selection – as well as

many other areas of the grammar (e.g. participle agreement, ne-cliticization, SV vs VS word order, adverbial adjective agreement, marking of highly animate/specific Os –. in relation to a possible ergative parameter. However, these speculations can only be clarified by further analysis and systematization of the data, of the kind represented by the articles included here.

### **3. The verbal domain: TP-VP structure and auxiliaries**

#### **3.1. Introduction**

The verbal system of Italo-Romance offers an outstanding example of syntactic microvariation. Traditionally, the VP is the projection taken to encode the locus of the lexical information of the verb, its arguments, and its theta-roles. That all this information can hardly be clustered into one head is an observation that was underlined by Larson (1988), who proposed a VP-shell for ditransitive constructions. The VP-shell idea has developed in several directions, including that of a *v*-V verbal complex as the locus of Burzio's generalization. The *v* head was originally proposed by Chomsky (1955) and reintroduced in Chomsky (1995: ch. 4) and Kratzer (1996) as the head which assigns accusative Case and hosts the external argument in its specifier. This specific idea has been developed by Distributed Morphologists who take V to be the verbal root, which only has the basic meaning of the verb, while *v* provides the root with its 'v-ness' (Marantz 1997). Much work has recently been done on *v*, which is nowadays mostly conceived as the 'transitivity' head. In this short introduction we shall not enter into much detail regarding *v*, but will limit ourselves to the assumption that *v* is the head with which the external argument is first merged (or, in traditional terminology, the *v*P is the projection where the

external argument is inserted) and which assigns accusative to the object in a transitive construction, unless otherwise specified.

The INFL(ectional) head was originally proposed in Chomsky (1981) as a substitute for what had been called hitherto AUX (cf. the phrase structure rule  $S \rightarrow NP\ AUX\ VP$ ). So in Chomsky (1981), and all standard GB theory up to Chomsky (1986), there were two PS rules, namely,  $S' \rightarrow COMP\ S$  and  $S \rightarrow NP\ AUX\ VP$ , where  $S'$  was not an X-bar projection of  $S$ , but  $S$  and  $S'$  were different categories. Following proposals in Pesetsky (1982) and Kayne (1983), Chomsky (1986) replaces  $S'/S$  with  $CP/IP$ , such that the subject position, which was immediately dominated by  $S$  in the phrase structure rule model, came to occupy the  $SpecIP$  position. At around the same time, the VP-internal subject hypothesis was formulated (Kuroda 1988; Koopman and Sportiche 1991). According to this hypothesis, the subject originates in  $SpecVP$  and raises to  $SpecIP$ , where it receives nominative case. One of the pieces of empirical evidence for the VP-internal subject hypothesis was the position of the auxiliary in existential constructions. In a Sardinian sentence like *bi sun metas ervekes inoke* 'there are lots of sheep her', *sun* 'are' occupies the INFL head. Since then, INFL (then I, nowadays T) is assumed to be the head that hosts auxiliaries, whereas in previous theories (Chomsky 1957; 1981) AUX/INFL was assumed to undergo affix hopping.

The role of INFL has changed quite considerably during the course of the years, but it has fundamentally remained faithful to the original idea of being the head where the auxiliary is merged. Moreover, INFL (T nowadays) is the head which assigns nominative to the subject and which bears the tense/aspectual/modal 'morphology', which will 'attach' to the verb through V-to-T movement in Romance languages (Emonds 1978). T is hence the



head where inflection is hosted, and where information about the tense/aspectual/modal specification of the verb is encoded. T is also the head that assigns nominative case (i.e. T licenses the external argument). Finite inflection and external argument licensing thus take place in conjunction with the same head. This definition of T captures the empirical fact that the subject needs a licensing finite verb in its clause, thus capturing the common understanding that one cannot exist without the other. Examining the data from Italo-Romance varieties, we shall see below that this definition of T is however rather inappropriate. Instead, it will be shown that the inflectional information should be kept distinct from subject licensing, and that one head alone cannot (or does not, in most cases) encode all the temporal, aspectual and modal information relating to the verb.

In what follows, I will first outline a short overview of the role of T in Italo-Romance varieties. I will consider one by one the properties that are commonly assigned to T to determine how and if they hold for the Italian dialects. First, auxiliaries will be considered, and the mainstream theories of auxiliary selection will be considered in the light of the dialects, before turning to examine T as the head which hosts verbal agreement, and in particular person agreement. We will then consider T as the head of tense, aspect and mood. Subsequently, we shall examine complex verb forms, such as the periphrastic future and the multiple auxiliary pluperfect forms, after which we shall investigate V-to-T phenomena in Italo-Romance. Finally, we shall examine the syntax of past participles in Italo-Romance varieties and associated agreement phenomena.

## **3.2. Auxiliary selection in Italo-Romance**

### **3.2.1. Standard auxiliary selection**

The term ‘auxiliary selection’ refers to the variable selection of either BE or HAVE as the auxiliary in the formation of the present perfect, variously depending on verbal semantics or argument structure. One of the first attempts to explain auxiliary selection in Italian goes back to Burzio (1986), who, following Perlmutter’s (1978) intuition expressed within the Relational Grammar framework, observed that unaccusative (ergative in his terms) verbs pattern together with passives in selecting BE as their present perfect auxiliary, whereas transitives and unergatives select HAVE. Auxiliary selection is hence, according to Burzio, linked to argument structure. Specifically, BE is linked to intransitive (or passives) with an internal argument as their subject, while HAVE is selected by those verbs whose subject is an external argument (transitives or unergatives). Along the same (structural) lines, Kayne (1993) proposes a theory of auxiliary selection strictly associated with the structural definition of individual verbs. Building on Szabolcsi’s (1981; 1983) analysis of the Hungarian possessive construction, according to which HAVE is a derived form of BE, Kayne maintains that underlyingly BE and HAVE start off as the same form, namely, BE, from which HAVE is obtained through incorporation of an abstract D/P head. This non-overt prepositional D/P is situated lower than the head where BE is hosted:

42 BE [<sub>DP</sub> Spec D/P ... AgrS AgrO [<sub>VP</sub> Spec [<sub>V</sub> V DP]]]

In a sentence like (43), the subject *I* ‘I’ is generated in SpecVP and moves to SpecAgrS. From this position, it keeps moving successive-cyclically through SpecDP to reach SpecBE. However, as such this movement is not allowed, given that SpecBE is an A-position, while SpecDP is an A'-position. In order for this movement to be licensed, the D/P

head needs to incorporate into BE, transforming its specifier into an A-position and thereby permitting DP raising. This incorporation of D/P into BE is spelled out as HAVE.

