

OXFORD  
LINGUISTICS

Norma  
Schifano

---

**Verb  
Movement  
in Romance**

*A Comparative Study*

## Verb Movement in Romance

---

RETHINKING COMPARATIVE SYNTAX

PUBLISHED

*The Syntax of Yes and No*

Anders Holmberg

*Person, Case, and Agreement*

*The Morphosyntax of Inverse Agreement and Global Case Splits*

András Bárány

*Verb Movement in Romance*

*A Comparative Study*

Norma Schifano

IN PREPARATION

*Parameter Hierarchies and Universal Grammar*

Ian Roberts

*Case and Agreement Alignment in Romance and Beyond*

Michelle Sheehan

# Verb Movement in Romance

---

*A Comparative Study*

NORMA SCHIFANO

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Norma Schifano 2018

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2018

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017942498

ISBN 978-0-19-880464-2

Printed and bound by  
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CRO 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and  
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials  
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

*This book is dedicated to my parents, Susanna and Angelo, and my husband Nicola, for their endless love, patience and understanding, as well as to my grandmothers, Irene and Gina.*



# Contents

<i>Preface</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	x
<i>List of tables</i>	xi
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xiii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Research questions	1
1.2 Methodological assumptions	3
1.3 Theoretical assumptions	4
1.4 Method of data collection	6
2 Romance varieties of the Italian peninsula	7
2.1 Default placement	8
2.1.1 Regional varieties	8
2.1.2 Dialects	13
2.1.3 Interim conclusions	25
2.2 Microvariation in verb placement	26
2.2.1 Lexical vs auxiliary verbs	26
2.2.2 'Have' vs 'be' auxiliaries	29
2.2.3 Finite vs non-finite verbs	32
2.2.4 Modal distinctions	42
2.2.5 Temporal distinctions	51
2.2.6 Aspectual distinctions	57
2.3 Conclusions	60
3 Other Romance varieties	62
3.1 Default placement	62
3.1.1 French	62
3.1.2 Romanian	63
3.1.3 Spanish	66
3.1.4 Valencian Catalan	68
3.1.5 European Portuguese	69
3.1.6 Brazilian Portuguese	70
3.1.7 A note on Portuguese <i>sempre</i>	73
3.1.8 Interim conclusions	74



3.2	Microvariation in verb placement	75
3.2.1	Lexical vs auxiliary verbs	75
3.2.2	'Have' vs 'be' auxiliaries	80
3.2.3	Finite vs non-finite verbs	84
3.2.4	Modal distinctions	96
3.2.5	Temporal distinctions	113
3.2.6	Aspectual distinctions	126
3.3	Conclusions	131
4	Macrovariation	133
4.1	The <i>paradigmatic instantiation</i> of TAM	133
4.1.1	PI of <i>Mood</i>	139
4.1.2	PI of <i>Tense</i>	146
4.1.3	PI of <i>Aspect</i>	148
4.1.4	Minimal movement outside <i>v</i> -VP	152
4.2	Formalizing the attested variation	154
4.2.1	A feature-driven implementation of Romance verb movement	155
4.2.2	The order of assessment of PI	168
4.3	The Romance verb movement subhierarchy	175
4.4	Brazilian Portuguese	179
4.5	Conclusions	189
5	Microvariation	191
5.1	Romanian and Spanish marked patterns	191
5.1.1	The fine-grained left periphery of Romanian	192
5.1.2	The fine-grained left periphery of Spanish	193
5.2	Structural microvariation	204
5.2.1	Perfective 'have'	204
5.2.2	Active past participles	213
5.3	TAM microvariation	224
5.3.1	The role of <i>Mood</i>	224
5.3.2	The role of <i>Tense</i> and <i>Aspect</i>	247
5.4	On microvariation in Brazilian Portuguese	249
5.5	Conclusions	250
6	Conclusions	252
	<i>Appendix: Verb movement in Romance: additional data</i>	256
	<i>References</i>	278
	<i>Index</i>	298

# *Preface*

This book stems from my doctoral dissertation which I completed at the University of Cambridge (Schifano 2015a). It aims to present an enlarged version of the wealth of data contained in it, a short selection of which has appeared in previous publications (Schifano 2014; 2015c; 2016), as well as its main proposals on Romance verb movement partly summarized in Schifano (2015b). The topic of verb movement has already received great attention over the past decades, especially in relation to the Romance and Germanic families, and many interpretations have been put forward to explain the presence or lack of verb movement. Much of this research has also fed into wider debates, such as the one concerning the so-called Rich Agreement Hypothesis, thus having a broader impact on our understanding of morpho-syntax. My interest in tackling this topic again, despite the wealth of existing literature, arose when I first became acquainted with more recent cartographic works. Relying on a functionally richer representation of the internal composition of the clause, these studies started to reveal individual cases of Romance-internal variation in verb placement which challenged standard assumptions. What was still missing, though, was a complete empirical picture of the Romance scenario, which is the gap my research aimed to fill. Having identified the placement of a considerable selection of different verb forms across more than twenty (non-)standard Romance varieties, I was then able to put forward a principled account of Romance verb movement which is both descriptively adequate, inasmuch as it correctly predicts the internal variation, and empirically grounded, in that it links the attested patterns to independent morpho-syntactic properties of the languages under investigation. The comprehensive Romance comparative perspective is, therefore, its main value. It goes without saying that the challenge is not over, and many revisions, possibly even radical ones, will be required to better accommodate the data, but I do hope that this book will constitute a good point of departure for further investigations on the nature and trigger of verb movement in Romance and beyond.

Norma Schifano  
*University of Cambridge*  
April 2017

## *Acknowledgements*

Among the many people to whom I wish to express my gratitude, a special mention goes to Adam Ledgeway, my PhD supervisor, for the time, energy and unfailing dedication he has devoted to my work. Anything I achieve in my future research will always bear the hallmark of his outstanding scholarship. During my studies, I have also been lucky to benefit from discussions with Theresa Biberauer, Michelle Sheehan, and Ian Roberts, who have always been extremely generous in providing me with insightful feedback. I should also like to thank Roberta D'Alessandro, Giuliana Giusti, and Sten Vikner for taking the time to discuss my research during my earlier studies, as well as Guglielmo Cinque, who painstakingly went through all the data and proposals of my research and offered priceless advice. Needless to say, any remaining errors are mine.

