



HAL
open science

Clitic placement in the dialect of san Valentino in Abruzzo citeriore

Paola Benincà, Diego Pescarini

► **To cite this version:**

Paola Benincà, Diego Pescarini. Clitic placement in the dialect of san Valentino in Abruzzo citeriore. Archivio Glottologico Italiano, 2014. hal-01762664

HAL Id: hal-01762664

<https://hal.science/hal-01762664>

Submitted on 10 Apr 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

CLITIC PLACEMENT IN THE DIALECT OF SAN VALENTINO IN ABRUZZO CITERIORE (*)

ABSTRACT

Testo mancante.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the great majority of modern Romance languages and dialects, complement clitics are proclitic to the inflected verb. However, in the Middle Ages (up to the 14th-15th century), clitics appeared either proclitic or enclitic to the inflected verb, depending on the syntactic properties of the clause and their possible pragmatic correlates.

Some Romance varieties still preserve certain aspects of the old clitic syntax: this happens in Portuguese and related languages, such as Galician and Asturian (see below). In many dialects of Abruzzo (Upper-Southern Ita-

Dal Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax-Morphology Meeting (CIDSM 7, 2013)

(*) For their helpful comments, we would like to thank Silvio Pascetta, Mair Parry, Christina Tortora, and the audience of the 7th Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax Meeting (Cambridge, June 24th and 25th 2013). The usual disclaimer applies.

Most of the old Italian data are taken from the OVI database (<http://artfl-project.uchicago.edu/content/ovi>), while the Abruzzese data come from the ASIt database (<http://asit.maldura.unipd.it>).

This research is supported by a grant of the Italian Ministry of Research (FIRB 2008, n. RBF08KR5A).

Although the chapter is the result of close collaboration between the authors, Diego Pescarini carried the main responsibility for §§ 1, 3, 5, Paola Benincà for §§ 2, 4, 6.

ly) clitic pronouns are allowed to stand enclitic to *be* auxiliaries, as shown in (1): in the dialect of Martinsicuro (a village on the Abruzzo/Marche boundary) enclisis is mandatory if the inflected verb is the auxiliary *be*, otherwise the clitic must precede the inflected verb (the data are from Mastrangelo Latini 1981; for further Abruzzese data, see also Rohlfs 1968: § 471; Manzini – Savoia 2005, vol. II: 111-113). It is worth noting that in the dialect of Martinsicuro, as well as in many other Abruzzese dialects, the perfect auxiliary is subject to the ‘canonical’ person split ⁽¹⁾, i.e. *be* forms occur in the first and second person, while the *have* form *a* is used with third singular and plural. The position of clitics in this dialect is governed, then, by lexical-functional properties of the auxiliary *be* with respect to all other verbs (furthermore, notice that in (1c) the clitic is preceded by an optional particle *a*, to which we will return later when dealing with Sanvalentinense data):

- (1) a. **sollu** dittə (Martinsicuro)
 I.am=it said
 ‘I have said it’
 b. **sillu** dittə
 you.are=it said
 ‘you have said it’
 c. (a) **lu a** dittə
 (PRT) it=he/she.has/they.have said
 ‘he/she/they has/have said it’
 d. **səməlu** dittə
 we.are=it said
 ‘we have said it’
 e. **sətəlu** dittə
 you.have=it said
 ‘you have said it’

In this article, we will focus on another Abruzzese dialect, spoken in San Valentino in Abruzzo citeriore, a town with approximately 2000 inhabitants located 40 km far from the Adriatic Sea on a hill overlooking the Pescara river valley. Sanvalentinense displays a surprising variety of possible collocations of clitics. In main clauses, the distribution of clitics is as follows (subordinate clauses will be addressed later on):

⁽¹⁾ This split (1/2 *vs.* 3) is found in many dialects of the Upper South, although it is not the only pattern of person-split attested in Italo-Romance: see MANZINI – SAVOIA 2005: II, 721; 2007: 215; LOPORCARO 2007.

- with simple tenses, clitics may stand either proclitic to the inflected verb, as is generally the case in Modern Romance languages, or enclitic to the same verb, as in (2);
- with a compound tense, clitics stand either proclitic/enclitic to the auxiliary, as in (3), or proclitic/enclitic to the past participle, as in (4).

- (2) a. **mə** **lu** 'mɔɲɲə ɲgə lə 'me'nə.
 To.myself= it= I.eat with the hands
 b. 'mɔɲɲə=**me=lu** ɲgə lə 'me'nə.
 I.eat=to.myself=it with the hands
 'I eat it with my hands'

- (3) a. **mə** **l** 'ajə mɔɲ'ɲətə
 to.me= it= I.have eaten
 b. 'ajə **mə** **lu** mɔɲ'ɲətə
 I.have =to.me =it eaten
 'I have eaten it'

- (4) a. 'ajə dɔʒa mɔɲ'ɲətə**məlu**
 I.have already eaten=to.me=it
 b. 'ajə dɔʒa **mə** **lu** mɔɲ'ɲətə
 I.have already to.me= it= eaten
 'I have already eaten it'

The various orders shown above seem not to produce perceptible semantic or pragmatic effects. By contrast, according to our informants, an 'emphatic' interpretation is triggered whenever a further clitic (or particle) *a* precedes proclitic pronouns (or the negation marker, which in this dialect can be seen as a clitic itself: see below). Notice that the particle *a* (which we will consider more systematically in sect. 5) is only possible if there are other proclitics in the sentence:

- (5) a. (a) **mə** **l** 'ajə mɔɲ'ɲətə
 PRT= to.me= it= I.have eaten
 b. *a 'ajə **mə** **lu** mɔɲ'ɲətə
 PRT= I.have =to.me =it eaten
 'I have eaten it'

In this article we describe the pattern of clitic placement in Sanvalentine in comparison with Medieval and Modern Romance varieties and elaborate on the interaction between clitic placement and clausal syntax in finite

clauses ⁽²⁾. In particular, we will show that enclisis to both the finite verb and the past participle is not permitted whenever the so-called Left Periphery of the clause is occupied by certain elements such as left dislocated constituents, interrogative pronouns, or a particular kind of complementizer ⁽³⁾.

Regarding clitic syntax, we do not commit ourselves to any of the various proposals that have been made about the origin of clitics and their relation with argument positions. In particular, given the nature of the following analysis, it is not relevant whether clitics are directly generated in their surfacing positions or are moved from their basic argument positions. Concerning clausal syntax, we will limit ourselves to making the following specific theoretical assumptions:

- we take into consideration three main layers of sentence structure, termed CP, IP and VP. These acronyms stand for *Complementiser Phrase*, *Inflectional Phrase* and *Verb Phrase* respectively. However, we follow here a ‘cartographic’ view of sentence structure according to which CP, IP and VP are not single projections but rather *layers* formed by a series of projections, each of which can host a specific kind of syntactic constituent.

(6) [_{CP} ... [_{IP} ... [_{VP} ...]]]

For instance, the CP layer (or *left periphery*) normally hosts complementizers, interrogative pronouns, left-dislocated and focused constituents.

