The North-South Romance Continuum: Parameters of Variation in the Clausal Domain
Adam Ledgeway (anl21@cam.ac.uk)

1. Introduction
• Long tradition in Italian dialectology for geographical classifications

• Dante's Apennine west-east divide: 14 *vulgaria*

• Standard classifications today:[1]

   i) North-South axis (excludes Sardinia: Bossong 2016:65; Mensching & Remberger 2016:270)

   ii) 3 broad linguistic areas (with internal subdivisions) ⇒ geographic continuum

      (1) North (cf. Benincà, Parry & Pescarini 2016): Gallo-Italic vs Venetan northern dialects…

      (2) Centre (cf. Loporcaro & Paciaroni 2016): Tuscan vs non-Tuscan central dialects…

      (3) South (cf. Ledgeway 2016a): upper vs extreme southern dialects…

   iii) (Partial) coincidence with early administrative, political and cultural divisions and, in part, distribution of ancient peoples and their substrate languages (Ascoli 1882; Merlo 1924)

   iv) Principal isoglosses (Rohlfs [1972]1977; Savoia 1997):

      • La Spezia–Rimini Line (Carrara–Fano) ⇒
         i) bundle of phonetic and lexical isoglosses
         ii) delineates northern dialects from dialects of centre-south

      • Rome–Ancona Line ⇒
         i) loose bundle of phonetic, lexical and some morphological isoglosses
         ii) roughly delineates central dialects from southern dialects

• Romance areal-based classifications (for centre-periphery cf. Bartoli 1929; 1933)

   • West-East axis (Wartburg 1950): based on La Spezia–Rimini Line (cf. also Malkiel 1991)

   • North-South axis (La Fauci 1988; 1991; 1997; 1998; Zamboni 1998; 2000; Ledgeway 2012:ch.7)[2]

   (i)   Northern Romània:
         Gallia transalpina (northern Gallia: *langue d'oïl*, southern Gallia: *langue d'oc*)
         Gallia cisalpina (NIDs),
         Raetia (Raeto-Romance varieties)

   (ii) Southern Romània:
         central-southern Italy (C/SIDs)
         Sardinia (Campidanese, Loguodorese, Nuorese)
         Iberia (Galician, Portuguese, Spanish, Catalan)
         Istria/Illyria (Dalmatian)
         Dacia (Romanian, Istro-Romanian, Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian)

---

[1] Cf. Pellegrini (1975), Bruni (1987:290f.), Cortelazzo (1988), Maiden (1995:233-48), Loporcaro (2009).
[2] See also Cremona (1970), and Green (2006) for evidence of a Romance north-south axis.

(iii) Active-Stative (A/S$_A$ vs O/S$_O$) vs Nom-Acc (A/S$_{A/O}$ vs O) alignments

Table 1: North-South Continuum $\Rightarrow$ Active-Stative vs Nominative-Accusative syntax

Northern Romània (A/S$_A$ vs O/S$_O$)	Southern Romània (A/S$_{A/O}$ vs O)
Prolonged retention of V2 syntax	Early loss of V2 syntax
Subject (A/S) marking (SCLs, generalized preverbal position)	O(bject) marking (DOM, clitic doubling)
Prolonged retention of binary case system	Early loss of binary case system
HABERE/*ESSERE alternation of perfective auxiliaries	Generalisation of single perfective auxiliary (HABERE or *ESSERE)
Retention of participle agreement	Loss of participle agreement
Loss of preterit	Retention of preterit

• Aims of talk:

  i) Review some morphosyntactic evidence in support of (Italo-)Romance north-south divide

  ii) Dimensions of (micro)variation in properties of individual functional heads (Ledgeway 2016b)

  iii) Build on insights of the Borer-Chomsky Conjecture (cf. Baker 2008:353):

    – locus of parametric variation in lexicon

    – (PF-)lexicalization of feature values of individual functional heads (Borer 1984; Chomsky 1995)

  iv) Feature values not set in isolation: parameters = interrelated network of implicational relationships

    – value of parameter may entail activation of associated lower-order parametric choices

    – surface effects of associated parameters may become entirely predictable

    – parameter value may rule out and render entirely irrelevant other parameters

• Nominal domain:

  i) Already considerable progress (cf. Comparative Parametric Method)[3]

  ii) Establish, and model relationships between, important parameters of microvariation

• Clausal domain:

  i) Consider some key examples of representative morphosyntactic divergence between north-south

  ii) Parametric options and featural make-up of core functional heads of clause: C–T–*v*

---

[3] See, among others, Guardiano & Longobardi (2005; 2017a,b), Longobardi & Guardiano (2009), Longobardi, Guardiano, Silvestri, Boattini & Ceolin (2013), Guardiano (2014), Guardiano & Stavrou (2014), Ledgeway (2015), Guardiano, Michelioudakis, Ceolin, Irimia, Longobardi, Radkevich, Silvestri and Sitaridou (2016), Longobardi, Ghirotto, Guardiano, Tassi, Benazzo, Ceolin and Barbujani (2015), Longobardi, Ceolin, Ecay, Ghirotto, Guardiano, Irimia, Michelioudakis, Radkevic, Luiselli, Pettener and Barbujani (2016), Guardiano and Michelioudakis (2019).

2. C-domain

• Basic ingredients of V2 constraint (cf. Ledgeway 2007; Holmberg 2015; Wolfe 2018):

   i) Raising of the finite verb in root clauses to the C position (minimal requirement);

   ii) Fronting of salient constituent to preverbal operator position for (contrastively / informationally) focalized interpretation (optional);

2.1 V2 Residues

• Notable difference between north and south: availability of head- and phrasal-fronting to C-domain

• Medieval V2 (cf. Benincà 1984; 1994; 2006;2013; Salvesen 2013;Wolfe 2018; Ledgeway 2021):

   – strict(er) observance of surface V2 linearization in Gallo-Romance

   – robust null vs overt pronominal root-embedded asymmetry in Gallo-Romance

   – prolonged retention of V2 in Gallo-Romance (cf. Table 1), preserved in Ladin[4]

2.1.1 V-to-C Movement

• Stronger V2 constraint of Gallo-Romance visible in availability of V-to-C movement:

   i) NIDs, esp. northeast, C° may still probe V ($\Rightarrow$ V-to-C Mvt) under particular marked conditions

   ii) Overt reflexes of V-to-C Mvt (Poletto & Tortora 2016:779-81):

      – (simple/complex) verb-subject inversion

      – enclisis of object clitics

      – complementary distribution of subjunctive verb forms and complementizers

   iii) Constrained V-to-C Mvt = synchronic residue of medieval generalized V2 (cf. Rizzi & Roberts 1989; Rizzi 1990)

   iv) V-to-C Mvt licensed in restricted set of non-veridical polarity contexts tied to specific forces:

1   a Ven-lo   stasèira   teu   pari? (Rueglio, Pie.; interrogative; Parry 1997b)
        come.PRS.IND.3SG=SCL.2MSG this.evening your father ('Is your father coming this evening?')

      b Fusse-lo rivà! (Scorzè, CVen.; optative; Poletto 2000)
        were=he come.PTCP ('I wish he had come!')

      c Telefonasse-lo   almanco! (Padua; exhortative/jussive; Munaro 2010)
        telephone.SBJV.IPFV.3SG=SCL.3MSG at.least ('He should at least ring!')

      d 'fys-ɐt   ri'va   'primɒ… (Revere, Lmb.; hypothetical; M&S 2005)
        be.SBJV.PST.2SG=SCL.2SG arrive.PTCP before ('If you had arrived sooner…')

      e Gavesselo   anca   telefonà,… (Padua; concessive; Munaro 2010)
        have.SBJV.IPFV.3SG=SCL.3MSG even   telephone.PTCP ('Even if he had rung,…')

      f Sedi-al   rivat   o   no sedi-al
        be.SBJV.PRS.3SG=SCL.3MSG arrive.PTCP or not be.SBJV.PRS.3SG=SCL.3MSG
        rivat (Clauzetto, Frl.; disjunctive; Poletto 2000)
        arrive.PTCP ('Whether he's arrived or not,…')

      g No ga-lo   magnà   tuto! (Carmignano di Brenta, CVen.; exclamative)
        NEG have.IND.PRS.3SG=SCL.3MSG eat.PTCP   all ('He's eaten everything!'; Munaro 2010)

      h 'ʧame-me! (Cortemilia, Pie.; imperatival; Manzini & Savoia 2005)
        call.IMP.2SG=me ('Call me!')

---

[4] See Haiman & Benincà (1992:150), Poletto (2000; 2002), Kaiser (2002), Anderson (2016:179-81), Salvi (2000; 2016a:164-65, 2016b:1009).

• Ability of C to probe V:

   i) Generalized semantically uninterpretable V-feature on C° systematically lost in modern Romance

   ii) V-to-C Mvt exceptionally retained where plays role in interpretation ⇒ semantically interpretable V-feature

   iii) Distribution of semantically-driven V-to-C movement not uniform across Romance:

     – relatively well preserved in Gallo-Romance: (formal) French, north(east)ern Italian dialects[5]

     – different degrees of productivity/attrition outside of Gallo-Romance (cf. Ledgeway 2015:§3.2)

     – ability of C° to probe finite verb in southern dialects highly restricted

      <u>Cosentino, southern Calabria</u>

2   a **Ca**   venanu?
         that come.PRS.IND.3PL ('Are they coming?')

     b **Ca**   su   bbieddri!
         that be.PRS.IND.3PL handsome ('How beautiful they are!')

     c **Chi** vò   scattà!
         that want.PRS.IND.2SG burst.INF ('May you keel over!')

     d Mannamillu!
         send.IMP.2SG=me=it ('Send me it!')