My heartfelt thanks also go to all my language informants who have been so generous and patient in sharing their judgements with me. Among them, I address special thanks to Luigi Andriani, Silvio Cruschina, Carme Caldach Rios, Adina Dragomirescu, Ana Luiza Lopes, Alexandru Nicolae, Carmen Olmedilla Herrero, Claudia Peverini, and Giuseppina Silvestri. The extent and nature of their feedback went far beyond the call of informants and has enriched my work in ways that I had not foreseen. My research would not have been possible without the generosity of the Gates Cambridge Trust, which I also heartily thank.

# *List of tables*

2.1	Microvariation in verb placement in the Italian peninsula	61
3.1	Microvariation in verb placement in further Romance varieties	131
4.1	A macro-typology of Romance verb movement	134
4.2	Italian <i>lavorare</i> 'work'	137
4.3	Romanian <i>lucra</i> 'work'	138
4.4	French <i>travailler</i> 'work' (indicative / subjunctive)	138
4.5	French <i>travailler</i> 'work' (conditional)	141
4.6	E. Portuguese <i>trabalhar</i> 'work'	141
4.7	Spanish <i>trabajar</i> 'work'	141
4.8	Sardinian <i>cantai</i> 'sing'	142
4.9	V. Catalan <i>patir</i> 'suffer'	143
4.10	V. Catalan <i>cantar</i> 'sing'	144
4.11	Mussomelese <i>cantari</i> 'sing'	147
4.12	E. Portuguese <i>cantar</i> 'sing'	147
4.13	Spanish <i>cantar</i> 'sing'	148
4.14	V. Catalan <i>posar</i> 'put'	148
4.15	The development of HABEO + past participle across Romance	151
4.16	The correlation between movement and PI	166
4.17	The correlation between PI and (un)interpretability	166
4.18	Romance verb movement in the current approach	167
4.19	Logical combinations of the PI of TAM	169
4.20	Logical possibilities to assess the PI of TAM	171
4.21	Assessment of PI: option (b)	172
4.22	Assessment of PI: option (a)	172
4.23	Assessment of PI: option (c)	173
4.24	Assessment of PI: option (d)	173
4.25	B. Portuguese <i>falar</i> 'to speak' (indicative / subjunctive / conditional)	180
4.26	B. Portuguese <i>falar</i> 'to speak' (present / past)	183
4.27	Person / number distinctions in B. Portuguese (present indicative)	184
4.28	Person / number distinctions in French (present indicative)	188

5.1 A typology of Romance 'have' placement	205
5.2 Default and 'have' placements	210
5.3 A typology of Romance active past participle placement (present perfect 'have')	215
5.4 A typology of Romance lexical infinitive placement (subject clauses)	226
5.5 A typology of Romance subjunctive placement (lexical verb)	228

## *List of abbreviations*

=	cliticized to
Abr.	Abruzzese
ACC.MRK	accusative marker
Adv	adverb
Aux	auxiliary
BFr.	Belgian French
BPrt.	Brazilian Portuguese
Cat.	Catalan
CFocP	Contrastive Focus Phrase
COND	conditional
Cos.	Cosentino
CP	Complementizer Phrase
DP	Determiner Phrase
EA	external argument
EPrt.	European Portuguese
ESID	Extreme Southern Italian dialect
F	feminine
Fa.	Fabrianese
FE	Feature Economy
Fin	finiteness position (head of Finiteness Phrase)
FOFC	Final-Over-Final Condition
FP	functional projection
Fr.	French
FUT	future
HAS	Higher Adverb Space
HMC	Head Movement Constraint
I	inflection
IFocP	Informational Focus Phrase
IG	Input Generalisation
IMP	imperative
IMPERS	impersonal

IND	indicative
INF	infinitive
IP	Inflection Phrase
IPFV	imperfect(ive)
It.	Italian
LAS	Lower Adverb Space
LF	Logical Form
LOC	locative
Liv.	Livornese
LP <sub>1</sub>	high left periphery
LP <sub>2</sub>	low left periphery
M	masculine
Mi.	Milanese
MSp.	Mexican Spanish
Muss.	Mussomelese
mvt	movement
NID	Northern Italian dialect
NRIt.	Northern regional Italian
PF	Phonological Form
O	object
ONeap.	Old Neapolitan
OSic.	Old Sicilian
Ost.	Ostuni
PCB	<i>Po Cantu Biddanoa</i> (by Benvenuto Lobina 1987)
PFV	perfective
PI	paradigmatic instantiation
PL	plural
PP	Prepositional Phrase
PPt	Romanian supine / participle
PRES	presuppositional
PRS	present
Prt / PRT	participle
Prt.	Portuguese
Ro.	Romanian
Rom.	Romanesco

S	subject
S. Agata	Sant'Agata di Militello
S. Maria	Santa Maria Capua Vetere
Sass.	Sassoferratese
SBJV	subjunctive
SCL	subject clitic
SG	singular
SID	Southern Italian dialect
Sp.	Spanish
Spec	specifier
Srd.	Sardinian
SRIt.	Southern regional Italian
SUP	supine
TAM	Tense, Aspect, Mood
Te.	Teolese
UG	Universal Grammar
USID	Upper Southern Italian dialect
V	verb
VP	Verb Phrase
VCat.	Valencian Catalan





# Introduction

## 1.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Verbs of the Romance and Germanic families differ in their placement with respect to a number of positionally fixed elements, such as adverbs and negators; witness the examples in (1), where the French finite lexical verb obligatorily precedes the aspectual adverb *souvent*, while its English counterpart must follow it:

- (1) a Jean arrive **souvent** (\*arrive) en retard  
 b John (\*arrives) **often** arrives late

One way to derive this distinction is to invoke a different behaviour of verbs in the two families, whereby verbs undergo syntactic movement to the sentential core in Romance, hence preceding adverbs and negators, but not in Germanic.<sup>1</sup> As for Romance specifically, the traditional assumption in the literature is that this family behaves uniformly, in that all Romance languages exhibit a version of V-to-I movement.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, many of the aforementioned studies (see fns 2–3) have tended to equate Romance with French *tout court*, without considering further varieties.<sup>3</sup> However, a number of more fine-grained works have recently revealed a much more nuanced picture, whereby distinct Romance varieties exhibit different extents of verb movement across the sentential core.<sup>4</sup> In order to shed light on this under-explored area of variation, I have tested the placement of the verb across a wide sample of (non-)standard Romance varieties. Unlike many works on the topic, I have not limited my attention to the placement of a reduced set of verb