⁽²⁾ We point out here that when we say ‘inflected verbs’ or ‘tensed sentences’, we intend to exclude – besides non-finite verbs and clauses – also imperatives, whose behaviour is akin to the one of non-finite forms, despite the presence of apparent personal inflection. A very detailed and convincing demonstration, based on the grammar of the dialect of Borgomanero compared with apparently independent phenomena from different Romance languages, is presented in TORTORA forthcoming: Ch. 3.

⁽³⁾ It is often suggested – lately by one of the reviewers of this article – that clitic placement is subject to prosodic restrictions. This kind of explanation was first proposed by the same Adolf Mussafia in his seminal work. As he himself reports (MUSSAFIA 1986: 474-475), a friend of his objected privately that articles and prepositions share the same atonic nature as clitic pronouns, but do not have restrictions with respect to sentence initial position. Apart from the wide amount of data that have been analysed since then, showing the strict relation between the syntactic structure and the position of clitics, we could further observe that, on the one hand, all Romance languages until about the XIV century shared the restriction on clitics known as the Tobler-Mussafia Law, although they had most likely different intonational patterns, as their present-day counterparts; on the other hand, today we see that very closely related dialects, with very similar or identical intonational patterns, have different restrictions regulating the position of clitics, as shown in (1) and (2).

As shown by Rizzi (1997) and Benincà and Poletto (2004), these elements, each of which is hosted by a dedicated projection, are rigidly ordered (more on this in the following sections). Similarly, the IP layer is formed by a series of ordered projections hosting functional elements expressing agreement, tense, aspect, mood, etc. This layer contains the canonical position of pre-verbal subjects and the inflected verb. Lastly, sentences contain a VP layer, which is the locus of argument structure. We assume here that VP hosts the past participle and internal arguments, while in section 4, dealing with cases of enclisis to the past participle, we will provide a finer representation of the structure at the VP/IP border. For the sake of clarity, we give in (7) a schematic representation of an Italian sentence:

- (7) [_{CP} Quei libri, A MARCO [_{IP} li ho già [_{VP} dati]]]
 Those books, to Marco them= has already given
 ‘Why has Marco already gave them (= those books) to Luca’

- clitics can emerge in three distinct functional areas in sentence structure, respectively located in each of the aforementioned layers, namely CP, IP, and outside the VP (see Benincà – Tortora 2009 for references). In what follows we will term such areas ‘clitic fields’: the CP, IP and VP field respectively. In a Romance language one or more of these fields can be active and capable of hosting clitics.

- (8) [_{CP} ... {clitics} ... [_{IP} ... {clitics} ... {clitics} [_{VP}]]]

- the clitics emerge in one or more of the areas, depending on the language, on the verb tense and mood, on the kind of sentence. In modern Italian, for instance, the IP field is active with finite verbs, while in non-finite contexts clitics occupy the VP layer (alternatively, one might argue that enclisis is due to the non-finite verb moving above the clitic, but it seems to us that there is no conclusive evidence showing that non-finite verbs move so high in the structure of the clause).
- clitics can be enclitic or proclitic; enclisis is the effect of the movement of a verbal head crossing over the locus of clitics and incorporating the clitic itself, while proclisis is simply structural adjacency of the respective functional positions in the structure ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽⁴⁾ Empirical evidence supporting this difference between enclisis and proclisis is presented and discussed in BENINCÀ – CINQUE 1993, which shows that the relation be-

The structure of the article is as follows: in sect. 2 we deal with clitic placement in old and Modern Romance: in 2.1 we briefly illustrate clitic placement in Old Italian (as a representative of Early Romance), which is sensitive to the position of the inflected verb and to the content of the left periphery; in 2.2 we compare old Italian with some modern Romance varieties, to consider the possibility that some characteristics of the medieval syntax are preserved in some of them. In section 3 we introduce the data from Sanvalentinese and analyse them to see to what extent Sanvalentinese phenomena can be considered late reflexes of Old Romance V2 (namely, verb second) grammar. In section 4 we deal with enclisis to the past participle in Sanvalentinese. We submit the hypothesis that enclisis to the past participle also results from the past participle moving higher to its own left periphery, the Low periphery proposed by Belletti (2001, 2004). Lastly, in section 5, we summarize more systematically the conditions governing the insertion of the particle *a*, which parallel in some way the conditions governing the enclisis of clitics. In 6 we propose a possible direction for a formal interpretation of the phenomena described.

2. AN OUTLINE OF CLITIC PLACEMENT IN ROMANCE

2.1. *Medieval Romance: Old Italian*

This section summarizes the main lines of the theory concerning clitic placement in Old Italian to see whether some of these constraints are preserved in the dialect of San Valentino.

The conditions ruling the choice between enclisis and proclisis in Old Italian and Old Romance in general are primarily governed by syntax, which is in turn connected with pragmatic effects. Such conditions are normally subsumed under the generalization called Tobler-Mussafia Law (Mussafia 1886/1983; Schiaffini 1926; Formentin 2007; see Foulet 1928, §§ 449-461 on French), which, in its original formulation, states that complement clitics cannot appear in first position in a sentence. Hence, when the verb is first, clitics are expected to be enclitic.

tween a verb and an enclitic pronoun is 'tighter' than the relation of a verb and proclitic pronouns, and is similar to that of the sub-parts of a compound word.

- (9) Levò =**ssi** questa femmina e aiutò=**llo** (Novellino, 38)
 rose =herself this woman and helped=him
 ‘This woman rose and helped him’

However, to accommodate a number of counter-examples, Mussafia concluded that enclisis is always an option, while proclisis is prohibited in some contexts, namely when the verb hosting the clitics is in first position of the clause, although this formulation left the cases in which we have proclisis in first position unaccounted for (⁵).

An accurate examination of the contexts of enclisis and proclisis led Benincà (1995, 2006) to reformulate the Tobler-Mussafia Law in terms of verb movement to the left periphery of main clauses (the aforementioned CP layer of sentence structure). As previously mentioned, the CP layer is formed by several syntactic positions dedicated to specific kinds of constituent. For the sake of simplicity, let us concentrate on two positions: a lower one (FocP) hosting focused constituents and operators (*wh* phrases, interrogative operators, and the like) and a higher one (TopP) dedicated to Topic-like element. A simplified map of the CP, with a couple of Italian examples, is given below:

- (10) [_{CP} [_{TopP} ... [_{FocP} ... [_{IP} ... [_{VP} ...

- a. [_{CP} [_{TopP} Quei libri [_{FocP} quando [_{IP} li hai [_{VP} dati a Luca?
 Those books, when them= you.have given to Luca
 ‘When did you give them (= those books) to Luca’

⁽⁵⁾ This happens, for example, in *yes-no* questions, at least in some old Romance varieties, such as old French [see (i)] or old Venetian [see (ii)]:

- (i) a **me** fetes vos droit de doner a la reine si lonc respit? (*Artu* 68, 30)
 ‘to-me=give you the right of ...?’
 b **Se** vastarave lo pes a farlo a bona pevrada? (*Lio Mazor*: 20t, 46)
 self-would spoil the fish to make it at good *pevrada*: ‘Will the fish spoil...?’

Other Romance varieties – such as old Italian – have enclisis in *yes/no* questions:

- (ii) a Confessast**iti** tu anno? (*Novellino*, 93)
 you.confessed=yourself you year? (‘Did you go to confession last year?’)
 b **Halo** tu fatto per provarmi? (*Fiori di filosofia*, p. 211)
 you.have=it you done to try=me? (‘Did you do it to try me?’)

