



Università  
Ca'Foscari  
Venezia

Corso di Dottorato di ricerca  
in Lingue, culture e società moderne  
e Scienze del linguaggio  
ciclo 31°

Tesi di Ricerca

**Multiple Agreement Constructions  
in Southern Italo-Romance**

The Syntax of Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination

SSD: L-LIN/01

**Coordinatore del Dottorato**

Ch.mo prof. Enric Bou Maqueda

**Supervisora**

Ch.ma prof.ssa Giuliana Giusti

**Dottorando**

Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro

Matricola 964012



# Table of contents

<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	1
1.1 Aims of the dissertation.....	1
1.2 Collection, organisation and display of the data.....	2
1.3 Protocol Linguistics.....	4
1.4 Structure of the dissertation.....	5

## Part I

<b>2. Multiple Agreement Constructions in Southern Italy</b> .....	8
2.1 The Infinitival Construction in Romance.....	8
2.2 The “unpopularity of the Infinitive” in Southern Italy.....	13
2.3 Pseudo-Coordination.....	23
2.4 The Neapolitan asyndetic complementation.....	32
2.5 A protocol for the Multiple Agreement Constructions.....	37
2.6 Research questions.....	39
<b>3. Different accounts of Multiple Agreement Constructions</b> .....	42
3.1.1 From Ascoli to Leone: the first accounts of Pseudo-Coordination.....	42
3.1.2 Sornicola (1976) .....	46
3.1.3 Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) .....	51
3.1.4 Manzini & Savoia (2005) .....	62
3.1.5 Cruschina (2013) .....	66
3.1.6 Di Caro & Giusti (2015) .....	75
3.1.7 Todaro & Del Prete (2018) .....	81
3.1.8 Cardinaletti & Giusti (2019) .....	84
3.2 Pseudo-Coordination in non-Romance languages.....	89
3.2.1 Pseudo-Coordination in the Germanic languages.....	89
3.2.2 Pseudo-Coordination in the Semitic languages.....	98
3.3 Serial Verb Constructions.....	106
3.3.1 What are Serial Verb Constructions.....	106
3.3.2 Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination as a particular type of SVCs.....	110

<b>4. New insights on Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination</b> .....	115
4.1 Di Caro’s (2018) proposal: three types of Pseudo-Coordination.....	115
4.2 The selection of V1.....	116
4.3 The selection of Mood and Tense.....	124
4.4 The selection of V2.....	130
4.5 The selection of Person.....	136
4.6 The grammaticalisation of V1 GO.....	142
4.7 Conclusions and open questions.....	150

## Part II

<b>5. Quantitative research on Pseudo-Coordination in the dialect of Delia: some preliminary remarks and the case of the Preterite W-Pattern</b> .....	155
5.1 What are morphemes and the morphomic patterns.....	155
5.2 Some information about Delia.....	157
5.3 Pseudo-Coordination in the dialect of Delia: the Preterite W-Pattern.....	158
5.4 The morphological characteristics of the Indicative Preterite in Deliano.....	166
5.5 Why quantitative research is needed.....	170
5.6 The survey.....	171
5.6.1 Problems in gathering the data.....	171
5.6.1.1 Eliciting Pseudo-Coordination: competing constructions.....	172
5.6.1.2 Eliciting the Preterite W-Pattern: the narrative Tense.....	173
<b>6. Quantitative research on Pseudo-Coordination in the dialect of Delia: the questionnaire and the analysis of the data</b> .....	176
6.1 The questionnaire.....	176
6.1.1 The sample.....	176
6.1.2 The age groups.....	177
6.1.3 How the questionnaire is designed.....	178
6.2 The research hypotheses.....	181
6.2.1 How to assess the emergence of the expected patterns.....	182
6.3 Dataset.....	185
6.4 Analysis and discussion.....	197
6.5 Interim conclusions.....	202

## Part III

<b>7. Conclusions</b> .....	205
<b>References</b> .....	210
<b>Appendices</b> .....	225
Appendix A: Informed consent for adult participants.....	229
Appendix B: Informed consent for participants under 18.....	230
Appendix C: Questionnaire.....	231

## List of tables

1. An example of linguistic protocol.....	4
2. The selection of the connecting element in Southern Italo-Romance with motion V1s.....	39
3. The N-Pattern of PseCo with V1 GO + V2 EAT.....	70
4. The Indicative Present of GO in the Romanian dialect of Fundătura.....	71
5. Different constructions with motion V1 in Sicily.....	76
6. The distribution of V2 in Sicilian PseCo.....	78
7. The distribution of prefixed V1 GO in Eastern Sicilian PseCo.....	80
8. Different constructions with motion V1s across Europe.....	80
9. The paradigm partition of an Indicative Present in Italian.....	85
10. The N-Pattern of the Indicative Present of <i>amare</i> ‘love’.....	86
11. A protocol for PseCo in Sicilian and Arabic dialects.....	105
12. A protocol for Serial Verb Constructions.....	110
13. The distribution of lexical items as V1 in Sicilian PseCo.....	122
14. A protocol for the selection of Moods and Tenses in Sicilian PseCo.....	130
15. The distribution of PseCo with <i>a</i> across Moods and Tenses in Pitrè (1993 [1875]) .....	137
16. The distribution of asyndetic PseCo across Moods and Tenses in Pitrè (1993 [1875]) .....	138
17. The distribution of the InfCo across Moods and Tenses in Pitrè (1993 [1875]) .....	138
18. A protocol for the selection of the Person in Sicilian PseCo with V1 GO.....	141
19. A protocol for the selection of the Person in Sicilian PseCo with V1 COME.....	141
20. The N-Pattern of V1 GO in Deliano.....	156
21. The Indicative Preterite of <i>fari</i> ‘do/make’, <i>mìntiri</i> ‘put’ and <i>vìviri</i> ‘drink’.....	161
22. The Indicative Preterite of <i>vidiri</i> ‘see’, <i>sèntiri</i> ‘hear’ and <i>crìdiri</i> ‘believe’.....	161
23. The Indicative Preterite of <i>dari</i> ‘give’ and <i>stari</i> ‘stay’.....	162
24. The Indicative Preterite of <i>pigliari</i> ‘fetch’, <i>capiri</i> ‘understand’, <i>muriri/mòriri</i> ‘die’.....	162
25. Regular and suppletive Indicative Preterite of <i>sèntiri</i> ‘hear’.....	163
26. Regular and suppletive Indicative Preterite of <i>muriri/mòriri</i> ‘die’.....	163
27. The arhizotonic Indicative Preterite in Standard Italian and Deliano.....	167
28. The rhizotonic Indicative Preterite in Standard Italian and Deliano.....	167
29. Grid for testing the emergence of the N-Pattern in the Indicative Present.....	182
30. Grid for testing the emergence of the N-Pattern in the Imperative.....	183
31. Grid for testing the emergence of the W-Pattern in the Indicative Preterite.....	183
32. The emergence of the expected N- and W-Patterns.....	186
33. The results of the Indicative Present PseCo with V1 GO.....	187

34. The results of the Imperative PseCo with V1 GO.....	189
35. The results of the Indicative Present PseCo with V1 COME.....	190
36. The results of the Indicative Preterite PseCo with V1 GO.....	192
37. Demografic data of the participants.....	195
38. An overview of the 'Idk' answers.....	196
39. Emergence of the expected patterns (in percentage).....	198
40. The Indicative Present and Preterite of <i>jiri</i> 'go' in Deliano.....	199
41. Acceptability of some V2s in the Ind. Pret. PseCo (in percentage) .....	200
42. Results of the Mann-Whitney test.....	201

## Abbreviations

1SG	First Person singular
2SG	Second Person singular
3SG	Third person singular
1PL	First Person plural
2PL	Second Person plural
3PL	Third person plural
ACC	Accusative
Agr	Agreement
CL	Clitic
C(P)	Complementiser (Phrase)
DAT	Dative
DET	Determiner
F	Feminine
FinCo	Finite Construction
Fin(P)	Finiteness (Phrase)
FUT	Future
GEN	Genitive
GFC	'Go for' Construction
IMP	Imperative
IMPRF	Imperfect
INF	Infinitive
InfCo	Infinitival Construction
<i>init</i> (P)	Initiation/Causation (Phrase)
LOC	Locative
M	Masculine
MAC	Multiple Agreement Construction
MEP	Macro-Event Property
MP	Modal Particle
NEG	Negation
PAST	Preterite
PAST.PART	Past Participle
PERF	Perfective
PRES	Present



<i>proc</i> (P)	Process (Phrase)
PseCo	Pseudo-Coordination
REFL	Reflexive
<i>res</i> (P)	Result (Phrase)
RF	Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico (Phonosyntactic Doubling)
SE	Surprise Effect
SFI	Seconda Forma dell'Infinito (Second Form of the Infinitive)
SUBJ	Subjunctive
SVC	Serial Verb Construction
TAM	Tense-Aspect-Mood
T(P)	Tense (Phrase)
<i>t</i> (P)	Little <i>t</i> (Phrase)
V1	First verb of the construction
V2	Second verb of the construction
V(P)	Verb (Phrase)
<i>v</i> (P)	Little <i>v</i> (Phrase)

## Acknowledgements

Three years is a great deal of time, in which many things can happen, and many others inevitably change. For this reason, I find that it would be a bit unfair to try to be (too) concise in acknowledging all the people who played a role during my doctoral research process.

It would have been impossible to write this thesis without the help of the hundreds of people speaking Sicilian dialects I have interviewed, talked to, listened to, or even simply eavesdropped in those public places where one generally has to wait in a queue for long. It is thanks to those people that I now always keep an ear to the ground when I am in Sicily, ready to detect new linguistic phenomena to investigate.

What I owe to my PhD supervisor Prof. Giuliana Giusti can hardly be summarised in these few lines. She has been a constant source of inspiration and a guide for me. Since the very beginning of my three years in Venice, she has believed in the potential of my research and has encouraged me to take part in International conferences, even after just a couple of months of my moving to Venice. Her precious advice has always aimed, not only to allow me to do better work with my research, but at my growth as a professional in the field of Linguistics as a whole. She has fostered my passion for Linguistics and, in particular, for dialectology. Moreover, she has taught me the importance of keeping an open dialogue with colleagues of different fields and theoretical persuasion to pay justice to the linguistic phenomena, without entrenching myself behind a given framework. Among the many things I am grateful to her, I would like to mention the opportunity she gave me to co-author two papers and to co-organise my first international conference in Venice, the “Workshop on Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions - PseCoMAC 2017”, which turned to be an incredible professional experience. For this latter matter, I would like to thank, again, all the speakers, the organizing committee, the supporting crew and the audience of that event.

As is usual for those who are lucky enough to have a caring, supportive family behind them, I wish to pay a little tribute to mine. My parents, Angela and Rocco, may not exactly know all the subtleties of the syntactic constructions described in my thesis, but they surely know what it means to be eagerly waiting for an important e-mail that can decide whether you are going to take part in a conference, or to have a paper published. They have supported me in all possible ways and have understood all the times I had to neglect my family because of an important deadline. With this respect, my cousins “Pezzettoni” have been so kind to pretend they were interested in my work (but in a very convincing way), to let me pour out when I needed it the most, to give me shelter during some of my many travels up and down Italy, and to put me in touch with new informants, not only from Sicily.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Silvio Cruschina and Fabio Del Prete for having read the first draft of my thesis and providing me with helpful remarks for its reviewing process. I first met them both in Vienna during the “11th Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax-Morphology Meeting” (an event that would have become particularly dear to me in the following years) and, since then, I have had the fortune to benefit from their kind availability to comment on my generalisations as I managed to collect new data.

My doctoral adventure in Venice started three years ago with the crucial help from Fiorenza Bonutto, who hosted (and put up with) me at her house in Mestre during what I like to call my “Mestre Quarantine”. In Venice, I have found a second family of colleagues who very soon became dear friends: I have shared with Silvia D’Ortenzio, Fabiana Fazzi, Valeria Tonioli and Camilla Spaliviero all the lovely moments in Venice, consisting of meals made of delicacies from Southern Italy, long walks along Zattere on sunny days, afternoon ice-creams around the city, multi-cultural and multi-ethnic dinners with new friends from all over the world. But, of course, being a family also means having to cope with less pleasant moments such as the crazy moves from flat to flat carrying heavy luggage over the endless bridges of Venice, the (unfortunately too many) hearts broken, the deep professional crises that, inevitably, hit each of us at given times during our research activities.

The Ca’ Foscari University of Venice gave me the opportunity to work in a very stimulating environment. I would like to thank Chiara Branchini, Laura Brugè, Marina Buzzoni, Anna Cardinaletti, Guglielmo Cinque, Alessandra Giorgi, Roland Hinterhölzl and Nicola Munaro for their work at Ca’ Foscari. Working in our studio at Ca’ Bembo was made more enjoyable by my colleagues Chiara Calderone, Chiara Dal Farra, Chiara De Bastiani, Elena Fornasiero, Beatrice Giuliano, Francesco Pinzin and Laura Volpato, with whom I could share both demanding debates over specific morpho-syntactic phenomena and easygoing chats, laughter and, obviously, snacks. Although being mostly abroad for their research, Lucio De Capitani and Francesca Pasciolla surely belong to this group of doctoral fellow-adventurers.

I also thank all the BA students of the courses of General Linguistics at Ca’ Foscari that I have tutored in these three years. With their unceasing questions on many aspects of this subject, they have helped me fine-tune my understanding of the basics of Generative Grammar.