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Emonds (1978); Pollock (1989); Vikner (1994; 1995; 1997); Bentzen (2007; 2009); Biberauer and Roberts (2010); Roberts (2010); Holmberg and Roberts (2013), a.o.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Pollock (1989); Belletti (1990); Kayne (1991: 649); Vikner (1994; 1995; 1997); Zanuttini (1997); Roberts (2001); Alboiu (2002); Gutiérrez-Bravo (2006: 23); Biberauer and Roberts (2010); Gallego (2013: 425); Koenenman and Zeijlstra (2014), a.o. See Schifano (2011; 2015d) for a critical review.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Roberts (2010: 161, 163ff) and Vikner (1997).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Cinque (1999); Tortora (2002; 2014b); Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005; 2014); Sheehan (2006); Rowlett (2007); Peverini (2009); Fedele (2010); Ledgeway (2012a; 2015a; forthcoming a); Cyrino and Reintges (2012); Tescari Neto (2012; 2013); Cyrino (2013); Cyrino and Lopes (2013); Taylor (2014); Schifano (2011; 2013; 2014; 2015a; b; c; 2016); Wolfe (2015a; b), a.o.

forms (most notably the present indicative, auxiliaries, past participles and infinitives), but I have tested a wide array of different typologies of verbs, including lexical and auxiliary verbs, ‘have’ and ‘be’ auxiliaries, finite and non-finite verbs, as well as a selection of modally, temporally, and aspectually marked forms. As for the diagnostic for verb movement, I was able to take advantage of Cinque’s (1999) seminal work on adverbs, which allowed me to test the placement of the verb with respect to a wide selection of adverbs lexicalizing specifiers of hierarchically ordered modal, temporal, and aspectual functional projections (FPs).<sup>5</sup> Following Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005: 83), I descriptively divide them into a Higher Adverb Space (HAS) and Lower Adverb Space (LAS), as summarized below (hierarchies adapted from Cinque 1999: 106 and Ledgeway forthcoming a).<sup>6,7</sup>

(2) a HAS

[ *frankly* Mood<sub>speech act</sub> [ *unfortunately* Mood<sub>evaluative</sub> [ *apparently* Mood<sub>evidential</sub> [ *probably* Mod<sub>epistemic</sub> [ *now* T<sub>(past/future)</sub> [ *perhaps* Mood<sub>irrealis</sub> [ *necessarily* Mod<sub>necessity</sub> [ *usually* Asp<sub>habitual</sub> [ *again* Asp<sub>repetitive(event)</sub> [ *often* Asp<sub>frequentative(event)</sub> [ *intentionally* Mod<sub>volitional</sub> [ *slowly* Asp<sub>celerative(event)</sub>

b LAS

[ *not* Neg<sub>1presuppositional</sub> [ *already* T<sub>(anterior)</sub> [ *anymore* Asp<sub>terminative</sub> [ *still* Asp<sub>continuative</sub> [ *always* Asp<sub>perfect</sub> [ *hardly* Neg<sub>2</sub> [ *just* Asp<sub>retrospective</sub> [ *soon* Asp<sub>proximative</sub> [ *briefly* Asp<sub>durative</sub> [ *typically* Asp<sub>generic/progressive</sub> [ *almost* Asp<sub>prospective</sub> [ *completely* Asp<sub>SgCompletive(event)</sub> [ *everything* Asp<sub>PlCompletive</sub> [ *well* Voice [ *fast* Asp<sub>celerative(process)</sub> [ *again* Asp<sub>repetitive(process)</sub> [ *often* Asp<sub>frequentative(process)</sub> [ *completely* Asp<sub>SgCompletive(process)</sub> [v-VP...

Of all the adverbs listed in (2), a selection of them, placed at a distinct height within the hierarchy, has been employed, depending on their availability and productivity across the (non-standard) varieties under investigation.<sup>8</sup> This methodology allowed

<sup>5</sup> Among the many works which employ or support adverbs as a diagnostic for verb movement, see also Jones (1996: 342); Benincà (2001: 40); Poletto (2001: 273); Cinque (2004b: 686; 2006: 121ff); Bentzen (2007: 5); Roberts (2007: §1.3); Cinque and Rizzi (2008: 43); Haeberli and Ihsane (2016); Tescari Neto (2012; 2013, but see fn 7); Harwood (2014: 329–30). See Lightfoot and Hornstein (1994: 6); Williams (1994: 189); Abeillé and Godard (1994: 169–171; 2002: 440, fn 49) and Bobaljik (1999) for critiques of this diagnostic and Manzini and Savoia (2005III: ch 6) for an alternative analysis.

<sup>6</sup> Over years, further refinements and partial revisions of the hierarchies have been suggested (Cinque 2006; Tescari Neto 2012: 30; Ledgeway forthcoming a, a.o.). For the sake of the present discussion, the dependencies illustrated in (2) will suffice.

<sup>7</sup> Tescari Neto (2013: ch 5) argues that adverbs are scope-inducing elements whose FP is associated with a probing head attracting the constituent bearing focus. One of the consequences of his analysis is that high adverbs are not a diagnostic for verb movement, under either their wide- or narrow-scope interpretation (Tescari Neto 2013: 230). Following the counter-arguments outlined in Schifano (2015d), I assume instead that high adverbs under their wide-scope interpretation are a safe diagnostic for verb movement.

<sup>8</sup> Agreement has not been reached on the exact content of the ‘adverb’ morphological category. See Schifano (2015c: 134, fn 4) for a discussion, including comments on the morpho-syntactic status of adverbs

me to draw a detailed mapping of the target of verb movement across Romance, identifying distinct macro- and micro-typologies which largely have previously been overlooked. Before proceeding any further, I will set out a number of methodological and theoretical assumptions.