2.1.2 Operator Movement to SpecCP
• EPP-style edge feature on C ⇒ focus-fronting:

   i) NIDs: impossible (but cf. Paoli 2010), with exception of partial questions (including apparent wh-*in situ* questions; Munaro 1998; Munaro, Poletto and Pollock 2001; Munaro and Poletto 2002; De Cia 2019; but see also Bonan 2019), presumably licensed by Q[F] on C°;

   ii) SIDs: highly productive (cf. Cruschina 2006; 2010; 2012; Ledgeway 2009a:784-90; Cruschina, Ledgeway and Remberger 2019:29f)

3   a Wè Marì, ca   TOND GIAÒV'N nan sì! (Matera; contrastive)
         look Maria that so   young   NEG be.PRS.IND.2SG
         'Hey Maria, you're not SO YOUNG yourself!'

     b **'O   pate**   songh' io! (Nap.; informational)
         the   father be.PRS.IND.1SG   I
         'I'm **the daddy**!'

     c **Nu càvuciu a ru culu** ti   dugnu! (Cosenza; mirative)
         a   kick   to the arse   you= give.PRS.IND.1SG
         'I'll give you **a kick up the arse**!'

     d **Caccose** s'   a   scurdate. (Chieti; quantified expressions)
         something self= have.PRS.IND.3SG forget
         'He's forgotten **something**.'

---

[5] Cf. Poletto (2000:chs 3,5), Munaro (2004; 2010), Manzini & Savoia (2005,I:384-87), Benincà, Parry & Pescarini (2016:200).

2.2 V2 Residues in North and South
• Conclusion:

   i) medieval Romance V2: simultaneous overt PF-satisfaction of $\Rightarrow$

     – head requirement: generalized V-raising triggered by semantically uninterpretable V[F] on C°

     – associated edge requirement: focus-fronting to SpecCP triggered by EPP feature

   ii) 2 fundamental reflexes of original V2 syntax stand in complementary distribution: north vs south

   iii) C-related requirements: subject to reanalysis and redistribution in modern Italo-Romance:

     • NIDs:
     – V-to-C Mvt = semantically interpretable V-feature on C° (non-veridical polarity values)

     – loss of associated EPP-style edge feature on Cº (SpecCP hosts null operator)

     • SIDs:
     – V-to-C Mvt all but lost (cf. imperatives; Rivero 1994; Graffi 1996; Zanuttini 1997)

     – EPP feature on Cº no longer generalized, but restricted to particular marked focal interpretations

   iv) North-South: complementary distribution of head and edge probing features on Cº

3. T-Domain

3.1 V-Movement
• Ability of T° to probe V (Ledgeway 2009b; Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005:103-06; 2014; Schifano 2015; 2018)

   i) NIDs: finite V probed by T° (4a-b)

   ii) SIDS: finite V not probed by T°, but remains in *v*-VP: (Cl +) Adv +V (5-6)

4 a La   sua miè la   **cuzina**   <u>aposta</u>   el risot. (MI)
       the his wife SCL.FSG cook.IND.PRS.3SG deliberately the risotto
    b La   sua miè la   **cuzina**   <u>minga</u> el risot. (MI)
       the his wife SCL.FSG cook.IND.PRS.3SG NEG   the risotto
       'His wife deliberately cooks/doesn't cook the risotto.'

5 a Sa mujjeri <u>mancu</u> i   **cucina**,   i vrùcculi. (Mussomeli, CT)
       his wife   NEG   them= cook.IND.PRS.3SG the broccoli ('His wife doesn't cook broccoli.')
    b A   carusa <u>già</u>   **cammina**. (Mussomeli, CT)
       the girl   already walk.IND.PRS.3SG ('The girl is already walking.')
    c U   picciluddru **dormi**   <u>ancora/sempi/bbonu</u> (Mussomeli, CT)
       the child   sleep.IND.PRS.3SG still/always/well ('The child still/always sleeps well.')

6 a Chiru <u>forse/mancu</u> **vena**   ccu nua. (Cosenza)
       that.one perhaps/NEG   come.PRS.3SG   with us ('He's perhaps coming/isn't coming with us.')
    b Iddu mi <u>ggià/ancora/sempe</u> **chiamava**. (Cosenza)
       he   me=already/still/always call.IND.PST.3SG ('He already/still/always called me.')
    c U   picciliddu **durmia**   <u>bbuonu</u>. (Cosenza)
       the boy   sleep.IND.PST.3SG well ('The child was sleeping well.')

• (Near) Absence of V-to-C Mvt in SIDs (cf. 2a-d)

i) Finite verb in *v*-VP: not available for T-to-C Mvt (cf. inversion in history of English; Biberauer & Roberts 2012; 2017)

ii) V-to-C Mvt with imperatives: T-domain missing (Graffi 1996; Zanuttini 1997; Ledgeway 2019a)

3.2 Postverbal Negation: Jespersen's Stages II-III

• Negation in Italian dialects (Zanuttini 1997; Parry 1997a; 2013; Manzini & Savoia 2005,III:127-55; Poletto 2008; 2016a,b; Garzonio & Poletto 2009; 2018)

(i)   Preverbal / Stage I: CIDs/SIDs, north-eastern dialects, Ligurian, eastern Romansh, Cat., EuPt, Sp, Ro. (7a)

(ii) Discontinuous / Stage II: many NIDs, standard French, Gascon (7b)

(iii) Postverbal / Stage III: many north-western Italian dialects, western/central Romansh, spoken French, Occitan, Aragonese, northern Catalan dialects (7c)

7   a **Un**   duarmu. (Cosenza)
       NEG   sleep.1SG

    b A   **n**   dorum   **briza**. (Modena)
       SCL   NEG   sleep.1SG   NEG

    c Dürmirai   **nen**. (Pie.)
       sleep.FUT.1SG   NEG
       'I don't/won't sleep.'

• Linking postverbal negators and verb movement (cf. Ledgeway & Schifano in press; in prep.):

i) Preverbal negators (Stage I): varieties low or high V-Mvt

ii) Non-emphatic postverbal negators (Stages II-III): varieties with clause-medial/high V-Mvt

Table 2: Verb-movement and negation typologies (from Ledgeway & Schifano in press)

Negation \ Verb-movement	Stage I	Stages II-III
High	Romanian$_2$	French, Occitan, Gascon
Clause-medial	northern regional Italian, NIDs (e.g. Teolese)	(northern regional Italian), NIDs (e.g. Milanese)
Low	European Portuguese, southern regional Italian, SIDs, Romanian$_1$	*
Very low	Spanish, Valencian	*

8   If a variety is at Stages II-III, it necessarily exhibits clause-medial or high verb-movement

• Conclusion: postverbal negator licensed by V-raising through its associated head

3.3 Subject Clitics

• Distribution of subject clitics (cf. Poletto 2000; Manzini & Savoia 2005,I; Poletto & Tortora 2016):

– North (& northern Tuscany): attested everywhere

– South: absent

• Related to T movement? Strong/weak D-feature (= phi-features) on T

• Subject clitics and null subject parameter: a typology (Roberts 2010; cf. also D'Alessandro in press:§19.5.1.1)

9   a   scl [+agr]   V [+agr]   – a 'fully redundant', null-subject system ⇒ Florentine

    b   scl [+agr]   V [–agr]   – a non-null-subject system ⇒ French

    c   scl [–agr]   V [+agr]   – a null-subject system ⇒ Comasco

    d   scl [–agr]   V [–agr]   – (usually) a complementary system ⇒ Carrara

Table 3: Subject clitics and null subject parameter (Roberts 2010)

	Florentine	French	Comasco	Carrara	Cosenza	Naples
1SG	(e) dorm**o**	**je** dors	dorm-i	**a** dɔrmə	d**uo**rmu	dormə
2SG	**tu** dorm**ii**	**tu** dors	**ta** dorm-at	**t** dɔrmə	d**uo**rmi	d**uo**rmə
3SG	**e/la** dorm**e**	**il/elle** dort	**al/la** dorm-a	**i/al** dɔrmə	dorm**a**	dormə
1PL	**si** dorm**e**	**nous** dormons	dormu-um	**a** durm-i**ŋ**	durm**imu**	durm**immə**
2PL	**vu** dorm**ite**	**vous** dormez	dorm-uf	durm-**it**	durm**iti**	durm**itə**
3PL	**e/le** dorm**ano**	**ils/elles** dorment	dorm-an	**i/al** dɔrmənə	dorm**anu**	dormənə

• Conclusion: (i) T-head in NIDs carries strong V and D features

(ii) T-head in SIDs carries weak V and D features

3.4 Active-Stative Auxiliary Selection

• Perfective auxiliary selection (cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005,II-III; Ledgeway 2012:ch. 7; 2019b):

– North: active-stative split: A/S$_A$ (⇒ HAVE) vs S$_O$ (⇒ BE)

10   a   i'   **eu**   drimì / a   **suma**   partìi. (Cairo Montenotte, SV; cf. Parry 2005)
         SCL   I   have slept   SCL we.are   left
         'I have slept / we have left'

– South: generalization of single auxiliary (11a-b) or person split (11c):

11   a   **Avìanu**   manciatu / nisciutu. (Sic.)
             they.had   eaten   gone.out
             'They had eaten/gone out.'

     b   **sɔŋgə** / **si**   /   ε…   mə'nuːtə / maɲ'ɲɛɐtə. (Pescolanciano, IS; Manzini & Savoia 2005)
             I.am   you.are   s/he.is   come   eaten
             'I have/you have/(s)he has come/eaten.'

     c   **So** / **Si**   / **A**   fatecate / ite. (Arielli, eastern Abruzzo; D'Alessandro p.c.)
             I.am you.are have.3   worked   gone
             'I have/you have/(s)he has worked/gone.'