I spent the Lent Term of 2018 as a visiting PhD student at the University of Cambridge, where I had already taken part in a conference in the summer of 2017. A heart-felt ‘thank you’ goes to Theresa Biberauer for her warm welcome, for always cheering me up at a point in my work in which many doubts flooded my mind, for discussing with me many aspects of my research and inviting me to give a talk on my quantitative study at the SyntaxLab seminars. Luigi Andriani and

Norma Schifano, two key-people during my stay in Cambridge, also gave me the opportunity to discuss my data in a talk given at the ARC Romance Linguistics Seminars. I wish to thank Ian Roberts and Michelle Sheehan for their insightful comments during my two talks, and Adam Ledgeway for discussing my data with me at length. I thank Valentina Colasanti, Kim Groothuis and Giuseppina Silvestri for making me feel part of their team in the Italian Department at Sidgwick Site, and Jamie Douglas for always being there for some proofreading. It is thanks to all of them if I feel a bit at home when I am there.

I am grateful to Alessandro De Angelis for his helpful advice on the relevant literature about Southern Italo-Romance dialects. Many thanks go to Mariangela Aronica, Ada Bier and Nicole Cilia, who helped me shape the paper questionnaire in its previous versions, and to Giulia Bencini, Anna Esposito, Maria Garraffa and Francesca Volpato for their remarks on different aspects of my quantitative study.

I also wish to thank all the linguists that I have met over these three years for their feedback about my research: Metin Bağriaçık, Konstantina Balasi, Salvatore Bancheri, Caterina Bonan, Andrea Calabrese, Jan Casalicchio, Roberta D'Alessandro, Asmaa El Hansali, Riccardo Ginevra, Elvira Graziano, Cristina Guardiano, Paolo Lorusso, Io Manolessou, Iara Mantenuto, Karen Martini Fabio Montermini, Silvia Perpiñán, Roberto Petrosino, Giuseppe Samo, Giusi Todaro, Giuseppe Torcolacci, Daniel Ross, Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson, Nicoletta Swinburne and Stanislao Zompi.

I am very grateful to Michaela Vann, who has proofread this work and has patiently listened to me during my sometimes-tortuous reasoning over the best way to translate the Sicilian examples into English. Naturally, all inadequacies remain my own.

This thesis is dedicated to my mother, my father and to the memory of my grandfather Vincenzo who, having been an impenitent speaker of the dialect of his hometown Gela, even after 50 years spent in Delia, must have secretly instilled in me an ear for dialects different from mine.

Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro

Delia, December 2018

# Chapter 1: Introduction

This dissertation deals with a group of different verbal configurations, referring to the phenomenon of Pseudo-Coordination, which are typical of the Sicilian dialects. These are monoclausal syntactic constructions formed by a restructuring verb (V1), usually of motion, followed by a finite lexical verb (V2), with an optional linking element between them (*a* or, more rarely, *e*). Such constructions belong to a wider group found in Southern Italo-Romance, referred to as *Multiple Agreement Constructions*. Pseudo-Coordination, in all its configurations, displays defective paradigms and a high degree of microvariation with regard to what verbs can occur as V1, what verbs can occur as V2, what cells of the paradigm can be filled (the ungrammatical cells being filled by an alternative construction featuring an infinitival V2), and in what Moods and Tense the construction is allowed.

In the first chapter, which presents the aims of this dissertation, some issues concerning how to collect the data, the main difficulties this activity has encountered, and how to display the data are discussed. With regard to the latter point, a specific way to display the data discussed, known as Protocol Linguistics, and the theoretical justification behind them is presented. The chapter ends with some research questions that have guided the study on Pseudo-Coordination, some of which are still open and request further investigations.

## 1.1 Aims of the dissertation

This dissertation was conceived to provide a wide overview of Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination, a syntactic construction which is introduced together with the other competing constructions typical of Southern Italo-Romance varieties. It does so by discussing the main parameters of microvariation that explain for the high number of different configurations found cross-dialectally in Sicily, and by offering the readers a digest of the relevant published literature, in which the most important contributions to the understanding of Pseudo-Coordination are highlighted. In order to propose new avenues for future research, each parameter of microvariation discussed is followed by a hierarchy indicating which elements are most likely to occur in Pseudo-Coordination and in which order of appearance, and which features these elements are more likely to display.

There is also another aim, to which the second part of this dissertation is entirely dedicated, that is to discuss the results of a quantitative study concerning one Sicilian variety, i.e. that spoken in Delia, to assess i) whether Pseudo-Coordination is productive among speakers of different ages, and ii) whether the prediction that specific paradigm patterns – which are ultimately the result of some typical Mood, Tense and Person restrictions –, should consistently emerge through the

speakers' grammaticality judgements is borne out. The hope that the quantitative study presented could be a point of reference for future research on the microvariation of Pseudo-Coordination in other areas of Sicily is expressed in the end of the relevant part of the dissertation.

## **1.2 Collection, organisation and display of the data**

The present section illustrates the rationale for the disposition of the data provided. This dissertation contains a large amount of linguistic data from many languages of the world, from both the existing literature and recent fieldwork. Sometimes, some examples found in the literature on Italo-Romance Multiple Agreement Constructions, and in particular on Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination, are not geographically accurate, especially in case of diachronic data. For example, the term 'Sicilian' can be used to indicate any of the dialects spoken in Sicily, which on the one hand is common practice in linguistics but on the other hand can be very misleading when it comes to constructions that display such a high degree of microvariation, because it does not allow us to attribute that particular configuration to a given dialect. With this regard, I have tried to trace back the actual dialect a given example refers to, but sometimes this has not been possible. In any case, in order to distinguish between the names of the languages and the names of the places, I have used italics for the former and a regular typeface for the latter (with the name of the related province within brackets). The examples whose reference is not indicated are to be considered from my own fieldwork.

Throughout the dissertation the English rendition of Sicilian examples can change, according to the choice of the authors cited. I am aware of the fact that sentences like 'I go to fetch the bread' or 'I go to do the shopping' necessitate more context in order for the Indicative Present Simple to be effective (otherwise a Present Continuous should be used instead). Nevertheless, in line with an established tradition, I have kept the Present Simple in the English translation, unless the original example provides enough context to opt for the Present Continuous or for other solutions. Another translation-related issue to deal with was the one concerning the rendition of the Imperatives. In this case, I have proposed the 'Go (and) do...' translation for the novel examples, whereas some examples from the published literature propose the infinitival 'Go to do...', which I have kept. Furthermore, being the Indicative Present the default Tense for most examples, I have kept its indication (i.e. PRES) away from the glosses with the exception of languages such as Swedish, where verbs display no overt inflectional features for Person.

The verbs discussed are generally displayed in small caps and in English (eg. GO, STAND and COME BACK) when the discussion focusses on their syntactic or semantic properties, irrespective of the language-specific verbal morphology. Otherwise, the verbs are presented in their original

language, in italics, followed by their English translation (i.e. *jiri* ‘go’, *stari* ‘stand’ and *turnari* ‘come back’). Moreover, with regard to the cross-linguistic property of some verbs to occur in an invariable form, I have glossed them in small caps (as for all the other verbs in the examples) without indicating any Person features, when the nature of the invariable form does not impinge on the relevant discussion. When, on the other hand, the particular form of the verb is relevant, because it is one of a set of allomorphs available for a given verb, I have kept the original invariable form in the glosses, in italics.

As regards Sicilian-specific issues, a note must be made concerning the rendition of the 3SG clitic pronoun *lu* in Southern Italo-Romance dialects, which is ambiguous between ‘him’ and ‘it’. Generally, I have shown both possibilities in the glosses and the translations of novel data and in those examples from the existing literature where no clear translation were provided (for example, in case a given paper only provides an Italian translation of dialectal data, the Italian clitic pronoun *lo* displays the same ambiguity). On the contrary, I have kept the original translations (i.e. either ‘him’ or ‘it’) in those examples where the semantics was enough to disambiguate (as in Sicilian *lu vaju a mmangiu* / Italian *lo vado a mangiare* ‘I go and eat it/\*him’). The same criterion was applied to the clitic *cci*, which is ambiguous between the locative ‘there’ and the dative ‘to him/her/it/them’.

As regards the graphic renditions of the dialectal data, I have followed the original versions for the examples taken from the literature. Note that in some cases the authors have opted for the phonetic or semiphonetic transcription, while in others the examples have been written in normal typeface but with different notations. This is particularly evident for the examples from the Semitic languages and from the Southern Italo-Romance dialects. For the new dialectal data, I have tried to use a consistent rendition. Note that, in this latter case, the graphic accent is always grave and is signed on the vowel of the ultima (i.e. the last syllable) or on the antepenult (i.e. the third from last syllable), but never on the penult (i.e. the second from last), which is considered as the default stressed syllable. This, however, does not imply any indication on the nature of the vowel (i.e. whether is it to be pronounced open or closed).

In conclusion, a note on the nomenclature used in this dissertation. Pseudo-Coordination is a phenomenon which has been labelled in many different ways. These are presented in Chapter 3, where, however, I have kept the label ‘Pseudo-Coordination’ when discussing the main contributions to the study of this phenomenon.

### 1.3 Protocol Linguistics

In this dissertation, I intend to continue the research tradition started with Di Caro & Giusti (2015) in which Protocol Linguistics is applied for the first time to Italo-Romance Multiple Agreement Constructions. Protocol Linguistics is a research project started in 2011 by Giuliana Giusti, which aims at

“the creation of tools of syntactic analysis to enhance positive linguistic awareness on the general principles underlying the human language capacity and the modalities of differentiation (parameters) that make languages vary in a form which is less wild and unpredictable than usually perceived. This will contribute to create inclusive cultural identity and preserve the linguistic heritage of minority groups in forms that are accessible to modern scientific research as well as apt to dissemination.”

(Giusti 2011)

These tools of syntactic analysis have already been used in Giusti & Zegrean (2015) – where they have received a formal description – and in Giusti & Iovino (2016) to deal with, respectively, the clausal structure in Istro-Romanian, and Psych Verbs in Latin and Italian, proof of their high versatility. Protocols consist of simple table-charts with the horizontal axis displaying the languages or dialects under analysis, and the vertical axis displaying the properties to be tested. The way the data are displayed is conceived to facilitate the drawing of possible implications and correlations among properties and to suggest possible alleys for further research.

**Table 1. An example of linguistic protocol**

	?	Language 1	Language 2	Language 3	Language 4	?
property 1	-	+	+	+	-	+
property 2	-	-	+	+	+	+
feature 1	0	0	+	+	+	+
feature 2	0	0	-	+/-	+	+
feature 3	0	0	-	-	?	+
property 3	-	-	-	-	+	+

The protocol exemplified in Table 1 must be read as follows: each of the four languages under analysis are tested for three main properties. The second property is actually a cluster of properties (e.g. three different Tenses in which a given verbal construction could occur, or the three Genders the nominal inflection of a given noun could be sensitive to), which are displayed individually in the right part of the column. The columns at the two edges are marked ‘?’ to suggest that there can be two (or more) varieties – to be investigated in further research – in which the properties tested



are all missing (left-most column) or all present (right-most column). Note that there may be a ‘?’ put at any point in the horizontal axis to indicate that some varieties not yet documented could display e.g. a ‘+’ for the properties 1 and 3 and a ‘-’ for property 2. The mark ‘+/-’ indicates that for that given property the outcome ‘+’ or ‘-’ depends on other properties, not listed in the protocol. Finally, the mark ‘?’ as value for any property means that either that piece of information is not available in the literature or that the researcher could not test it in his or her fieldwork.

As is clear from Giusti’s claim above, the aims of protocols go beyond Linguistics. While they try to bridge the gap in terms of too highly specialised (and thus non-mutually intelligible) terminology between disciplines that all have language as their object of study or application – such as social sciences, endangered language policies, neuro-psychology and language rehabilitation, pedagogy and language education – protocols are also meant to be a means through which to enhance language awareness, by disseminating knowledge on differences and similarities across languages. The kind of language awareness promoted by Protocol Linguistics finally aims at enhancing inclusive cultural identity.

Given the high degree of microvariation found in the syntactic constructions dealt with in this dissertation, proposing linguistic protocols has the twofold purpose of suggesting more fine-grained alleys for future research – especially on the parameters of microvariation –, and providing researchers of different theoretical frameworks with data displayed in a comparable and easy to handle way.

#### **1.4 Structure of the dissertation**

This dissertation has a tripartite structure. Beside this introductory chapter, the first part is composed of three more chapters and analyses the phenomenon of Multiple Agreement Constructions in Southern Italy at length. More specifically, Chapter 2 addresses a phenomenon widespread in Southern Italo-Romance, namely the loss of the Infinitive. Two main groups of related syntactic constructions featuring two inflected verbs are identified and presented: the Finite Construction and Pseudo-Coordination, the latter being the main topic of the dissertation.

Chapter 3 offers a detailed overview of the previous literature from the first studies, published more than one century ago, to the latest additions. This overview discusses the nature of the contribution that each work has given to the understanding of the relevant construction. Chapter 3 also offers a brief overview of the main studies on Pseudo-Coordination as found in Germanic – where it is a widespread phenomenon – and in some Semitic languages, and on Serial Verb Constructions, syntactic constructions sharing many properties with Pseudo-Coordination, which are typical of non-European languages. In Chapter 4 new data from different Sicilian varieties are

discussed and a series of hierarchies in the selection of the two verbs involved, and of the Mood, Tense and Person restrictions found in Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination are proposed.