- 43 I' aggiu rott' (\*rutt) 'a butteglia  
I have broken-f.sg. broken-m.sg. the bottle.f.sg  
'I have broken the bottle' (Nap., Ledgeway 2000: 191)

A completely different approach is the lexico-semantic analysis of Sorace (1993; 2000), who considers auxiliary selection of the 'standard' Romance type a reflex of a particular verb's 'unaccusative' or 'unergative' status. After comparing most Romance varieties, Sorace concludes that auxiliary selection takes place according to an Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy (ASH; for discussion, see also, Cennamo this volume), which is determined by the lexico-semantic and aspectual properties of individual verbs. Specifically, the more 'unaccusative' the verb is, the more likely it is to select BE. Unaccusativity is determined, in turn, by the semantics of individual verbs, which are arranged along a scale of unaccusativity determined by factors such as 'change of location', 'change of state', 'continuation of a pre-existing state', 'existence of state' and so on. These 'factors' are, in turn, the results of the combination of binary features such as [ $\pm$ dynamic], [ $\pm$ telic], [ $\pm$ abstract], whose values combine to give the semantic classes above. For example, in Paduan Cennamo and Sorace (2007) demonstrate that with manner of motion verbs auxiliary selection, rather like in Italian, is determined by the telic aspectual interpretation of the verb. Consequently, in (3a) *correre* 'to run' selects BE in conjunction

with a telic directional phrase, but HAVE in (3b) where the same verb is used in its non-telic interpretation:

44 a la Maria la ze corsa casa  
the Maria scl3f.sg. is run home  
'Maria ran home'

b la Maria la ga corso par tre ore in tel parco  
the Maria scl3f.sg. has run for three hours in the park  
'Maria ran for three hours in the park'

In between the structural and the semantic approaches we can find two further approaches to auxiliary selection: that of Chierchia (1989-2004) and that of Reinhart (1997). According to these approaches, BE is a marker of the subject underlying some semantic operation (reflexivization or reduction).

These approaches, with the exception of Kayne's (see §3.2.2) and Cennamo and Sorace's, all address the distribution of auxiliaries in 'standard' varieties. Remember that in these varieties, the selection of BE and HAVE varies according to the verb in question (either in terms of its argument structure or its semantics). However, auxiliary selection in Italian dialects is not limited to the kind we have just seen. In particular, it can vary according to the person of the subject, the tense and mood of the verb, the argument structure of the verb, and according to a combination of these factors. Moreover, in some varieties, there is no auxiliary selection at all, and the auxiliary selected is either HAVE or BE (for a comprehensive overview of auxiliary selection patterns in Italo-Romance, see Manzini and

Savoia 2005, II-III). In what follows, we will take a closer look at the most salient features of so-called ‘split auxiliary selection’.

### 3.2.2. Auxiliary selection according to person

In many southern Italian varieties, the auxiliary in the present perfect is selected according to the subject’s person feature. The most commonly found pattern is that in which 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person subjects select auxiliary BE and 3<sup>rd</sup> person subjects select HAVE (Rohlf’s 1969: §730; Giammarco 1973; Tuttle 1986; Kayne 1993). As an example, consider the following data from Amandola (AP) presented in Manzini and Savoia (2005, II: 681):

45 a Lu so ccamatu

him= I-am called.m.sg.

‘I have called him’

b li si ccamatu

him= you-are.sg. called.m.sg.

‘You have called him’

c L a camatu

him= have.3 called.m.sg.

‘(S)he has called him’

d Lu simo camatu

him= we-are called.m.sg.

‘We have called him’

e Lu sete camatu  
him= you-are.pl. called.m.sg.  
'You have called him'

f L a camatu  
him= have.3 called.m.sg.  
'They have called him'

This kind of auxiliary alternation has been attributed by Bentley and Eythórsson (2001) to an original neutralization of HAVE in the 1/2sg. (HABES/HABET > (*h*)*a*) due to the loss of the final Latin consonant (and its eventual syntactic doubling effect), an ambiguity resolved by using the corresponding form of BE in the 2sg., with BE subsequently extending to the 1sg.. The auxiliary selection paradigm has consequently been reanalysed as a morphological system of person marking. Observe that this analysis is supported by the fact that in split auxiliary varieties BE is obligatory only with a 2sg. subject, but not elsewhere (Manzini and Savoia 2005, II: 681). This apparent freedom suggests that there are several possible patterns of subject-oriented auxiliary selection (see Legendre, this volume, for an OT analysis of such microlinguistic variation), and this is in fact what we find (for a thorough overview of all possible interactions among person features and BE/HAVE, see Manzini and Savoia 2005, II: ch. 5).

According to Kayne (1993), this person split is due to a different strength status of the AgrS features. Specifically, Kayne proposes that strong person/number features on AgrS can only be activated by certain kind of subjects passing through its specifier, namely 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> person subjects. When activated by the right kind of features, AgrS can, in turn,

raise to D/P and convert its specifier into an A-position. Given that SpecDP is an A-position, no incorporation of this head into BE is necessary in order to enable DP movement to SpecBE. Hence, the auxiliary remains BE, since no incorporation takes place. Along the same lines, Ledgeway (2000) offers an analysis of split auxiliary selection according to finiteness in several southern Italian dialects.

It is interesting to observe, with Manzini and Savoia (2005) and D'Alessandro and Roberts (to appear), that split auxiliary selection patterns of the kind 1/2 vs 3 persons recall patterns of split ergativity found in languages such Hindi and Georgian. Notably, in these languages split ergativity tends to emerge in perfective contexts. This is also the case in southern Italian dialects, where split auxiliary selection mainly emerges in perfective contexts, as has been pointed out by the same authors. The sensitivity to feature hierarchies and to tense are thus a common feature for these otherwise very different languages.

Auxiliary selection according to person is not the only 'deviant' phenomenon with respect to 'standard' HAVE/BE auxiliation. Some southern Italian varieties predominantly exhibit a HAVE pattern (e.g. urban Nap. *ite sciso* 'you have descended', Sic. *avia nisciuto* 'he had gone out'; La Fauci 1992; Ledgeway 2000; 2007). In these varieties, most or all perfective forms are obtained with the auxiliary HAVE. This expansion of HAVE to the detriment of BE has been interpreted as a consequence of temporal/modal factors (Formentin 2001; Ledgeway 2003) or by syntactico-semantic factors (Cennamo 1999; 2002). Ledgeway (2003), for instance, presents a thorough analysis of Old Neapolitan data and compares them with data from several other southern dialects. In the *Libro de la destruction de Troya (LDT)*, an early 14th-c. text, he documents numerous alternations between BE and HAVE in unaccusative and passive contexts, which testify to the emergence

of HAVE in contexts usually reserved for BE. He observes that HAVE and BE alternate freely, but only when the verb is characterized by an *irrealis* modal value. Consequently, HAVE with unaccusatives is typically attested with verbs in the subjunctive, conditional and future. By way of example, Ledgeway discusses the sentence in (46), where an apparently free alternation between BE and HAVE occurs with the unaccusative verb *bastare* ‘to suffice’. Significantly, Ledgeway observes that HAVE appears in the conditional, while BE occurs in the indicative. In other words, when the verb appears in an *irrealis* mood, the auxiliary is HAVE, but when the same verb in the same sentence appears in the present perfect the auxiliary surfaces as BE:

46 E se eo non avesse avuta in me questa potestate **averriame** bene  
 and if I not had.subj. had.PtP in me this power it-would=to-me well  
 potuto bastare, commo èy bastato ad onnuno de quist'altri signuri  
 been-able suffice.inf. like it-is sufficedPtP to each of these other men  
 ‘And if I didn’t have this power in me, it would have sufficed me, like it has to each of  
 these other men’ (14<sup>th</sup>-c. Nap, *Libro de la destructione de Troya* 201.35-36)

Ledgeway concludes that Formentin’s (2001) proposal, according to which the extension of HAVE at the expense of BE is determined by the temporal-aspectual morpho-syntactic specification of the verb, is on the right track, but that this claim needs to be further refined by recognizing that it is actually the *irrealis* modal value of a given clause that facilitates the expansion of HAVE. Interestingly, this once again recalls split ergativity patterns. Indeed, as Ledgeway observes, ergative and accusative systems alternate in Pări



and Sumerian according to the modal specification of the clause: ‘descriptive’ mood does not permit ergative, whereas ‘intentional’ mood triggers an ergative case system (Dixon 1994).