• Structural condition on auxiliary selection: (cf. Perlmutter 1978; Burzio 1986):

12   Auxiliary BE is selected whenever (Spec)T is indexed with V(,DP)

• (Auxiliary) verbs raise to T in NIDs (hence sensitive to A/S$_A$ vs S$_O$ distinction; cf. PIC)

4. *v*-Domain

4.1 Auxiliary Selection

• SIDs: (auxiliary) verbs don't raise to T (cf. PIC) ⟹

    i) No active-stative effects on Aux: T and V not co-indexed (cf. 11a-b)

    ii) Aux in *v* sensitive to subject features in Spec*v*P: (11c; cf. D'Alessandro & Roberts 2010)

4.2. Participle Agreement

• Active-stative participle agreement (Rohlfs 1969:116; Smith 1991; Loporcaro 1998:64-78; 2016:§49.2.3; Manzini & Savoia 2005,II:§5.1)

   i) NIDs: restricted to (raised) unaccusative subjects (S$_O$) and raised clitic objects (O$_{CL}$)

       Casorezzo (MI; Manzini & Savoia 2005)

13   a [pro] l   e   [pro] **mɔrtu/mɔrta**   [pro].
          SCL.3 be.PRS.IND.3SG   die.PTCP.MSG/FSG
          'He/She has died.'

     b o   **pɛrsu/*pɛrsa**   a   biʧiklɛta.
       have.PRS.IND.1SG lose.PTCP.MSG/FSG the.FSG bicycle.FSG
       'I've lost my bike.'

     c [l]   o   ***pɛrsu/pɛrsa**   [ɫ].
       it= have.PRS.IND.1SG lose.PTCP.MSG/FSG
       'I've lost it.'

   ii) SIDs: preserved with (raised) unaccusative subjects (S$_O$) and *in situ* objects (O$_{(CL)}$)

       Scorrano (Musio 1995)

14   a li   tre su   già   **ssuti**   li tre
       the.MPL three be.PRS.IND.3PL already go.out.PTCP.MPL
       'the three of them have gone out'

     b aggiu   **nnutti**   ddo chili   de pampasciuni
       have.PRS.IND.1SG bring.PTCP.MPL two kilos.M of hyacinth.bulbs.M
       'I've brought two kilos of hyacinth bulbs'

     c l' aggiu   **vista**   [ɫ] puru nuta
       it=have.PRS.IND.1SG seen.FSG   also naked
       'I've seen her naked too'

• (Participial) V-movement and the PIC (cf. Kayne 1989; D'Alessandro & Roberts 2008):

  i) NIDs: high, PtP can only probe nominals in higher phase (= S$_O$, O$_{CL}$)

  ii) SIDs: low(er), PtP can probe *in situ* nominals in lower phase (raised S$_O$/O$_{CL}$ pass through PtP)

4.3. Lower Left Periphery: Focus

• Loss of focus-fronting to higher Left periphery (CP) in NIDs: cf. §2.1 (Rizzi 1997)

• Focus fronting to lower Left Periphery (*v*P) in NIDs (cf. Paoli 2003; Belletti 2004; 2005)

15 (*IL GELATO)   a l' ha catà   IL GELATO, nen la torta. (Tur.)
     the ice-cream   SCL= has bought the ice-cream not the cake
    'It's the ice-cream that he bought, not the cake.'

• Conclusion: availability of interpretable focus-related edge feature on *v* (north) vs C (south)

4.4 Differential Object Marking (DOM)

• Distribution of DOM:

   i) North: no distinction between different classes of in/animate specific objects (but cf. Parry 2003)

16 u   mi**ŋ**ga   vist **la tuza** / **la cros** (Milan)
      I.have NEG   seen the girl   the cross
      'I didn't see the girl / the cross'

   ii) (Centre-)South (cf. Rohlfs 1971:314-17; Guardiano 1999; 2000; 2010; Ledgeway 2000:ch.2; 2018; in press a,b,c)

       <u>Borbona (RI) / Canosa Sannita (CH); Manzini & Savoia 2005)</u>
17 a 'camenu   **a** **m'mi** / **a**   **t'ti** / **a**   **n'nu** / **a**   **b'bu** / (***a**)
       call.PRS.IND.3PL DOM me   DOM you.SG DOM us   DOM you.PL   DOM
       'issu (pro: 1/2 vs 3)
       him
       'They call me/you/us/you/him'

    b 'camo   **a**   **t'tɛ**   / **a**   **v'vo** / (**a**) **(k)kul'lu** / (***a**)
       call.PRS.IND.1SG DOM   you.SG DOM you.PL DOM him   DOM
       'fratətə (pro vs kinship)
       brother=your.SG
       'I call you.SG/you.PL/him/your brother'

       <u>Lecce, Salento (Prototapa 1991)</u>
18 a **A**   **cci** uèi?   **A**   **mmie** o **a**   **ssorma**? (Wh-pro, pro, kin)
       DOM who you.SG.want DOM me   or DOM sister=my
       'Who do you want? Me or my sister?'

    b ieu bu   cüèrnu   **a**   **tutti** (Q-pro)
       I   you.PL= I.govern DOM all

---

    c cu   cchiamàmu **lu** **mìètecu** (common noun)
       that we.call   the doctor
       'Let's call the doctor!'

       <u>Camerota (SA), Campania (Manzini & Savoia 2005)</u>
19 a 'addʒu   'vistu **a** **v'vui** / **a** **k'killi waʎ'ʎuni** (pro, def. com.)
       have.PRS.IND.1SG seen DOM you.PL DOM those children
       'I saw you / those children'

    b 'addʒu   'vistu (**a**) **nu waʎ'ʎuni** (indef. com.)
       have.PRS.IND.1SG seen DOM a   child
       'I saw a child'

• DOM licensed by object shift to Spec*v*P (Torrego 1998; Ledgeway 2000; Peverini-Benson 2004; Andriani 2011; 2015; López 2012; Cornilescu 2020; Tigău 2021)

• Ability of D-feature on *v* to probe Obj-V,DP (structural acc.):

   i) Not in NIDs

   ii) Only in (CIDs-)SIDs: internal variation for person, number, (pro)nominal, animacy, definiteness

5. Conclusions for Italo-Romance

• North–South divide (La Spezia–Rimini Line): morphosyntactically robust

• Parameters don't operate in isolation:

    • North: T probes V $\Rightarrow$

        i) verb-subject inversion (§2.1.1)

        ii) Stage II and III negation (§3.2)

        iii) Subject clitics (§3.3; dedicated subject marking)

        iv) Active-stative perfective auxiliary selection (§3.4)

        v) Absence of participle agreement with *in situ* objects (§4.2)

    • South: *v* probes V $\Rightarrow$

        i) V-to-C movement limited to positive imperatives (§2.1.1)

        ii) Stage I negation (§3.2)

        iii) Generalized or person-driven perfective auxiliation (§4.1)

        iv) Active participle agreement with *in situ* objects (§4.2)

        v) Prepositional accusative (§4.4; differential object marking)

6. Beyond Italo-Romance

Table 4: Major clausal parameters across Romance

				Fr.	Occ.	NIDs	Lad.	It.	Srd.	IbR.	Ro.	SIDs
1		Non-veridical V-to-C Mvt		+	+	+	+	±	(±)	(−)	−	−
	(a)	V-to-T Mvt		+	+	+	+ +	±	±	−	−	−
		(i)	Stage II-III Neg	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	−
		(ii)	A/S$_O$ Aux	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	−	−
		(iii)	Strong D edge feature (= Scls, SVO)	+	+ −	+	+	+	+	−	−	−
	(b)	V-to-*v* Mvt		−	−	−	−	−	−	+	+	+
		(i)	Gen/P-D Aux	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	+	+
		(ii)	PtP Agr with *in situ* O	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	+
		(iii)	Strong D edge feature (= DOM)	−	− +	−	−	(±)	+	+	+	+
	(c)	Focus-fronting to C		−	−	−	− +	±	+	±	+	+
		(i)	Focus-fronting to *v*	+	+	+	+ −	±	−	±	−	−

• Symbols '+' and '–' indicate positive and negative settings respectively

• Shading: parameter setting rendered predictable or irrelevant by higher-order parametric choice

6.1 Gallo-Romance (French, Occitan) and Romanian

• Extreme points of comparison:

    i) NIDs $\Rightarrow$ northern Romània: French, Occitan (Gallo-Romance)

    ii) SIDs $\Rightarrow$ southern Romània: Romanian

• P(arameter)1 (Non-veridical V-to-C Mvt) implicationally defines setting for Sub-parameters (1.a,b)

    Yes $\Rightarrow$ V-to-T Mvt (= V accessible for probing by C)

    No $\Rightarrow$ V-to-*v* Mvt ($\neq$ V not accessible for probing by C)[6]

---

[6] For low(er) V-movement in Romanian, see Ledgeway & Lombardi (2005), Ledgeway (2012; in press c), Costea (2019).

• Further consequences and predictions of setting of Sub-P1a (= V-to-T Mvt):

  • Sub-P1a(i): Stage II-III negation:
    – French: Stage II: standard (written) language; Stage III: everyday spoken language
    – Occitan: Stage II: Gascon; Stage III: non-Gascon varieties
    – NIDs: Stage I: Liguria, Veneto; Stages II-III: Piedmont, Lombard, Emilia-Romagna
    – SIDs/Romanian: Stage I: V-raising not high enough to license postverbal negator

  • Sub-P1a(ii): argument-driven Aux selection (= active-stative A/S_A vs S_O; cf. Ledgeway 2019b)
    – NIDs, French, Occitan: Yes
    – SIDs, Romanian: No

20   a **Avez**-vous   fait   bon   voyage? / Je **suis** venu   avec les amis. (Fr.)
      b **Avètz**   fach   bon   viatge? / **Soi**   vengut amb los amics. (Occ., Lgd.)
         have.2PL(=you) made   good   trip   I   am   come   with the friends
         'Did you have a good journey? / I came with friends.'