The second part of the dissertation is dedicated to the discussion on the first quantitative research concerning Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination. In particular, Chapter 5 introduces the syntactic features that make the Pseudo-Coordination found in the dialect of Delia worth investigating. It also provides an overview of the linguistic characteristics of the place where the study was conducted and discusses the main problems in gathering data that led to the solution used in the questionnaire. Chapter 6 describes the structure of the questionnaire, presents and discusses the data collected and provides an analysis of the results obtained. Finally, Chapter 7 – which constitutes the third and last part of the dissertation – draws the conclusions and leaves some open questions to address further research on this very multi-faceted topic.

## **PART I**

## Chapter 2. Multiple Agreement Constructions in Southern Italy

This chapter provides an overview of the richness of syntactic configurations found in Southern Italy when a lexical verb is followed by a second lexical verb, with or without a connecting element between them. What is typical of these constructions is the fact that both verbs share the same inflectional features. For this reason, I generally refer to them in this dissertation as *Multiple Agreement Constructions* (henceforth MACs). Since MACs represent a striking exception in West Romance, where infinitival hypotaxis is preferred, this chapter will open with a brief overview of some of the varieties where this latter construction is obligatory, after which a synopsis of a number of MACs in Southern Italo-Romance will be given.

The difference among the various configurations described lies on a number of characteristics ranging from the defectiveness of the paradigms to the selection of the verbs involved, from the obligatory correspondence of Tense/Mood/Aspect features for the two verbs to the possibility for these constructions to co-occur with an infinitival counterpart in one and the same variety. However, there seems to be an areal criterion that helps us make an important distinction. Two main different groups of MACs will then emerge: on the one hand, a type that instantiates a biclausal construction and that is typical of Southern Italy, with just a marginal role in Sicily; on the other hand, a type that is monoclausal and is widespread in Sicily, which is the main focus of this dissertation. At the end of the chapter, some theoretical questions will be addressed concerning what diagnostics can be applied to distinguish the biclausal from the monoclausal MACs, and if such a distinction is always possible.

### 2.1 The Infinitival Construction in Romance

In most Western Romance varieties, when verbs like GO, COME and WANT are followed by another verb, the latter appears in the Infinitive. The first verb of this construction will henceforth be referred to as V1, while the second verb as V2. The examples in (1-5)<sup>1</sup>, from the main West Romance varieties, provide some instances of this Infinitival Construction (henceforth, InfCo)<sup>2</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup> Following a well-established tradition in the literature on Southern Italo-Romance varieties (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003; Di Caro 2015, 2019; Di Caro & Giusti 2015, 2018), I will mainly use the V2 FETCH (in combination with “some bread”) in novel examples with transitive V2s preceded by motion V1s, as well as the V2 BUY (for reasons that will become clear later one in this dissertation). The default intransitive V2s in novel examples, when needed, will be WORK and RUN. Note that the Indicative Present, being the default tense in the examples, will not be indicated in the glosses.

- (1) a. *Vado a prendere / comprare il pane.*  
 go.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
 ‘I go to fetch / buy the bread.’
- b. *Vengo a prendere / comprare il pane.*  
 come.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
 ‘I come to fetch / buy the bread.’
- c. *Voglio leggere un libro.*  
 want.1SG read.INF a book  
 ‘I want to read a book.’

[Italian]

- (2) a. *Je vais prendre / acheter du pain.*  
 I go.1SG fetch.INF / buy.INF of-the bread  
 ‘I go to fetch / buy some bread.’ / ‘I will fetch / buy some bread.’
- b. *Je viens à prendre / acheter du pain.*  
 I come.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF of-the bread  
 ‘I come to fetch / buy some bread.’
- c. *Je veux lire un livre.*  
 I want.1SG read.INF a book

---

<sup>2</sup> The InfCo is the only possible construction in these languages when V1 is a motion verb, and also when the subject of V2 is controlled by the subject of V1 WANT. Compare (ia) with (1a), (ib) with (1b) and (ic) with (1c):

- (i) a. *\*Vado che prendo / compro il pane.*  
 go.1SG that fetch.1SG / buy.1SG the bread
- b. *\*Vengo che prendo / compro il pane.*  
 come.1SG that fetch.1SG / buy.1SG the bread
- c. *\*Voglio che leggo un libro.*  
 want.1SG that read.1SG a book
- c'. *Voglio che legga un libro.*  
 want.1SG that read.SUB.PRES.3SG a book  
 ‘I want him/her to read a book.’

[Italian]

‘I want to read a book.’

[French]

- (3) a. *Voy a coger / comprar el pan.*  
go.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
‘I go to fetch / buy some bread.’ / ‘I will fetch / buy some bread.’
- b. *Mañana vienes a recoger / comprar el pan?*  
tomorrow come.2SG to retrieve.INF / buy.INF the bread  
‘Will you come (at my place) to retrieve / buy the bread?’
- c. *Quiero leer un libro.*  
want.1SG read.INF a book  
‘I want to read a book.’

[Spanish]

- (4) a. *Vou buscar / comprar pão.*  
go.1SG fetch.INF / buy.INF bread  
‘I go to fetch / buy some bread.’ / ‘I will fetch / buy some bread.’
- b. *Venho buscar / comprar pão.*  
come.1SG fetch.INF / buy.INF bread  
‘I come to fetch / buy some bread.’
- c. *Quero ler um livro.*  
want.1SG read.INF a book  
‘I want to read a book.’

[Portuguese]

- (5) a. *Vaig a prendre / comprar el pa.*  
go.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
‘I go to fetch / buy some bread.’
- b. *Vinc a prendre / comprar el pa.*  
come.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
‘I come to fetch / buy some bread.’
- c. *Vull llegir un llibre.*  
want.1SG fetch.INF a book

‘I want to read a book.’

[Catalan]

This hypotactic construction with infinitival V2 is also found in most Northern, Central, Middle Southern Italo-Romance, and Sardinian varieties, again as the only possible construction. Here are some examples I could collect in my recent fieldwork:

- (6) a. *A vag a tor / comprar al pan.*  
I go.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
‘I go to fetch / buy some bread.’ / ‘I will fetch / buy some bread.’
- b. *A jen a tor / comprar al pan.*  
I come.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
‘I come to fetch / buy some bread.’
- c. *A voi lezar un libar.*  
I want.1SG read.INF a book  
‘I want to read a book.’

[Ferrara]

- (7) a. *(Me) vu a töl / cumprà ul pan.*  
I go.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
‘I go to fetch / buy some bread.’
- b. *(Me) vegni a töl / cumprà ul pan.*  
I come.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
‘I come to fetch / buy some bread.’
- c. *(Me) voeuri lengi un liber.*  
I want.1SG read.INF a book  
‘I want to read a book.’

[Ponte Lambro (Como)]

- (8) a. *Vagu a ppigià / accattà u ppan.*  
go.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
‘I go to fetch / buy the bread.’

b. *Vegnu a ppigià / accattà u ppan.*  
 come.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
 ‘I come to fetch / buy the bread.’

c. *Oeggiu leze in libru.*  
 want.1SG read.INF a book  
 ‘I want to read a book.’

[Genoa]

(9) a. *Vajà a ppijà / accattà lu panə.*  
 go.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
 ‘I go to fetch / buy some bread.’

b. *Venghə a ppijà / accattà lu panə.*  
 come.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
 ‘I come to fetch / buy some bread.’

c. *Vujà legge nu libbrə.*  
 want.1SG read.INF a book  
 ‘I want to read a book.’

[Rosciano (Pescara)]

(10) a. *Vaghə a ppiglià / accattà r panə.*  
 go.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
 ‘I go to fetch / buy the bread.’ / ‘I will fetch / buy the bread.’

b. *Venghə a ppiglià / accattà r panə.*  
 come.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
 ‘I come to fetch / buy some bread.’

c. *Vogliə leggə nu libbrə.*  
 want.1SG read.INF a book  
 ‘I want to read a book.’

[Brienza (Potenza)]

The sample cases of this hypotactic construction in Italo-Romance is completed by instances of InfCo throughout Sicily. The examples in (11) and (12) are from Palermitan and Deliano, but are good representatives of a general trend in the island:



- (11) a. *Vaju a ppigghjari / accattari u pani.*  
 go.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
 ‘I go to fetch / buy some bread.’
- b. *Vegnu a ppigghjari / accattari u pani.*  
 come.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
 ‘I come to fetch / buy some bread.’
- c. *Mi vogghju leggiri un libbru.*  
 to-me.CL want.1SG fetch.INF a book  
 ‘I want to read a book.’

[Palermo]

- (12) a. *Vaju a ppigliari / accattari lu pani.*  
 go.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
 ‘I go to fetch / buy some bread.’
- b. *Vjignu a ppigliari / accattari lu pani.*  
 come.1SG to fetch.INF / buy.INF the bread  
 ‘I come to fetch / buy some bread.’
- c. *Mi vuigliu leggiri un libbru.*  
 to-me.CL want.1SG fetch.INF a book  
 ‘I want to read a book.’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

However, the InfCo in Southern Italy is not the only option for speakers. A number of different combinations of a V1 followed by a finite V2 are available, and sometimes more than one of these constructions can be found in one and the same variety. When this is the case, a subtle difference in the general meaning of the co-occurring constructions arises. The next section will provide an overview of this phenomenon by dealing with each area separately.

## 2.2 The “unpopularity of the Infinitive” in Southern Italy

Rohlf's (1969: §717) uses the expression “unpopularity of the Infinitive” to describe a trend very common in some areas of Southern Italy, where the Infinitive is replaced by a finite verb preceded

by different types of connectors. Rohlfs identifies three main areas where the Infinitive is “unpopular”:

- i) North-Eastern Sicily (with Messina, Naso – on the Tyrrhenian coast – and Taormina – on the Ionian coast – as vertices of the area (cf. De Angelis 2016: 75);
- ii) Southern Calabria (south of the Nicastro-Catanzaro-Crotone line);
- iii) Southern Apulia (south of the Taranto-Ostuni line).

In these areas the finite V2 is generally preceded by a connecting element<sup>3</sup> that can occur in different shapes, according to the area: it occurs as *mi* in Sicilian, as *ma*, *(m)i*, *(m)u* in Calabrian (elements which all derive from Lat. MODO<sup>4</sup>), and as *cu* in Salentino (from Lat. QUOD) (cf. De Angelis 2017: 137)<sup>5</sup>. The verb following these connectors generally occurs in the Indicative Present (but it can be sometimes in the Subjunctive in Salentino), regardless of the Mood / Tense displayed by the matrix verb. According to Rohlfs (1969: 103), the Infinitive is most frequently replaced by a finite V2 when the speaker expresses through V1 his/her will or the aim that he/she has in mind. As will be clear from the examples in (13)-(26), V1 of the InfCo is taken from a wide set of verbs, including motion verbs, modals, causative HAVE / GET, causative LET, deontic HAVE TO, inceptive START, and THINK.

---

<sup>3</sup> There is no general consensus about the syntactic nature of these connecting elements. In Manzini & Savoia’s (2005: 667) analysis, *cu*, *ma*, *(m)i* and *(m)u* are all modal conjunctions merged in a low position of the Left Periphery of the sentence. Other scholars, such as Ledgeway (1998) and Damonte (2010), propose a separate analysis for Salentino *cu*, which is a conjunction, and Southern Calabrian *mu*, which is a modal particle merged in TP. According to Damonte (2010), considering *mu* as a modal particle allows to account for many properties that Southern Calabrian dialects display, such as the fact that they can be preceded by the complementiser *pe*.

For Messinese *mi*, Damonte (2005) proposes a different analysis from *mu* because, despite the fact that they are formally similar, *mi* in Messinese acts as a complementiser, since it can precede an embedded subject. This is not the case in Salentino and in Southern Calabrian dialects. For this reason, Damonte proposes that *mi* is merged in a higher position of CP.

<sup>4</sup> Sorrento (1950: 392) and Rohlfs (1969: 192-193) consider *mu* (found in the province of Catanzaro) as the regular outcome of Latin MODO, with *ma* (city of Catanzaro and its immediate surroundings) and *mi* (Reggio Calabria and Messina) being the result of the crossing of MODO, respectively, with *ca* and *chi* ‘that’. A previous account by Bertoni (1916: §129) attributes to Latin QUOMODO the origin of both *cu* and *ma*, *(m)i* and *(m)u*.

<sup>5</sup> See De Angelis (2016) for an account of the grammaticalisation of Latin MODO into the complementisers *ma*, *(m)i*, *(m)u*. See also Damonte (2009) for an account of the diatopic and morpho-syntactic microvariation of *mu* in Southern Calabrian dialects.

Let us see, in turn, some examples of Finite Construction (FinCo, henceforth) from the areas in (i), (ii) and (iii):

(13) a. *Vaju mi ccattu.*  
 go.1SG *mi* buy.1SG  
 ‘I go to buy.’

b. *Iqđu annau mi si curca.*  
 he go.PAST.1SG *mi* REFL.CL.3SG lay-down.3SG  
 ‘He went to sleep.’

c. *Pinsau mi parti*  
 think.PAST.3SG *mi* leave.3SG  
 ‘He thought about leaving.’

d. *Cercu mi mi votu.*  
 try.1SG *mi* REFL.CL.1SG turn-around.1SG  
 ‘I try to turn around.’

[Rohlf 1969: 103; Province of Messina]

e. *Nom mólì mi cci va.*  
 NEG want.3SG *mi* there.CL go.3SG  
 ‘He doesn’t want him to go there.’