## 1.2 METHODOLOGICAL ASSUMPTIONS

When testing the position of the verb with respect to adverbs to assess the target of movement, all adverbs tested must be read with a flat, neutral intonation as the manipulation of the intonational properties of adverbs can license different structural configurations. More specifically, parenthetical or ‘comma intonation’ uses of adverbs must be avoided (Cinque 1999: 87; Tescari Neto 2013: 200). As shown in (3), this allows them to appear in positions from which they would normally be banned, hence rendering them an ineffective diagnostic for verb movement:

- (3) a Gianni **probabilmente** sbaglia (\*probabilmente)  
       G.       probably       errs  
       ‘G. probably makes a mistake’  
       b Gianni sbaglia, **probabilmente** [comma intonation]  
       G.       errs       probably  
       ‘G. makes a mistake, probably’

Similarly, it is important to ensure that adverbs are not employed in their focusing usages (Belletti 1990: 130, fn 29; Cinque 1999: 31; Ledgeway forthcoming a), i.e. having narrow scope over a single constituent, as this allows them again to appear in positions distinct from their base FP:

- (4) a Gianni **probabilmente** dorme (\*probabilmente) [wide scope]  
       G.       probably       sleeps  
       ‘G. is probably sleeping’  
       b Gianni dorme **probabilmente** da tre ore [narrow scope on PP]  
       G.       sleeps probably       since three hours  
       ‘G. has probably been sleeping for three hours’

As such, configurations such as (4b) should not be taken as indicative of verb movement, as the surface position of the verb is not the genuine output of the verb movement typology of the language (see Tescari Neto 2013: ch 5 for a possible derivation). Furthermore, I have avoided adverbs that are ambiguous between an

proper (e.g. It. *ultimamente* ‘lately’) vs more complex adverbial expressions (e.g. It. *negli ultimi tempi*, lit. ‘in the latest times’).

Event (5a) and a Process (5b) interpretation (cf. Asp<sub>repetitive</sub>, Asp<sub>frequentative</sub>, Asp<sub>celerative</sub>) which is difficult to control with speakers, as these are associated with two distinct positions, located in the higher and lower domain, respectively (Cinque 1999: 93; Cinque 2006: 94, fn 1):

- (5) a John **quickly** lifted his arm ('John was quick in...')  
 b John lifted his arm **quickly** ('John did it in a quick way')

Whenever possible, the sentences I have tested exhibit an unmarked S-(Adv)-V-(Adv)-O order, where a rhematic subject appears in sentence-initial position, thus guaranteeing that the preverbal adverb is not left-dislocated.<sup>9</sup> For this reason, I have typically avoided adverbs lexicalizing the topmost projections of Cinque's hierarchy (e.g. 'frankly', 'unfortunately', 'apparently') as, in my data, they often appear in a sentence-initial position, before a rhematic subject, with only few exceptions (see also Cinque 1999: 32). Since this may suggest their left-dislocation, I decided not to interpret them as a diagnostic (unless they admitted a post-subject placement). Similarly, I have disregarded the placement of (low) adverbs after the (direct) complement, following Cinque's (1999: 22) claim that the apparent post-complement position of adverbs is only the surface effect of the focus-induced movement of lower portions of the clause around one or more adverbs.<sup>10</sup>

### 1.3 THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS

The aim of the present book is not to investigate the technical aspects surrounding the (verb) movement machinery within a given theoretical framework, but to establish a detailed empirical mapping of the placement of different verb forms across Romance and identify the (set of) properties shared by these languages whose variation determines the attested typologies of verb movement. To this end, I have couched my book within a hybrid cartographic-minimalist framework. On the one hand, I have used the richly articulated sentence structure of the cartographic framework (Cinque and Rizzi 2008) as an empirical tool of investigation to identify instances of variation which would be invisible in more impoverished structures, such as those postulated by Minimalism for different reasons (Chomsky 1995 *et seq.*). In this respect, my book does not aim to verify the theoretical assumptions of

<sup>9</sup> See Belletti (1990); Cardinaletti (1997; 2004); Costa and Duarte (2002); Costa (2004); Gutiérrez-Bravo (2007); Sheehan (2006; 2010; 2015b; 2016); López (2009); Villa-García (2013) a.o. for the claim that preverbal rhematic subjects in null-subject languages can sit at the left-edge of the I-domain (as opposed to the claim that they are always left-dislocated, as argued by Contreras 1991; Solà 1992; Barbosa 1995; 2001; Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998, a.o.).

<sup>10</sup> For a discussion on the different permutations of low Adv-direct object orderings in Brazilian Portuguese, see Tescari Neto (2013).

cartography against a specific syntactic phenomenon such as verb movement, but rather capitalizes on its widely accepted tenets in adverbial syntax in order to establish a sufficiently adequate empirical scenario.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, standard theoretical assumptions from Minimalism (Chomsky 1995 *et seq.*) have been adopted to provide technical motivations for the movement phenomena observed.

Because of this specific objective, many interesting research questions have not been (directly) addressed, while not underestimating their importance. One of the most important technical puzzles surrounding verb movement that will not be considered here is the contention that verb movement is a case of narrow-syntactic head movement. This issue can be de-composed into two related questions: (i) whether verb movement is part of Narrow Syntax; (ii) whether verb movement is head movement. The debate partly originates from Chomsky's (2001) claim that head movement should no longer be considered part of Narrow Syntax but should be analysed as a PF-effect because of its apparent lack of semantic import. Concerning verb movement, abundant empirical evidence has already been provided in favour of its semantic effects.<sup>12</sup> Interestingly, the present investigation will provide further empirical cases in which distinct verb placements around the same adverbial correlate with distinct interpretations, thus indirectly supporting the view that verb movement can be considered a narrow-syntactic instance of movement.<sup>13</sup> Regarding the size of constituent involved in the movement, partly as a response to Chomsky's (2001) arguments, some authors have proposed reanalysing various instances of head movement, including verb movement, as instances of remnant phrasal movement (e.g. Bentzen 2007; 2009; Tescari Neto 2012; 2013; Nicolae 2013; 2015; Cornilescu and Nicolae 2013, a.o.; see also discussion and further references in Alexiadou et al. 2002; Roberts 2011: 206–12; Cinque 2013: 62–3).<sup>14</sup> Conversely, other authors have retained the idea that verb movement can be analysed as head movement, whose existence as a narrow-syntactic operation (*pace* Chomsky 2001) is both empirically and theoretically supported in Roberts (2010). Regarding verb movement, specifically, technical solutions to escape the issues raised by approaches based on Phase Theory can be found in works such as Gallego's (2007), who develops a technical account whereby verb movement as syntactic head movement can be retained,

<sup>11</sup> This does not imply that the cartographic assumptions adopted here, such as the fixed position of adverbs, are unanimously accepted in the literature. See Cinque (2004), Tescari Neto (2013), and references therein, for a response to some of the arguments raised against such assumptions.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Pollock (1989: 407); Zanuttini (1997a: 169, fn 11); Cinque (1999: 102ff, 184 fn 8; 2004: 687–8, fn 10); Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005: 98–100); Penello (2005: 12–13); Fedele (2010: 9; 13–32); Roberts (2010: ch 1); Ledgeway (2012a: 148–50; forthcoming a); Duffield (2014); Harwood (2014: 301), a.o.