A different explanation for the expansion of HAVE over BE in some southern Italian varieties is put forward by Cennamo (1999; 2002), who proposes that this spread begins with unaccusatives denoting mental or physical activity, with an AGENT or EXPERIENCER subject, and with telic verbs denoting dynamic situations. This analysis is not completely antithetical to that of Ledgeway, in that unaccusatives denoting activity or intention often appear in an *irrealis* mood or encode an intentional, unrealized activity.

Let us now go back to the function of T in the dialects. As stated above, T is the locus where both inflection and subject licensing are believed to be located. Furthermore, there is a supposed correlation between the verb’s finiteness and its ability to license a nominative subject, such that non-finite verbs do not usually license nominative subjects. This is traditionally attributed to the absence of T or to its defectiveness. Consider the sentence in (47):

47 \*Occorrono 10 minuti per partire il treno  
are-needed 10 minutes for leave.inf. the train

The ungrammaticality of this sentence is attributed to the non-finiteness of the infinitival verb *partire*, which cannot license the subject *il treno*. This generalization does not hold for many Italian dialects, where we can find explicit nominative subjects with non-finite verb forms such as the infinitive or the gerund (Cresti 1994; Cuneo 1997; Ledgeway

1998; 2000; Mensching 2000):

48 a Ce vonno 10 minute pe partì 'o treno

LOC want.pl. 10 minutes for leave.inf. the train

'It takes still 10 minutes before the train leaves' (Nap., Ledgeway 2007: 163)

b nu serve egnê u vîgile!

not it-serves come.inf. the traffic-warden

'There is no need for the traffic warden to come' (Cicagna, GE, Cuneo 1997: 107)

These sentences show that finiteness and subject licensing do not necessarily go hand in hand, but also that the information on tense and agreement can be accommodated into different heads. In this respect, an important piece of evidence is provided by D'Alessandro and Ledgeway (this volume), who examine the pluperfect in the Eastern Abruzzese dialect of Arielli (CH). In this dialect both auxiliaries co-occur in the formation of the pluperfect, the higher auxiliary surfacing as BE and the lower as HAVE. While the higher auxiliary carries (person and number) agreement information, the lower auxiliary carries temporal/aspectual information (e.g. *so 've viste a Marije*, lit. 'I-am had seen Mary'). This periphrastic form is not the only one in use in Italian dialects, where several analytical forms have replaced the synthetic Latin forms (see also Cennamo this volume).

In northern Italian dialects, particularly in Piedmontese, Northern Lombard, Venetan and Friulian, the so-called *surcomposée* forms are quite widely used to express actions that are completed (for the use of a similar paradigm in Old Neapolitan, see Ledgeway 1997-

99):

49 Quand l' a avü consumà  
when it= he-has had.PtP. used-up  
'When he has used it up' (Cuneo)

In (49) the auxiliary HAVE occurs twice: the first (higher) form is used to encode agreement and the lower to encode tense. This form probably originates from the complete disappearance of the Latin synthetic perfect in northern Italian dialects and its replacement with a present perfect (though see Formentin 2004). This construction shows once again that the agreement and tense/aspectual information are not always clustered within the T head.

Other periphrastic verb forms are found in southern Italian dialects to express future or modal values (Loporcaro 1999). Specifically, those varieties that lack an analytic form for 'must' generally exhibit the form 'have + P + infinitive' (see Hastings 2007). An overview of the distribution of the form *aviri a/da* ('to have to') + infinitive in Sicilian is presented in Amenta (this volume).

### 3.3. V-to-T

One of the characteristic features of Romance languages is so-called 'V-to-T' movement. This label refers to the observation that in Romance verbs move to the T head, possibly in order to receive or license their tense/aspectual inflection. V-to-T was first observed by Emonds (1978) and subsequently taken up again by Pollock (1989). Emonds pointed out a

difference in word order between the English sentence in (50a) and its French equivalent in (50b).

- 50 a John often kisses Mary  
b Jean embrasse souvent Marie

According to Emonds and Pollock, the fact that the adverb *souvent/often* appears to the right of the French finite verb and to the left of the English finite verb shows that the verb in French has moved to a higher position than in English. Accordingly, the verb in French (and in Romance more generally) is taken to move to the T head.

According to Chomsky (1991), V-to-T (or, more precisely, *v*-to-T) does not involve verb raising at all, but simply follows from whether the *v* head raises to T before or after Transfer. This in turn implies that Romance languages have strong  $\phi$ -features on T (and therefore *v* moves to T overtly, before Transfer), whereas the  $\phi$ -features on T in English are weak (hence, no overt *v*-to-T movement). However, V (or *v*)-to-T movement is hardly justifiable in a phase-theoretical approach such as that assumed in Chomsky's current instantiation of the Minimalist Program. Now that feature strength has been abandoned and that there is no correlation between movement and Agree, it proves quite difficult to explain the English/French asymmetry with respect to the position of the verb. No generally accepted solution seems to have emerged in relation to this problem. However, one possibility, put forward by Gallego (2007), is that the C-T-*v* dependency is established through Tense (see Pesetsky and Torrego 2004), and that verb movement is related to the tense specification of the clause. Here we leave open the discussion of how what appears to

be an empirical fact of (Italo-)Romance varieties can be best accounted for, noting instead that verb movement in Italian dialects seems to be more complex than in the rest of Romance. On the basis of several southern and central Italian dialects, as well as Triestino, Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005) show that the lexical verb does not have only one landing site, but at least two (see also, Tortora 2002; this volume). By way of illustration, consider the following data from Cosentino taken from Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005: 80):

- 51 a Un vi parranu **mancu**  
 not you= they-speak not-even  
 ‘They won’t even speak to you’
- b Un vi **mancu** parranu  
 not you= not-even they-speak  
 ‘In any case they won’t speak to you’

Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005) note that the clitic in these varieties does not need to attach directly to the verb. Moreover, the finite verb can remain among lower VP adverbs (Cinque 1999) in a space which Ledgeway and Lombardi identify with a clause-medial position. Sentences like (52a-b) taken from Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005: 88), which would sound very unnatural in Italian, prove perfectly natural in Cosentino (where HAS and LAS indicate the higher and lower adverb spaces, respectively):

- 52 a [<sub>HAS</sub> Rosina (\*fatica) **purtroppu**] [<sub>YP</sub> ci (fatica) [<sub>LAS</sub> **sempe** fatica] [<sub>v-VP</sub> t<sub>fatica</sub> t<sub>ci</sub>]]  
 Rosina works unfortunately to-it= works always works

‘Rosina unfortunately is always working on it’

b [HAS Rosina] [YP (cucina) [LAS cucina **buonu** (\*cucina)][V-VP t<sub>cucina</sub> ]]

Rosina cooks cooks well cooks

‘Rosina cooks well’

The landing site of the verb in these Italo-Romance varieties is hence lower than T.