[Tropea 1965: 150 cited in De Angelis 2017: 140; Sant’Alfio (Catania)]

(14) a. *Vogghiu mu mangiu.*  
 want.1SG *mu* eat.1SG  
 ‘I want to eat.’

b. *Vorria mu sacciu.*  
 want.COND.1SG *mu* know.1SG  
 ‘I would like to know.’

c. *Vulia mu mi porta.*  
 want.IMPRF.3SG *mu* to-me.CL bring.3SG  
 ‘He/She wanted to bring me.’

- d. *Vaju mu dormu.*  
 go.1SG *mu* sleep.1SG  
 ‘I go to sleep.’
- e. *Avimu mu partimu.*  
 have.1PL *mu* leave.1PL  
 ‘We have to leave.’
- f. *Vinni mu ti viju.*  
 come.PAST.1SG *mu* you.CL see.1SG  
 ‘I’ve come to see you.’

[Rohlf 1969: 103; *Southern Calabrian*]

- (15) *Vinni ma ti viju.*  
 come.PAST.1SG *ma* you.CL see.1SG  
 ‘I’ve come to see you.’

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 654; Sorbo San Basile (Catanzaro)]

- (16) a. *Se nde sciu cu mmangia.*  
 REFL.CL.3SG LOC.CL go.PAST.3SG *cu* eat.3SG  
 ‘He/She went to eat.’
- b. *Vulia cu ssacciu.*  
 want.IMPRF.1SG *cu* know.1SG  
 ‘I wanted to know.’
- c. *Tocca cu scrivimu.*  
 touch.3SG *cu* write.1PL  
 ‘We have to write.’
- d. *Egnu cu ccercu.*  
 come.1SG *cu* search.1SG  
 ‘I come to search.’

[Rohlf 1969: 103; *Salentino*]

- e. *Lu Karlu ole ku bbene krai.*  
 the Karlu want.3SG *cu* come.3SG tomorrow

‘Karlu wants to come tomorrow.’

[Calabrese 1993: 28; Carmiano (Lecce)]

In these varieties, the phenomenon is so widespread that the Infinitive is replaced by a finite V2 also in the case when it is the argument of a noun, an adjective, or a preposition, or when it is the subject of a sentence:

(17) a. *Ai raggiuni mi ti lagni.*  
have.2SG right mi REFL.CL.2SG complain.2SG  
‘You are right to complain.’

b. *Passai senza mi ti viu.*  
come-by.PAST.1SG without mi you.CL.ACC see.1SG  
‘I came by without seeing you.’

[Rohlf 1969: 103; Province of Messina]

c. *Annu raggiuni mu ti chiamanu ciucciu.*  
have.3PL right mu you.CL.ACC call.3PL ass  
‘They are right to call you an ass.’

[Rohlf 1969: 103; *Southern Calabrian*]

d. *Nun avia curaggiu cu ccánta.*  
NEG have.IMPRF.3SG courage cu sing.3SG  
‘He/She didn’t dare sing.’

[Rohlf 1969: 103; *Salentino*]

Most scholars believe that the disappearance of the Infinitive can be justified by the Greek substratum of these areas<sup>6</sup>, where Greek was spoken until the Middle Ages.<sup>7</sup> Rohlf (1969: 104) points out that the Infinitive became unpopular even in the spoken Greek of Southern Italy (in Southern Calabria and in part of the Salento peninsula), where it was replaced by a subordinate

---

<sup>6</sup> Ledgeway (2013) recognises the general interference effect that Greek has exerted over Southern Italo-Romance varieties, nevertheless he states that the big picture is far from being that uniform, since some verbs are more likely to select the finite embedded clause instead of the infinitival one than other verbs are.

<sup>7</sup> Modern Greek, Romanian and Albanian belong to the Balkan *Sprachbund*, which is characterised by the loss of the Infinitive. In these languages too, the different connecting elements introducing the embedded clause that replaces the Infinitive have been analyzed as both complementisers or modal particles (cf. Rivero & Ralli 2001).

sentence introduced by *hina* ‘that’ (see also Rohlf 1933).<sup>8</sup> But unlike the modern Greek spoken in the mainland, where the Infinitive has disappeared uniformly, the one spoken in Southern Italy has in some cases preserved the Infinitive after verbs like CAN, KNOW, HEAR, MAKE, and LET. Interestingly, with the same verbs, the Infinitive is preferred (but not obligatory) in the Romance varieties of these areas, too:

- (18) *A vitti spugghiari mi si curca.*  
 her.CL see.PAST.1SG undress.INF *mi* REFL.CL.3SG lay-down.3SG  
 ‘I saw her getting undressed to go to sleep.’

[ATP 19, 367 cited in Rohlf 1969: 105; Milazzo (Messina)]

- (19) a. *Pozzu vidiri.*  
 can.1SG see.INF  
 ‘I can see.’

- b. *Sapi scríviri.*  
 know.1SG write.INF  
 ‘I can write.’ (‘I know how to write.’)

- c. *U ntisi gridari.*  
 him.CL hear.PAST.1SG shout.INF  
 ‘I heard him shout.’

[Rohlf 1969: 104-105; *Southern Calabrian*]

- (20) a. *Se potia tajare.*  
 REFL.CL.3SG can.COND.3SG cut.INF  
 ‘He/She could cut him/herself.’

- b. *No ssapi scríviri.*  
 NEG know.3SG write.INF  
 ‘He/She can’t write.’ (‘He/She doesn’t know how to write.’)

[Rohlf 1969: 105; *Salentino*]

On a par with their Calabrian Greek counterparts, the Infinitive is not found in dubitative embedded clauses in Southern Calabrian, as shown by the examples (21):

<sup>8</sup> De Angelis (2016: fn. 5) reports that the use of *hina* as a complementiser was already attested in Italo-Greek notarial acts of the Norman era (cf. Korhonen 2012: 134).

- (21) a. *Den zzeri ti na cami.*  
 NEG know.3SG what that do.3SG  
 ‘He/She doesn’t know what to do.’

[Rohlf 1969: 105; *Calabrian Greek*]

- b. *Non sapi chi mmu faci.*  
 NEG know.3SG what that do.3SG  
 ‘He/She doesn’t know what to do.’

- c. *Nun avia chi mmu mangia.*  
 NEG have.IMPRF.3SG what that eat.3SG  
 ‘He/She didn’t have anything to eat.’

[Rohlf 1969: 105; *Southern Calabrian*]

If the range of configurations is already wide enough among the different instances of FinCo in the considered areas, further microvariation can be found as regards the actual form in which they can occur. For example, the complementiser *cu* found in Salento is covert in some varieties, where the two verbs of the construction are coreferential (cf. Ledgeway 2012, 2015). In this case, traces of covert *cu* can be detected in the Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico of the word that follows the matrix verb:

- (22) a. *Ulía tte vasu.*  
 want.COND.1SG you.CL kiss.1SG  
 ‘I would like to kiss you.’

- b. *No vvogghiu mmanciu.*  
 NEG want.1SG eat.1SG  
 ‘I don’t want to eat.’

[Rohlf 1969: 105-106; *Salentino*]

Moreover, the connectors *mu* and *mi* can occur in the reduced forms *u* and *i*, as shown in (23) (cf. Rohlf 1969: 105; Manzini & Savoia 2005: 653), while this is not attested in the literature for *ma*.<sup>9</sup> However, in the dialect spoken in Crotona (in the extreme Southern Calabria), the Infinitive is replaced by an embedded clause preceded by a different kind of *u*, which triggers Raddoppiamento

<sup>9</sup> In the dialect of Monasterace (in the province of Reggio Calabria), *mu* can also occur as *u m* before a vowel. See Damonte (2009) and Prantera & Mendicino (2013) for two different analyses of the origin of *u m*.

Fonosintattico of V2 (cf. (24)). Rohlfs (1969: 106) points out that this *u* occurs as *unn'* when followed by a word starting with a vowel (cf. (25)). Since *-nd-* is assimilated in *-nn-* in this area, *unn'* (and its short form *u*) is thus to be associated with Tuscan *onde*, which introduces a final embedded clause (cf. 25d):

(23) a. *Vaju u manciu.*  
 go.1SG *u* eat.1SG  
 'I go to eat.'

b. *Tu mi fa u moru.*  
 you me make.2SG *u* die.1SG  
 'You make me die.'

[Rohlfs 1969: 105; *Southern Calabrian*]

c. [vɔ'li:ti ɔ vi'ni:ti a mɛ 'ka:sa?]  
 want.2PL *u* come.2PL to my house  
 'Do you want to come to my place?'

[De Angelis 2017: 138; Oppido Mamertina (Reggio Calabria)]

d. *Ncignu u fazzu.*  
 start.1SG *u* make.1SG  
 'I start doing.'

[Di Caro 2015: 69; Cittanova (Reggio Calabria)]

e. *Dássalu i mangia.*  
 let.IMP.2SG+him.CL *i* eat.3SG  
 'Let him eat.'

f. *Non vogghiu i moru.*  
 NEG want.1SG *i* die.1SG  
 'I don't want to die.'

[Rohlfs 1969: 105; *Southern Calabrian*]

(24) a. *Iqđu vena u tti saluta.*  
 he come.3SG *u* you.CL.ACC greet.3SG  
 'He comes to greet you.'



- b. *Va u bbida.*  
 go.3SG u see.3SG  
 ‘He/She goes to see.’
- c. *Jívanu u mmáncianu.*  
 go.IMPRF.3PL u eat.3PL  
 ‘They went to eat.’
- d. *Pensu u mmi nne vaju.*  
 think.1SG u LOC.CL.1SG LOC.CL go.1SG  
 ‘I think of going.’

[Rohlf 1969: 106; Crotonè]

- (25) a. *Va unn’ ammazza ru porcu.*  
 go.3SG unn’ kill.3SG the pig  
 ‘He/She goes to kill the pig.’
- b. *Ncignava unn’ accatta.*  
 start.IMPRF.3SG unn’ buy.3SG  
 ‘He/She started buying.’
- c. *Va unn’ u saluta.*  
 go.3SG unn’ him.CL greet.3SG  
 ‘He/She goes to greet him.’

[Rohlf 1969: 106; Crotonè]

- d. *Ti scrissi onde avvertirti.*  
 you.CL.DAT write.PAST.1SG to warn.INF+you.CL.ACC  
 ‘I wrote to you in order to warn you.’

[Rohlf 1969: 106; *Tuscan*]

All the examples taken into consideration so far instantiate a biclausal construction where a matrix verb takes an embedded clause featuring the connecting element *cu*, *(m)u*, *(m)i*, or *ma* as its complement.<sup>10</sup> That the FinCo is commonly considered biclausal is confirmed by the fact that De Angelis (2016: 75) refers to these kinds of connecting elements as *subordinators* à la Nordström

<sup>10</sup> While *mu* and *mi* can occur in their reduced forms *u* and *i* (see examples (23)-(25)), there seems to be no variety in which two of the connectors *(m)u*, *(m)i*, *ma* and *cu* are in use at the same time. Therefore, this is a clear case of diatopic distribution (cf. Damonte 2009: 104).

(2010: 95ff.), instead of using the more common term *complementisers*, because in some Calabrian varieties *(m)u*, *(m)i* and *ma* have turned their status from complementisers to modal affixes. These affixes have lost their stress, having procliticised to the embedded verb, can be preceded by another element acting as complementiser, such as *pe*, and cannot be separated from their embedded verb by a negation<sup>11</sup> (cf. Strumbo 1996; Ledgeway 1998, 2007; Roberts & Roussou 2003: 88ff.; Manzini & Savoia 2005):

(26) a. ['vinni pe mma ti 'viʝu]  
 come.PAST.1SG *pe* *ma* you.CL.ACC see.1SG  
 'I've come to see you.'

b. ['neʃʃenu 'pe mma 'lavani ε r'rɔbbɛ]  
 go-out.3PL *pe* *ma* wash.3PL the clothes  
 'They go out to wash their clothes.'

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 654; Sorbo San Basile (Catanzaro)]

c. ['statti at'tentɔ 'nɔm mi ti 'ʃɔŋki]  
 stay.IMP.2SG+REFL.CL.2SG careful NEG *mi* REFL.CL.2SG fall.2SG  
 'Be careful not to fall.'

[De Angelis 2017: 138; San Roberto d'Aspromonte (Reggio Calabria)]

d. [ti 'ði:ko 'ðɔm mɔ 'vai]  
 you.CL.DAT tell.1SG NEG *mu* go.3SG  
 'I tell you not to go.'

[De Angelis 2017: 146; Stilo (Reggio Calabria)]

---

<sup>11</sup> The status of Sicilian *mi* is more conservative in the city of Messina where, as a partial complementiser, *mi* has not become an infinitival marker as a consequence of a process of grammaticalisation – and hence never occurs in the reduced form *i* –, and is always found before the negation:

(i) [bbas'tʃa:nɔ 'vɔ:lɪ ma'rɪ:a mi nɔn sɪ ma'rɪ:ta]  
 bastianu want.3SG maria *mi* NEG REFL.CL.3SG marry.3SG  
 'Bastianu doesn't want Maria to get married.'

[De Angelis 2017: 147; Messina]

However, according to De Angelis (2017: fn. 18), there is microvariation as regards the order between *mi* and the negator. The order *non + mi* is found in Mandanici (AIS VI, 1143–1144), in Melia and Forza d'Agro (Rohlf's 1972b: 335), while the reverse order is found in Fantina di Sicilia (AIS VI, 1143–1144), in S. Marco d'Alunzio (Manzini & Savoia 2005, 1: 660), in Francavilla di Sicilia and in Sant'Alfio.