<sup>13</sup> See, for example, (55d) and (87) in Ch 2 and (90b) in Ch 3.

<sup>14</sup> See, for example, Bentzen (2007; 2009); Tescari Neto (2012; 2013); Nicolae (2013; 2015); Cornilescu and Nicolae (2013). See also discussion and further references in Alexiadou et al. (2002); Roberts (2011: 206–12); Cinque (2013: 62–3).

hinging on the notion of Phase-Sliding.<sup>15</sup> Assessing the validity of such opposing views (cf. head vs phrasal verb movement) goes beyond the scope of the present work. Given the aim of my research, that is establishing a complete macro- and micro-typology of Romance verb movement, I have simply assumed that the element involved in the movement is the V head. I will leave it open to further research to determine whether the extreme wealth of variation revealed by my investigation is amenable to a head vs phrasal implementation.

## 1.4 METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

The data which will be presented in this book have been collected via a questionnaire designed by the author in accordance with the methodological and theoretical assumptions outlined in §1.3 and §1.4. This consisted of a guided translation task that I conducted in person with native speakers of the varieties under examination.<sup>16</sup> More specifically, speakers were asked to translate a number of sentences from English or Italian into their native variety, as well as a number of adverbs. Sentences comprised basic, everyday vocabulary and were within a context given as the questionnaire moved on. Once informants were satisfied with the translation, they were asked for grammaticality judgements on the placement of the relevant adverb in distinct positions within the sentence. Speakers were trained to produce sentences where adverbs have a wide-scope interpretation and each of the orders provided were discussed to check that the meaning was the one I intended to elicit.

<sup>15</sup> See also Harwood (2014), who treats English auxiliary movement as head movement, and Cinque (1999: ch 2) and Roberts (2010: 65ff), who specifically treat Romance verb movement as syntactic head movement.

<sup>16</sup> This is the technique also employed in the tried-and-tested questionnaires of the *Atlante Sintattico d'Italia* (<http://asit.maldura.unipd.it/questionnaires.html>). On the (dis)advantages of syntactic elicitation techniques, including translation tasks, see Cornips and Poletto (2005), a.o.

## Romance varieties of the Italian peninsula

This chapter investigates the differing patterns of verb placement attested across a selection of varieties of the Italian peninsula (see also Schifano 2015c). It is organized as follows. In §2.1, I describe the verb default placement in the northern, central and southern regional varieties of Italian (§2.1.1), as well as in a selection of northern, central, upper southern, extreme southern, and Sardinian dialects (§2.1.2). Based on these results, a macro-typology of verb placement in the Italian peninsula is drawn (§2.1.3). The rest of the chapter is devoted to the description of the microvariation attested across the above varieties which emerges once different verb typologies are considered, such as lexical and auxiliary verbs (§2.2.1), ‘have’ and ‘be’ auxiliaries (§2.2.2), finite and non-finite verbs (§2.2.3), and a selection of modally (§2.2.4), temporally (§2.2.5), and aspectually (§2.2.6) marked forms.<sup>1</sup> The tested adverbs are located at different heights within Cinque’s (1999) hierarchy (cf. (2) in Ch 1). The relevant positions are repeated in (1) with Italian examples for expositional convenience:

(1) a HAS

[ *francamente* ‘frankly’ Mood<sub>speech act</sub> [ ... [ *probabilmente* ‘probably’ Mod<sub>epistemic</sub> [ ... [ *forse* ‘perhaps’ Mood<sub>irrealis</sub> [ ... [ *generalmente* / *di solito* ‘usually’ Asp<sub>habitual</sub> [ ... [ *spesso* ‘often’ Asp<sub>frequentative(event)</sub> [ *apposta* ‘intentionally’ Mod<sub>volitional</sub> [ ...

b LAS

[ *mica* ‘not’ Neg<sub>1presuppositional</sub> [ *già* ‘already’ T<sub>(anterior)</sub> [ ... [ *ancora* ‘still’ Asp<sub>continuative</sub> [ *sempre* ‘always’ Asp<sub>perfect</sub> [ ... [ *completamente* ‘completely’ Asp<sub>SgCompletive(event)</sub> [ ... [ *bene* ‘well’ Voice [ ... [ <sub>v-VP</sub> ...

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this book, the same verb repeated in distinct positions indicates optionality, not co-occurrence. In this chapter, one verb form between brackets indicates a grammatical but less-preferred option. If all verbs are between brackets, they are judged equal. See the Appendix for examples marked as ‘A’.



## 2.1 DEFAULT PLACEMENT

Our investigation of the distribution of verbs across the Italian peninsula starts with an overview of the placement of the lexical present indicative verb in declarative clauses, henceforth referred to as ‘default placement’.<sup>2</sup>

## 2.1.1 REGIONAL VARIETIES

## 2.1.1.1 Northern regional Italian

The data presented in this section exemplify the regional variety of Italian spoken in the area of Milan (Lombardy) and will be taken as one of the nearest approximations to the standard language, whose gradual adoption in this area has extensively been discussed (Galli de’ Paratesi 1984; Trifone 2007: 144). For the sake of the discussion, this variety will be taken to be representative of Italian when comparisons with other Romance languages are drawn. Also, expository reasons will force the idealization of northern regional Italian (henceforth N. R. Italian) as a unitary variety, contrary to fact.

On a parallel with the observations already made about standard Italian (Cinque 1999: 31, 110ff, 180, fn 80; Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005: 87–8; 2014: 36; Ledgeway 2012a: 144; forthcoming a; Cruschina and Ledgeway 2016: 561), in N. R. Italian the present indicative is displaced to a position situated at the low boundaries of the HAS. This is shown by the fact that the verb follows high adverbs such as *francamente* (2a), *probabilmente* (2b), *forse* (2c) and *generalmente* (2d), but precedes those which lexicalize the bottom positions of the HAS, starting from *apposta* (2e):<sup>3</sup>

- (2) a Gianni (\*si sbaglia) **francamente** si sbaglia  
     G.                      frankly        self= errs  
     ‘Frankly G. is wrong’
- b Gianni (\*confonde) **probabilmente** confonde questa poesia con  
     G.                      probably        confuses this     poem with  
     un’ altra  
     an    other  
     ‘G. probably confuses this poem with another’
- c Gianni (\*confonde) **forse**        confonde questa poesia con un’ altra  
     G.                      perhaps confuses this     poem with an    other  
     ‘Perhaps G. confuses this poem with another’

<sup>2</sup> Cf. instead Cardinaletti (2011: 513) on Italian verb movement in questions and Rivero (1994a; b), Rivero and Terzi (1995) and Poletto and Zanuttini (2003) a.o. on verb movement in imperatives across some Romance varieties.