• Further consequences and predictions of setting of Sub-P1b (= V-to-*v* Mvt):

  • Sub-P1b(i): Generalized or Person-driven Aux selection (cf. Ledgeway 2019b)

    – SIDs, Romanian (cf. Ledgeway 2014): Yes

    – Gallo-Romance: No

21   **Aţi**   avut o călătorie plăcută? / **Am** venit   cu   prietenii. (Ro.)
      have.2PL had a good   trip   I.am come   with   friends.DEF

  • Sub-P1b(ii): Active PtP Agr with *in situ* O
    – SIDs: Yes (cf. 14a-c)
    – NIDs: No (cf. 13a-c)

• Possible exceptions to Sub-P1b(ii) (= active PtP Agr with *in situ* O)

  • Romanian: V-to-*v*, but no active PtP Agr

22   Merele,   le-am   **mâncat**(*e)   ieri. (Ro.)
      apples.F.DEF.FPL them=have.PRS.IND.1SG eaten.MSG(FPL) yesterday
      'The apples, I ate them yesterday'

  • Adjacency of Aux + PtP in Romanian: 23a vs 23b

    i) PtP must raises to high position adjacent to Aux (cf. Schifano 2015; 2018)

    ii) PtP placed outside of local Agr configuration with *in situ* O

23   a Annu   **ggià**   abballatu.   (Cosenza, Calabria)
      b Au   (***deja**)   dansat   **deja**. (Romanian)
         have.PRS.IND.3PL already danced   already
         'They've already danced.'

• French vs Occitan: V-to-T $\Rightarrow$ no active PtP Agr

24 a Avez-vous   pris   des   photos? (French)
         have.2PL=you   taken.MSG   of.the.PL   photos.F

    b Avètz   pres**as**   de   fotòs?   (Lengadocien Occitan)
         have.2PL=you   taken.FPL   of   photos.F
         'Have you taken some photos?'

    i) Comparison with SIDs & Romanian contrast $\Rightarrow$ Occitan PtP remains within *v*-VP

    ii) PtP follows low VP-adverbs (cf. Cinque 1999)

         <u>Lengadocien Occitan</u>
25 a Avètz   <u>plan</u>   **dormit**?
         have.PRS.IND.2PL   well   slept
         'Have you slept well?'

    b Avèm   <u>pas</u> <u>encara</u> **enviadas** de cartas   postalas als   amics
         have.PRS.IND.1PL not still   sent   of cards   postal   to.the   friends
         'We've not yet sent our friends any post cards.'

    c Èrem   <u>ben</u>   **tombats**!
         be.PST.IPFV.1PL   well   fallen
         'We'd turned up at the right time!'

    d A   <u>tant</u>   **patit**.
         have.PRS.IND.3SG   so.much   suffered
         'He's suffered so much.'

• Conclusion: microvariation in setting of V-movement Parameter (P1)

   i) Consistent behaviour (mesoparameter):

      • NIDs: all verbs raise to T (1.a)

      • SIDs: all verbs raise to *v* (1.b)

   ii) Inconsistent behaviour (microparameter; cf. Roberts 2019:409f.):

      • Finite V $\Rightarrow$ T (Occitan) vs *v* (Romanian)

      • Non-finite (active) participial V $\Rightarrow$ *v* (Occitan) vs T (Romanian)

• Quick note on French:

   i) PtP also follows low VP-adverbs (cf. 26), so low movement of active PtP

   ii) Non-prescriptive French: loss/erosion of morphological rule (cf. Loporcaro 2010; 2016:806)

26 Vous avez   **bien** / **déjà** / **toujours** / **tant**   dormi. (Fr.)
       you   have. PRS.IND.2PL well   already always   so.much   slept
       'You've already/always slept well/so much.'

6.2 Ladin, Italian, Sardinian and Ibero-Romance (Catalan, Portuguese, Spanish)

• Gallo-Romance vs SIDs, Romanian: northern-southern extremes
• Ladin, Italian, Sardinian and Ibero-Romance: mixed, less consistent behaviour

6.2.1 Ladin

• Most varieties of Ladin: behave like Gallo-Romance for P1 $\Rightarrow$ [+Non-veridical V-to-C Mvt]

27 'rue-**l**   la   'mama? (Fassano; Salvi 2016a:164)
    arrive.PRS.IND.3SG=SCL.3SG the mother
    'Is the mother arriving?'

• Gaderano & Gardenese $\Rightarrow$

   i) Preserve V2 syntax (Haiman & Benincà 1992:150; Poletto 2000; Manzini & Savoia 2005:I§3.13; Anderson 2016:179-81; Salvi 2016a:164-65; 2016b:1009)

   ii) V-to-C Mvt: triggered by generalized semantically uninterpretable V-feature (28a-c)

   iii) Sub-P1a has to be independently stated $\Rightarrow$ [+V-to-T Mvt] (cf. embedded S**V**O)

28 a i'lo   **a**   l   ʃkumən'ʧa… (Gardenese, Salvi 2016b:165)
       there have.PRS.IND.3SG =SCL.3SG   begun
       'There he began…'
    b le 'liber **a**-i   lit (Gaderano, Manzini & Savoia 2005,I:702)
       the book   have.PRS.IND.1SG=SCL.1SG   read
       'I have read the book'
    c a-**l**   dor'mi   ʒaŋ? (Gaderano; Manzini & Savoia 2005,I:162)
       have.PRS.IND.3SG=SCL.MSG   slept   Gianni
       'Did Gianni sleep?'

• Further consequences and predictions of setting of Sub-P1a (cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005,III:133-36; Salvi 2016a:162f.):

   $\Rightarrow$ Sub-P1a(i): Stage I (Fassano, Livinallese; 29a), II negation (the rest; 29b)

   $\Rightarrow$ Sub-P1a(ii): Argument-driven Aux selection (29a,c)

29 a se **no**   te **'foses**   ve'ɲu da me… (Fassano; Salvi 2016a:164)
       if   neg   you be.SBJV.IPFV.2SG   come   by me
       'If you hadn't come to me…'
    b 'ana   **nə**   vaɲ   **'nia**. (Badiot; Salvi 2016a:163)
       Anna   neg   come.PRS.IND.3SG neg
       'Anna is not coming.'
    c **a'oŋ**   ve'du   de bie   'fjores. (Fassano; Salvi 2016a:162)
       have.PRS.IND.1SG see.PTCP of beautiful flowers
       'We have seen some beautiful flowers'

   • Lack of active PtP Agr with *in situ* O (Manzini & Savoia 2005,II:594f.; Salvi 2016a:162):

30 a i   t   l   a   **'dada**. (Badiot; Salvi 2016a:162)
       SCL.1SG= you= it.F= have.PRS.IND.1SG given
       'I have given it to you.'
    b […]kə 'klawdia 'æsa   **'ʃkrit(*a)**   la   'lætra. (Gard.;Salvi 2016a:163)
          that Claudia   have.PST.SBJV.3SG written.MSG(FSG) the.FSG letter.F
       '(I thought) that Claudia had written the letter.'

6.2.2 Italian and Sardinian

• Non-veridical V-to-C Mvt (cf. Ledgeway 2015:118-21; Ledgeway & Schifano in press:§23.3.2):

    i) Limited to optatives/exclamatives (more restricted in Sardinian), excludes interrogatives

    ii) ⇒ Italian '±', Sardinian '(±)' in Table 4

31 a Quanto   **puzza**   questo   formaggio! (It.)
         how.much smell.PRS.IND.3SG this   cheese
         'How this cheese stinks!
    b Ti   **falet**   unu   lampu! (Srd.; Jones 1993:27)
         you= strike.SBJV.PRS.3SG a   lightening.bolt
         'May you be struck by lightning!'

    iii) Sufficient V-to-C Mvt to infer positive setting for Sub-P1a (cf. Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005; Schifano 2018)

        (a) Argument-driven Aux selection (Sub-P1a(ii)): 32a-b (Burzio 1986; Jones 1993:106-13, 130ff.)

        (b) Absence of active PtP Agr with *in situ* O: 33a-b (Loporcaro 1998; Jones 1993:83)

        (c) Stage I negation (Sub-P1a.i): 34a-b (Poletto 2016a)

32 a **Ha**   telefonato il   muratore / Maria **è**   arrivata a casa. (It.)
         have.PRS.IND.3SG telephoned the builder   Maria be.PRS.IND.3SG arrived at home
    b **At**   telefonatu su mastru de muru / Maria **est**   arrivata a
         have.PRS.IND.3SG telephoned the máster of wall   Maria be.PRS.IND.3SG arrived at
         domo. (Srd.; Jones 1993:10/110)
         home
         'The builder has rung / Maria has arrived home.'

33 a Ho   **visto**   le   ragazze / Le   ho   **viste**. (It.)
    b Appo   **vistu**   sas   pitzinnas / Las   appo   **vistas**. (Srd)
         have.PRS.IND.1SG seen.MSG the.FPL girls   them.F= have.PRS.IND.1SG seen.FPL
         'I have seen the girls / I've seen them.'

34 a Questo vino **non** mi   piace. (It.)
    b Custu   vinu   **non** m'   aggradat. (Srd.)
         this   wine   neg me= please.PRS.IND.3SG
         'I don't like this wine.'

6.2.3 Ibero-Romance

• Non-veridical V-to-C Mvt:

    i) Limited to exclamatives (Ledgeway 2015:118-21)

    ii) ⇒ '(–)' in Table 4

35 ¡Cuán   rápido **habla**   Bruno! (Sp.)
    how   quick speak.PRS.IND.3SG Bruno
    'How quickly Bruno speaks!'

    iii) Overt evidence for partial positive setting of P1 too weak to unambiguously license corresponding positive setting for V-to-T Mvt (Sub-P1a)

iv) Low V-movement $\Rightarrow$ Sub-P1b: V-to-*v* Mvt (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005; Ledgeway 2012; Schifano 2015; 2018)

36 a Sergio <u>apenas</u> **sabe** cómo me llamo. (Sp. Schifano 2015:63)
   Sergio hardly know.PRS.IND.3SG how me= call.PRS.IND.1SG
   'Sergio barely knows my name.'

   b Maria <u>encara</u> **recorda** aquell dia. (Val.Cat., Schifano 2015:67)
   Maria still remember.PRS.IND.3SG that day
   'Maria still remembers that day.'

   c A Maria <u>já</u> **sabe** esta história. (EuPt., Schifano 2015:68)
   the Maria already know.PRS.IND.3SG this story
   'Maria already knows this story.'