We will see that the same holds for Sanvalentinense.

- b. [_{CP} [_{TopP} I libri [_{FocP} A LUCA [_{IP} li ho [_{VP} dati ieri
 The books, to Luca them= I.have given yesterday
 ‘I gave Luca the books yesterday’

With this in mind, Benincà (1995, 2006) (for Old Italian see also Benincà – Poletto 2010) argues that the peculiar word order of Medieval Romance (including Old Italian) is due to the inflected verb moving to the CP layer. According to this analysis, Old Romance languages are in fact a specific type of Verb second (henceforth V2) languages, whose most rigid and consistent example is perhaps modern standard German. While the general characteristics of Medieval Romance had been informally recognized by philologists and linguists, the formal analysis of Romance V2 syntax has permitted Benincà (1995, 2006) to reformulate in more restrictive and precise terms the Tobler-Mussafia Law on clitic placement. The observed generalizations are the following.

First, if the Focus position contains material, enclisis is impossible. Enclitics are never attested in contexts like (12) in which the absence of a resumptive clitic signals that the fronted direct object (*L'uscio*) is focalized.

- (11) [_{FocP} L'uscio] **mi** lascerai aperto istanotte (*Novellino*, 38)
 the door to.me you.will.leave open tonight.

Topics, conversely, trigger enclisis (it is worth recalling that left dislocations differ from focus constructions in requiring a resumptive clitic, which is mandatory if the dislocated element is a direct object as in the following example):

- (12) A voi [_{TopP} le mie poche parole ch' avete intese]
 to you the my few words that you.have heard
ho =le dette con grande fede (oFl.; Schiaffini 1926, 282)
 I.have =them said with great faith
 ‘The few words that you heard from me I pronounced with great faith’.

Notice that enclisis is allowed only if the Focus position – which always follows the topic one – is empty. Conversely, if a focus is present, enclisis is not permitted even if a left dislocated element is present too, as in (13):

- (13) [_{TopP} La figura piacente] [_{FocP} lo core] mi diranca.
 the figure pleasant the heart to.me= wrenches
 ‘The pleasing features tears my heart’ (oSic.: Scremin 1984-5, 34: Jacopo da Lentini)

In dependent clauses, as well as in negative clauses, the presence of a complementizer, or the negation, blocks the access of the verb to the left periphery; the mechanism generating enclisis is therefore not produced, and clitics must be proclitic.

The situation in Old Italian is summarized in the following table, where the content of the left periphery is observed in connection with the position of clitics:

(14)

Old Italian main clauses	
[FOC] + V	proclisis/*enclisis
[LD] + V	*proclisis/enclisis
[LD] [FOC] + V	proclisis/*enclisis
Comp	proclisis/*enclisis
Neg	proclisis/*enclisis

In (15)-(17) we give the essential scheme of positions accounting for the above patterns: (15) illustrates the structure of most Modern Romance languages, in which the inflected verb is always located in the IP layer and clitics are inserted in the IP field. The same order is found in old Italian in the specific contexts which prevent the inflected verb from moving to the CP layer or beyond the focus projection. (16) and (17) show the behaviour of Old Romance main clauses: the verb moves to the CP area below the CP clitic field⁽⁶⁾. In the absence of a Focus – and even if a topic is present – the verb has to move further to the left, crossing the CP clitic field and giving rise to enclisis as in (17).

- (15) a. (Stanotte) **mi** lascerai aperto l'uscio.
 (tonight) to.me= you.will.leave open the door
 b. [_{CP} ... [_{IP} ... *mi lascerai*.....

⁽⁶⁾ Alternatively, one might argue that clitics are always in IP and, once merged with the verb, move to the CP layer, where the verb exorporates from the clitic and leaves it behind when it moves further. However, the fact that if – and only if – the Verb is in CP we can find enclisis, leads us to conclude that the process happens in CP, as a consequence of a further movement of the verb past the clitic field.

- (16) a. L' uscio **mi** lascerai aperto istanotte
 The door to.me= you.will.leave open tonight.
 b. [_{CP} [_{Top} [_{Foc} *L'uscio*] *mi lascerai*] [_{IP} ...aperta istanotte
- (17) a. le mie poche parole [...] **holle** dette
 the my few words [...] I.have=them said
 b. [_{CP} [_{TopP} *le mie poche parole holle*] [_{Foc} [_{IP} ...dette

We have anticipated above that in Sanvalentinense clitics may stand enclitic to the past participle of a tensed main clause; in old Italian this is never possible if an auxiliary is present in the clause. Only when the auxiliary is missing, as in absolute participial constructions or in the second member of a coordinate sentence, the clitics are enclitic to the past participle (more on this in section 4).

2.2. Modern Romance

Medieval V2 syntax has been lost in most Romance languages, but some residual phenomena are found in various dialects and languages, localised in two distant Romance areas: Ladin, in the Dolomites, and Portuguese and related languages (see Benincà 2013 and bibliographical references therein).

In Ladin varieties, which have developed a system of subject clitics, Verb movement to the left periphery is still active in main clauses, with subject clitics (in some dialects, also subject DPs) inverting in all main clauses (either assertive or interrogative) wherever a constituent different from the subject appears in front of the main verb, as shown in (18).

- (18) a. T vas gonoot a ciasa sua. (S. Leonardo: from Benincà – Poletto 2004)
 you= go often at home his/her
 'You often visit him/her'
- b. Gonoot vas-t a ciasa sua.
 often you=you at home his/her
- c. *Gonoot t vas a ciasa sua.
 often you= go at home his/her

However, there are no traces in Ladin of the Tobler-Mussafia Law: object clitics in main and dependent clauses are always proclitic to the inflected verb, be it a lexical verb or an auxiliary.

Portuguese, Galician, Asturian display instead a disposition of clitics which clearly reflects the Tobler-Mussafia Law in the structural interpretation that we have illustrated above: in main clauses, clitics are always proclitic if the verb is preceded immediately by a Focus or an operator of any kind, while they are enclitic if immediately preceded by a topic. In particular, a lexical subject is interpreted as a topic (then, followed by enclisis), unless it is lexically or functionally an operator (a quantifier, a *wh*-pronoun, etc.), in which case it must be in FocP, then followed by proclisis:

- (19) a. O João disse-nos que...
 the John told=to.us that
 b. *O João nos disse
 the John to.us= told
 'John told us'
- (20) a. Quem me chamou?
 who me= called?
 'who called me?'
 b. *Quem chamou-me?
 who called=me
- (21) a. Todos se lembran
 All self= remember
 b. *Todos lembran-se.
 All remember=self

This behaviour suggests that verb movement to the left periphery with the characteristics of Medieval Romance is still working, in some form, in Portuguese and related varieties. Interesting support comes from Galician dependent clauses: in Galician, as shown in Anòè (2014), enclisis in main clauses is sensitive – exactly like Portuguese – to the content of the left periphery (presence or absence of a constituent in focus); in subordinate clauses we have enclisis or proclisis depending on the type of subordination: where a high complementizer (namely, a complementiser which is located in the higher portion of the C layer) is selected by the governing verb, in particular with 'bridge verbs' of saying, enclisis is possible, while it is impossible with modal complementizers, whose dedicated position is low, at the borders with IP.

