

On Factivity: Speculations on the split-CP in Upper Southern Italian Dialects

Valentina Colasanti
St John's College, University of Cambridge

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

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

1 Ferentinese *triple* complementiser system

Ferentino (FR) shows triple complementiser system: *ca* (<QUIA), *chə* (<QUID)¹ and *cu* (<QUOD).

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

➤ Ferentinese complementation sensitive to:

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

- (1) a. Peppu dici/credi **ca**/*chə/*cu Angilu po' uni' a casa [factive/non-factive]
Peter say/believe.IND.3SG that Angelo can to-come at home
'Peter says that Angelo can come at home'
- b. Maria ulessu/ularìa **chə/ca**/*cu Peppu laora sempre [volitive]
Mary want.SUBJ/COND.3SG that Peter work.IND.3SG always
'Mary would like that Peter would always drink'
- c. Giuagni uò **cu/ca**/*chə ie nə ci uadu alla festa [volitive]
John want.IND.3SG that I not CL go.IND.3SG to-the party
'John would like that you wouldn't go to the party' *Modern Ferentinese*
- (2) a. Sacci **ca** tu nun si 'na bbona pezza [factive]
I-know.IND that you not are a good patch
- b. Curi mu dissu, dacciforte, **che** tu si magnatu lu pane [declarative/non-factive]
Curi to-me he-said with-power that you are eaten the bread
- c. Vurìa **cu** gli vénto m' annariàsse [volitive]
I-want.COND that the wind to-me areate.SUBJ.IMP *Earlier Ferentinese*

(ii) **the fine structure of the left periphery** (cf. 3, 4);

(iii) **modality** (viz. realis vs irrealis; cf. 4).

* I am grateful to Alessandro Pompeo, Alberto Volponi, Simona Leonetti and her family for their native grammaticality judgements on Ferentinese. Unless otherwise indicated, examples are from the author's own field notes.

** I would like to thank: Adam Ledgeway for his extremely helpful comments on this paper; Luigi Rizzi and Enoch Aboh for their feedback. Any errors are the responsibility of the author.

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

- (3) a. Peppu dici **ca/*chə/*cu_{Force}** Angilu ADDUMANU (***ca/*chə/*cu_{Fin}**) po'
 Peter say.IND.3SG that Angelo tomorrow that can.IND.3SG
 uni' a casa
 come.INF to home
 'Peter says that Angelo can come at home tomorrow' *Modern Ferentinese*
- b. [_{ForceP} **ca** [_{TopP} [_{FocP} [_{FinP} *Fin* ... [IP ...]]]]]
- (4) a. Maria ulèssu ADDUMANU **ca/cu_{Fin}** Giuàgni unesse
 Mary want.SUBJ.3SG tomorrow that John come.SUBJ.3SG
 'Mary would want that tomorrow John would come'
- b. 'Ndoni vò la figlia ALLOCU **ca/chə_{Fin}** 'n ci la mannassu
 Antony want.IND.3SG the daughter there that not CL the send.SUBJ.3SG
 più
 anymore
 'Antony wants that his daughter wouldn't go there anymore' *Modern Ferentinese*
- c. [_{ForceP} *Force* [_{TopP} [_{FocP} [_{FinP} **ca/chə/cu** ... [IP ...]]]]]

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

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

2 Factivity selection in Ferentinese

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

► *Factivity* selection: another pattern of microvariation found in Italo-Romance.

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

3 Proposal: factivity selection as phase edge phenomenon

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

- (5) a. paro **ca** tuneva gli mazzosalato i mu facéva male gli ziméo
 it-seems_{FACTIVE} that hold.IMP.3SG the salt and CL do.IMP.3SG hurt the butt
- b. Po' dici **che** ci batte 'n pett
 Then you-say_{NON-FACTIVE} that CL beat.IND.1PL in chest
- c. [_{ForceP} **che/ca** [_{TopP} [_{FocP} [_{FinP} *Fin* ... [_{IP} ...]]]]] *Earlier Ferentinese*

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

Ferentinese complementiser distribution influenced by:

- semantico-functional factors (i.e. factivity);
- structure of left periphery.

► How can these two 'ingredients' be put together? Are both factors strongly related?

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

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

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

- (7) a. [_{IP} [_{VP} V-non-factive_[Ø] [_{ForceP} **che**_[Ø] [_{TopP} *Top [_{FocP} *Foc [_{FinP} Ø... [_{IP} ...]]]]]]]]
 b. [_{IP} Gli frintinénisi vóto [_{VP} dici_Ø [_{ForceP} **che**_[Ø] [_{FinP} Ø [_{IP}
 The inhabitants-of-Ferentino sometimes say.IND.3SG that
 biastéma fiacca è pu 'ssi santi du 'ss' àtri paesi]]]]]
 swear softly is for those saints of these other towns

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

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

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

- *non-declarative clauses*: [+fact] verb selects [+fact] *ca* in *Force*, hence *Force* and T share same feature blocking any elements from passing through phase edge.

➤ **Claim:** leftward movement in factive complement blocked by Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990; 2005).

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

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

➤ *Factivity* selection = phase edge phenomenon.