• Further consequences and predictions of setting of Sub-P1b

   • Impossibility of Stage II-III negation (Sub-P1a(i)): 37a-c

   • Sub-P1b(i): Generalized or Person-driven Aux selection (Ledgeway 2019b):

37 a <u>No</u> **había** fumado/venido. (Sp.)
   b <u>No</u> **havia** fumat/vingut. (Cat.)
   c <u>Não</u> **tinha** fumado/vindo. (Pt.)
   neg have.PST.IND.3SG smoked/come
   'S/he hadn't smoked/come.'

   • Problem $\Rightarrow$ Sub-P1b(ii): Active PtP Agr with *in situ* O?

38 a Había **escrito(/*-a)** la carta. (Sp.)
   b Havia **escrit(*a)** la carta. (Cat.)
   c Tinha **escrito(/*-a)** a carta. (Pt.)
   have.PST.IND.3SG written.MSG(/FSG) the.FSG letter.F
   'S/he written the letter.'

   • Adjacency of Aux + PtP in Ibero-Romance (cf. Romanian 21b):

      i) PtP raises to high position adjacent to Aux (cf. Schifano 2015; 2018)

      ii) PtP placed outside of local Agr configuration with *in situ* O

39 a Han (*<u>siempre</u>) **trabajado** <u>siempre</u> la tierra a lo largo de muchas
   b Han (*<u>sempre</u>) **treballat** <u>sempre</u> la terra al llarg de moltes
   c Têm (*<u>sempre</u>) **trabalhado** <u>sempre</u> a terra ao longo de muitas
   have.PRS.IND.3PL always worked always the land to(.)the length of many
   generaciones. (Sp.)
   generacions. (Cat.)
   gerações. (Pt.)
   generations
   'They have always worked/been continuously working the land for many generations.'

   • Conclusion: microparametric variation in setting of V-Mvt Sub-parameter in Ibero-Romance

      i) Finite V $\Rightarrow$ *v*

      ii) Non-finite (active) participial V $\Rightarrow$ T

6.3 Differential Subject and Object Marking

• Setting of Parameter 1 $\Rightarrow$ Predictable settings for Subparameters (1.a) and (1.b)

    i) [+V-to-C] $\Rightarrow$ V-to-T Mvt: North

    ii) [–V-to-C] $\Rightarrow$ V-to-*v* Mvt: South

• Setting of Sub-P1a-b implicationally correlated with distribution of subject clitics and DOM

    i) Strong V-feature on T $\Rightarrow$ strong D-feature on T (= Sub-p 1a.iii)

    ii) Strong V-feature on *v* $\Rightarrow$ strong D-feature on *v* (= Sub-p 1b.iii)

    (Cf. strong Head and Edge features on C in (Ladin) V2 varieties)

• Northern Romance: dedicated marking of subject through grammaticalization of dedicated preverbal SpecTP subject position

    $\Rightarrow$ Reversal in pro-drop parameter in French, some (northern) Occitan varieties

    $\Rightarrow$ Spell-out of strong D-feature through (partial/complete) system of subject clitics in NIDs, Raeto-Romance, some northern Occitan varieties[7]

    $\Rightarrow$ **S**VO word order

40 a **Les enfants** buvaient   du   lait. (Fr.)
          the   children drink.PST.IPFV.3PL some   milk
          'The children were drinking some milk'
    b **Madamo** fa   sa   toueleto (Occ.; Oliviéri & Sauzet 2016:343)
        Madame   do.PRS.IND.3SG her toilette
        'Madame is getting ready'

• Southern Romance: differential marking of (subset of) objects through grammaticalized pseudo-preposition (*a, ma/me, ana, pe*)

    $\Rightarrow$ Strong D-checking mechanism on *v* (= object shift)[8]

    $\Rightarrow$ (SVO/)V**S**O word order[9] (with assumption that preverbal subjects = clitic left-dislocated[10])

41 a A   obţinut **o prietenă de-a mea** o bursă. (Ro., Salvi 2016b:1003)
        have.PRS.IND.3SG obtained a   friend   of   mine a grant'
    b Se   comieron   **los niños**   todo el   pastel. (Sp., Salvi 2016b:1003)
        self= eat.PST.PFV.3PL the children all   the cake
        'The children ate the whole cake.'

• Conclusion: complementary distribution of:

    i) **S**VO and subject clitics: northern Romance

    ii) SVO/V**S**O and DOM: southern Romance

    Cf. complementary distribution in Occitan:
        $\Rightarrow$ Subject clitics (and loss of pro-drop): northern varieties (Oliviéri & Sauzet 2016:338-40)
        $\Rightarrow$ DOM: southern varieties (Rohlfs 1971:320f.; Ledgeway in press c)

---

[7] Cf. Manzini & Savoia (2005,I), Roberts (2010), Oliviéri & Sauzet (2016:338-40), Poletto & Tortora (2016).

[8] Cf. Torrego (1998), Ledgeway (2000; in press c), Peverini-Benson (2004), Andriani (2011; 2015), López (2012), Cornilescu (2020), Tigău (2021).

[9] Cf. Motapanyane (1989), Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), Zagona (2002:214-16), Belletti (2004), Ledgeway & Roberts (in press:§2.3).

[10] Cf. Contreras (1991), Barbosa (1995; 2001), Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998), Solà (1992).

6.3.1 Apparent Exceptions

• Small number of NIDs present:

   i) V-to-T Mvt (Sub-P1a)

   ii) Subject clitics (Sub-P1a(iii))

   iii) Limited DOM: 1/2 pronouns (Ledgeway in press a)

     <u>Viguzzolo, Piedmont (Manzini & Savoia 2005,II:523)</u>

42 a **a**   **'mi** / **'ti**   a m / t   'ʧamən   'dɔp. (1/2sg C-top)
        DOM me   you.SG SCL me= you.SG= call.PRS.IND.3PL after
        'They'll call me/you afterwards.'

    b (***a**) ly a l   'ʧamən   'dɔp. (3sg C-top)
        DOM him SCL him= call.PRS.IND.3PL   after
        'They'll call him afterwards.'

   • Proposal: strong D edge feature on *v*

  i) automatically associated 'for free' with *v* in southern varieties with V-to-*v* (Sub-P1b)

  ii) selected as more marked (hence unpredictable) option in northern varieties with V-to-T (Sub-P1a)

• Northern/Tuscan regional Italian and standard Italian present:

   i) V-to-T Mvt (Sub-P1a)

   ii) SVO (Sub-P1a(iii))

   iii) Limited DOM (Belletti 2018a,b; Ledgeway in press a):

   ⇒ Clitic left-dislocated 1/2 pronouns: northern/Tuscan regional Italian (43)

   ⇒ Clitic left-dislocated Experiencers with psych and causative predicates: standard Italian (44)

     <u>Colloquial northern/Tuscan Italian (Benincà 1988:156)</u>

43 a **A**   **me**,   non   mi   hanno invitato. (ClLD 1sg)
        DOM me   not   me=   they.have   invited
        'As for me, they didn't invite me/I wasn't invited.'

    b **A**   **te**,   non ti   vogliamo. (ClLD 2sg)
        DOM you.SG not   you.SG= we.want
        'As for you, we don't want you.'

    c??**A**   **lui**, l'   hanno   chiamato ieri. (ClLD 3sg)
        DOM him him= they.have called   yesterday
        'As for him, they called him yesterday/He was called yesterday.'

     <u>Italian (Benincà 1988:134f.)</u>

44 a **A**   **noi**, la soluzione non ci   ha soddisfatti. (ClLD 1pl)
        DOM us the solution   not us= has satisfied
        'We weren't satisfied by the solution.'

    b **A** **Giorgio**, questi argomenti non l'   hanno convinto. (ClLD proper name)
        DOM Giorgio these argoments not   him= have   convinced
        'Giorgio wasn't satisfied by these arguments.'

• Proposals:

i) Exogenous factor: possible contact/influence from southern varieties of Italian

ii) Endogenous factor: height of V-movement (Ledgeway & Lombardi 2005; Schifano 2015; 2018)

– (regional) Italian V-movement (45a): targets clause-medial position (between T and *v*)

– Lower position of V correlates with P1-setting '±' in Table 4 (cf. Gallo-Romance '+')

– P-setting for V-movement not correlate *tout court* with either Sub-P1a or Sub-P1b

⇒ incongruous mixing of **S**VO (northern varieties) and limited DOM (southern varieties)

45 a   Gianni (*non **fuma**) <u>generalmente</u>   non **fuma** <u>mica</u> tanto. (It.)
    b   Jean   ne **fume** <u>généralement</u>   (*ne **fume**) <u>pas</u> beaucoup. (Fr.)
         'John doesn't usually smoke a lot.'

iii) Sardinian:

– Preferred clause-medial V-movement (Schifano 2015; 2018): 46a

– **S**VO (Jones 1993:13f.; Mensching & Remberger 2016:286): 46b

– DOM (Jones 1993:65-68; M&S 2005,II:§4.9; Mensching & Remberger 2016:283f.): 46c

46 a   Mulleri rua   (?<u>de propositu</u>) **portara**   <u>de propositu</u> is malloreddus. (Srd.)
         wife   your deliberately   bring.PRS.IND.3SG deliberately   the malloreddus
         'Your wife is bringing the malloreddus pasta on purpose.'
    b   **Sos pastores** murghen   sas berbekes. (Srd.)
         the   shepherds milk.PRS.IND.3PL   the sheep ('The shepherds milk the sheep')
    c   Istimo   **a   frate   meu**. (Srd.)
         love.PRS.IND.1SG   DOM brother my ('I love my brother')

6.4 Focus-fronting

• 2 original reflexes of V2 now in complementary distribution (cf. §2.1) ⇒

i) Head-fronting (V-to-C Mvt): NIDs

ii) Phrasal-fronting (focusing in SpecCP): SIDs

• Focus-fronting to C-domain: derived from setting of P1 (V-to-C Mvt)

• Complementary distribution of focus-fronting: cross-parametric dependency

i) C-domain (SIDs, Srd, Ro; cf. 3a-d):[11] [–P1] (V-to-C) ⇒ [+Sub-P1c] (CP-focus)

ii) *v*-domain (NIDs, Fr, Occ; cf. 15): [+P1] (V-to-C) ⇒ [–Sub-P1c] (*v*-focus)

• Ladin dialects: exhibit both options in accordance with distribution of V2

i) V2 varieties: generalized EPP feature on C which readily licenses focus-fronting in SpecCP

ii) Non-V2 varieties resort to lower left periphery (as expected)

---

[11] Cf. Cruschina (2006; 2010; 2012; 2016:§34.5), Cruschina & Ledgeway (2016:557f., 572-74), Mensching & Remberger (2016:290f.).