- (22) a. O Pedro disse que o livro foi-te entregué onte
 the Peter said that the book was=to.you sent yesterday
 'Peter said that the book was sent you yesterday'

3. SAN VALENTINO

We are going to see whether the Abruzzese dialect that we are observing is a variety where relics of the medieval syntax are still preserved in some form, or more precisely, whether the function of the constituent preceding the verb has some consequence for the choice of enclisis or proclisis.

In the previous section we have seen examples of V2 in medieval and modern Romance: enclisis and proclisis is governed on the basis of the content of the left periphery, and triggered by the movement of the inflected verb to this area. We will see that in some sense the placement of clitics in Sanvalentinense is sensitive to the presence of specific constituents in the CP area, with no distinction, though, between topic or focus; this means that the verb is not moving along the left periphery, and enclisis and proclisis are ruled by phenomena possibly related to the left periphery but happening in IP or at its upper border.

We observed above that in main assertive clauses clitics appear either proclitic or enclitic to the inflected verb (we leave past participles aside for the moment). If we examine our observation in detail, we see that, while proclisis is always allowed, enclisis is not permitted under certain circumstances.

First of all, enclisis is ungrammatical with left dislocated elements (which must be resumed by a clitic when they are the direct object):

- (23) a. lu 'pənə, I 'ajə 'dətə a m'marəjə
 the bread, it=I.have given to Mario
 b. *lu 'pənə 'ajə **lu** dətə a m'marəjə
 the bread, I.have =it givent to Mario
 'I have given M. the bread'

b. * Me	n	son	ascort
myself=	of.it=	am	been.aware
c. Me	n'	é	ascort
myself=	of.it=	have	been.aware
d. * Me	é	n	ascort
myself=	have	of.it=	been.aware

We thank Sabrina Rasom, p.c., who provided data and descriptive generalisations. Proclisis is much more common with the infinitive; in Fissan it is used with all kinds of verbs (RASOM 2006):

- (ii) Recordete de **ge=** telefonar per temp.
 remember of to.him= telephone in time ('Remember to call him in time')

See Tortora (2014) for a comparison of Fissan and Piedmontese. With the infinitive, proclisis is widely attested also in Central and Southern Italian dialects.

- (24) a. la mə'nəftrə, mə la 'majnə kkju t'tardə
 the soup, to.me= it= I.eat more late
 'I'll eat the soup later'
 b. *?la mə'nəftrə, 'majnə mə la kkju t'tardə
 The soup, I.eat =to.me =it more late
 'I'll eat the soup later'

With focus and focus-like constituents, the data are more problematic: enclisis is never permitted in combination with an interrogative *wh*-element, as shown in (25); with a focalized adverb, as in (26), enclisis is prohibited; with a DP focus and an indefinite pronoun, as in (27) and (28), enclisis is allowed; lastly, enclisis is allowed in *yes/no* questions, as shown in (29) (it is worth recalling that the same holds for some medieval varieties: see fn. 6).

- (25) a. a ki l 'ajə 'dətə?
 To whom it= I.have given
 b. *a ki 'ajə lu 'dətə?
 To whom I.have =it given
 Who have I given it to?
- (26) a. ddʒa mə l ɪ 'dattə
 already to.me= it= you.have said
 b. *ddʒa ɪ mə lu 'dattə
 already you.have =to.me =it said
- (27) a. 'sulə nu 'ləbbrə m ɪ kum'prətə!
 Only one book to.me= you.have bought
 'You bought only one book for me'
 b. ??sulə nu 'ləbbrə ɪ mə kum'prətə!
 Only one book you.have =to.me bought
 'You bought only one book for me'
- (28) nə'ʃeʷnə 'majnə sə li
 nobody eats =to.him/herself =them
 'Nobody eats them'
- (29) vɛʷ lu?
 you.want =it
 'Do you want it?'

Furthermore, it is worth noting that in a main clause the presence of a DP subject is compatible with both proclisis and enclisis:

- (30) a. l amə'fɛtsəjə də li 'fijəmi sə 'kjəmə ma'rijə
 The friend of the sons=my herself= calls M.
 'My sons' friend is called Maria'
- b. l amə'fɛtsəjə də li 'fijəmi 'kjəmə sə ma'rijə
 The friend of the sons=my calls =herself M.
 'My sons' friend is called Maria'

The apparent optionality may depend on the exact position of the DP subject, which can be in its 'canonical' position in the IP layer or in the Left Periphery, as unmarked Topic; only further, more precise inquiries can clarify the optionality of enclisis in this case and connect proclisis and enclisis to the precise position of the subject in the structure.

As for negation, in Sanvalentinense it does not impede enclisis (the negative marker, however, has an ambiguous status, as we will show below):

- (31) a. nən sə lu 'majnə mi
 Not him/herself= it= eat never
- b. nən 'majnə sə lu mi
 Not eat =him/herself =it never
 'He/she never eats it'

Things become more interesting with subordinate clauses, as Sanvalentinense, like other southern dialects, exhibits two complementizers: *ca* vs *che* (see above, fn. 8). Ledgeway (2003, 2005), Damonte (2010), and, specifically for Abruzzese, D'Alessandro – Ledgeway (2010) have shown that these complementizers differ with respect to their position in the CP field and to the kind of subordinate clause they introduce. As shown in the following examples, *ka* – the higher complementizer – allows enclisis, while *kə* – the lower one – prevents any clitic from occurring after the inflected verb:

- (32) a. 'dɔ:fə ka sə lu 'majnə 'sɛmprə
 says that to.him/her-self= it= eats always
- b. 'dɔ:fə ka 'majnə sə lu 'sɛmprə
 says that eats =to.him/her-self =it always
 'He/she says that he/she always eats it'
- (33) a. 'wɔjə kə tə lu 'mijnə
 I.want that to.you= it= eat
- b. *'wɔjə kə 'mijnə te lu
 I.want that you.eat =to.yourself =it
 'I want you to eat it'

The following table summarizes the data just introduced and provides a comparison between the pattern of clitic placement of Sanvalentinese and Old Italian: in Sanvalentinese proclisis is always an option, while enclisis is prohibited with certain focus-like elements (wh pronouns, focalized adverbs), a left dislocation, and the lower complementizer like *che*; in Old Italian, by contrast, proclisis is mandatory if focus is present and in the other cases in which the movement of the verb past the position of clitics is inhibited, namely when a complementizer or the negation marker occupies a head in the left periphery. Another observation that can be made is that old Italian differs from Sanvalentinese (and Galician) because the presence of any complementizer (be it high or low) makes enclisis impossible.