<sup>3</sup> Recall that in all the examples the adverb must be interpreted as having wide-scope over the sentence rather than narrow-scope over a single constituent, such as the direct object.

- d Gianni (\*confonde) **generalmente** confonde queste due poesie  
 G. generally confuses these two poems  
 ‘G. usually confuses these two poems’
- e Gianni parla **apposta** (\*parla) con un accento napoletano<sup>4</sup>  
 G. speaks intentionally with an accent Neapolitan  
 ‘G. speaks with a Neapolitan accent on purpose’

In order to test the verb landing site in the low HAS more precisely, we should consider the placement of *spesso* (Asp<sub>frequentative(event)</sub>), sandwiched between *generalmente* and *apposta*. (3) shows that this naturally appears preverbally, the postverbal placement being possible only with a Process interpretation, for which *spesso* lexicalizes a distinct FP in the lowest portion of the LAS (Asp<sub>frequentative(process)</sub>) (Cinque 1999: 92, 205, fn 39–40):

- (3) Gianni (esce) **spesso** esce con Maria  
 G. often goes.out with M.  
 ‘G. often goes out with M.’

Consistently with the pattern observed so far, (4) shows that in N. R. Italian the verb must precede the presuppositional negator *mica*, marking the uppermost boundary of the LAS:<sup>5</sup>

- (4) Gianni non conosce **mica** quel ristorante  
 G. not knows neg.PRES that restaurant  
 ‘@G. does not know that restaurant’

Finally, the selection of examples in (1A) shows that the verb precedes all the adverbs contained in the LAS, as expected by transitivity. Based on the data reported here, I conclude that in N. R. Italian the verb reaches a clause-medial position, sandwiched between Asp<sub>frequentative(event)</sub> and Mod<sub>volitional</sub>.<sup>6</sup>

### 2.1.1.2 Central regional Italian

The data presented in this section have been collected with speakers of Fabriano (Ancona, Marche) and Rome (Lazio). Both varieties exhibit the same distribution of the finite lexical verb, which I will take as representative of central regional Italian

<sup>4</sup> The most natural placement of *apposta* is in fact a non-parenthetical post-complement position, i.e. *Gianni confonde le due poesie apposta*. A very similar state of affairs is attested across most Romance varieties (cf. Table 4.1). For the sake of the present discussion, it is sufficient to note the contrast between the ungrammaticality of the order *apposta*-V-XP and the grammaticality of V-*apposta*-XP.

<sup>5</sup> Following Zanuttini (1997a: 62), @ in the translations signals presuppositional negation. See Schifano (2015e) and references within on the possibility of preverbal *mica* and Penello (2005), Penello and Pescarini (2008), Cruschina (2010a) and Ledgeway (2017b, forthcoming a) for a discussion on corresponding forms in other regional varieties and dialects of Italy.

<sup>6</sup> As noted by Cinque (1999: 214–15, fn 7), more careful styles of Italian also allow a lower placement of the present indicative lexical verb, below LAS adverbs (but above ‘well’).

(5) a Er Sandro (\*sbaja) **probbabbilmente** sbaja a domanna (Rom.)  
the S. probably errs the question  
'S. probably gets the question wrong'

b Eli (\*c'azzecca) **de solito** c'azzecca (Fa.)  
E. of usual there=gets.right  
'E. is usually right (about it)'

c Er Sandro (\*sbaja) **de solito** sbaja a domanna (Rom.)  
the S. of usual errs the question  
'S. usually gets the question wrong'

d Su moje porta **apposta** (\*porta) e puntarelle (Rom.)  
his wife brings intentionally the puntarelle  
'His wife brings the puntarelle on purpose'

(6) a Eli non c'azzecca mica (\*c'azzecca) (Fa.)  
E. not there=gets.right neg.PRES  
'@E. is not right about it'

b Su marito (\*non fa) mica fa la caprese  
her husband neg.PRES prepares the caprese  
'@Her husband does not prepare the caprese'

<sup>7</sup> 'Probably' could not be tested in Fabrianese, while 'intentionally' preferably appears in post-complement position. In (5d) and in all similar examples featuring 'intentionally' discussed in this book, the original context of elicitation was one where every time there is a party, the subject is bringing or preparing something on purpose for it.

- (7) a Er Sandro nu sbaja **miga** (?sbaja) a domanna (Rom.)  
 the S. not errs neg.PRES the question  
 ‘@S. does not get the question wrong’
- b Su moje (?nu porta) **miga** porta e puntarelle  
 his wife not neg.PRES brings the puntarelle  
 ‘@His wife does not bring the puntarelle’

The sentences in (6)–(7) show speakers’ hesitation in the placement of *miga*, which in both cases gave rise to contrasting results, with no clear-cut preference attached to any of the two orderings. Unlike N. R. Italian, where the preverbal placement of *miga* obeys scope-related requirements (Schifano 2015e), I argue that in the central varieties its preverbal placement is the output of the grammar of the underlying dialects, where the shorter verb movement always results in *miga* surfacing preverbally (cf. Sassoferrato, §2.1.2.2).

Moving further down the hierarchy, judgements become neater. In Fabrianese, for example, the verb can either precede or follow low adverbs such as ‘already’ (8a) and ‘still’ (8b), located at the very top of the LAS (1b), with a preference for the higher verb placement:

- (8) a La mamma prepara **già** (prepara) la pasta<sup>8</sup> (Fa.)  
 the mum prepares already the pasta  
 ‘Mum is already preparing the pasta’
- b Il monello dorme **ancora** (dorme)  
 the boy sleeps still  
 ‘The boy is still sleeping’

In this respect, Fabrianese differs from N. R. Italian, where the preverbal placement of *già* and *ancora* is ungrammatical (§2.1.1.1). Again, I take this possibility, in Fabrianese but not in N. R. Italian, to be the by-product of the underlying dialects (cf. 18–19). Crucially, northern Italian dialects (henceforth NIDs) do not allow the verb to stay in the LAS (§2.1.2.1), explaining why in N. R. Italian there is no such conflict as in central varieties. Finally, judgements become clear in relation to the (very) low adverbs ‘always’ and ‘well’, which must be surpassed by the verb in both varieties (2A). In sum, if we take the contrasting judgements in relation to *miga* and the less preferred placements expressed at the level of ‘already’ and ‘still’ to be the by-product of a conflicting underlying grammar, we can conclude that in C. R. Italian the verb targets the same clause-medial position as in N. R. Italian, roughly sandwiched between Asp<sub>habitual</sub> and Mod<sub>volitional</sub>.