4 Conclusions

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

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

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

- (1) *So saputu / mu dispiaci / mu su recurdatu ca gliu palazzu era cadutu, ma
I-am known to-me I-regret to-me I-am remembered that the building was fallen but
n' era veru
not was true
'#I knew / regretted / remembered that the building collapsed, but it didn't'

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

- (2) So dittu / pensatu / credutu ca gliu palazzu era cadutu, ma n' era veru
I-am said thought believed that the building was fallen but not was true
'I said / thought / believed that the building collapsed, but it didn't'

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

➤ Argument fronting is generally disallowed in *factives*:

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

Textual Sources

- Angelisanti, Alberto. 1983. *Pensieri*. Ferentino.
- Bianchi, Ferdinando. 1978. *Imbròsi figlietta*. Roma: Tipografia Roma.
- Bianchi, Ferdinando. 1991. *La serenata a figlimena*. Roma: Tipografia Roma.
- Bianchi, Fernando. 1974. *Fiuri i Fruschi. Poesie in dialetto ferentino*. Frosinone: Editrice Frusinate.
- Bianchi, Fernando. 1984. *La cummeddia du... vinaccia*. Ferentino: Tipografia Galassi.
- Bianchi, Fernando. 1991. *Drènt' i Fòri pòrta*. Roma: Tipografia Roma.
- Cedrone, Alberto. 1976. *Gli Mori attornu a Frintinu*. Frosinone: Tipografia Frosinone.
- Prosperi, Giovanni, & Bianchi, Fernando. 1980. *Rusbiglitu Frintinu!*. Roma: Tipolitograf.

References

- Acquaviva, Paolo. 1990. Un'analisi della complementazione dei predicati fattivi. *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 15. 3–28.
- Benincà, Paola, & Poletto, Cecilia. 2004. Topic, focus, and V2. In L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, 2. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 52–75.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A-dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- Colasanti, Valentina. 2015a. *The Complementiser System of Cepranese*. M.Phil dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Colasanti, Valentina. 2015b. Dual complementiser systems in Southern Lazio dialects: a microparametric approach. Paper presented at *Romance Syntax. Comparative and Diachronic Perspectives*. 27–28 November, University of Bucharest.
- Colasanti, Valentina. 2016. On triple complementation in Upper-southern Italian Dialects: a syn-diachronic case study. Ms. University of Cambridge.
- Colonna Dahlman, Roberta. 2015. *Studies on Factivity, Complementation, and Propositional Attitudes*. Études Romanes de Lund 102. PhD dissertation, Lund University.
- Damonte, Federico. 2006. Complementatori e complementi congiuntivi in alcuni dialetti Sardi. In A. Padovan, N. Penello (eds.), *Osservazioni sul sardo* (Quaderni di lavoro ASIIt n. 6), 71–95.
- De Cuba, Carlos Francisco. 2007. *On (non) factivity, clausal complementation and the CP-field*. PhD dissertation, Stony Brook University.
- De Cuba, Carlos, & Ürögdi, Barbara. 2009. Eliminating factivity from syntax: Sentential complements in Hungarian. *Approaches to Hungarian* 11. 29–63.
- D'Alessandro, Roberta, & Ledgeway, Adam. 2010. At the CT boundary: Investigating Abruzzese complementation, *Lingua* 120: 2040–60.
- Giorgi, Alessandra, & Pianesi, Fabio. 1997. *Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1985. Believing and intending: two sides of the same coin. *Linguistic inquiry* 16(3). 445–460.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 2007. *Language, consciousness, culture: Essays on mental structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kastner, Itamar. 2015. Factivity mirrors interpretation: The selectional requirements of presuppositional verbs. *Lingua* 164. 156–188.

- Kiparsky, Paul, & Kiparsky, Carol. 1970. Fact. In M. Bierwisch and K. E. Heidolph (eds.), *Progress in linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton, 143–147.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2003. Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: la doppia serie di complementatori, *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 27:89–147.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2005. Moving through the left periphery: the dual complementiser system in the dialects of Southern Italy, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 103/3:339–396.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. La sopravvivenza del sistema dei doppi complementatori nei dialetti meridionali. In P. Del Puente (ed.), *Atti del II Convegno internazionale di dialettologia - Progetto A.L.Ba. Rionero in Vulture*: Calice Editore, 151–76.
- Ledgeway, Adam, & Lombardi, Alessandra. 2014. The development of the southern subjunctive. Morphological Loss and Syntactic Gain. In P. Benincà, A. Ledgeway and N. Vincent (eds.), *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 25–47.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman, *Elements of grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*. Springer, 281–337.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2005. Phase theory and the privilege of the root. In H. Broekhuis, N. Corver, R. Huybregts (eds.), *Organizing grammar: studies in honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roberts, Ian. 2004. The C-system in Brythonic Celtic languages, V2, and the EPP. In L. Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP: the Cartography of syntactic Structures 2*. 297–328.
- Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Schulz, Petra. 2003. *Factivity: Its Nature and Acquisition*. Linguistische Arbeiten. Vol. 480. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Vecchio, Paola. 2006. La distribuzione dei complementatori ka e ku nel dialetto salentino settentrionale di Francavilla Fontana (BR). In D'Alessandro, R., Ledgeway, A. & I. Roberts, *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy*. Cambridge: University Press, 312–322.
- Zuber, Richard, & Zuber, Ryszard. 1983. *Non-declarative sentences*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.