(34)

	Old Italian	Sanvalentinese
[FOC]	proclisis/*enclisis	Wh: proclisis/*enclisis DP: proclisis/?enclisis
[LD]	*proclisis/enclisis	proclisis/*enclisis
Comp	<i>che</i> : proclisis/*enclisis	<i>che</i> : proclisis/*enclisis <i>ca</i> : proclisis/enclisis
Neg	proclisis/*enclisis	proclisis/enclisis

Summing up, differently from Old Italian and Old Romance, in Sanvalentinese enclisis is never obligatory. Moreover, the position of clitics is insensitive to the kind of constituent present in the left periphery: be it a Topic or a Focus/*wh*-, enclisis is impossible or marginal. Finally, as previously said, enclisis is impossible with *wh*-questions but allowed with *yes/no* questions. This leads us to conclude that the verb movement that produces enclisis does not happen in the same area of the structure where it is localised in Old Romance. The landing site of the verb that produces enclisis must be lower than the focus position. This conclusion is consistent with the fact that we have no independent evidence of V2 syntax.

The landing site of the verb, which produces enclisis, must be close to the position of the low complementizer, since when the latter is present, it prevents the finite verb from crossing the IP clitic field, giving rise to the order *ke* clitic V. By contrast, *ka* is too high to interfere with the syntax of the verb and its movement at the IP/CP border:

- (35) a. $[_{CP} \dots \quad kə \quad [_{IP} \quad *V_{[+finite]} \{clitics\}$
 b. $[_{CP} \quad ka \quad \dots \quad [_{IP} \quad V_{[+finite]} \{clitics\}$

We locate the verb with enclitic pronouns in Sanvalentinense at the border between IP and CP where the verb licenses a ‘subject of predication’, i.e. a non-grammatical subject (see Rizzi 2006; Rizzi – Shlonsky 2007; Cardinaletti 2004, Ledgeway 2010) ⁽⁹⁾. Following Rizzi’s works, we therefore assume that in Sanvalentinense the verb may move to the head of that projection (called SubjP), crossing the clitic field in IP:

- (36) $[_{CP} \dots \quad [_{SubjP} \quad V_{[+finite]} \quad [_{IP} \{clitics\}$

The optionality of enclisis to the inflected verb reflects the pragmatic nature of this kind of subject, which deserves to be investigated further. Our hypothesis, which remains open, is that the activation of the corresponding area depends on the decisions of the speaker concerning the organisation of the discourse, the presuppositions s/he wants to insert, etc.

With this in mind, let us turn to negation, which in San Valentino seems to behave like a proclitic element: in fact, while in old Italian negation rules out enclisis (blocking the verb in a low position in CP), in Sanvalentinense negation is compatible with enclisis. First of all, we have evidence for the clitic status of negation, which comes from the syntax of the already mentioned particle *a* (on which see more details below in section 5): the particle is optional and precedes all proclitic pronouns, as in (38a), while it cannot occur if the clitic is enclitic or absent, as in (37b):

- (37) a. (a) *s* *a* 'mess a 'pjɔ^{wə}
 PRT to.itself= has put to rain
 ‘It has begun to rain’
 b. (*a) 'pjɔ^{wə}
 PRT rains
 ‘It rains’

⁽⁹⁾ LEDGEWAY 2010 is particularly relevant for our argument, because it deals with the optional insertion of a pronoun doubling the subject of predication in Neapolitan. The exact position of this pronoun is not determined by the author, but it is clearly in CP, higher than topic, while the subject of predication is located in the IP layer, above the grammatical subject. We will briefly return to this matter later.

What is relevant here is that *a* is allowed even before negation (and regardless of the presence of a clitic pronoun, see section 38b):

- (38) a. (a) n tə nə wrəgʊn'ne pə 'nɪndə
 PRT not to.yourself= of.it= be.ashamed for nothing
 'Don't be ashamed at all!'
 b. (a) nən 'pjo^{wə}
 PRT= not rains

The negation has to be therefore analysed as a clitic element, as proposed for several northern dialects by Zanuttini (1997) on the basis of independent arguments (more on the particle *a* in section 5).

4. ENCLISIS TO THE PAST PARTICIPLE

As we have seen above, Sanvalentinense allows enclisis to the past participle of a compound tense. We suppose that this option has to do with the characteristics of a low functional area that involves the syntax of past participles⁽¹⁰⁾.

Following Belletti (2004), we assume that the sentence structure contains a Low Periphery above the VP area. This further layer of projections features a Focus projection which, according to Belletti, is the site of postverbal subjects. The Low Periphery is in some way isomorphic to the High Periphery (namely, the CP layer), even if its properties are more limited than those of the CP layer. The proposed structure is given in (39).

- (39) [_{CP} ... [_{IP} ... [... [_{VP} ...
 ↑ ↑
 High Periphery Low Periphery

This hypothesis permits us to account for a well-known peculiarity of old Italian, namely the occurrence of OV orders with compound tenses: direct or indirect objects – complements in general – precede the past participle, often producing an apparent verb final order, which has even been considered an imitation of Latin order, see (41). Poletto (2006, 2014) provides convincing evidence against the latter idea and shows that OV order is

⁽¹⁰⁾ This is consistent with the hypothesis of 'light bi-clausality' proposed by TORTORA 2010.

produced by the movement of the complement to a Low Periphery position of topic or focus:

- (40) ch' egli avea il maleficio commesso
 that he had the crime committed
 (*Fiore di retorica*, p. 31)

Moreover, the past participle itself moves out of the VP, to a functional head where it triggers obligatory agreement with the direct object (on the syntax of the past participle in old Italian, see also Egerland 1996) ⁽¹¹⁾:

- (41) E quando Carlo ebbe tutta Lombardia conquistat-a, e tutta Italia
 and when C. had all Lombardy conquered-FSG and all-FSG Italy
 sottomess-a a sé, ed a santa Chiesa, egli se n'andò a Roma
 submitted-FSG to himself and to holy Church, he went to Rome
 (*Tesoro*; L. 2, cap. 27)

Poletto's analysis is as follows: whenever a direct object moves to a topic or focus position in the Low Periphery (depending on its pragmatic nature), the past participle obligatorily moves to a position outside the VP from which it agrees with the direct object (AgrP in (42) stands for Agreement Phrase). The following scheme illustrates the proposed structure for a portion of the example (42):

- (42) [_{Top/Foc} tutta Lombardia [_{AgrP} conquistata [_{VP} ...

As pointed out by Poletto, corresponding to enclisis to an inflected verb in first position (in the High Periphery), we should therefore have enclisis to the past participle in the Low Periphery. If the Low Periphery were really parallel to the High periphery, and – as Poletto interestingly assumes – the same properties that govern movement of the inflected verb to the High Periphery forced the past participle to move to a head in the Low Periphery, we would expect that the position of clitics would be derived in parallel fashion: we should therefore have focus + proclitic + past participle, or topic + past participle + enclitics. However, she recognizes that we always have enclisis, even if we find many instances of operators (*tutto* 'everything', *molto* 'much', etc.) on the left of the past participle, presumably located in focus

⁽¹¹⁾ This is also suggested by the fact that the past participle appears on the left of 'lower adverbs', as shown by POLETTO 2014: Ch. 2.

in the low periphery: in this context, on analogy with what happens in the Left Periphery in Old Italian, we expect proclisis.

The parallelism between the High and the Low Periphery is therefore limited by orthogonal factors. For instance, one might argue that, for independent reasons, the participle always moves above the VP clitic field, namely the lower site for clitic placement in the structure of the clause. In fact, it is worth recalling that almost all old and modern Romance languages do not allow proclisis to the past participle (see fn 9 for a unique exception).