### 3.3.1. Past participle agreement

The position of the non-finite verb (and the past participle in particular) can also play a significant role in some Italo-Romance varieties. In dialects like Eastern Abruzzese, past participles can agree with the external argument, contradicting Belletti’s (2005) generalization according to which past participles never agree with external arguments in Romance. Moreover, the past participle can also overtly agree with an internal argument, which, again, does not happen in standard Italian. D’Alessandro and Roberts (to appear) explain these facts by claiming that the participle occupies a higher position in standard Italian than it does in Eastern Abruzzese, with the consequence that the participle and the direct object are not in the same Spell-Out domain at PF and hence are unable to realize the Agree relation morphophonologically. Following D’Alessandro and Roberts (2008), D’Alessandro and Roberts (to appear) propose that the overt realization of the Agree relation is obtained only if the elements that are in an Agree relation belong to the same Spell-Out domain. In standard Italian, the participle raises to a position outside the substructure containing the direct object and hence the two do not overtly agree. In Eastern Abruzzese (and presumably a number of other central-southern dialects where general

participle agreement with direct objects is observed; cf. Loporcaro 1998; this volume), the participle remains in a sufficiently 'low' position for overt agreement to be licensed.

The following sentences highlight that the position of the past participle is different in Italian than in Eastern Abruzzese. As noted above for Ledgeway and Lombardi, the difference does not lie in grammaticality versus ungrammaticality but, rather, in what is more natural in the two languages. The sentence in (53a) is perfectly natural in Eastern Abruzzese, but more marked in Italian.

53 a Le so poche capite (?poche)

it= I-am little understood little

b L' ho (??poco) capito poco

it= I-have little understood little

'I understood it a little' (D'Alessandro and Roberts to appear, fn. 14)

As for the external argument, once again the subject and the past participle are much closer in Eastern Abruzzese than in Italian. D'Alessandro and Roberts propose that *v* is the head that licenses the subject in Eastern Abruzzese, and propose a mechanism of feature inheritance for external argument agreement in Eastern Abruzzese. Observe furthermore that, if D'Alessandro and Roberts are on the right track, this means that *v* is not the only head that can assign nominative in Romance.

Manzini and Savoia (2005, II: ch. 5) offer an overview of past participle agreement facts, discussing the correlation with auxiliary selection (for a treatment within a Relation Grammar framework, see also Loporcaro 1998). It is traditionally assumed that with BE

selection past participle agreement is present, whereas no past participle agreement takes place, either with the subject or the object *in situ*, when the auxiliary is HAVE. This claim is substantiated by languages such as Spanish, which does not have auxiliary selection (invariably selecting HAVE in the present perfect) and does not display past participle agreement (except in the passive), and Italian, where the presence of BE (with passives and unaccusatives) correlates with past participle agreement with the internal argument, while the presence of HAVE (with transitives and unergatives) correlates with zero agreement. Legendre (this volume), offers however some examples of languages where this correlation does not hold. As for agreement with the object *in situ*, in some dialects such Carmiano, Copertino and Alliste (LE; Manzini and Savoia 2005, II: 561), as well as in Old Italian, this type of agreement is still robustly documented (see also Loporcaro, this volume, for a discussion of similar cases in Campania):

54 addzu ʃʃakkwate ε kammise

I-have washed.f.pl. the.fpl. shirtsf.pl.

‘I washed the shirts’ (Alliste, LE, Manzini and Savoia 2005, II: 516)

To conclude, it is important to underline that the phenomena discussed above are in no way intended to provide an exhaustive account of the enormous variation that the dialects of Italy afford the linguist with regard to typological and theoretical issues relating to the structure of the Italo-Romance T-V system. Rather, the aim of this section has been to merely offer a selective overview of some of the main problems that the dialects raise and



some indication of the vast micro-variation attested in this area of the grammar.

#### **4. The clausal domain: CP structure and the left periphery**

##### **4.1. Introduction**

In recent years much research within generative syntax has been increasingly directed towards the investigation of the fine structure of the C-domain, culminating in the seminal work of Rizzi (1997) which has given rise to a widely-accepted view of the fundamental cartography of the left periphery.<sup>14</sup> Significantly, a considerable amount of such work on the split C-system has been conducted on the basis of the rich dialectal variation offered by the linguistic varieties of the Italian peninsula,<sup>15</sup> which in many cases provide invaluable overt evidence with which to map the fine structural organization of the left periphery. In particular, the left periphery, traditionally defined in terms of CP and its associated specifier and head positions hosting *wh*-operators and complementizers (cf. 55), respectively (Chomsky 1986: §1), is now conceived as a split domain, hierarchically articulated into several fields and associated projections. In what follows we shall review some of the dialectal evidence in support of this richly articulated representation of the C-

---

<sup>14</sup> Much of Rizzi's (1997) sketch of the left periphery is already informally mapped out in Benincà's (1988) descriptive overview of the Italian left periphery. It is also worth recalling that Chomsky (1977) posited a TOPIC position above COMP.

<sup>15</sup> See, among others, Benincà (1983; 1994b; 1996; 2001; 2003; 2006), Munaro (1999; 2003; 2004), Poletto (2000; 2001; 2003; 2005b), Munaro and Poletto (2002), Chinellato and Garzonio (2003), Ledgeway (2003b; 2005; 2007b; 2008; in press a), Paoli (2003a; 2003b; 2005; 2007), Benincà and Poletto (2004), Garzonio (2004), Poletto and Zanuttini (2003), Cruschina (2006), Damonte (2006b; in press), Remberger (in press).

domain, although limitations of space allow us to consider here only a small selection of the available evidence reported in the literature.

55 [<sub>SpecCP</sub> *wh*-XP [<sub>C</sub> Comp [<sub>TP</sub>... ]]]

#### 4.2 *Topic and Focus fields*

The traditional assumption of a simple CP layer immediately above the sentential core (cf. 55) forces us to assume that topicalized or focused elements target the same position, namely SpecCP. This assumption, however, runs into a number of empirical difficulties. For instance, it incorrectly predicts that fronted topicalized and focused constituents should occur in complementary distribution given the availability of a single position. Yet one does not need to look far to find evidence to the contrary: just consider the first documented attestation of the vernacular within the Italian peninsula, the *Placito capuano*, a brief, formulaic, sworn declaration dating from March 960 (see also Benincà 2003: 241):<sup>16</sup>

56 Sao ko kelle terre, per kelle fini que ki contene, TRENTA ANNI  
I-know that those lands for those confines which here contains thirty years  
le possette parte sancti Benedicti  
them= possessed party of-saint Benedict

---

<sup>16</sup> In all examples that follow, topicalized constituents are underlined, contrastive foci appear in small capitals and non-contrastive foci in bold. All other salient categories appear in italics.

‘I know that, those lands, within those borders which are contained here [in the document/map], have belonged for thirty years to the part [= monastery] of St. Benedict [of Montecassino]’

Although an extremely brief glimpse of the early vernacular, it nonetheless contains for our purposes invaluable early evidence of the fine structure of the C-domain and, in particular, incontrovertible proof of the existence of at least two left-peripheral positions. Even within a theory in which multiple specifier positions are allowed (Chomsky 1995; 2000; 2001), it is not immediately clear how the rigid Topic + Focus ordering in (56) is to be captured. Moreover, this example, in which the contrastively focused constituent *TRENTA ANNI* ‘thirty years’ is preceded by the two topicalized constituents *per kelle fini que ki contene* ‘within those borders that are contained here’ and *kelle terre* ‘those lands’, highlights that even the postulation of two left-peripheral positions is not sufficient. Rather, the relevant positions must be reconceived as distinct pragmatico-syntactic spaces along the lines of Benincà and Poletto (2004), according to which we can identify from left to right at least two fields termed *Topic* and *Focus*, respectively. Not only is this demarcation between *Topic* and *Focus* justified at a pragmatico-semantic level, in that elements appearing in the *Topic* field are generally interpreted as ‘old’ or ‘given’ information whereas the *Focus* field is typically associated with informationally ‘new’ elements, but it also finds considerable confirmation at the syntactic level. For instance, in contrast to elements appearing within the *Topic* field, which often call for a resumptive pronominal clitic where available