Among Southern Italo-Romance MACs, however, there are some configurations with two inflected verbs that display a different syntactic behaviour: the verbs involved seem to be more closely bound to the extent that no intervening material is found between the two verbs, except for the connecting element. The next section deals with this latter case.

### 2.3 Pseudo-Coordination

The unpopularity of the Infinitive in some areas of the extreme Southern Calabria, of Apulia, and in most Sicilian centres arises in a number of MACs, all occurring in the form of a verbal coordination. The two verbs involved in the construction can be coordinated by two different connecting elements, namely *e* and *a*, or juxtaposed without any coordinator. Regardless of the presence of a coordinator and of its nature, the syntactic behaviour of these constructions is not that of a real coordination, i.e. the two verbs, acting as a single predicate, must occur in a fixed order, and allow for the *Wh*-extraction of the internal argument of V2, as in a subordination. Moreover, in these constructions a clitic pronoun which is the argument of V2 can procliticise onto V1. For these reasons, such constructions will be referred to as Pseudo-Coordination (PseCo, henceforth)<sup>12</sup>.

Diachronically, we can find some examples of PseCo featuring the connecting element *e*, which is the continuation of Latin ET, in Rohlfs (1969: 164-165):

- (27) a. *Sutta a la te finestra vegnu e staju.*  
 under at the your window come.1SG and stay.1SG  
 ‘I come and stand under your window.’

[Mandalari 1881 cited in Rohlfs 1969: 164; Reggio Calabria]

- b. *Vaju e truovu la vecchia Zia Driana.*  
 go.1SG and find.1SG and old aunt Driana  
 ‘I’m going to see my old aunt Driana.’

[Gallucci 1862: 46 cited in Rohlfs 1969: 105; Aprigliano (Cosenza)]

- c. *Valeriu grida, jamulu e cacciamu.*  
 Valeriu shout.3SG go.IMP.1PL+it.CL and hunt.IMP.1PL  
 ‘Valeriu shouts: let’s go and hunt it.’

[Gallucci 1862: 122 cited in Rohlfs 1969: 105; Aprigliano (Cosenza)]

<sup>12</sup> This construction is known with many denominations in the literature, which are presented in Chapter 3.

The productivity of this construction is confirmed by the data from Furcise, the dialect spoken in Furci Siculo (in the province of Messina):

- (28) a. *Vaju e ppigghju u pani.*  
 go.1SG and fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I go and fetch the bread.’
- b. *Annamu e ffacemu a spisa.*  
 go.1PL and do.1PL the shopping  
 ‘We go and do the shopping.’
- c. *Va e ppigghja u pani!*  
 go.IMP.2SG and fetch.IMP.2SG the bread  
 ‘Go (and) fetch the bread!’

[Furci Siculo (Messina)]

As regards the origin of the connector *a*, which in the dialects of Southern Italy is always homophonous to the preposition *a* ‘to’, there is no consensus among scholars, but a long tradition starting from Ascoli (1896, 1901) considers it as the continuation of Latin coordinator AC ‘and’. In Latin, AC (along with ATQUE) has a more specific purpose than ET. It is used to coordinate two elements that belong to the same semantic field and generally share the same features, namely case, number and gender in the nominal domain, and mood, tense, person and number in the verbal domain. Some examples are provided by Rohlfs (1969: §761), who points out that in late Latin AC was used in stereotyped expressions (cf. (29a, b)), and that it only survives in Italian in few numeral forms (cf. (29c)):

- (29) a. *Viri ac feminae.*  
 Men and women  
 ‘Men and women.’
- b. *Noctu ac die.*  
 Nightly and day.ABL.SG  
 ‘By night and by day.’
- c. *Diciassette / Diciannove.*  
 ten+and+seven / ten+and+nine

[Rohlfs 1969: 166; *Latin*]

‘Seventeen.’ / ‘Nineteen.’

[Rohlf 1969: 166; *Italian*]

In the case of verbal conjunctions, when the two verbs form a single concept so that the two propositions can be considered as simultaneous, they are linked by AC or ATQUE, whereas ET could link verbs expressing different concepts (cf. Sorrento 1950: 223). In example (30), the actions expressed by the two verbs are to be considered as simultaneous: the returning home of the soldiers is closely linked to their deserting someone on their way:

- (30) *Milites in itinere ab eo discedunt ac domum revertuntur.*  
soldiers on way from him depart.3PL and home return.3PL  
‘His soldiers desert him on the way and return home.’

[Spevak 2010: 40; *Latin*]

PseCo with *a* as a connecting element are found in many Southern dialects. Rohlf (1969) provides the following examples:

- (31) a. *Cci vaju a fazzu na visita.*  
to-him go.1SG *a* do.1SG *a* visit  
‘I go and visit him.’

[Pitrè II: 140 cited in Rohlf 1969: 166; *Sicilian*]

- b. *Iqda si iju a curcau.*  
she REFL.CL.3SG go.PAST.3SG *a* lay-down. PAST.3SG  
‘She went to sleep.’

[Pitrè II: 253 cited in Rohlf 1969: 166; *Sicilian*]

- c. *Vaju a bbinnu.*  
go.1SG *a* sell.1SG  
‘I go to sell.’

[Rohlf 1969: 167; *Crotone*]

- d. *Oj' a mmangiu.*  
want.1SG *a* eat.1SG  
‘I want to eat.’

[Rohlf 1969: 167; *Avetrana (Taranto)*]

- e. *Vogghiu a vesciu.*  
 want.1SG a see.1SG  
 ‘I want to see.’

[Rohlf 1969: 167; Brindisi]

- f. *Non ci vògghiu a ddòrmu.*  
 NEG there.CL want.1SG a see.1SG  
 ‘I don’t want to sleep there.’

[Rohlf 1969: 167; Pulsano (Taranto)]

Further examples of this PseCo are found in Bari (Apulia) with V1 STAY:

- (32) a. *Ci st’ a bbevə, ci st’ a mmangə.*  
 there.CL stay.3SG a drink.3SG there.CL stay.3SG a drink.3SG  
 ‘One eats, one drinks.’

[Lopez 1915: 60 cited in Rohlf 1969: 167; Bari]

- b. *St’ a parlə Dì.*  
 stay.3SG a speak.3SG god  
 ‘God is speaking.’

[Lopez 1915: 65 cited in Rohlf 1969: 167; Bari]

Finally, the two finite verbs of the constructions under investigation can be juxtaposed with no connecting elements in-between. But here, a premise is in order: when V1 is GO (i.e. *va*) and it is inflected in the Imperative, this asyndetic PseCo can be found diachronically in many Italo-Romance varieties. In most cases, this *va* has lost its semantics of motion to become an emphatic marker. When V1 GO is in the Indicative, on the other hand, it is restricted to the Southern Italian dialects where it is still productive. When it occurs in the Imperative, again, this V1 can be used as an emphatic marker and, in this case, it displays the singular even when followed by a plural V2:<sup>13</sup>

- (33) a. *Va saluta la piú gente.*  
 go.IMP.2SG greet.IMP.2SG the most people  
 ‘Go greet the most people.’

[Wiese 1928: 148 cited in Rohlf 1969: 171; Lucca]

<sup>13</sup> V1 GO in this case could also be considered an invariable uninflected form. See the discussion in Section 4.6.

- b. *Va scupa la casa.*  
 go.IMP.2SG sweep.IMP.2SG the house  
 ‘Go (and) sweep the house.’

[Pitrè III: 85 cited in Rohlfs 1969: 171; *Sicilian*]

- c. *Va criditi a fimmini!*  
 go.IMP.2SG trust.IMP.2SG to women  
 ‘Go trust women!’

[Pitrè III: 278 cited in Rohlfs 1969: 171; *Sicilian*]

According to Rohlfs (1969), asyndetic PseCo with a V2 that is not in the Imperative is uncommon in Sicilian<sup>14</sup>. The paucity of instances of this PseCo in Sicilian is confirmed by Cruschina (2013) and Di Caro (2015), who provide examples from Pantelleria and Enna, respectively:

- (34) a. *Si va fa zitu.*  
 REFL.CL.3SG go.3SG make.3SG engaged  
 ‘He goes to get engaged.’

[Pitrè III: 137 cited in Rohlfs 1969: 171; *Sicilian*]

- b. *Vaju vidu.*  
 go.1SG see.1SG  
 ‘I go and see.’

- c. *Vegnu mangiu.*  
 come.1SG eat.1SG  
 ‘I come and eat.’

[Tropea 1988 cited in Cruschina 2013: 171; Pantelleria (Trapani)]

- d. *Vaju / Vignu pigliu u pani.*  
 go.1SG / come.1SG fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I go/come to fetch the bread.’

[Di Caro 2015: 84; Enna]

<sup>14</sup> The example from Pitrè III in (34) is problematic because the Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico, which is to be taken as proof of a covert pseudo-coordinator *a*, is not displayed consistently in all the examples provided by Rohlfs (1969) and, more generally, in the old literature on that topic. For this reason, one cannot be sure that the V2 *fa* in (34) is not in fact *ffa*, especially because *a* could have been easily assimilated to the preceding vowel of the V1 *va*.

On the other hand, Rohlfs continues, asyndetic PseCo when V1 is a motion verb is very common in Calabrian. Old data by Rohlfs (cf. (35a, b)) are confirmed by more recent data from Manzini & Savoia (2005) (cf. (35c, d), and by novel data from my fieldwork in Rossano (Cosenza) (cf. 35e, f):<sup>15</sup>

(35) a. *Vaju truovu a sorema.*  
 go.3SG find.3SG to sister-my.CL  
 ‘I go and see my sister.’

b. *Iddi vènanu pìglianu a ru figliu.*  
 they go.3PL pick-up.3PL to the son  
 ‘They come and pick up their son.’

[Rohlfs 1969: 171; *Calabrian*]

c. [u 'vəju 'cəmu]  
 him.CL go.1SG call.1SG  
 ‘I go and call him.’

d. [u 'vjəŋnu 'viʝu]  
 him.CL come.1SG see.1SG  
 ‘I come and see him.’

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 695; Umbriatico (Crotone)]

e. *Vajə pijə u panə.*  
 go.1SG fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I go and fetch the bread.’

[Di Caro 2018; Rossano (Cosenza)]

f. *Vegnə fazzə a spisa.*  
 come.1SG do.1SG the shopping  
 ‘I come and do the shopping.’

[Rossano (Cosenza)]

The three ways in which the two verbs of a PseCo can occur, i.e. (pseudo-)coordinated by AC, by ET, or in asyndetic conjunction, are basically interchangeable. This is confirmed by Sorrento (1915),

<sup>15</sup> See also Vespucci (1994), cited in Ledgeway (1996: 258, 259), for some asyndetic examples in the Calabrian dialect of Piano Lago (*frazione* of Mangone, in the province of Cosenza).



who shows examples from Latin of the three configurations in the Imperative (cf. (36)) – and, interestingly, also with the causative motion V1 SEND – in comparison with their Sicilian counterparts (cf. (37)). Note, however, that the fact that more than one of these configurations have survived throughout extreme Southern Italian dialects suggests that there must have been a semantic specialisation.

- (36) a. *I dormi.*  
 go.IMP.2SG sleep.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Go to sleep.’
- b. *Mitte et dormi.*  
 send.IMP.2SG and sleep.IMP.2SG
- c. *Mitte ac dormi.*  
 send.IMP.2SG and sleep.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Send someone to sleep.’

[Sorrento 1915: 109; *Latin*]

- (37) a. *Va dormi.*  
 go.IMP.2SG sleep.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Go to sleep.’
- b. *Manna e dormi.*  
 send.IMP.2SG and sleep.IMP.2SG
- c. *Manna a dormi.*  
 send.IMP.2SG and sleep.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Send someone to sleep.’

[Sorrento 1915: 109; *Sicilian*]

An important clarification is in order here: the pseudo-coordinator *e* shown in the examples (27) and (37b) is homophonous to the real coordinator *e*, which is widespread in Italo-Romance. This means that a configuration ‘V1 *e* V2’ without sufficient context is, in principle, always acceptable by all speakers even in those varieties in which PseCo is construed with *a* or which display asyndetic PseCo. That the data in (28) from Furcese instantiate an actual case of PseCo and not just a real coordination is demonstrated by the grammatical result of the Wh-extraction of an argument/adjunct of V2, which is impossible in other varieties. Compare the grammatical examples in (38a, a’), which are the interrogative counterparts of (28a), with the examples in (38b’, b’’),

which display the impossible *Wh*-extraction from a real coordination in Deliano, one of the varieties where *e* is not used in PseCo<sup>16</sup>:

(38) a. *Cchi vai e ppigghji?*  
 what go.2SG and fetch.2SG  
 ‘What do you go and fetch?’

a’. *Unni vai e ppigghji u pani?*  
 where go.2SG and fetch.2SG the bread  
 ‘Where do you go and fetch the bread.’

[Furci Siculo (Messina)]

b. *Vaju e ppigliu lu pani.*  
 go.1SG and fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I go and fetch the bread.’

b’. \**Cchi va e ppigli?*  
 what go.2SG and fetch.2SG  
 ‘What do you go and fetch?’

b’’. \**Unni va e ppigli lu pani?*  
 where go.2SG and fetch.2SG the bread  
 ‘Where do you go and fetch the bread.’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

This extraction of the *wh*-complement must be used as a diagnostic when trying to offer an overview of the different instances of PseCo in the three relevant areas of Southern Italy, to prevent improper ‘V1 *e* V2’ from being counted in.