### 2.1.1.3 Southern regional Italian

The data presented in this section exemplify the regional variety of Italian spoken in Calabria, taken as representative of southern regional Italian (henceforth S. R. Italian).

<sup>8</sup> The progressive interpretation of the verbs in (8) does not affect their placement, here and elsewhere in all the Romance varieties under investigation.

Unlike the central varieties reviewed, which largely adhere to the northern model, S. R. Italian seems to have ignored the northern pressure, exhibiting an extension of verb movement closer to the underlying dialects (§2.1.2.3).

Starting from the HAS, we observe that in S. R. Italian the verb follows high adverbs such as ‘probably’ (9a) and ‘usually’ (9c), while ‘perhaps’, lexicalizing an FP half-way between the two, cannot be employed as a diagnostic for verb placement as it preferably appears in a sentence-initial position (9b).<sup>9</sup> Similarly, ‘intentionally’ does not provide a clue for verb-movement, being preferably placed in post-complement position (9d):

- (9) a Mamma (\*conosce) **probabilmente** conosce qualcuno che te  
 mum probably knows somebody who to.you=  
 le può aggiustare  
 them= (s)he.can fix.INF  
 ‘Mum probably knows somebody who can fix them for you’
- b **Forse** mamma (?forse) si ricorda (\*forse) dove sono  
 perhaps mum self= remembers where they.are  
 le scarpe  
 the shoes  
 ‘Perhaps mum remembers where your shoes are’
- c Il treno (\*si ferma) **di solito** si ferma a Reggio  
 the train of usual self= stops at Reggio  
 ‘The train usually stops in Reggio’
- d Maria accende la radio **apposta**  
 M. switches.on the radio intentionally  
 ‘M. switches on the radio on purpose’

Moving down the LAS, we see that in S. R. Italian the presuppositional negator *mica* is unambiguously placed in preverbal position (10a), like ‘already’ (10b) and ‘still’ (10c), whose postverbal placement is excluded:

- (10) a Maria (\*non conosce) **mica** conosce quel ristorante  
 M. neg.PRES knows that restaurant  
 ‘@M. does not know that restaurant’
- b Nonna (\*conosce) **già** conosce la ricetta  
 grandmother already knows the recipe  
 ‘My grandmother already knows the recipe’
- c Nonna (\*si ricorda) **ancora** si ricorda l’infanzia  
 grandmother still self= remembers the childhood  
 ‘My grandmother still remembers her childhood’

<sup>9</sup> My survey revealed that this is a very common state of affairs across Romance, see also Verbicarese in (11A) (Ch 2, Appendix A), Spanish in (2B-b) (Ch 3, Appendix B), and B. Portuguese in (11) (Ch 3).

In this respect, S. R. Italian diverges from both N. R. Italian, where the verb unambiguously raises above the LAS (the possible preverbal placement of *mica* being the result of the displacement of the adverb to satisfy scope-related requirements, Schifano 2015e), and from C. R. Italian, where the pressure of the underlying lower movement dialects results in marginal alternative placements at the highest boundary of the lower space. Finally, its verb must climb over the remaining lower adverbs (3A). Based on the data reported above, I conclude that in S. R. Italian the verb reaches a low position, sandwiched between *Asp<sub>continuative</sub>* and *Asp<sub>perfect</sub>*.

### 2.1.2 DIALECTS

In this section I review the default placement of the verb across a number of Italo-Romance dialects, as well as in a Campidanese variety of Sardinian. Anticipating the discussion, we will see that the northern dialects exhibit a clause-medial instance of movement, while the central and southern varieties display a more restricted version of verb movement, naturally matching the patterns reviewed above for the corresponding regional varieties.<sup>10</sup>

#### 2.1.2.1 Northern Italy: Milano, Teolo

The data presented in this section have been collected with speakers of Milano (Lombardy) and Teolo (Padova, Veneto). Milanese is a Gallo-Italic dialect falling into the Western Lombard group, while Teolese belongs to the central group of the Venetan dialects (Sanga 1997: 255; Loporcaro 2009: 97–102).<sup>11</sup> Starting from the HAS, the set of data in (4A) show that the verb must follow high adverbs such as ‘frankly’, ‘probably’, and ‘usually’. As with N. R. Italian, the turning point is ‘intentionally / on purpose’, which is obligatorily preceded by the verb in both dialects, suggesting that the verb’s landing site must be situated at the bottom of the HAS:

- (11) a La sua miè la cuzina **aposta** (\*la cuzina) el risot (Mi.)  
       the his wife SCL cooks on.purpose the rice  
       ‘His wife is preparing rice on purpose’  
       b Gabriela parecia **aposta** (\*parecia) ea verdura (Te.)  
       G. prepares on.purpose the vegetables  
       ‘G. is preparing the vegetables on purpose’

<sup>10</sup> For all the dialects reported in this book, the nearest approximation to Italian spelling is provided, with a few exceptions where phonetic symbols are employed too.

<sup>11</sup> On verb movement in NIDs, cf. also Zanuttini (1997a; b), Tortora (2002; 2014b: 94–9), and Fedele (2010).