(cf. 57a),<sup>17</sup> those appearing within *Focus* (cf. 57b) typically prove incompatible with a pronominal copy (Benincà 2001: 43ff.):

57 a Mario, de so sorela, \*(el) ghe ne parla sempre

Mario of his sister scl= of-her= speaks always

‘Mario is always talking about his sister’ (Pad., Benincà and Poletto 2004)

b **El mato del pian de soto** (\*lo) go visto

the guy of-the floor of below him= I-have seen

‘I saw the guy from downstairs’ (Tries., Paoli this volume)

Additional evidence for this strict structural demarcation between the *Topic* and *Focus* fields comes from the distribution of clitic placement in the medieval dialects (Benincà 1994b: 228-38; 2003: 243-44; 2006: 67-68; Salvi 2004: ch. 3; Poletto 2005b: 226; Ledgeway 2007b: 131-34; 2008: 443), which generally display enclisis following topicalized constituents (cf. 58a) and proclisis in conjunction with fronted focused constituents (cf. 58b):

58 a [<sub>TopP</sub> de queste toy promissiune [<sub>FocP</sub> Ø [<sub>FinP</sub> voglyo [<sub>TP</sub> t<sub>voglyo</sub> *nde* essere

of these your promises I-want =thereof be.inf.

certa]]]]

certain

---

<sup>17</sup> Also relevant here is the use of the resumptive clitic *le* ‘them’ referencing the topic *kelle terre* ‘those lands’ in (56) above.

‘I want to be certain of these promises of yours’ (14<sup>th</sup>-c. Nap., *Libro de la destructione de Troya* 60.21-22)

b [<sub>FocP</sub> **sì**    **fuorti cuolpi** [<sub>FinP</sub> *li*    donava [<sub>TP</sub> *t<sub>li</sub> donava t<sub>sì</sub> fuorti cuolpi*]]]

such strong blows    to-it=he-gave

‘he gave him such strong blows with his sword’ (ibid. 66.12)

These facts find a straightforward explanation in terms of the traditional Tobler-Mussafia Law, one of the principal generalizations of which states that enclisis obtains whenever the verb occurs in clause-initial position. Thus, in the case of focus fronting in (58b), proclisis invariably obtains since the verb (raised to C-Fin under V2) occurs in second position preceded by a fronted constituent in the *Focus* field. However, whenever the topicalization space hosts a hanging topic or a left-dislocated constituent, and the *Focus* field remains empty (cf. 58), only enclisis is possible because the verb now raised to C-Fin technically occurs in clause-initial position, inasmuch as elements contained within the *Topic* space are extra-sentential and hence prove invisible to the computation of the Tobler-Mussafia generalization. In short, we interpret the observed proclisis-enclisis alternation as a side effect of V2 fed by verb raising to C-Fin, which creates either a V1 structure and enclisis with no fronting to the *Focus* field or a V2 structure and proclisis with fronting to the *Focus* field. Robust evidence like this demonstrates that topicalized and focused constituents indeed target distinct spaces within the left periphery, forcing us to recognize a representation of the C-domain along the lines of (59) below:

59 [<sub>CP</sub> Comp [<sub>TopP</sub> Top [<sub>FocP</sub> Foc [<sub>TP</sub>...]]]]

## 4.1.2 Internal structure of *Topic* and *Focus* fields

### 4.1.2.1 The *Focus* field

The evidence of Italian and other Romance languages suggests the existence of, at most, a single focus position specialized in licensing contrastively focused interpretations (typically correcting a previous assertion). While it is true that some dialects such as Turinese appear, on a par with French, not to license any left-peripheral focus position (cf. 60a; Paoli 2003a), most northern dialects pattern with Italian in this respect. However, the further one moves South, the more accessible the *Focus* field becomes, such that in many southern dialects, notably Sicilian (Bentley 2007; Cruschina this volume), as well as in Sardinian (Mensching and Remberger this volume) and, quite exceptionally among the northern dialects, Triestino (Paoli this volume), the *Focus* field also licenses non-contrastively focused constituents, as illustrated by the Sicilian examples in (60b-c):

60 a (\*IL GELATO) a l' ha catà IL GELATO, nen la torta  
the ice-cream scl=has bought the ice-cream not the cake  
'It is the ice-cream that he bought, not the cake'

b A SALVU i chiavi i detti  
to Salvu the keys them= I-gave  
'It was Salvu I gave the keys to' (Sic., Cruschina this volume)

c A cu i dasti i chiavi? A SALVU i detti  
to who them= you-gave the keys to Salvu them= I-gave  
'Who did you give the keys to? I gave them to Salvu (Sic., Cruschina this volume)

Although the contrastive and informational foci in (60b-c) might appear to move to the same left-peripheral position, as suggested by the fact that they can never co-occur, there are good reasons to believe that they target distinct positions. More specifically, we can view the *Focus* space as a hierarchically-structured field, articulated from left to right into the subfields of *Contrastive Focus* (CFoc) and *Informational Focus* (IFoc) which provide dedicated positions for contrastively and informationally focused constituents (see also Benincà 2003: 238-39; Rizzi 1997; Kiss 1998; Belletti 2001a; 2004; Benincà and Poletto 2004; Cruschina 2008: ch. 3). This distinction is supported, among other things, by the observation that in those dialects that display both types of foci only contrastive focus, but not informational focus, is compatible with embedded contexts (see, this volume, Cruschina §3.3; Paoli §3.1), witness the Triestino contrast in (61a-c):

- 61 a (DAMONTI) se pensava che (DA MONTI) i gavessi meio roba,  
 at Monti self= thought that at Monti scl.3pl.=had betterstuff  
 no al'Emporio  
 not at-the-Emporio  
 'It is AT MONTI'S that we thought they had better things, not at the Emporio'
- b **Una pelicia** me preocupa che (?**una pelicia**) la se cioghi  
 a fur me= worries that a fur scl.3f.sg.= self= buys  
 'I'm worried that she will buy herself a fur coat'

Similarly, in these same varieties strict adjacency between the verb and the focused constituent is only required in the case of the lower informational focus position (see, this volume, Cruschina §3.1; Mensching and Remberger §4.1; Paoli §4), as revealed by the following Sardinian contrast (taken from Cruschina 2008: ch. 3):

- 62 a SOS DURCHES, a su pitzinnu appo comporadu, no sos puliches  
 the sweets to the child I-have bought not the fleas  
 ‘I bought sweets for the child, not fleas’
- b \***Retzidu** dae Predu as su regalu?  
 received from Predu you-have the gift  
 ‘Did you receive the gift from Predu?’

This same lower focus position also appears to be involved in hosting (non-D-linked) *wh*-interrogatives, since these too require strict adjacency with their associated inflected verb (Munaro, this volume, §2):<sup>18</sup>

- 63 Al marcà quanti libri (\*al marcà) avé-o comprà?

---

<sup>18</sup> As demonstrated in Munaro (this volume, §2), these same *wh*-interrogatives target the specifier of the higher ForceP projection when employed in exclamatives, witness their position to the left of clitic left-dislocated topics:

- i *Che bel liber, a la tua surèla*, che gh’ àn regalà!  
 what fine book to the your sister that to-her= they-have given  
 ‘What an interesting book they’ve given your sister as a present!’ (Mil.)



at-the-market how-many books at-the market have=2scl.2pl. bought?