- Occitan variation:

  i) (eastern) Occitan dialects proper pattern with Fr, NIDs $\Rightarrow$ focus in *v*-domain ([+P1]; cf. 47a)

  ii) western dialects = Gascon (cf. Oliviéri and Sauzet 2016:341)

  $\Rightarrow$ No V-to-C Mvt ([–P.1]): system of enunciative particles (cf. Ledgeway 2020)

  $\Rightarrow$ focus-fronting to the C-domain ([+Sub-P1.c]: (47b-c)

47   a   Te   creiran,   TU! (Langadocian)
         you= believe.FUT.3PL   you ('They will believe YOU!')
     b   MA   BACHO   ai   pierdut (Gévaudan)
         my   cow   have.PRS.IND.1SG   lost ('I've lost MY COW')
     c   QUITES   qu' èm!   (Arrens-Marous)
         quits.MPL *que* be.PRS.IND.1PL ('We're QUITS!')

- Italian and Ibero-Romance: specialized (cf. Belletti 2004; 2005; though see Cruschina 2012)

  i) C-domain $\Rightarrow$ contrastive focus (cf. 48a)

  ii) *v*-domain $\Rightarrow$ informational focus (cf. 48b)

48   a   UNA PIZZA ho   ordinato, non un gelato. (It.)
         a   pizza have.PRS.IND.1SG ordered   not an ice-cream
         'It was a pizza that I ordered, not an ice-cream.'
     b   Cosa hai   mangiato? – Ho   mangiato **una pizza**. (It.)
         what have.PRS.IND.2SG eaten   have.PRS.IND.1SG eaten   a   pizza
         'What did you eat? – I ate a pizza.'

  - Italian and Ibero-Romance focus parameter: microparametric behaviour (cf. (non-)finite V-Mvt)

References

Alexiadou, A., and Anagnostopoulou, E. (1998). 'Parametrizing AGR: word order, verb-movement and EPP-checking', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, pp. 491-539.

Alighieri, D. (1995) *De vulgari eloquentia* (ed. By V. Coletti *3ᵃ ed.*), Milan: Garzanti.

Anderson, S.. (2016). Romansh (Rumantsch). In Ledgeway, A. & Maiden, M. (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 169-84. Oxford: OUP.

Andriani, L. (2011). Differential Object Marking, Clitic Doubling and Argumental Structure in Barese. University of Leiden: unpublished MA thesis.

Andriani, L. (2015). 'Semantic and syntactic properties of the prepositional accusative in Barese', *Linguistica Atlantica* 34: 61-78.

Ascoli, G.I. (1882) 'L'Italia dialettale', *Archivio glottologico italiano*, 98-128.

Benincà, P. (1984). 'Un'ipotesi sulla sintassi delle lingue romanze medievali', *Quaderni patavini di linguistica* 4:3-19.

Baker, Mark (2008). 'The Macroparameter in a Microparametric World', in Theresa Biberauer (ed.), *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 351-74.

Barbosa, P. (1995). *Null Subjects*. MIT: thesis.

Barbosa, P. (2001) 'On inversion in wh-questions in Romance', in A. Hulk and J.-Y. Pollock (eds.), *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 20-59.

Bartoli, M. (1929) 'La norma linguistica dell'area maggiore', *Rivista di filologia e d'istruzione classica* 57: 333-345.

Bartoli, M. (1933) 'Le norme neolinguistiche e la loro utilità per la storia dei linguaggi e dei costumi', *Atti della Società italiana per il progresso delle scienze,* 157-67.

Belletti, A. (2004). 'Aspects of the Low IP Area', in L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP.* Oxford: Oxford University of Press, 16-51.

Belletti, A. (2005). 'Extended doubling and the VP periphery', *Probus* 17:1-35.

Belletti, A. (2018a). 'On *a*-marking of object topics in the Italian left periphery', in Petrosino, R., Cerrone, P., Hulst, H. van der (Eds.), *From Sounds to Structures: Beyond the Veil of Maya, Studies in Generative Grammar (SGG)*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 445-66.

Belletti, A. (2018b). 'Objects and subjects in the left periphery: the case of a-topics', in M. Grimaldi, R. Lai, L. Franco and B. Baldi (eds), *Structuring Variation in Romance Linguistics and Beyond: In Honour of Leonardo M. Savoia*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 57-72

Benincà, P. (1984) 'Un'ipotesi sulla sintassi delle lingue romanze medievali', *Quaderni patavini di linguistica* 4: 3-19.

Benincà, P. (1988). 'L'ordine degli elementi della frase. Costruzioni con ordine marcato degli elementi', in L. Renzi (ed.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione. Volume 1: La frase. I sintagmi nominale e preposizionale.* Bologna: il Mulino 129-94.

Benincà, P. (1994) 'L'interferenza sintattica: di un aspetto della sintassi ladina considerato di origine tedesca', in P. Benincà (ed.), *La variazione sintattica*, Bologna, il Mulino, 89-103.

Benincà, P. (2006). 'A detailed map of the left periphery of medieval Romance'. In Zanuttini, R., Campos, H., Herberger, E., and Portner, P. (eds), *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics. Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture.* Washington: Georgetown University Press, 53-86.

Benincà, P. (2013). Caratteristiche del V2 romanzo. Lingue romanze antiche, ladino dolomitico e portoghese. In Cognola, Federcia & Bidese, Ermengildo (eds.). *Introduzione alla linguistica del mòcheno*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier, 65-84.

Benincà, P., Parry, M., and Pescarini, D. (2016). 'The dialects of northern Italy'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: OUP, 185-205.

Biberauer, T. and Roberts, I. (2012). 'Towards a parameter hierarchy for auxiliaries: diachronic considerations'. In Chancharu, J., Hu, X., and Mitrović, M. (eds.), *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 6:209-36.

Biberauer, T. and Roberts, I. (2017). 'Conditional inversion and types of parametric change'. In Los, B. and de Haan, P. (eds), *Verb-Second Languages: Essays in Honour of Ans van Kemenade*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 55-77.

Bonan, C. (2019). *On Clause-internally Moved Wh-phrases. Wh-to-Foc, Nominative Clitics, and the Theory of Northern Italian Wh-In Situ*. Univeristy of Geneva: doctoral thesis.

Borer, Hagit (1984). *Parametric Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Bossong, G. (2016). 'Classifications', in A. Ledgeway and M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: OUP, 63-72.

Bruni, F. (1987). *L'italiano. Elementi di storia della lingua e della cultura*. Turin: UTET.

Burzio, L. 1986. *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Contreras, H. (1991). 'On the position of subjects', in S. Rothstein (ed.), *Perspectives on Phrase Structure: Heads and Licensing*, San Diego, Academic Press, 63-79.

Cornilescu, A. (2020). Ditransitive constructions with differentially marked direct objects in Romanian. In A. Pineda and J. Mateu (eds.), *Dative Constructions in Romance and Beyond*, 117-42. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Cortelazzo, M. (1988) 'Ripartizione dialettale' in G.Holtus, M. Metzeltin & C. Schmidt (eds) *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik. Band 4. Italienisch, Korsisch, Sardisch*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 445-53.

Costea, Ş. (2019) When Romanian meets Russian. The Effects of Contact on Moldovan Daco-Romanian Syntax. University of Cambridge: MPhil thesis.

Cremona, J. (1970). 'L'axe nord-sud de la Romania et la position du toscan', in Alexandru Rosetti, (ed.), *Actele celui de-al XII-lea Congres internaţional de lingvistică şi filologie romanică*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 155–9.

Cruschina, S. (2006). 'Informational focus in Sicilian and the left periphery'. In M. Frascarelli (ed.), *Phases of Interpretations*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 363-86.

Cruschina, S. (2010). 'Fronting as focalization in Sicilian'. In R. D'Alessandro, A. Ledgeway and I. Roberts (eds.), *Syntactic variation: The dialects of Italy*. Cambridge: CUP, 247-60.

Cruschina, S. (2012). *Discourse-related Features and Functional Projections*. New York: OUP.

Cruschina, S., and Ledgeway, A. (2016) 'Structure of the clause', in A. Ledgeway and M. Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 446-74.

Cruschina, S., Ledgeway, A. and Remberger, E.-M. (2019). 'The dialects of Italy at the interfaces: introduction', in Silvio Cruschina, Adam Ledgeway and Eva-Maria Remberger (eds), *Italian Dialectology at the Interfaces (Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics Today)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1-39.

D'Alessandro, R. (In press). 'Agreement', in A. Ledgeway and M. Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge Handbook of Romance Linguistics*. Cambridge: CUP.