Furthermore, only a few dialects allow enclisis to the past participle in tensed clauses. To the best of our knowledge, VP clitics (i.e. clitics occurring in the VP clitic field) in tensed clauses are allowed only in Piedmontese dialects (including those on the Piedmont/Lombardy border which allow enclisis to the inflected verb as well). Elsewhere, it seems impossible to have clitics inside the VP field in tensed sentences, whether enclitic or proclitic (but see Ledgeway – Lombardi 2005). It is reasonable to think that this follows from a general principle requiring clitics to climb to the highest active field: in fact, in the absence of a tensed verb, clitics may be inserted in the VP field, as shown in the elliptical constructions from old Italian exemplified here below: this interpretation is obvious if we assume that the clitic field has to be activated by a verb in the area headed by the verbal form itself. As shown in (43), in old Italian, coordinated sentences with compound tenses allow the second member of the coordination to drop the auxiliary; in this case the clitic(s) appear in the VP area, enclitic to the participle. We submit the hypothesis that, under ellipsis, the CP and IP clitic fields are not activated and, consequently, the clitic(s) must be placed in the VP field, where they are crossed by the participle, giving rise to enclisis.

- (43) a. m' ha con un bastone tutto rotto e dettami la maggior
me= has with a cudgel all broken and said=to.me the greatest

villania che mai si dicesse a niuna cattiva femina
rudeness that ever one said to any bad woman

(Boccaccio, *Decam.*)

- b. trovò l' arme del re Meliadus, che lli avea fatta sì bella
found the weapons of.the king M. that to.him=he.had done so nice
deliberanza, e donatogli
disposal, and given=to.him

(*Novellino*, 63)

- c. avea una sola pecora, la quale avea comperata,
 he.had one only sheep, the which he.had bought,
 nutricata e cresciuta, e datole a mangiare
 fed and raised and given=to.her to eat
 del suo pane
 of.the his bread (Ottimo, p. 304)

In a few Modern Italo-Romance dialects, clitics can or must occupy the VP layer even in the presence of a tensed auxiliary. In most Piedmontese dialects this is the only possible placement of clitics in compound tenses (in some Piedmontese varieties clitics in VP are accompanied by a doubling copy in IP: see Parry 2005 and further bibliography therein).

Sanvalentinense, to the best of our knowledge, is the most liberal dialect with respect to clitic placement, as enclisis and proclisis to the past participle are both allowed also in tensed clauses:

- (44) a. 'ajə dɔʒa məŋ'ɲətə mə u
 I.have already eaten =to.me =it
 b. 'ajə dɔʒa mə lu məŋ'ɲətə
 I.have already to.me= it= eaten
 'I have already eaten it'

In parallel to what happens with inflected verbs, enclisis to the past participle is not always permitted, and it is forbidden in the same contexts in which enclisis to the auxiliary is ungrammatical. Clitics cannot follow the past participle when the sentence contains a *wh*-, a left dislocation or a low complementizer:

- (45) a. a ki I 'ajə 'dɛtə?
 To whom it= I.have given
 'Who have I given it to?'
 b. *a ki 'ajə 'dɛtə lu?
 To whom I.have given =it
 'Who have I given it to?'
- (46) a. lu 'pənə, I ajə 'dɛtə a m'marəjə
 The bread, it= I.have given to Mario
 b. *lu 'pənə, 'ajə 'dɛtə lu a m'marəjə
 The bread, I.have given =it to M.
 'I gave the bread to Mario'
- (47) a. 'do:ʃə k a'nomə məŋ'ɲətə sə =lu 'sɛmprə
 They.say that have=they eaten =to.themselves =it always
 'They say that they have always eaten it'

- b. [?]*wə'le'rə kə nn a'vessə 'wej'tə **Iu** k'kju
 I.would that not have seen =it anymore
 'I wish they had not seen it/him anymore'

On the one hand, the data of Sanvalentinese reinforce the idea that there are two peripheries in sentence structure, and they have parallel, similar properties: enclisis to the inflected verb and enclisis to the past participle are subject to the same pragmatic conditions. Moreover, we can also see this phenomenon as a residue of medieval V2 syntax; the verb moves, in this case not so high, with a limited – and optional – task: that of licensing a 'Subject of Predication' or another non-grammatical subject. The cases in which enclisis is impossible are cases in which a subject of predication is overtly present in the sentence, so that the V has no reason to move higher.

5. A FURTHER LOOK AT THE PARTICLE *A*

In this section we sketch a more systematic description of the behaviour of the particle *a*, which we have mentioned above. This particle occurs only when a proclitic element is present (including negation, see (48c), which can be therefore considered as a clitic particle):

- (48) a. (A) s a 'mess a 'pjo^{wə}
 PRT to.itself= has put to rain
 'It has begun to rain'
 b. (*a) 'pjo^{wə}
 PRT rains
 'It rains'
 c. (a) nən 'pjo^{wə}
 PRT= not rains

Moreover, *a* it is sensitive to the presence of elements in the left periphery: *a* cannot co-occur with a *wh*- item and with the low complementizer *kə*, cf. (49) and (50), while it is compatible with a topic and with the higher complementizer *ka*:

- (49) kə (*a) ttə 'mijjə?
 What PRT= to.yourself= you.eat
 'What do you eat?'

- (50) 'wojə kə (*a) tə lu= 'mɪŋŋə
 I.want that PRT to.yourself= it= eat
 'I want you to eat it'
- (51) lu 'kɛfə, (a) mə lu 'maŋŋə 'doʷpə
 The cheese, PRT to.myself= it= I.eat later
 'I'll eat the cheese later'
- (52) (a) t a'vej 'dattə ka 'kwɪllə (a) tə fa'ʃeivə 'ʃkreivərə
 PRT to.you= I.have told that he PRT to.you= make write
 da l avvu'kɛtə
 from the attorney
 'I told you that he would make his attorney write a letter to you'

With a DP subject, the particle *a* occurs between the subject and the clitic(s), although in contexts like (53) we cannot exclude that the subject DP occupies the topic position:

- (53) ma'rijə (a)= sə l a 'viʃtə arɾə'və lla 'kɛsə all əmbruv'visə
 M. PRT= herself= them= has seen to.arrive at.the house to.the sudden
 'Marijə saw them arrive home suddenly'

Given the above distribution we can therefore suppose that this element is located at the IP/CP border, arguably in the position of the Subject of Predication introduced at the end of section 3, following Cardinaletti (2004), Rizzi (2006), Rizzi – Shlonsky (2007), Ledgeway (2010). In section 3 we concluded that that position is the target of verb movement in sentences with enclisis. One might therefore advance the hypothesis that in Sanvalentinense *a*-insertion and verb movement (causing enclisis) both have to do with the same functional projection located at the CP/IP border.

In particular, we submit the hypothesis that the particle *a* occupies the position of the Subject of Predication (namely, the specifier of SubjP) as it cannot occur in the very same contexts in which preverbal subjects are prohibited. This happens in Focus-like structures, including *wh*-interrogative pronouns, where the subject must appear in a postverbal position – arguably in Belletti's Low periphery – giving rise to the order termed 'Stylistic inversion':

- (54) a. kə (*'karlə) sə 'maŋŋə 'karlə?
 What (*Carlo) to.himself= eat (Carlo)
 'What does Carlo eat?'