‘At the market, how many books did you buy?’ (Bell.)

As subfields, however, even CFoc and IFoc can be further dissected to reveal additional positions within these spaces. For example, following Poletto and Zanuttini (2000), Benincà and Poletto (2004: 61) note in the Rhaeto-Romance V2 dialect of S. Leonardo (BZ) a differential licensing of contrastively focalized constituents in embedded contexts. More specifically, in complements to non-bridge verbs only circumstantial and quantificational adverbs such as *da trai* ‘sometimes’ can be fronted under contrastive focus (cf. 64a), whereas other adverbial types such as *d sigy* ‘for sure’ (cf. 64b) and other categories such as objects like *l giat* ‘the cat’ prove ungrammatical (cf. 64c):

64 a al s cruzie c DA TRAI l a-al odù

he is worried that sometimes him= has-he seen

‘He is worried because he saw him sometimes’

b \*al s cruzie c D SIGY mang-ela a ciasa

he is worried that for sure eats-she at home

‘He is worried because she is going to eat at home for sure’

c \*al s cruzie c L GIAT a-al odù

he is worried that the cat has-he seen

‘He is worried that it was the cat he has seen’

Under the usual assumption that non-bridge verbs do not select a full CP layer, the contrast in (64a) vs (64b-c) follows straightforwardly: the CP space is pruned below the focus projection(s) which license the contrastive reading of particular adverb classes and objects, but retains the lower focus projection(s) responsible for licensing the contrastive reading of circumstantial and quantificational adverbs.

A similar split within the IFoc space is evidenced by the behaviour of indefinite quantifiers (Benincà and Poletto 2004: 62-63; Cruschina 2008: ch. 3, §3.5.1). Although not all dialects permit fronting of informationally new, non-contrastive constituents (cf. 65a), many varieties do readily allow fronting of indefinite quantifiers even in the absence of a contrastive reading (cf. 65b):

- 65 a Cchi ti bu mangià? - (\***Nu milu**)Mi mangiu **nu milu**  
 what yourself= you-want eat.inf. an apple myself= I-eat an apple  
 ‘What do you want to eat? – I’ll eat an apple’ (Cos.)
- b **’Ngunacosa** m’ aja mancià  
 something myself= I-must eat.inf.  
 ‘I must eat something’ (Cos.)
- c criju ca **’ngunacosa** cci addi essa  
 I-believe that something there has be.inf.  
 ‘I think that there must be something’ (Cos.)

Just like other foci, fronted indefinite quantifiers such as *’ngunacosa* in (65b) prove incompatible with clitic resumption and on a par with informational focus, but unlike

contrastive focus, must stand strictly adjacent to the verb. However, the contrast in grammaticality of informational focus fronting and quantifier fronting in varieties like Cosentino evidenced in (65a-b)<sup>19</sup> – widely attested in many other varieties, including northern Italian dialects where bare quantifiers in subject function always target the *Focus* field – suggests that non-contrastive focus should be dissected into at least two distinct positions. Indeed, this splitting of the non-contrastive focus space is further substantiated by examples like (65c), which demonstrate that fronted indefinite quantifiers, unlike canonical informational foci (cf. 61b), can be fronted even in embedded contexts. We might tentatively interpret this contrast as indicative of a higher position for indefinite quantifiers which is not pruned in embedded contexts, as is the lower position dedicated to canonical informational foci.

At this point in our discussion, we can thus sketch the following extended representation of the focus field within the left periphery (curly brackets indicate fields):

66 [CP Comp [TopP Top {Focus [CFocP1 Obj/Adv [CFocP2 Adv<sub>circum./quant.</sub> [IFocP1 Indef-Q [IFocP2 IFoc  
[TP...]]]]}]]]

#### 4.1.2.2 The *Topic* field

---

<sup>19</sup> Although irrelevant to the present discussion, it should be noted that (65a) with fronting of the direct object is grammatical under the marked ‘mirative’ reading (Cruschina 2008: chs 2, 3) expressing, typically in exclamatives, such nuances as disbelief and surprise, roughly paraphrasable in this case as ‘I’ll eat an apple, of course, what else do you expect me to eat?’. While this reading is also available in varieties like Sicilian, the latter also permits a purely, unmarked informational reading (namely, ‘I’ll eat an apple’), not available in Cosentino.

One does not need to look far to find evidence for the complex internal structure of the *Topic* field. In addition to early examples like (56) above, the modern dialects also abound in structures with multiple topics such as the Sardinian and Marchigiano examples in (67a-b), respectively:

- 67 a E tui sa fà **pappàda** ti dd' hasi?  
 and you the bean eaten yourself= it= you-have  
 ‘And have you eaten the beans?’ (Mensching and Remberger, this volume)
- b I fijə mia lo spumante a capodanno l’ a biudo  
 the children my the spumante at New-Year’s-Eve it=has drunk  
 ‘my children drunk spumante on New Year’s Eve’ (Peverini in prep.)

Evidence such as this has led many to suggest a number of further subdivisions within the *Topic* field, the most significant of which is that between the *Frame* and *Theme* subfields (Benincà and Poletto 2004: §3.1; Benincà 2006: 54-58). In pragmatico-semantic terms, these two subfields differ in that the former defines the ‘frame’ to which the sentence refers, including its spatio-temporal coordinates, while the latter defines the entities which the sentence is about, including the theme of predication and other anaphoric constituents taken to express shared knowledge (Chafe 1976: 50). The pragmatico-semantic primacy of *Frame* with respect to *Theme* is also reflected at the syntactic level in the obligatory ordering *Frame* + *Theme* (cf. 68a). Within the former we can recognize hanging topics (HT) and scene-setting adverbials ( $Adv_{sc.-set.}$ ), with hanging topics situated above scene-setting adverbs (cf. 68b). Besides its left-most position, hanging topics are distinguished

from other topic elements in being restricted to a single occurrence per sentence and in invariably surfacing as DPs (Benincà 2001: 43), their syntactic function being obligatorily signalled by a resumptive pronoun or epithet within the sentential core.

68 a iu 'a ciucculata non mi piaci

I the chocolate not me= pleases

‘I don’t like chocolate’ (Reg.)

b io 'a \_\_\_\_\_ quando è muorto pàteto me staie ntussecanno 'a vita mia!

I from when is died father=my me= you-are poisoning the life my

‘Since my dad died, you’ve been poisoning my life!’ (Nap.)