D'Alessandro, R. and Roberts, I. (2008). 'Movement and Agreement in Italian Past Participles and Defective Phases', *Linguistic Inquiry* 39:447-91.

D'Alessandro, R. and Roberts, I. (2010). Past participle agreement in Abruzzese: Split auxiliary selection and the null-subject parameter. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28. 41–72.

De Cia, S. (2019). *The Syntax-Pragmatics Interface in North-Eastern Italian Dialects. Consequences for the Geometry of the Left Periphery*. University of Manchester: doctoral thesis.

Dobrovie-Sorin, C. (1994) *The Syntax of Romanian*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter.

Garzonio, J. and Poletto, C. (2009). 'Quantifiers as negative markers in Italian dialects', *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 9:127-52.

Garzonio, J. and Poletto, C. (2018). 'Sintassi formale e micro-tipologia della negazione dei dialetti italiani'. In Brincat, J. and Caruana, S. (eds), *Tipologia e 'dintorni': Il metodo tipologico alla intersezione di piani*. Rome: Bulzoni, 83-102.

Graffi, G. (1996). 'Alcune riflessioni sugli imperativi italiani'. In Benincà, P., Cinque, G., De Mauro, T., and Vincent, N. (eds), *Italiano e dialetto nel tempo. Saggi di grammatica per Giulio C. Lepschy*. Rome: Bulzoni 143-48.

Green, J. (2006). 'The North-South Axis of Romance: Contact Reinforcing Typology', in A.L. Lepschy and A. Tosi (eds), *Rethinking Languages in Contact: The Case of Italian*. Oxford: Legenda, 73–86.

Guardiano, C. (1999) Sull'oggetto diretto preposizionale nel siciliano. University of Pisa: BA thesis.

Guardiano, C. (2000) "Note sull'oggetto diretto preposizionale nel siciliano", *L'Italia Dialettale* 51, pp. 1-35.

Guardiano, C. (2010). 'L'oggetto diretto preposizionale in siciliano. Una breve rassegna e qualche domanda', in J. Garzonio (ed.), *Studi sui dialetti della Sicilia*, Padua, Unipress, pp. 83-101.

Guardiano, C. (2014). Fenomeni di contatto sintattico in Italia meridionale? Alcune note comparative. *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt* 18: 73-102.

Guardiano, C. and Longobardi, G. (2005). 'Parametric comparison and language taxonomy', in M. Batllori, M.-Ll. Hernanz, C. Picallo and F. Roca (eds), *Grammaticalization and parametric variation*. Oxford: OUP, 149-74.

Guardiano C. and Longobardi, G. (2017a). 'Phylogenetic reconstruction in syntax: the Parametric Comparison Method', in A. Ledgeway and I. Roberts (eds), *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax*. Cambridge: CUP, 241-71.

Guardiano C. and Longobardi, G. (2017b). 'Parameter Theory and Parametric Comparison', in I. Roberts (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Universal Grammar*. Oxford: OUP, 377-98.

Guardiano, C., Michelioudakis, D. (2019). 'Syntactic variation across Greek dialects: the case of demonstratives', in S. Cruschina, A. Ledgeway and E.-M. Remberger (eds.), *Italian Dialectology at the Interfaces*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 319-55.

Guardiano, C., Michelioudakis, D., Ceolin, A., Irimia, M.A., Longobardi, G., Radkevich, N., Silvestri, G., and Sitaridou, I. (2016) 'South by southeast: a syntactic approach to Greek and Romance microvariation', *L'Italia Dialettale* 77:95-166.

Guardiano, C. and Stavrou, M. (2014). Greek and Romance in southern Italy: History and contact in nominal Structures. *L'Italia dialettale* LXXV: 121-147.

Haiman, J. & Benincà, P. (1992). *The Rhaeto-Romance Languages*. London: Routledge.

Holmberg, A. (2015). 'Verb second'. In Kiss, T. and Alexiadou, A. (eds), *Syntax – Theory and Analysis. An International Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Research*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 242-83.

Jones, M. (1993). *Sardinian Syntax*. London: Routledge.

Kaiser, G. (2002). 'Die Verb-Zweit-Stellung im Raetoromanischen. Ein typologischer Vergleich', *Ladinia* 26-27:313-334.

Kayne, R., (1989) 'Facets of Romance past participle agreement', in P. Benincà (ed.), *Dialect Variation on the Theory of Grammar*, Dordrecht, Foris, 108-40.

La Fauci, N. (1988). *Oggetti e soggetti nella formazione della morfosintassi romanza*. Pisa: Giardini (English translation: La Fauci, Nunzio (1994). *Objects and Subjects in the Formation of Romance Morphosyntax*. Bloomington, Indiana: IULC).

La Fauci, N. (1991). 'La continuità nella diversità formale: Aspetti di morfosintassi diacronica romanza', in Vincenzo Orioles (ed.), *Innovazione e conservazione nelle lingue*. Pisa: Giardini, 135–58.

La Fauci, N. (1997). *Per una teoria grammaticale del mutamento morfosintattico. Dal latino verso il romanzo*. Pisa: ETS.

La Fauci, N. (1998). 'Riflettendo sul mutamento morfosintattico: Nel latino, verso il romanzo', Ramat, Paolo, and Roma, Elisa (eds) (1998). *Sintassi storica. Atti del XXX congresso internazionale della Società di linguistica italiana, Pavia, 26–28 settembre 1996*. Rome: Bulzoni, 519–45.

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

Ledgeway, A. (2007). 'Old Neapolitan word order: some initial observations'. In Lepschy, A.L. and Tosi, A. (eds), *Histories and Dictionaries of the Languages of Italy*. Ravenna: Longo, 121-49.

Ledgeway, A. (2009a). *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Ledgeway, A. (2009b). 'Aspetti della sintassi della periferia sinistra del cosentino', in D. Pescarini (ed.), *Studi sui dialetti della Calabria*, Padua, Unipress, 3–24.

Ledgeway, A. (2012). *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*. Oxford: OUP

Ledgeway, A. (2014) 'Romance auxiliary selection in light of Romanian evidence', in G. Pană Dindelegan, R. Zafiu, A. Dragomirescu, I. Nicula and A. Nicolae (eds.), *Diachronic Variation in Romanian*, Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 3-35.

Ledgeway, A. (2015). 'Parallels in Romance Nominal and Clausal Microvariation', *Revue roumaine de linguistique* LX: 105-27.

Ledgeway, A. (2016a). 'The dialects of southern Italy', in A. Ledgeway and M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: OUP, 246-69.

Ledgeway, A. (2016b). 'Functional Categories', in Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: OUP, 761-71.

Ledgeway, A. (2018). 'Parametric variation in DOM in the dialects of Italy', *Differential Object Marking in Less-studied Romance Varieties*, Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales, Paris, 9-10 November 2018

Ledgeway, A. (2019a). 'The causative construction in the dialects of southern Italy and the phonology-syntax interface', in G. Bellucci, I. Franco and P. Lorusso (eds.), *Linguistic Variation: Structure and Interpretation* (Studies in Generative Grammar), Berlin, de Gruyter, 371-99.

Ledgeway, A. (2019b). 'Parameters in the development of Romance perfective auxiliary selection', in Michela Cennamo and Claudia Fabrizio (eds), *Historical Linguistics 2015. Selected Papers from the 22nd International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Naples, 27-31 July 2015*. Amsterdam / Phildelphia: Benjamins, 344-84.

Ledgeway, A. (2020). 'Variation in the Gallo-Romance Left-periphery: V2, Complementizers, and the Gascon Enunciative System', in M. Maiden and S. Wolfe (eds.), *Variation and Change in Gallo-Romance Grammar*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 71-99.

Ledgeway, A. (2021). 'V2 Beyond Borders: The *Histoire Ancienne jusqu'a César*', in C. Meklenborg and S. Wolfe (eds), *Secrets of Success*, special issue of *Journal of Historical Syntax* 5(29):1-65. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18148/hs/2021.v5i29.83

Ledgeway, A. (In press a). 'Parametric variation in differential object marking in Italo-Romance', in M. Irimia and A. Mardale (eds.), *Differential Object Marking in Romance*, Amsterdam, Benjamins.

Ledgeway, A. (In press b). 'Differential object marking in the dialects of southern Italy', in Anna Pineda (ed.), *Differential Object Marking in Romance*, special issue of *Caplletra. Revista Internacional de Filologia*.

Ledgeway, A. (In press c). 'Disentangling parameters: Romance differential object marking and the distribution of head and edge features', in Gabriela Alboiu, Daniela Isac, Alexandru Nicolae, Mihaela Tănase-Dogaru, Alina Tigău (eds), *Studies in honor of X*. Bucharest: Editura Universităţi din Bucureşti.

Ledgeway, A. and Lombardi, A. (2005). 'Verb Movement, Adverbs and Clitic Positions in Romance', *Probus* 17: 79–113.

Ledgeway, A., and Roberts, I., (In press) 'The verb phrase', in G. Longobardi (ed.), *The Syntax of Italian*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Ledgeway, A. and Schifano, N. (In press). 'Parametric variation', in Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden (eds), *The Cambridge Handbook of Romance Linguistics*. Cambridge: CUP.

Ledgeway, A. and Schifano, N. (In prep.) 'On the correlation between verb movement and negation microtypologies'. Ms.

Longobardi, G. and Guardiano, C. 2009. 'Evidence for syntax as a signal of historical relatedness', *Lingua* 119/11: 1679-706.⌈⌉SEP

Longobardi G., Guardiano, C., Silvestri, G., Boattini, A. and Ceolin, A. (2013). 'Toward a syntactic phylogeny of modern Indo-European languages', *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 3: 122-52.

Longobardi G., Ghirotto, S., Guardiano, C., Tassi, F., Benazzo, A., Ceolin, A. and Barbujani, G. (2015). 'Across language families: Genome diversity mirrors linguistic variation within Europe', *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 157: 630-40.