- b. lu 'paʃʃə a s a məŋ'ɲetə 'karlə
 The fish, PRT to.himself= has eaten (Carlo)
 'Carlo ate fish'

To sum up, the pivot of the analysis is a functional projection Subject of Predication, independently proposed – as mentioned above – on the basis of independent evidence. In section 3, we argued that enclisis in Sanvalentinese follows from the finite verb moving to SubjP under certain pragmatic conditions. When the verb is in SubjP, *a* is forbidden. Furthermore, *a* cannot occur in contexts of Stylistic Inversion, i.e. in contexts such as interrogatives and focus constructions in which SubjP cannot host a subject.

6. FINAL REMARKS

In this article we have tried to provide a detailed description of particular phenomena of enclisis of clitic pronouns in the dialect of San Valentino in Abruzzo citeriore. We have compared the Sanvalentinese pattern with the conditions triggering enclisis/proclisis in Medieval Romance and other Romance languages and concluded that Sanvalentinese departs from old vernaculars in not showing traces of V2 syntax, i.e. we do not have any evidence showing that the verb in Sanvalentinese moves to the CP layer of the clause.

However, Sanvalentinese differs quite radically from the majority of Modern Italo-Romance dialects in allowing enclisis in finite clauses under certain circumstances, namely when the sentence does not contain a left-dislocated topic, or operators in focus, or the low complementizer *che*. By contrast, enclisis is permitted in co-occurrence with a DP subject or negation. We have seen above that both these elements are structurally or functionally ambiguous: the DP subject can in fact be a topic, in which case only proclisis is admitted, and the negation marker can be itself a clitic (a choice that however leaves some questions open).

Given the above pattern of clitic placement, in the absence of compelling evidence in favour of V2 syntax, we propose that enclisis of pronouns in Sanvalentinese results from movement of the verb to a position licensing an optional Subject of Predication. Since enclisis in this dialect is optional, it seems correct to connect it with a pragmatic property that is, by definition, largely optional and dependent on discourse-related factors to be clarified in following works.

From this perspective, it seems particularly interesting to explore the possible relation of this phenomenon to a different characteristic of southern dialects (in particular of Naples and nearby area), which has been described and formally analysed by Ledgeway (2010). Despite the superficial differences between the two phenomena, both share some specific characteristics and seem to reveal new general structural properties. In Neapolitan and varieties of the same area, a sentence often displays two co-referent subjects, namely the lexical subject, which can be pre-verbal or post-verbal, and an agreeing pronoun, originally distal, doubling the subject:

- (55) a. Chella a fibbia, s' è rotta (Neapolitan: Ledgeway 2010)
 that.one.F the buckle.F, self= is broken.F
 b. Chella s' è rotta a fibbia
 that.one.F self= is broken.F the buckle.F
 'The buckle has broken'

Ledgeway describes in great detail many interesting aspects of the construction: the pronoun copies not only a grammatical subject, but also a topic, or a focus, which appear on its right, or a Hanging Topic, which however precedes the pronoun. Through direct investigation we can state that the pronoun has to agree with a left dislocated constituent, if present, even if there is a grammatical subject:

- (56) a. Chelle / *chille la porta, Mario nun l' ha araputa
 That.one.F / that.one.M, the door.F Mario.M not it= has opened.F
 'Mario did not open the door'

Moreover, the pronoun can also refer to a topic of the discourse, not present in the sentence.

Ledgeway proposes a structure with two Subject of Predication positions (besides the one hosting the grammatical subject). We think that his proposal can be combined with our new data and concur to develop a more detailed structure. In synthesis, what we propose for Sanvalentinese is that the verb moves further when no other accessible argument occupies a pragmatically marked position of topic or Focus in the Left Periphery in order to license a Subject of Predication, which can also be a null pronominal argument (*pro*). This movement gives rise to enclisis, as shown in the following scheme:

- (57) [_{SubjP} *pro* V_[+finite] [_{IP} clitics] (Sanvalentinese)

The evidence coming from the syntax of the particle/clitic *a* is encouraging in this direction. This optional element, which occurs in pragmatically marked sentences with a surprise flavour, immediately precedes complement clitics and cannot occur in combination with focus elements (including first of all *wh*-operators), the low complementizer *che* and enclitic pronouns. Given the above scenario, one may argue that *a* is placed in the head of SubjP – thus, it ends up being adjacent to the IP clitic field; in this position, it competes with the verb and prevents it from crossing the clitic field.

We have also described patterns of enclisis to the past participle, which require even more new data to be explained. Nevertheless, it appears that enclisis to the past participle in Sanvalentinese is permitted under conditions similar to those allowing enclisis to the inflected verb. We argued for a light-biclausal analysis in the spirit of Tortora (2010) to account for the fact that clitics appear in the VP field also in tensed clauses. Moreover, following Poletto (2006), in the light of Belletti's (2010) theory on the Low Left Periphery, we argued for a parallelism between the movement of the inflected verb at the IP/High Periphery border and the movement of the participle at the VP/Low Periphery border. This visible parallelism means that a topic or a focus in the High Periphery is visible from the Low Periphery, through a process that we hope to understand in more detail in the future. To answer the initial question of this paper, we would say that clitic placement in Sanvalentinese and the syntax of enclisis and proclisis in this dialect is a residue of Medieval syntax; it is possible that a deeper understanding of this aspect, and its relation to Neapolitan 'double subject' described in Ledge-way (2010), will shed new light on V2 syntax and on the interface between syntax and pragmatics.

PAOLA BENINCÀ

e-mail

DIEGO PESCARINI

e-mail

REFERENCES

- ANOÈ, Gianluca (2014), *Enclisi e proclisi in galego: un confronto con la sintassi romanza medievale*, Master thesis, University of Padua.
- BELLETTI, Adriana (2001), 'Inversion as focalization', in A. HULK – J.-Y. POLLOCK (edd.), *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, New York, Oxford University Press: 60-90.