Finally, a common feature of V1 GO in PseCo is its possibility to occur in an invariable form, whose realisation is subject to microvariation but generally surfaces as *va*. (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 383-385). One last configuration of PseCo, mainly found in the Eastern Sicilian coast, capitalises on this characteristic behaviour of V1 GO, which has been considered in literature since at least Sorrento (1950) but has been described more in detail in Di Caro (2015: 64-68; 2018) and Di Caro & Giusti (2015: 415-418).<sup>17</sup> In this configuration, V1 GO, which displays a rich range of

<sup>16</sup> According to J. Ross (1967: 158-161), coordinations are syntactic islands, thus it is impossible to extract the object of the V2 from a real coordination.

<sup>17</sup> See Chapter 4 for a thorough discussion on this topic.

allomorphs, namely *va-*, *vo-*, *uo-*, and *o-*, is prefixed to V2 with an optional covert *a* (hence, the presence of *a* in the glosses)<sup>18</sup>:

- (39) a. *Voppigghju u pani.*  
 go+a+fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I go and fetch the bread.’

[Di Caro & Giusti 2015: 415; Marina di Ragusa (Ragusa)]

- a'. *Vopigghja / Voppigghja u pani!*  
 go+fetch.IMP.2SG / go+a+fetch.IMP.2SG the bread  
 ‘Go (and) fetch the bread!’

[Marina di Ragusa (Ragusa)]

- b. *Occattu u giunnali.*  
 go+a+buy.1SG the newspaper  
 ‘I go and buy the newspaper.’

[Di Caro & Giusti 2015: 415; Acireale (Catania)]

- b'. *Occatta u giunnali!*  
 go+buy.IMP.2SG the newspaper  
 ‘Go (and) buy the newspaper!’

[Acireale (Catania)]

Few other V1s are allowed in the PseCo of this area, generally COME, SEND, and sometimes COME BACK. When these V1s occur, the configuration is the canonical ‘V1 *a* V2’. But GO does not have to occur necessarily in its prefixed invariable version. This means that there are two co-occurring constructions in the linguistic repertoire of some speakers when GO is concerned.

---

<sup>18</sup> When this type of PseCo is in the Imperative, Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico on V2 signals the presence of a covert *a*, but however this is not the option most speakers prefer. Furthermore, with V2 starting with a vowel followed by a long consonant, like *accattari* ‘buy’ or *abbessari* ‘set, fix’, it is not possible to tell the presence of the pseudo-coordinator because the prefixed V1 is linked directly with the V2 without its onset, as shown in (i) (see also (39b')):

- (i) *Obbessa a televisjoni!*  
 go+set.IMP.2SG the television  
 ‘Go (and) fix the television!’

[Acireale (Catania)]

Di Caro (2015: 63) reports that among the speakers that have this double PseCo with V1 GO in their repertoire, younger ones usually fail to recognise the prefixed version (i.e. *Oppigghju u pani*) as related to the extended version (i.e. *Vaju a ppigghju u pani*). This fact may have favoured the process of semantic specialisation of the former. This is not a trivial question, since the two co-occurring constructions are also different with regard to their Mood/Tense/Person restrictions, as will become clear in Chapter 4. Compare the grammatical examples in (40a, b) with the impossible ones in (40a', b'):

- (40) a. *Oppigghjamu u pani.*  
 go+a+fetch.1PL the bread
- a'. \**Jemu a ppigghjamu u pani.*  
 go.1PL a fetch.1PL the bread  
 'We go and fetch the bread'
- b. *Oppigghjai u pani.*  
 go+a+fetch.PAST.1SG the bread
- b'. \**Jii a ppigghjai u pani.*  
 go.PAST.1SG a fetch.PAST.1SG the bread  
 'I went to fetch the bread'

[Acireale (Catania)]

Before proceeding with a final section summing up all the possible configurations displayed by Southern Italo-Romance MACs as strategies to avoid the Infinitive, a last case is to be considered, which is only apparently related to the instances of PseCo we have seen so far: the asyndetic complementation in Neapolitan dialect.

## 2.4 The Neapolitan asyndetic complementation

Ledgeway (1997) analyses in depth a highly restricted syntactic construction found in Neapolitan, which closely resembles PseCo in that it surfaces as a 'V1 V2' Imperative construction. If we compare the example in (41a) from Neapolitan with its Deliano counterpart in (41b), the structural similarity is straightforward:

- (41) a. *Va spanne 'e panne 'nfuse.*  
 go.IMP.2SG hang-out.IMP.2SG the clothes wet  
 [Ledgeway 1997: 232; *Neapolitan*]
- b. *Va stjinni li rrobbi vagnati.*  
 go.IMP.2SG hang-out.IMP.2SG the clothes wet  
 'Go (and) hang out the washing.'  
 [Delia (Caltanissetta)]

Ledgeway (1997: 233) states that this is a case of paratactic structure featuring two juxtaposed imperatives, which is the grammaticalisation of an original hypotactic infinitival complementation structure. He also adds that, as such, this phenomenon goes against the common grammaticalisation path – widely considered as the only possible direction (cf. Hopper & Traugott 2003: §7.2) – that goes from parataxis to hypotaxis (as shown in Harris & Campbell 1995: §10). But besides the structural identity with the Imperative asyndetic PseCo, Neapolitan V2 is analysed as an infinitive that has undergone a process of stress retraction as a result of the systematic dropping of the final *-re* desinence, attested since the nineteenth century.

This phenomenon affects verbs from the I and III conjugation, whose Infinitive is always paroxytone, and the paroxytone verbs of the II conjugation in Neapolitan (cf. (42a-c)), but extends to the proparoxytone verbs of the II conjugation in the peripheral dialects of the area, such as Procida and Ischia (cf. (42d-f)). The *-re* desinence, however, is always restored, with the elision of the final *e*, when a clitic pronoun encliticises onto V2, as shown in (43).

- (42) a. *parlare > parlà.*  
 go.INF go.INF
- b. *vedere > vedé.*  
 see.INF see.INF
- c. *fernire > fernì.*  
 finish.INF finish.INF  
 [Ledgeway 1997: 235; *Neapolitan*]
- d. *scénnere > scénne.*  
 descend.INF descend.INF

- e. *mèttete* > *mètte*.  
 put.INF put.INF
- f. *vènnete* > *vénne*.  
 sell.INF sell.INF

[Ledgeway 1997: 235; Procida (Naples)]

- (43) *chiamare* > *chiamà* > *chiamarse*  
 call.INF call.INF call.INF+REFL.CL  
 ‘To be named / called.’

[Ledgeway 1997: 235; Neapolitan]

This truncated stress-retracted Infinitive has been labelled as *seconda forma dell’infinito* (second form of the infinitive, SFI henceforth) by Bichelli (1974: 207-210) (see also Colasuonno 1976), who adds that these Infinitive can always be replaced by the canonical one (while the opposite does not hold true). Ledgeway (1997: 237) rejects Rohlf’s (1966: §315) analysis of the SFI as a phenomenon that is triggered by the presence of a paroxytone word following the verb and explains that what characterises these Infinitives is their being the complement of a (semi)-auxiliary like causative HAVE / GET, causative LET, deontic HAVE TO, GO AND, KNOW, BE V-ING, COME AND.

Ledgeway (1997: 238-239) reports that, when a 2SG Imperative V1 GO or COME is involved, the clitic pronoun which is the complement of an Infinitive V2 must encliticise onto V1 (cf. (44)), following the well known restructuring rules in Romance (cf. Rizzi 1982). However, most speakers find marginal, and sometimes completely ungrammatical, the use of a SFI in this context (cf. (45)):

- (44) a. *Vatte* *a ccuccà*.  
 go.IMP.2SG+REFL.CL.2SG to lay-down.INF  
 ‘Go to bed.’ (lit. ‘Go to lay yourself down.’)
- b. *Vienelo* *a ppurtà*.  
 come.IMP.2SG+it.CL to bring.INF  
 ‘Come to bring it.’

[Ledgeway 1997: 239; Neapolitan]

- (45) a. *?Vatte* *a ccócca*.  
 go.IMP.2SG+REFL.CL.2SG to lay-down.INF  
 ‘Go to bed.’ (lit. ‘Go to lay yourself down.’)

- b. ?*Vienelo*                      *a*            *ppòrta*.  
 come.IMP.2SG+it.CL    to            bring.INF  
 ‘Come to bring it.’

[Ledgeway 1997: 239; *Neapolitan*]

Moreover, while the infinitival introducer *a* is obligatory when V2 is a canonical Infinitive, it is optional when V2 is a SFI. The resulting asyndetic construction in this latter case is not compatible with a canonical Infinitive and displays obligatory procliticisation of the relevant pronouns onto V2. For this reason, V1 GO in (46a) cannot trigger the Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico on *te*, and the accusative clitic in (46b) appears as the allomorph *'o* instead of *lo* (as in (44b)), all facts that demonstrate that V2 SFI displays a certain degree of finiteness and this goes in favour of a biclausal analysis of the construction.

- (46) a. *Va*                              *te*                              *cócça*.  
 go.IMP.2SG                      REFL.CL.2SG            lay-down.INF  
 ‘Go to bed.’ (lit. ‘Go to lay yourself down.’)

- b. *Viene*                              *'o*                              *pòrta*.  
 come.IMP.2SG    it.CL            bring.INF  
 ‘Come to bring it.’

[Ledgeway 1997: 239; *Neapolitan*]

Since this asyndetic construction with V1 GO and COME is crucially biclausal, this fact poses a problem for the interpretation of SFI as a real Infinitive, since the procliticisation of pronouns onto V1 would be expected, as it is always the case in Neapolitan.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Ledgeway (1997: 242) observes that an Imperative ranks higher than an Infinitive on a scale of finiteness, but it is still less finite than a Present or Past Indicative V2. The relative finiteness of the SFI, when the latter is the complement of obligatory restructuring verbs such as GO and COME, allows for it to retain its clitic pronoun (as shown in (46) and (47)), given that GO and COME are among the semi-auxiliary verbs that can retain part of their argument structure. But with restructuring verbs such as WANT, clitic climbing is obligatory with a non-finite V2 (cf. (ia)), while it is impossible with a finite V2 (cf. (ib)):

- (i) a. *\*Voglio*            *dicerlo*                      >    *'O<sub>i</sub>*    *bboglio*            *dicere*    *t<sub>i</sub>*.  
 want.1SG            say.INF+it.CL                      it.CL    want.1SG            say.INF  
 ‘I want to say it.’

Ledgeway reports that in this very restricted construction, some SFI verbs can display metaphonic agreement (cf. (47)) that makes them homophonous to the 2SG Imperative, whose metaphonic alternation is a late development.<sup>20</sup>

- (47) a. *Va*                      *te*                      *viéste.*  
 go.IMP.2SG              REFL.CL.2SG      dress.INF  
 ‘Go to get dressed.’
- b. *Viene*                      ‘*o*                      *puórte.*  
 come.IMP.2SG      it.CL              bring.INF  
 ‘Come to bring it.’

[Ledgeway 1997: 240; *Neapolitan*]

On the basis of the characteristics of SFI seen so far, Ledgeway shows the path of reanalysis of the underlying structure of a SFI complement by listing the following steps: i) the SFI V2 is reanalysed as a 2SG Imperative because of their homophony (cf. (48a, b)); ii) the infinitival/imperative status of SFI in (48b) gets extended and the V2, now considered as more finite than a simple Infinitive, blocks clitic climbing onto V1, and loses the possibility to be associated to the infinitival introducer *a* (cf. (48c)); iii) now that the SFI V2 is closer to an Imperative than an Infinitive, it can display the same metaphony found in the new metaphonic 2SG Imperative verbs (cf. (48d)). It is this metaphony that triggers further reanalysis of SFI that at this point cannot but be considered as an Imperative:

- (48) a. [*Vatte* [Infinitive              *a bbèste.*]]  
 b. [*Vatte* [Infinitive/Imperative      *a bbèste.*]]  
 c. [*Va* [Infinitive/Imperative      *te vèste.*]]  
 d. [*Va* [Imperative              *te vèste/viéste.*]]

[Ledgeway 1997: 255; *Neapolitan*]

To conclude, as far as PseCo in Southern Italo-Romance is concerned, according to Ledgeway (1997), Neapolitan asyndetic construction is not to be considered as a related phenomenon, being an

- 
- b. *Voglio*    *ch’*    *isso*    ‘*o*    *ddice*    >    \*‘*O<sub>i</sub>*    *bboglio*    *ch’*    *isso*    *t<sub>i</sub>*    *dice.*  
 want.1SG    that    him    it.CL    say.1SG              it.CL    want.1SG    that    him    say.3SG  
 ‘I want him to say it.’

[Ledgeway 1997: 242; *Neapolitan*]

<sup>20</sup> To corroborate his analysis that metaphonic SFI is derived from Imperative, Ledgeway (1997: 241) reports Bichelli’s (1974: 208) observation that SFI in 2SG negative Imperative frequently replaces the canonical Infinitive.



independent and rather late development of Neapolitan. Once the possibility of considering this particular case of MAC as a potential instance of PseCo has been dismissed, the next section will offer a synopsis concerning the different configurations in which FinCo and PseCo may occur.