As for scene-setting adverbs, their position within the higher portion of the left periphery finds support in the V2 variety of S. Leonardo (BZ) considered in (64) above (Benincà and Poletto 2004: 66). Whereas in root clauses a scene-setting adverb such as the temporal *duman* ‘tomorrow’ proves entirely grammatical when fronted under topicalization or contrastive focus (cf. 69a), this is not the case for the topicalized reading in embedded clauses (cf. 69b), even when selected by a bridge verb, an observation which suggests that the top ‘frame’ layer of the CP has been pruned in these cases since its semantics is fundamentally incompatible with the informational structure of subordination:

69 a duman / DUMAN va-al a Venezia

tomorrow / TOMORROW goes-he to Venice

b Al m a dit c \*duman / DUMAN va-al a Venezia

he me= has told that tomorrow / TOMORROW goes-he to Venice

‘(He told me that) he is going to Venice tomorrow’

Turning now to the *Theme* subfield, here too we need to recognize several subtypes of thematicized constituent, the number of which, unlike topic elements occurring in the *Frame* subfield, is in principle unrestricted, although subject to the pragmatic intentions of the speaker to repeat or re-establish particular anaphoric constituents of the previous discourse or to introduce cognitively accessible referents considered to form part of the interlocutors’ shared knowledge. Syntactically, all elements occurring in the *Theme* subfield are generally referenced by a resumptive clitic pronoun, where available, constituting a case of clitic left-dislocation (CILD; Cinque 1990):

70 Mario, na casa, no l la compra

Mario a house not scl=it=buys

‘Mario is not going to buy a house’ (Pad., Benincà and Poletto 2004)

As for the topic types occurring in *Theme*, there is no general consensus as to the number of distinct positions involved and their precise pragmatic interpretations (for an overview, see Benincà and Poletto 2004: 64-70; Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007; Cruschina 2008: ch. 1, §1.5). A broad distinction between *aboutness topics* (ATop) and all other types of (clitic) left-dislocated topics (sometimes termed *referential* or *familiarity topics*) is, however, widely recognized. The former represent what the (categorical) sentence is about, thus standardly equated with the subject of predication and hence limited

to a single occurrence per clause and the preverbal position, whereas the latter re-establish contextually-given referents belonging to the previous discourse, hence optional and unlimited in number and occurring in both pre- and postverbal position.<sup>20</sup> As a general principle, then, aboutness topics precede all other topic elements in the *Theme* field, as witnessed by the order of clitic left-dislocated subject and object in the Paduan example in (70).

In many varieties, these different topic categories are distinctly marked. For instance, Ledgeway (in press, a) demonstrates that, as part of a topic-announcing or topic-shifting strategy, the aboutness topic in Campanian dialects is encoded by a doubling distal demonstrative *chillo* ‘that-one’ (cf. 71a), whereas Cruschina (2006; 2008: ch. 1, §2.1) proposes for Sicilian a strict principle of Syntactic Extraposition (SE), which requires all [-focus] constituents to be obligatorily dislocated to dedicated functional positions (cf. 71b):

- 71 a Chillo, San Pietro, 'o tuzzuliaie rint''e scianche, a Gesù  
 that-one.m. Saint Peter.m. him= tapped in the hips, to Jesus  
 ‘Saint Peter tapped Jesus on his hip’ (Brezza, Grazzanise, CA)
- b A Maria ci dissi ca pitrusinu n' u jardinu un ci nn' avi  
 to Maria to-her=I-saidthat parsley in the garden not there= of-it= she-has  
 a chiantari  
 to plant.inf.

---

<sup>20</sup> On the existence of a further position within the *Theme* subfield hosting left-dislocated topics with a ‘List Interpretation’, see Benincà and Poletto (2004: §3.3).

‘I told Maria not to plant parsley in the garden’ (Cruschina 2008)

Putting together the results of our discussion so far, the richly articulated functional structure of the left periphery can be represented schematically as in (72):

72 [CP Comp {Topic [FrameP1 HT [FrameP2 Adv<sub>sc.-set.</sub> [ThemeP1 ATop [ThemeP2 CILD  
 {Focus [CFocP1 Obj/Adv [CFocP2 Adv<sub>circum./quant.</sub> [IFocP1 Indef-Q [IFocP2 IFoc [TP...]]]]]]}}]]}]

### 4.3 Force, Finiteness and other projections

Finally, we note that the *Topic* and *Focus* fields outlined above are, in turn, closed off upwards by a complementizer position *Force* marking the illocutionary force of the clause, hosting such items as the southern Calabrian and Salentino finite declarative/epistemic complementizer (QU(I)A >) *ca* (cf. 73a-b, 74a-b), and downwards by a complementizer position *Fin(iteness)* specifying the modality and/or finiteness of the clause, hosting such items as the southern Calabrian and Salentino irrealis complementizers (MODO >) *mi / mu* and (QUOD >) *cu* (cf. 73c-d, 74c-d):<sup>21</sup>

73 a nci        dissì *ca*, nta dda casa, non ci        vai        chiùni  
 to-him= I-saidthat in    that house, not there= he-goes more

<sup>21</sup> For further discussion of the position and distribution of dual complementizers in the dialects of the extreme South, see Calabrese (1993), Ledgeway (1998; 2003b; 2005), Damonte (2002; 2006a), Roberts and Roussou (2003: §3.2), Manzini and Savoia (2005, I: 455-501, 650-76), Hart (2006; 2007; in prep.) and Vecchio (this volume).



‘I said that he doesn’t go to that house anymore’ (Reg.)

b v’ assicuru *ca* NA BELLIZZA CUMPAGNA, non si trova

‘you=I-assure that a beauty companion not self= finds

‘I assure you that you’ll never find such a beauty’ (Reg.)

c spittava ‘a carbunella *mi* sbrasciava

he-waited the coal that was-incandescent

‘He waited for the coal to glow brightly’ (Reg.)

d falli celati e **nudhu** *mu* ti vidi

do-them hidden and nobody that you= sees

‘Do them secretly and such that nobody sees you’ (Radicena, RC)

74 a Addzu tittu *ka* la Lia ene

I-have said that the Lia comes

‘I said that Lia is coming’

b Addzu tittu *ka* KRAI ene

I-have said that tomorrow she-comes

‘I said that it’s tomorrow that she is coming’

c Oyyu lu libbru *ku* *lu* kkatta *lu* Maryu

I-want the book that it= buys the Mario

‘I want Mario to buy the book’

d Oyyu KRAI *ku* bbene *lu* Maryu

I-want TOMORROW that comes the Mario

‘I want Mario to come tomorrow’

Further compelling evidence for these two complementizer positions comes from those varieties which allow the simultaneous lexicalization of both positions around a fronted topic or focus constituent, including Ligurian (cf. 75a; Paoli 2002; 2003a,b; 2005) and many early southern Italian varieties (cf. 75b-d; Ledgeway 2003b: §4.3.2.2; 2005: 380-89):<sup>22</sup>

- 75 a A Teeja a credda *che* a Maria *ch'* a parta duman  
the Teresa scl believes that the Mary that scl leaves tomorrow  
‘Teresa believes that Mary will leave tomorrow’ (Lig.)
- b Et èy manifesta cosa *che* homo che se ave a defendere a la patria soa intre li amici e li canussienti suoy *cha* ave a chesta parte gran prerogativa e gran avantayo  
‘And it is abundantly clear that (*che*), a man who has to defend himself in his own country among his friends and acquaintances, that (*cha*) he has in this respect considerable privilege and advantage’ (14<sup>th</sup>-c. Nap., *Libro de la destructione de Troya* 126.2-4)
- c Et ancora li mandao a dire lo re *che* si li volia obedire alli sua comandamenti, *ca* li perdonara omne cosa  
‘And again the king had word sent to him that (*che*), if he wished to obey his orders, that (*ca*) he would forgive him everything’ (15<sup>th</sup>-c. Sal., *Il libro di Sidrac salentino* 2v.38-9)

---

<sup>22</sup> In the following early southern examples we do not provide glosses, the English translations reflecting (albeit somewhat unnaturally) the surface realizations of the two complementizers in the original sentences.

d È da sape(re) *ch(e)* lu cavallo b(e)n et diligentem(en)te custodito et a(m)modato cavalcato, così como se (con)vè, *ch(e)* illo no(n) sia fatigato de grande et sup(er)flua travaglia