- BELLETTI, Adriana (2004), 'Aspects of the Low IP Area', in L. RIZZI (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Vol. 2*, New York, Oxford University Press: 16-51.
- BENINCÀ, Paola (1995), 'Complement clitics in Medieval Romance. The Tobler-Mussafia Law', in A. BATTYE – I. ROBERTS (edd.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 325-344.
- BENINCÀ, Paola (2006), 'A detailed map of the left periphery of medieval Romance', in R. ZANUTTINI et alii (edd.), *Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture. Cross-linguistic Investigations*, Washington DC, Georgetown University Press: 53-86.
- BENINCÀ, Paola (2012), 'Lexical complementizers and headless relatives', in L. BRUGÈ et alii (eds.), *Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 7*, New York, Oxford University Press: 29-41.
- BENINCÀ, Paola (2013), 'Caratteristiche del V2 romanzo. Lingue romanze antiche, ladino dolomitico e portoghese', in E. BIDESE e F. COGNOLA (eds.), *Introduzione alla linguistica del mòcheno*, Torino, Rosenberg & Sellier: 65-83.
- BENINCÀ, Paola – CINQUE, Guglielmo (1993), 'Su alcune differenze fra enclisi e proclisi', in *Omaggio a Gianfranco Folea*, Padova, Programma: 2313-2326.
- BENINCÀ, Paola – POLETO, Cecilia (2004), 'Topic, Focus and V2. Defining the CP sublayers', in L. RIZZI, *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Vol. 2*. New York, Oxford University Press: 52-76.
- BENINCÀ, Paola – POLETO, Cecilia (2010), *L'ordine delle parole e la struttura della frase*, in SALVI – RENZI (2010: 27-75).
- BENINCÀ, Paola – TORTORA, Christina (2009), 'Towards a finer-grained theory of Italian participial clausal architecture', *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 15.1: 17-26.
- CARDINALETTI, Anna (2004), 'Towards a cartography of subject positions', in L. RIZZI (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 2*, New York, Oxford University Press: 115-165.
- D'ALESSANDRO, Roberta – LEDGEWAY, Adam (2010), 'At the C-T boundary. Investigating Abruzzese complementation', *Lingua* 120: 2040-2060.
- DAMONTE, Federico (2010), 'Matching moods. Mood concord between CP and IP in Salentino and southern Italian subjunctive complements', in P. BENINCÀ and N. MUNARO (edd.), *Mapping the Left Periphery. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 5*, New York, Oxford University Press: 228-256.
- EGERLAND, Verner (1996), *The Syntax of Past Participles. A Generative Study of Nonfinite Constructions in Ancient and Modern Italian*, Lund, Lund University Press.
- FORMENTIN, Vittorio (2007), *Poesia italiana delle origini*, Roma, Carocci.
- FOULET, Lucien (1928), *Petite syntaxe de l'ancien français*, Paris, Champion.
- 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: 336-396.
- LEDGEWAY, Adam (2010), 'Subject licensing in CP. The Neapolitan double subject construction', in P. BENINCÀ and N. MUNARO (eds.), *Mapping the Left Periphery. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 5*, New York, Oxford University Press: 257-296.

- LEDGEWAY, Adam – LOMBARDI, Alessandra (2005) 'Verb Movement, adverbs and clitic positions in Romance', *Probus* 17: 79-113.
- LOPORCARO, Michele (2007), 'On triple auxiliation in Romance', *Linguistics* 45: 173-222.
- MANZINI, M. Rita – SAVOIA, Leonardo M. (2005), *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*, 3 voll., Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.
- MANZINI, M. Rita and Leonardo M. SAVOIA (2007). *A Unification of Morphology and Syntax. Investigations into Romance and Albanian Dialects*, London-New York, Routledge.
- MUSSAFIA, Adolfo (1886), 'Una particolarità sintattica della lingua italiana dei primi secoli', in *Miscellanea di filologia e linguistica, dedicata alla memoria di Napoleone Caix e Ugo A. Canello*, Firenze, Le Monnier: 255-261, 474-475. [Republished in Adolfo MUSSAFIA, *Scritti di filologia e linguistica*, ed. by A. DANIELE, L. RENZI, Padova, Antenore, 1983: 291-301].
- MASTRANGELO LATINI, Giulia (1981), 'Note di morfologia dialettale', *Quaderni di filologia e lingue romanze* 3: 241-249.
- PARRY, Mair (2005), *Parluma 'd Còiri. Sociolinguistica e grammatica del dialetto di Cairo Montenotte*, Savona, Editrice Liguria.
- POLETTI, Cecilia (2006), 'Parallel phases. A study on the High and Low left periphery in old Italian', in M. FRASCARELLI (ed.), *Phases of Interpretation*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter: 238-261.
- POLETTI, Cecilia (2014), *Word Order in Old Italian*, New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- RASOM, Sabrina (2006), 'La posizione del pronome clitico oggetto con le forme verbali 'non-finite'. Differenze areali e generazionali nel fassano', in G. MARCATO (ed.), *Giovani, lingue e dialetti*. Padova, Unipress: 109-114.
- RIZZI, Luigi (1997), 'The fine structure of the left periphery', in L. HAEGEMAN (ed.), *Elements of Grammar. Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Dordrecht, Kluwer: 281-337.
- RIZZI, Luigi (2006), 'On the form of chains. Criterial positions and ECP effects', in L. CHENG, N. CORVER (eds.), *Wh-movement. Moving on*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press: 97-134.
- RIZZI, Luigi – SHLONSKY, Ur (2007), 'Strategies for subject extraction', in U. SAUERLAND, H.-M. GÄRTNER (eds.), *Interfaces + recursion = language? Chomsky's minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics*, Studies in Generative Grammar 89, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter: 115-160.
- ROHLFS, Gerhard (1968), *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, Vol. II, Morfologia, Torino, Einaudi.
- SALVI, Giampaolo – RENZI, Lorenzo (eds.) (2010), *Grammatica dell'italiano antico*, Bologna, Il Mulino.
- TORTORA, Christina (2010), 'Domains of clitic placement in finite and non-finite clauses. Evidence from a Piedmontese dialect', in R. D'ALESSANDRO, A. LEDGEWAY, I. ROBERTS (eds.), *Syntactic Variation. The Dialects of Italy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 135-149.
- TORTORA, Christina (2014), 'Patterns of variation and diachronic change in Piedmontese object clitic syntax', in P. BENINCÀ, A. LEDGEWAY, N. VINCENT (eds.), *Diachrony*

and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

TORTORA, Christina (forthcoming), *A Comparative Grammar of Borgomanerese*, New York-Oxford, Oxford University Press.

ZANUTTINI, Raffaella (1997), *Negation and Clausal Structure*, New York-Oxford, Oxford University Press.

TEXTS AND SOURCES

Artu = *La Mort le roi Artu*. ed., by J. FRAPPIER (1954), Geneva, Droz

Boccaccio, = Giovanni BOCCACCIO, *Decameron*, ed. by V. BRANCA (1976), Florence, Accademia della Crusca, (The number refers to the number of the tale).

Fiore di Rettorica = Bono GIAMBONI, *Fiore di rettorica*, ed. by G. B. SPERONI (1994), Pavia, Dip. di Scienza della Letteratura e dell'Arte medioevale e moderna.

Fiori di filosafi = *Fiori e vita di filosafi e d'altri savi e d'imperadori*, ed. by A. D'AGOSTINO (1978), Firenze, La Nuova Italia.

Lio Mazor = *I monumenti del dialetto di Lio Mazor*. ed. by U. Levi (1904), Venice, Visentini.

Novellino = *Il Novellino*, ed., by G. FAVATI (1970), Genoa, Bozzi. (The number refers to the number of the tale).

Ottimo = *L'Ottimo Commento della Commedia*, t. III *Paradiso*, ed by A. TORRI (1829), Pisa, Capurro.

SCHIAFFINI, Alfredo (1926), *Testi fiorentini del Duecento e dei primi del Trecento*, Firenze, Sansoni.

SCREMIN, M. Francesca (1984-1985), *La struttura della frase nella lingua poetica siciliana*, Padua, Laurea Dissertation.

Tesoro = *Il Tesoro di Brunetto LATINI volgarizzato da Bono GIAMBONI*, ed. by P. CHABAILLE, Revised by L. GAITER (1878-1883), Bologna, Romagnoli, 4 vols.