## 2.5 A protocol for the Multiple Agreement Constructions

Most Southern Italo-Romance varieties display a number of verbal Multiple Agreement Constructions that feature two finite verbs and an optional connecting element between them. We have seen in the present chapter that MACs mainly occur in two different types, according to their bi- or monoclausal structure. FinCos are biclausal, select their V1 from a wide set of restructuring verbs (cf. (13)-(26)), and feature different areally-specialised connecting elements (or subordinators), which can sometimes surface in a reduced form or be covert, giving rise to the possible configurations listed in (49):<sup>21</sup>

- (49) a. V1 *cu* V2;  
 b. V1 *mu* V2;  
 c. V1 *u* V2;  
 d. V1 *u m* V2  
 e. V1 *mi* V2;  
 f. V1 *i* V2;

---

<sup>21</sup> The range of configurations displayed in (49) can be further enriched by the combinations of these connecting elements with the complementiser *chi* (< Lat. QUID) giving rise to *chimmu*, *chimmi*, *chimma* (cf. De Angelis 2017: 142-143), also used in a marked form to express maxims, proverbs, wishes or curses (as in (ic)):

- (i) a. *Vógghiu chimma vena.*  
 want.1SG *chimma* come.3SG  
 ‘I want him to come.’

[NCD cited in De Angelis 2017: 142; Catanzaro]

- b. *Nci dissi chimmi faci.*  
 him.CL.DAT say.PAST.1SG *chimmi* do.3SG  
 ‘I asked him what he was doing.’

[NCD cited in De Angelis 2017: 142; Reggio Calabria]

- c. [mala'nɔ:va 'kimmɪ 'ai]  
 misfortune *chimmi* have.2SG  
 ‘May you have misfortune!’

[De Angelis 2017: 142; Messina]

- g. V1 *ma* V2;
- h. V1 V2.

A hallmark of the FinCo is the non-obligatory Mood/Tense feature sharing between V1 and V2, since the embedded clause is usually in the Indicative Present even when the matrix clause is in the Indicative Imperfect (cf. (14c), (16b)), in the Preterite (cf. (13b, c), (14f), (15), (16a)), and in the Conditional (14b).

On the other hand, PseCos are monoclausal and, unlike FinCos, constitute a minor threat to the unpopularity of the Infinitive we have discussed in the present chapter. In fact, they can only occur when V1 belongs to a restricted class of restructuring verbs (such as GO, COME, WANT and STAY) and, above all, they can be replaced by the InfCo in nearly all cases. PseCos can basically display two different configurations. They can occur with a covert or overt connecting element between the two verbs, which is diachronically derived from a Latin coordinator – either AC or ET –, as shown in (50a, b). In this case, V1 can also surface as an invariable verb prefixed to the rest of the construction (cf. (50c)).<sup>22</sup> The second configuration occurs in a very limited number of varieties, where the two verbs are simply juxtaposed (cf. (50d)), and V2 does not display any Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico:

- (50) a. V1 *a* V2;  
 b. V1 *e* V2;  
 c. invariable V1+*a*+V2;  
 d. V1 V2.

The protocol in Table 2 shows what syntactic construction with a motion V1 selects what connecting element in Southern Italo-Romance.

---

<sup>22</sup> In the configuration in (50c), the connecting element *a* is covert but detectable thanks to RF on V2. Theoretically, that covert element could also be an *e*, since it can trigger RF too (as seen in the Furcuse examples in (28)). Nevertheless, in recent fieldwork I could ascertain that in the area where this particular PseCo is found – i.e. mainly the Eastern provinces of Catania, Ragusa and Syracuse (cf. Di Caro 2015; Di Caro & Giusti 2015) – the alternative ‘V1 *a* V2’ configuration is present in some speakers’ repertoire (so that *Vaju a ppigghju u pani* and *Oppigghju u pani* ‘I go and fetch the bread’ can co-occur), probably because it is the most common form throughout Sicily. Note, moreover, that also in Ledgeway’s (2016) analysis of similar instances of PseCo in Lecce (Apulia), with GO and STAND as prefixed V1, the only potential covert connecting element is *a* (< AC).

**Table 2. The selection of the connecting element in Southern Italo-Romance with motion V1s**

	PseCo	FinCo	InfCo
<i>a</i> (<AC)	+	-	-
<i>e</i>	+	-	-
no connecting element	+	+	-
<i>(m)u</i>	-	+	-
<i>(m)i</i>	-	+	-
<i>ma</i>	-	+	-
<i>cu</i>	-	+	-
<i>a</i> (<AD)	-	-	+

At this point in the discussion, we must consider two important issues that complicate the main picture. The first is internal to PseCo and regards the fact that in some Eastern Sicilian varieties which display the invariable V1 GO, two or more allomorphs are available to the speakers, usually with semantic specialisation, but sometimes just as a reflex of PseCos of different varieties that have converged to the same town (cf. Ch. 4; See also Di Caro *to appear*). The second one more generally regards the areas where it is possible to find both PseCo and FinCo in use. With this regard, the province of Messina is an interesting case: it constitutes the southernmost point of the areas where the FinCo is found but, at the same time, it lies in the eastern coast of Sicily, the zone that characterises for its extensive use of PseCo, especially with the invariable V1 GO.

We know from the literature (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 374) that in Milazzo, a village in the northern part of the province of Messina, both PseCo and FinCo are possible and that they co-occur with the InfCo. However, data from my fieldwork suggest that this is not the case for most Milazzese speakers, who only accept the FinCo with *mi* as a connecting element. The fact that some speakers of Milazzo accept PseCo can be due to the influences of the dialects of the surrounding areas where PseCo is attested. Moreover, in some centres of the *mi*-FinCo area (see *supra* Section 2.2), such as Santa Teresa di Riva, San Piero Patti, and Furci Siculo (where PseCo with *e* is attested, cf. (28)), the FinCo is not accepted by some speakers.

A good example is provided by the Imperative, where the dedicated form from PseCo (cf. (51a)) is accepted and sometimes preferred by most speakers, even though PseCo is not generally attested elsewhere:<sup>23</sup>

- (51) a. *Va pigghja u pani!*  
 go.IMP.2SG fetch.IMP.2SG the bread  
 ‘Go fetch the bread!’

<sup>23</sup> The Mood, Tense and Person restrictions in PseCo will be dealt with in detail in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.

- b. *Va mi pigghji u pani!*  
 go.IMP.2SG *mi* fetch.2SG the bread  
 ‘Go fetch the bread!’

[San Piero Patti (Messina)]

A similar situation could well be found in the other two southern regions where PseCo and the FinCo are found: Calabria and Apulia. In Apulia, for example, Ledgeway (2016) reports instances of *a*-PseCo with fully inflected V1 in the northern provinces of Bari and Foggia, and in the province of Taranto (see also Di Caro 2015: 70-76), and instances of *a*-PseCo with prefixed V1 in Salento, i.e. the southern provinces of Brindisi and Lecce. But the *ku*-FinCo is also attested south of the Taranto-Ostuni line (see Section 2.2). A detailed analysis of non-Sicilian PseCo goes beyond the scope of this dissertation, but it would be interesting to ascertain, in those Calabrian and Apulian varieties in which PseCo and FinCo are both attested, whether they have semantically specialised or they just co-occur because one of the two is borrowed from the surrounding area.

Once all the main possible configurations displayed by Southern Italo-Romance MACs have been sketched out, it is possible to consider some questions concerning PseCo. These will be addressed in the next section.

## 2.6 Research questions

We have seen in the previous sections that MACs in Southern Italo-Romance are found in very different configurations with regard to a number of properties, such as the type of verbs involved, the nature of the connecting element and its optionality, and the type of restrictions each of these elements display. We have also seen that, even when two constructions surface as identical – as is the case of some types of Sicilian PseCo and the Neapolitan asyndetic construction – they can have different syntactic origins. Since the focus of the present dissertation is Sicilian PseCo, the first question to ask is what makes PseCo different from other MACs found in Southern Italo-Romance, i.e. whether there are V1s that are found in PseCo only, or whether Mood/Tense/Person restrictions work differently in PseCo and MACs. Cardinaletti & Giusti (2019) is the latest contribution that tackles these questions (see also Di Caro *forthcoming*).

Other important issues concern what parameters of microvariation are to be taken into consideration in order to account for the different PseCo configurations found across Sicily. In particular, the research questions leading the present dissertation are:

- i) What is the best way to classify the different configurations of PseCo?

- ii) Is there a common feature shared by all the V1s occurring in PseCo?
- iii) What V1s are more likely to occur in the PseCo of all the Sicilian varieties?
- iv) In what Moods and Tenses is PseCo more likely to occur? Why are some Moods and Tenses favoured?
- v) In what Persons is PseCo more likely to occur? Why are some Persons favoured?
- vi) In what ways can the V2s interact to determine whether PseCo is available or not?
- vii) What grammaticalisation paths does the V1 follow?
- viii) Is the V1 more likely to preserve its semantics of motion or to grammaticalise as an Aspect marker? Does its occurring in specific Moods and Tenses play a role in this respect?
- ix) What is the relationship between PseCo and the InfCo? Is it always the case that the former can be replaced by the latter?

As regards the question in (i), I follow the grouping system proposed in Di Caro (2019) (see Section 4.1). I consider most of the other questions, in detail, in Chapter 4, where I also suggest that some more parameters of microvariation would be worth exploring, for which the available data in the published literature are insufficient and further research is needed. Finally, Chapter 7 contains some considerations which are useful to answer the questions in (vi) and (ix).

## Chapter 3. Different accounts of Multiple Agreement Constructions

This chapter offers an overview of the main works that have contributed to the study of Sicilian PseCo in more than one century, from the first descriptive papers where just few instances of PseCo were taken into consideration, to the more detailed syntactic accounts of the last two decades, and the first macro-comparative studies. After this overview, the chapter goes on by focussing on PseCo in non-romance varieties – mainly in Germanic – and ends with the account of Serial Verb Constructions, which are typical of non-European languages but share many properties with Romance and Germanic PseCo.

### 3.1.1 From Ascoli to Leone: the first accounts of PseCo

The first study of Sicilian PseCo is traditionally attributed to the work of Ascoli (1896, 1901), who considers cases of ET-coordination, as in (27) and (28), AC-coordination, as in (31), and asyndeton, as in (33) and (34), not necessarily as instances of the same phenomenon, namely PseCo, but as competing constructions opposed to the InfCo. As regards the AC-coordination, he does not consider it as peculiar to Sicilian dialects but, instead, as common to many Italo-Romance varieties (1896: 453), where the predominant form is in the Imperative.<sup>24</sup> The distribution of this construction in Sicilian, however, is described as opposite, with the Indicative being the context in which it normally occurs, and the Imperative being a rare context for this construction to occur – something that has been widely confuted in recent literature.

Ascoli acknowledges that the V2 in the Imperative is not just a shortened Infinitive but a verb inflected according to the same features of the V1. In fact, in Tuscan Imperative parataxis, the V2 *piglia* of *va a piglia* ‘go and fetch’ could be derived from the truncated form of the Infinitive *pigliare*, which share the same thematic vowel, although, following the stress location of shortened Infinitives, that V2 should be oxytone, whereas it is paroxytone. But the V2 *pigghiu* of the Sicilian Indicative *vaju a pigghiu* ‘I go and fetch’ cannot in any case be the shortened form of the Infinitive *pigghiari*. Ascoli (1896: 465) adds that even in Tuscan, when the V2 belongs to the second conjugation (i.e. when it ends in *-ere*), its form ending in *-i* as in *va a prendi* ‘go and fetch’ suggests that it cannot be considered a shortened Infinitive – which should end in *-e* – but rather an Imperative.

---

<sup>24</sup> See Ledgeway (1997: 268) for a collection of Imperative PseCo in Italo-Romance.

One of the most important contributions that the Ascoli's work has given to the understanding of this construction, paving the road to a long tradition among scholars, is the analysis of the connecting element *a* as the continuation of Latin coordinator AC – and its reinforced form ATQUE – instead of the preposition AD, typical of the InfCo. ATQUE, in particular, was used to unite the Imperative form of a motion verb with the Imperative form of another verb. In Ascoli (1901), the use of the connecting element *a* in the AC-coordination is compared to the use of the *a* found in Italian numerals such as *diciassette* 'seventeen' and *diciannove* 'nineteen'. Ascoli, then, suggests that the AC-coordination, originally found in the Imperative, has extended to the Indicative forms.<sup>25</sup>

On the other hand, Ascoli's analysis (1901: 222) does not seem to be correct when he supports Avolio's claim that there is no difference in the use of the connecting element *a* and *e* in PseCo, and that this construction displays no Mood/Tense/Person restrictions. As regards the former claim, Ascoli does not provide synchronic data of ET-coordination, all his data being from old Sicilian. As regards the latter claim, the examples provided are insufficient and do not take into account the high microvariation found in the Sicilian varieties, a problem that affects all the early literature on PseCo. Finally, Ascoli's claim that the Indicative AC-coordination never occurs without the connecting element suffers from the paucity of the data considered.

Sorrento (1915: 103-104) praises Ascoli's analysis on Sicilian PseCo, with which he largely agrees. Nevertheless, his contribution is noteworthy in many respects. First, he provides examples of asyndetic PseCo in the Indicative and refutes the idea that this construction is not popular in the Imperative. Second, he provides an example of Indicative Preterite PseCo (cf. 52), which will be relevant to the present and ongoing discussion on the characteristics of Preterite PseCo in some central Sicilian dialects (cf. Di Caro 2015; Di Caro & Giusti 2015, 2018; see also Chapter 4 and 5):

(52)      *Si*            *vinni*                      *a*            *misi*.  
              REFL.CL        come.PAST.3SG        *a*            put.PAST.3SG  
              'He went and put him/herself.'