‘It is to be noted that (*che*), a horse (which is) well and attentively cared for and properly ridden in accordance with good practice, that (*che*) it should not be overburdened with too much unnecessary work’ (15<sup>th</sup>-c. Laz., *Volgarizzamento della ‘Mascalcia’ di Lorenzo Rusio* 158.27-9)

A not too dissimilar distribution of the two complementizers is found in many modern Salentino varieties (Damonte 2006a; Vecchio this volume), where the lower irrealis complementizer *cu* is replaced by the higher complementizer *ca* whenever the left periphery hosts a fronted constituent, as the following examples from Francavilla Fontana (BR, Vecchio this volume) illustrate:

- 76 a Vogghiu (\*Carlu) *cu* (\*Ccarlu) vveni cu nnui, Carlu  
 I-want Carlu that Carlu comes with us Carlu
- b Vogghiu (\*Carlu,) *ca* Carlu, veni cu nnui  
 I-want Carlu that Carlu comes with us  
 ‘I want Carlo to come with us’

The postulation of the higher and lower complementizer positions also provides an elegant explanation for cases of embedded V2, which in the simple CP model were difficult to accommodate without reference to *ad hoc* assumptions such as the reinterpretation of V2

as V-to-I movement (Santorini 1995; Vikner 1995: §4.2.1) or CP recursion (Authier 1992; Vickner 1995; Vance 1997: ch. 4). Now within the split C-model the co-occurrence of an overt complementizer and the raised finite verb can be viewed as the simultaneous lexicalizations of the *Force* and *Fin* heads, respectively (Ledgeway 2007: 139-40; 2008: 458-61), as in the Old Neapolitan example in (77):

77 *resoltande certa speranza* [<sub>ForceP</sub> *che* [<sub>TopP</sub> *lo re Priamo* [<sub>FinP</sub> *poterrà*  
emerged=therefrom certain hope that the king Priamus will-be-able  
[<sub>TP</sub> *nde recuperare la soro soa*]]]] (102.26)  
=therefrom to-recover the sister his  
‘therefrom has come certain hope that King Priamus will be able to rescue his sister  
from there’ (14th-c. Nap., *Libro de la destructione de Troya* 102.26)

In the literature, many other projections and positions have been proposed in investigations of the left periphery of the dialects, including, among others, a projection situated below ForceP but higher than FocP (presumably to be identified with Rizzi’s (2001) IntP) dedicated to marking interrogative force, whose head is variously lexicalized by Florentine *o(cche)* (cf. 78a; Garzonio 2004) and central-southern dialectal *che/chi/ce* (cf. 78b; Cruschina 2008: ch. 5; see also Rohlfs 1969: 157-59; Manzini and Savoia 2005, I: §3.8.2). In northern Italian dialects, by contrast, interrogative force is licensed by FocP (Munaro, this volume, §6), either through V-raising to Foc (cf. 78c) or through lexicalization of the same with the complementizer *che/cha* (cf. 78d). A not too dissimilar situation is found in Sardinian (cf. 78e), where in polar interrogatives the head of FocP is

lexicalized by the particle (AUT >) *a* (Jones 1993: 244ff.; Manzini and Savoia 2005, I: 610-11; Mensching and Remberger in press).

78 a *O a casa quando tu ci vòì tornare?*

int. to home when you there want return.inf.

‘Home, when do you intend to return?’

b *Ce sta cchiovì?*

int. prog. it-rains

‘Is it raining?’ (Sal., Rohlfs 1969: 158)

c *Se an-o fat?*

what have=scl.3pl. done

‘What did they do?’ (Palmanova, UD)

d *Cosa cha r’ ha fait?*

what that scl.3sg.= has done

‘What has he done?’ (Poirino, TO)

e *A kere vénnera a domo mea?*

int. wants come.fin. to house my

‘Do you want to come to my house?’ (Jones 1993: 25)

Finally, mention should be made of other clause typing projections such as those recently discussed in Munaro (2004). On the evidence of northern Italian dialects and Italian, Munaro demonstrates that the clausal adjuncts of conditional clauses raise to a

specifier of the matrix C-domain in order to enter a local relation with a particular *Force* projection, including *Hyp(othetical)P* (cf. 79a) and *Conc(essive)P* (cf. 79b):

- 79 a [<sub>HypP</sub> [*fùsselo vegnùo anca Mario*]<sub>i</sub> [<sub>TopP</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *gavaressimo*  
 were=he come also Mario we-would-have  
 podùo dirghelo...t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]]!  
 been-able say.inf.=to-him=it  
 ‘If Mario had come as well, we would have been able to tell him’ (Pad.)
- b [<sub>ConcP</sub> [*sedi-al rivat o no sedi-al rivat*]<sub>i</sub> [<sub>HypP</sub> [<sub>TopP</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *jo o voi vie*  
 be=scl arrived or not be=scl arrived I scl go away  
 istés...t<sub>i</sub> ]]]]]]]!  
 same  
 ‘Whether he has arrived or not, I am leaving all the same’ (Friul.)

On this view, *Force* can be reconceived as a field which, according to Munaro, consists of as many as four distinct clause typing projections sandwiched between the *Frame* and *Theme* subfields,<sup>23</sup> namely *ConcP* > *HypP* > *Excl(amative)P* > *IntP*, the order of which is held to mirror from right to left an increasing degree of assertive force.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Munaro shows that fronted clausal adjuncts of conditional clauses may be preceded by hanging topics (cf. i.a), although in southern Italian dialects (though not in Italian; cf. Benincà and Poletto 2004: 74 n. 13; Manzini and Savoia 2005, I: 525) hanging topics follow *Force* complementizers (cf. i.b):

- i a Mario, *ci avessero telefonato (o meno)*, avremmo dovuto dirglielo  
 Mario us= they-had phoned or not we-would-have had-to tell.inf.=to-him=it

To conclude, we give below in (80) the full structural representation of the left periphery of the clause in accordance with the entire range of Italian dialect data reviewed

---

‘Mario, whether they had rung us or not, we ought to have told him’

b Avisandove *che la do(n)na* le      rencessie      essere      femmena  
 tell.ger.=you that the lady      to-her= it-displeases be.inf. woman

‘Informing you that the lady regrets being a woman’ (15<sup>th</sup>-c. Nap., *De Rosa* id. 51v.18)

One possible solution to this problem is to assume that the different clause typing projections proposed by Munaro are partly interspersed within the *Frame* subfield, with *ConcP* and *HypP* situated to the right of *FrameP* (hosting hanging topics), whereas the default *Force* projection (call it, *DeclP*) licensing declarative complementizers is situated to its left:

ii [<sub>DeclP</sub> *che* [<sub>FrameP</sub> HT [<sub>ConcP</sub> *whether*-clause [<sub>HypP</sub> *if*-clause [<sub>ExclP</sub> ...

<sup>24</sup> The content of *ExclP* may be overtly lexicalized in a number of varieties, including the 3rd person tonic personal pronouns *lu* in Paduan (cf. i.a; Benincà 1996) and *iddu* in many Calabrian and Sicilian varieties (cf. i.b; Ledgeway 2003c: §2.3).

i a a xe beo *lu*!

scl is nice he

‘It’s really nice!’

b ca *iddu* ti spagni!

that he yourself= you-frighten

‘You’ll be frightened!’ (Catanz.)

In the former case, it is necessary to assume remnant movement of the core sentence to SpecExclP (or perhaps to the specifier of some higher position), whereas in the Catanzarese example the highest *Force* head is simultaneously lexicalized by the declarative complementizer *ca* ‘that’.