Longobardi, G., Ceolin, A., Ecay, A., Ghirotto, S., Guardiano, C., Irimia, M.A., Michelioudakis, D., Radkevic., N., Luiselli, D., Pettener, D., and Barbujani, G. (2016). 'Formal linguistics as a cue to demographic history', *Journal of Anthropological Sciences* 94: 147-55.

López, L. 2012. *Indefinite Objects: Scrambling, Choice Functions and Differential Marking.* Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Loporcaro, M. (1998). *Sintassi comparata dell'accordo participiale romanzo*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Loporcaro, M. (2009). *Profilo linguistico dei dialetti italiani*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Loporcaro, M. (2010). 'The logic of Romance past participle agreement', in R. D'Alessandro, A. Ledgeway and I. Roberts (eds), *Syntactic Variation. The Dialects of Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 225-43.

Loporcaro, M. (2016). 'Auxiliary selection and participle agreement;, in A. Ledgeway and M. Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 802-18.

Loporcaro, M. and Paciaroni, T. (2016). 'The dialects of central Italy', , in A. Ledgeway and M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: OUP, 228-45.

Maiden, M. (1995) *A Linguistic History of Italian*, London: Longman.

Malkiel, Y. (1991) '"Western Romance" versus "Eastern Romance". The terms, the images, and the underlying concepts', *Romanische Forschungen* 103:141-56.

Manzini, M.R. and Savoia, L. (2005). *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa* (3 vols). Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Mensching, G. and Remberger, E. (2016). 'Sardinian', in A. Ledgeway and M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: OUP, 270-91.

Merlo, C., (1933) 'Il sostrato etnico e i dialetti italiani', *Revue de linguistique romane* 9: 176-94.

Motapanyane, V. 1989). 'La position du sujet dans une langue à l'ordre SVO/VSO', *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 14:75-103.

Munaro, N. (1998). 'Wh-in situ in the Northern Italian Dialects', in Olga Fullana & Francesc Roca (eds), *Studies on the Syntax of Central Romance Languages*, 189- 212. Girona: Universitat de Girona Convegno: III Symposium on the Syntax of Central Romance Languages.

Munaro, N. (2004). 'Computational puzzles of conditional clause preposing'. In Di Sciullo, A.M. and Delmonte, R. (eds), *UG and External Systems*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 73-94.

Munaro, N. (2010). 'Toward a hierarchy of clause types'. In Benincà, P. and Munaro, N. (eds), *Mapping the Left Periphery. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Volume 5*. Oxford: OUP, 125-62.

Munaro, N., Poletto, C. & Pollock, J. (2001). *Eppur si muove*! On Comparing French and Bellunese *Wh*-Movement. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 1, 147-180. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Munaro, N. & Poletto, C. (2002). 'La tipologia dei wh in situ nelle varietà alto-italiane'. *Quaderni patavini di linguistica* 18, 79-91.

Musio, C., (1995). *Il Salento in vernacolo*, Galatina, Congedo Editore.

Oliviéri, M., and Sauzet, P. (2016). 'Southern Gallo-Romance (Occitan)', in A. Ledgeway and M. Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 319-49.

Paoli, S. (2003). *COMP and the Left-Periphery: comparative evidence from Romance*. University of Manchester: thesis.

Paoli, S. (2010) 'In focus: an investigation of information and contrastive constructions', in R. D'Alessandro, A. Ledgeway and I. Roberts (eds.), *Syntactic variation: The dialects of Italy*. Cambridge: CUP, 277-291.

Parry, M. (1997a). 'Negation'. In Maiden, M. and Parry, M. (eds), *The Dialects of Italy*. London: Routledge, 179-85.

Parry, M. (1997b). 'Piedmont'. In Maiden, M. and Parry, M. (eds), *The Dialects of Italy*. London: Routl3dge, 237-44.

Parry, M. (2003) 'L'oggetto preposizionale nel ligure medievale', *Verbum* 5:113-26.

Parry, M. (2005). *Parluma 'd Coiri. Sociolinguistica e grammatica del dialetto di Cairo Montenotte*. Savona: Editrice Liguria.

Parry, M. (2013). 'Negation in the history of Italo-Romance'. In Willis, D., Lucas, C., and Breitbarth, A. (eds), *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean*. Oxford: OUP, 77-118.

Pellegrini, G. (1975). 'Tra lingua e dialetto in Italia', in *Saggi di linguistica italiana*. Turin: Boringhieri, 11-54.

Perlmutter, D. (1978). 'Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis', *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4: 157–189.

Peverini-Benson, C. (2004). *The Prepositional Accusative in Marchigiano*. Univeristy of Cambirdge: MPhil thesis.

Poletto, C. (2000). *The Higher Functional Field*. Oxford: OUP.

Poletto, C. (2002). 'The left periphery of a V2-Rhaetoromance dialect: a new perspective on V2 and V3', in: S. Barbiers, L. Cornips, S. van der Kleij (eds), *Syntactic Microvariation. Proceedings of the Workshop on Syntactic Microvariation, Amsterdam, August 2000*, Amsterdam, Meertens Institute, <www.meertens.knaw.nl/medewerkers/marc.van.oostendorp/microvariation/poletto.pdf>.

Poletto, C. (2008). 'On negative doubling'. In Cognola, F. and Pescarini, D. (eds), *La negazione: Variazione dialettale ed evoluzione diacronica* (Quaderni di lavoro dell'ASIt n.8). Padua: Unipress, 57-84.

Poletto, C. (2016a). 'Negation'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: OUP, 833-46.

Poletto, C. (2016b). 'Negative doubling: In favor of a "Big NegP" analysis'. In Cruschina, S., Hartmann, K., and Remberger, E.M. (eds), *Studies on Negation*. Vienna: V&R Unipress, 81-104.

Poletto, C. and Tortora. C. (2016). 'Subject clitics: syntax'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: OUP, 772-85.

Protopapa, R. (1991). *Teatro dialettale leccese. Volume terzo. L'àncura. La furtuna. Lu rre te Lecce. Filippu e ppanaru. Nna causa alla pretura*, Cavallino di Lecce, Capone.

Rizzi, L. (1990). 'Speculations on verb-second'. In Mascaró, J. and Nespor, M. (eds), *Grammar in Progress: Essays in Honour of Henk van Riemsdijk*. Groningen: Foris, 375-86.

Rizzi, L. (1997). 'The fine structure of the Left Periphery'. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *The New Comparative Syntax*. London: Longman, 281-337.

Rizzi, L. and Roberts, I. (1989). 'Complex inversion in French', *Probus* 1:1-30.

Rivero, M.-L. (1994). 'Negation, imperatives and Wackernagel effects', *Rivista di linguistica*, 6:39-66.

Roberts, I. (2010). *Agreement and Head Movement: Clitics, Incorporation, and Defective Goals*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Roberts, I. (2019). *Parameter Hierarchies and Universal Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rohlfs, G. (1969). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Turin: Einaudi.

Rohlfs, G. (1971). 'Autour de l'accusatif prépositionnel dans les langues romanes: concordances et discordances', *Revue de linguistique romane* 35: 312-34.

Rohlfs, G. ([1972]1997) 'L'Italia dialettale (Dal Piemonte in Sicilia)' in G.Rohlfs (ed) *Studi e ricerche su lingua e dialetti d'Italia*. Turin: Sansoni, 26-31.

Salvesen, C. (2013) 'Topics and the left periphery: A comparison of old French and modern Germanic', in Lohndal, Terje (ed.). *In search of Universal Grammar: From Old Norse to Zoque*, 131-72. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Salvi, G. (2000). 'Il ladino. Schizzo linguistico', *Verbum*, 1, 151–69.

Salvi, G. (2016a). 'Ladin', In Ledgeway, Adam & Maiden, Martin (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 154-68. Oxford: OUP.

Salvi, G. (2016b). 'Word order', in Ledgeway, Adam & Maiden, Martin (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 997-1012. Oxford: OUP.

Savoia, L. (1997) 'The geographical distribution of the dialects' in M.Maiden & M.Parry (eds) *The dialects of Italy*, London: Routledge, 225-34.

Schifano, N. (2015). *Verb-movement: A Pan-Romance Investigation*. University of Cambridge: doctoral thesis.

Schifano, N. (2018). *Verb Placement in Romance: A Comparative Study*. Oxford: OUP.

Smith, J. C. (1991). 'Problemi dell'accordo del participio passato coll'oggetto diretto nei tempi composti coniugati con avere in italiano, con speciale riferimento ai dialetti'. In Giannelli, L., Maraschio, N., Poggi Salani, T., and Vedovelli, M. (eds), *Tra Rinascimento e strutture attuali. Saggi di linguistica italiana*, I. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier, 365-71.

Solà, J. (1992). *Agreement and Subjects*. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona: thesis.

Tigău, A. (2021). Differential object marking in Romanian and Spanish. A contrastive analysis between differentially marked and unmarked direct objects. In J. Kabatek, P. Obrist and A. Wall (eds.), *Differential Object Marking in Romance. The third Wave*, 173-212. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Torrego, E. (1998). *The Dependencies of Objects*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Wartburg, W. von (1950) *Die Ausgliederung der romanischen Sprachräume*, Bern: Francke.

Wolfe, S. (2018). *Verb Second in Medieval Romance*. Oxford: OUP.

Zagona, K. (2002). *The Syntax of Spanish*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Zamboni, A. (1998). 'Dal latino tardo al romanzo arcaico: Aspetti diacronico-tipologici della flessione nominale', in Ramat, Paolo, and Roma, Elisa (eds) (1998). *Sintassi storica. Atti del XXX congresso internazionale della Società di linguistica italiana, Pavia, 26–28 settembre 1996*. Rome: Bulzoni, 127–46.

Zamboni, A. (2000). *Alle origini dell'italiano. Dinamiche e tipologie della transizione dal latino*. Rome: Carocci.

Zanuttini, R. (1997). *Negation and Clausal Structure.* Oxford: OUP.