If the pattern suggested by (11) is correct, we expect adverbs situated in the LAS to occur postverbally. Starting from the top of this space, we see that the expectation is borne out:

- (12) a La sua miè la cuzina **minga** (\*la cuzina) el risot (Mi.)  
 the his wife SCL cooks neg.PRES the rice  
 '@His wife does not cook rice'
- b So mojere no parecia **mia** (\*parecia) i bigoi (Te.)  
 his wife not prepares neg.PRES the bigoi  
 '@His wife does not prepare *bigoi*'

The properties of Mi. *minga* (12a) have been extensively discussed in the literature (Sanga 1997: 254; Parry 1997; Zanuttini 1997a: 85, a.o.). Originally derived from Latin MICA(M) 'crumb', it enjoys the same pragmatic restrictions as the Italian corresponding form *mica*, i.e. it occurs in contexts in which the negative counterpart of the proposition expressed by the sentence is assumed in the discourse. Unlike standard Italian, however, where postverbal *mica* obligatorily co-occurs with the canonical preverbal negator *non* (cf. It. Marco \*(*non*) sbaglia mica '@Marco is not wrong'), Mi. *minga* alone is sufficient to negate the clause (12a). Moreover, unlike It. *mica*, Mi. *minga* is always banned from preverbal position, irrespectively of any discourse considerations regarding the nature of the presupposition (Schifano 2015e):

- (13) \*El Marco **minga** el sbaglia  
 the M. neg.PRES SCL errs  
 '@M. is not wrong'

Both properties, i.e. non-occurrence with a preverbal negator and ban from preverbal position, apparently follow from the fact that Milanese, unlike standard Italian, belongs to stage III of Jespersen's 1917 cycle (Vai 1996; Zanuttini 1997a: 85; Parry 2013: 78), as shown by the following example (adapted from Zanuttini 1997a: 88), illustrating the use of the Milanese postverbal negator *no* 'not':

- (14) (\*No) u (\*no) vist **no** la tuza  
 I.have seen not the girl  
 'I haven't seen the girl'

As Milanese does not (overtly) possess a preverbal negator, it follows that *minga* alone will suffice to negate the clause. Regarding the ungrammaticality of (13), Zanuttini (1997a: 172, fn 28) notes that a very similar state of affairs is attested in Piedmontese. In this dialect (also stage III), the presuppositional negator *pa* is banned from the preverbal position, providing further evidence in favour of a tie between the impossibility of preposing the presuppositional negator and the lack of a

preverbal negator in the language. Conversely, negation in Teolese is marked preverbally (stage I). Consequently, the presuppositional negator *mia* must co-occur with the canonical preverbal negator *no*, on a par with N. R. Italian. Unlike the latter, however, Teolese does not allow *mia* to appear preverbally:

- (15) \*So moiere **mia** parecia i bigoi  
       his wife neg.PRES prepares the bigoi  
       ‘@His wife does not prepare *bigoi*’

The same ban is attested also in Paduan and Venetian, as observed by Zanuttini (1997a: 172, fn 28), who concludes that the impossibility of placing the presuppositional marker in preverbal position cannot be tied only to the lack of a preverbal negative marker. For the sake of the present discussion, it is sufficient to note that in both Milanese and Teolese the verb must climb over Neg<sub>1presuppositional</sub>, consistently with the movement to the bottom of the HAS observed above. Finally, examples in (5A) show the expected raising of the verb across the remainder of the LAS. Based on the data reported here, I conclude that in Milanese and Teolese the finite lexical verb targets the same landing site as N. R. Italian, that is a position comprised between Asp<sub>habitual</sub> and Mod<sub>volitional</sub>.

### 2.1.2.2 Central Italy: Livorno, Sassoferrato

In this section I discuss the extension of verb movement exhibited by two central varieties: the one spoken in Livorno (Tuscany) and the one of Sassoferrato (Ancona, Marche). From a classificatory point of view, Livornese belongs to the Western group of Tuscan dialects (Castelli 1993: 9), while the dialect of Sassoferrato falls into the broader category of ‘marchigiano centrale’ (Pellegrini 1977). As is to be expected from a transitional area such as central Italy, it will be shown that the Tuscan and the Marche varieties do not behave uniformly.

On a par with the varieties reviewed so far, neither Livornese (6A-a) nor Sassoferrate (6A-b) allow the verb to climb over high adverbs such as ‘usually’ (while the lower ‘intentionally / on purpose’ does not offer any clue, as it preferably appears in a post-complement position, after the direct object, cf. (6A-c) and (6A-d)). Moving down to the LAS, the behaviour of these two varieties diverges. While in Livornese the verb typically climbs over the presuppositional negator *mia* (16a), in Sassoferrate this pattern is perceived as a northern calque, the natural placement being that in which the verb stays lower (16b):<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> A short survey I conducted on a selection of articles from a local newspaper (<http://www.vernacoliere.com/index.php>) confirms that the genuine pattern in Livornese is postverbal *mia* (7A). The possibility that the preverbal placement of *mia*, as occasionally uttered by Tuscans, may not be autochthonous is also suggested by Rohlf's (1969: 305).



- (16) a 'R su marito un porta **mia** (porta) i crostoni (Liv.)  
 the her husband not brings neg.PRES the crostoni  
 '@Her husband is not bringing the crostoni'
- b La munella (\*non magna) **mica** magna la pasta (Sass.)  
 the girl neg.PRES eats the pasta  
 '@The girl doesn't eat pasta'

The analysis of the preverbal placement of Sassoferatese *mica* as the result of the low placement of the verb (rather than the displacement of *mica* itself, as suggested for N. R. Italian, see Schifano 2015e), is supported by the fact that the verb follows other low adverbs, as discussed below, unlike in N. R. Italian. Also note that if in this variety (and in all southern ones exhibiting preverbal *mica*) the preverbal placement of *mica* were the result of the displacement of the adverb (e.g. to the Spec of the higher NegP, hosting *non*), the opposite pattern (i.e. that in which *mica* is sitting in its default position, hence surfacing postverbally) should be attested too, contrary to fact.

Moving down the LAS, we expect to see the low adverbs appear postverbally in Livornese, as confirmed by (17):

- (17) a 'R su marito fa **sempre** (\*fa) 'r dorce  
 the her husband makes always the dessert  
 'Her husband always makes the dessert'
- b 'R su marito coce **bene** (\*coce) la ciccia  
 the her husband cooks well the meat  
 'Her husband is good at cooking meat'

Conversely, Sassoferatese exhibits a lower verb placement, consistently with the pattern suggested by the obligatorily preverbal placement of *mica* (16b). More specifically, the verb is allowed to follow 'already', although the opposite placement is preferred (Peverini 2009: 63):<sup>13</sup>

- (18) A tre anne nun magnava **aggia** (nun magnava) più gnente  
 at three years not (s)he.ate.IPFV already more nothing  
 'Already at the age of three (s)he was not eating anything anymore'

Similarly, both the preverbal and postverbal placements of *ancora* are admitted, but in this case the preference lies in the lower placement of the verb (Peverini *ibid.*):

- (19) Maria (pia) **ancora** pia l treno, quando bocca nte la stazione  
 M. still takes the train when it.enters in the station  
 'M. still takes the train as soon as it gets into the station'

<sup>13</sup> The fact that this example contains an imperfect rather than a present can be disregarded as the two exhibit the same placement (§2.2.6.1).