[Sorrento 1915: 107; *Sicilian*]

Third, Sorrento (1915: 106) rejects De Gregorio's (1899) analysis of the *mi*-constructions found in Messinese (cf. (13), (17a, b) and (18)) as instances of the same phenomenon, thus separating for the

---

<sup>25</sup> Although Ascoli (1901) does not agree with Gasparly's claim that the Sicilian parataxis of the type *va a piglia* 'go and fetch' could be the result of the combination of the InfCo *va a pigliare* with the pure coordination *va e piglia*, he does not provide any explanation for the expansion of the original Imperative construction to the Indicative Mood.

first time Sicilian PseCo from the Messinese FinCo, where the connecting element *mi* has a final value that is not present in PseCo *a* (cf. Sorrento 1912: 14).

Fourth, he dismisses the complete synonymy of AC-coordination and ET-coordination and, in doing so, he extends his analysis to the InfCo, whose presence is claimed to be the result of the contact with Italian (cf. Sorrento 1950). While the InfCo is perceived as more objective, the combination of the two verbs in Asyndetic PseCo and in PseCo with *a* – which are to be conceived as a whole (cf. Sorrento 1915: 108) – conveys an emotive meaning to the construction, especially in the Imperative. Sorrento maintains that PseCo with *e* does not share with the other two configurations the same semantic unity and simultaneity. As regards the connecting element *a*, in agreeing with Ascoli on its origin from Latin AC, Sorrento (1950: 223) adds Nardelli's claim that AC could confer simultaneity to the two propositions linked.

Another relevant feature of Sicilian PseCo that Sorrento highlights – and that will turn to be important in the recent literature, especially in the dialects of the eastern coast of Sicily – is the fact that a certain form of V1 GO, i.e. *va*, in the Imperative can become an invariable exhortative prefix adding nothing to the meaning of the construction. In particular, Sorrento (1915: 104) explains the typical lack of the connecting element *a* between V1 and V2 in this Imperative context by citing Meyer-Lübke's (1895b: 596-97) account of verbal parataxis as very common with two Imperatives, where the first generally expresses an exhortation to act, while the second more specifically indicates the actual action at stake, which is the case of the Catanese examples *va pigghia* 'go fetch' and *va pigghiala* 'go fetch it'.

Finally, like Ascoli, Sorrento tackles the problem of clitic placements in PseCo too. Ascoli (1896: 467) reports that clitic climbing onto V1 in parataxis may be due to the influence of hypotaxis, and that clitics are naturally related to V1 from a semantic point of view. Sorrento overturns Ascoli's claim on clitic placements and states that clitics generally encliticise onto V2, because of the emphasis on the action expressed by V2. But if Ascoli is wrong about the semantic link between the clitics and V1, these being, usually, arguments of V2, Sorrento ignores that clitic climbing onto V1 is widespread in Southern Italo-Romance.

The contribution by Stefanini (1970) to the discussion on PseCo is noteworthy as he adds an argument in favour of the monoclausality of the construction. In focussing on Florentine, where an Imperative V2 can replace an Infinitive, as in *vièn'a ppigli i' ppane* 'come and get the bread', Stefanini claims that this construction is allowed only in 2SG and, more interestingly, that it can occur only if no element intervenes between the two verbs, so that the insertion of e.g. a locative argument such as *qua* 'here' would have speakers prefer the use of a truncated Infinitive V2 than an Imperative V2, as in (53):



- (53) a. *Vièn qua a mmangià lla minèstra.*  
 come.IMP.2SG here to eat.INF the soup  
 ‘Come here to eat the soup.’
- b. *Vièn qua a mmàngia lla minèstra.*  
 come.IMP.2SG here a eat.IMP.2SG the soup  
 ‘Come here and eat the soup.’

[Stefanini 1970: 19; *Tuscan*]

Stefanini (1970: 20) takes into account the Latin Imperative form *VENI ET VIDE* ‘come and see’ to suggest that the similarity between the Imperative and the shortened Infinitive in those V2s whose Infinitives are rhizotonic, and their high frequency in Tuscan, could have fostered the use of parataxis. He takes this Latin example as a trend in Indo-European to show the similarity of Tuscan parataxis with Germanic forms such as ‘go and see’ and ‘come and get it’. Although no syntactic account is provided by Stefanini, this comparison with Germanic will be studied more in detail by other linguists some decades later.

Leone (1973) follows Folena’s claim (in Stefanini 1970) that parataxis could be the result of the combination of different structures with the InfCo. He postulates, however, the combination of the InfCo with a V2 only, which is the verb carrying the lexical content of the construction. So, for Imperatives like *vieni a vedi* ‘come and see’ he suggests the combination of the InfCo *vieni a vedere* ‘come to see’ with the simple Imperative *vedi* ‘see’, being *vedere* ‘see’ the real verb and the preceding motion verb *a* means to add a special nuance to the construction.<sup>26</sup> According to Leone, for similar constructions such as *venne a disse* ‘he came and said’, this account is more convincing than postulating the combination of *venne a dire* ‘he came to say’ with a real coordination. i.e. *venne e disse* ‘he came and he said’, which sounds rather artificial.

An essential contribution that Leone made to the study of Sicilian PseCo is his highlighting of two possible V1s other than *iri* ‘go’, *vèniri* ‘come’ and *mannari* ‘send’, namely *portari* ‘carry’ and *cuminciari* ‘begin’, ‘start’, as in (54):

- (54) *Ccumienzi a ddici.*  
 start.2SG a say.2SG  
 ‘You start saying.’

[Leone 1973: 12; *Sicilian*]

<sup>26</sup> Leone (1973) adds that if V1 is more than just a functional marker, i.e. if the idea expressed by V1 has its weight in the construction, the InfCo is to be used instead of PseCo.

While there is no other trace of CARRY as a V1 in the literature, BEGIN/START will be described as featuring in particular PseCo configurations in some central Sicilian dialects (cf. Di Caro 2015; Di Caro & Giusti 2015).

Moreover, Leone (1973) confirms Sorrento's description of the prefixed exhortative V1 GO in the Imperative that can be proposed to plural V2s and adds that this form loses its accent in the Imperative, being procliticised onto V2, but not in the Indicative.

In Leone (1995), he suggests a different account for the emergence of Sicilian PseCo than the one present in his paper of 1973: now what combines with the InfCo in cases such as *vaiu a fazzu* 'I go and do' is not the simple V2 *fazzu* but the asyndetic construction *vaiu fazzu*, the latter being present in areas where the AC-coordination is not used.

Leone (1995) confirms the claim that PseCo is, in principle, possible in all Tenses and Persons but is actually restricted to 1SG, 2SG and 3SG of the Indicative Present (and in some cases in the Indicative Preterite), where it is however in competition with the InfCo. Once again, the restricted number of Sicilian varieties considered may have contributed to this questionable claim, but what puzzles here is the fact that he notes for the exhortative V1 GO the allomorphs *vo*, *o* and *a*. In fact, these allomorphs are typical of the Eastern Sicilian varieties, where they occur in fully-fledged paradigms (cf. Di Caro 2015, 2019; Di Caro & Giusti 2015).

The works summarised in this section offer sketchy, non-organic descriptions of Sicilian PseCo. Although they detect different configurations of PseCo, they do not consider the high degree of microvariation found in Sicily and do not account for the distribution of the different configurations, often considering just few instances of PseCo and, mainly, the verb GO as V1. Moreover, in these works, the syntactic status of V1 is not analyzed in depth, but the idea that it could be semantically bleached begins to emerge.

### 3.1.2 Sornicola (1976)

As for the previous literature, Sornicola's (1976) main focus is on syntactic constructions featuring GO as V1. She compares Italian hypotaxis – which she confirms is widespread among Italo-Romance varieties with the exception of Salento and extreme Southern Calabria – with Sicilian parataxis, but she points out that parataxis has also been attested for Tuscan since Gherardini (1838: 661-662), although in the Imperative only.

For the Sicilian parataxis she follows the established subdivision in ET-coordination, AC-coordination and asyndeton, but she does not subscribe to Ascoli's (1896: 468; 1901: 222-225) proposal to consider *a* as derived from Latin AC, for the question is regarded as "a delicate problem" (1976: fn. 2). She criticises the data in the AIS reporting that the InfCo is widespread in Sicilian,

and attributes this possible mistake to the way informants were asked the relevant questions. As will be clear in Chapter 5, Sornicola’s criticism on how difficult eliciting PseCo is in a language system which also features the InfCo is not only reasonable but still relevant for current research.

In her paper, again, Ascoli’s (1901: 222) claim that Sicilian PseCo displays a fully-fledged paradigm across Moods and Tenses is confirmed, but without providing any examples to support a claim that will be proven to be incorrect in the following literature. On the other hand, some examples of PseCo outside of Southern Italy (cf. Sornicola 1976: 67-68) and in contexts other than the Imperative are reported, namely from the poet Giuseppe Gioachino Belli for Romanesco (cf. (55a, b)), and from the linguist and writer Niccolò Tommaseo for Tuscan (cf. (55c)):

- (55) a. *Bbisogna vede come me va a ttrova la scatola.*  
 need.3SG see.INF how to-me go.3SG a find.3SG the box  
 ‘We need to see how he succeeds in finding the box.’

[Belli, son. 1546, vol. B, p. 2094; *Romanesco*]

- b. *Mica poi sce va a ttrova la commare.*  
 NEG then there.CL go.3SG a find.3SG the godmother  
 ‘It is not sure whether he can find his godmother there.’

[Belli, son. 1546, vol. B, p. 2094; *Romanesco*]

- c. *e se la morte non ci viene a trova.*  
 and if the death NEG us.CL come.3SG a find.3SG  
 ‘and if death doesn’t come and find us.’

[Tommaseo, *Canti popolari toscani; Tuscan*]

Sornicola’s major contribution to the understanding of Sicilian PseCo lies in her analysis of the aspectual differences that characterise this construction with respect to the Italian InfCo. In doing so, she considers the work by Keniston (1936) on another Romance variety, i.e. Spanish, which is crucial to understanding Spanish parataxis and, according to Sornicola, Sicilian PseCo. Keniston distinguishes between subjective and objective aspects of the action. The former denote the speaker’s behaviour with respect to how he or she considers the action expressed, while the latter express the objective phases or modalities of the action.

As regards the subjective aspects, Keniston further distinguishes between an “integrative behaviour”, meaning that the speaker considers the action in its totality, and a “distinctive behaviour”, where the actions is considered as a series of distinguishable parts. According to Keniston, Spanish paratactic constructions with V1s such as *tomar* ‘take’, *coger* ‘take’ and *ir* ‘go’

express the subjective integrative aspect, whereas, on the one hand, V1s such as *estar* ‘stay’, ‘be’, *ir* ‘go’, *venir* ‘come’ and *seguir* ‘follow’ (in the sense of ‘keep’ in ‘keep doing something’) + a V2 in the Gerund express the subjective distinctive aspect, and, on the other hand, the hypotactic constructions express the objective (inchoative) aspect.

For the Italian InfCo, Sornicola (1976: 69) identifies the final value as characteristic of the Old Italian InfCo and attributes the ingressive value to a possible later contact with French. But she recognises that the distinction between final and ingressive value is difficult to ascertain even in Latin, and that the ingressive value could have naturally developed from the final value without external influences.

As regards Sicilian PseCo, Sornicola refers to Austin’s (1962: 147-48) concept of “illocutionary force”, and provides some examples in which she highlights the contribution of semantically bleached V1s as aspectual markers expressing astonishment, wonder, regret, or irritation:<sup>27</sup>

(56) a. *Vaiu a ssientu ca iddu ci fici*  
 go.1SG a hear.1SG that he to-her.CL do.PAST.3SG  
*stu tuortu a sso mughieri.*  
 this insult to his wife

‘I’ve heard that he insulted his wife in such a horrible way.’

b. *Si iu a ‘nfilau a vuggia nto iritu.*  
 REFL.CL go.PAST.3SG a insert.PAST.3SG the needle in-the finger

‘He inadvertently pierced his finger with a needle.’

c. *Cci iu a vvinni ‘ntesta stu malu pinzieru.*  
 to-him.CL go.PAST.3SG a come.PAST.3SG in-head this bad thought

‘What a shame! A bad thought went through his mind.’

[Sornicola 1976: 69; Santo Stefano di Camastra (Messina)]

In underlining the auxiliary function of the V1 in those sentences, Sornicola refers to Coseriu’s (1966) analysis of the German paratactic construction with *nehmen* ‘take’, where he points out that

<sup>27</sup> In my English version of Sornicola’s original Italian translations of the Sicilian examples in (56), I have tried to be consistent with her translations, which appear different, and sometimes longer, than the original examples, because Italian lacks PseCo and thus expresses astonishment, wonder, regret, and irritation in a different way. Interestingly, Sornicola (1976: 70) adds that all of the examples she could collect were characterised by the emphatic intonation typical of exclamations.

this construction acts as a whole, where *nehmen* takes on the function of an auxiliary which cannot have its own arguments.

There are, however, cases in which the V1 GO of PseCo retains his lexical meaning of motion and, thus, has a final value. But Sornicola (1976: 70-71) notes that in most of those cases the V1 GO is always ambiguous between a verb that retains its lexical meaning and an auxiliary. From a syntactic point of view, she suggests the possibility that Sicilian PseCo could have preserved the final value in a general trend of loss of the Infinitive, which could have also held true for the FinCo featuring the connecting elements *ma*, *(m)i*, *(m)u* in the relevant Southern Italo-Romance areas. From a semantic point of view, the interpretation of the V1 GO as always having a final value (as in *va ssientu a missa* ‘I go and listen to the mass’) or as being ambiguous between having a final value or not (as in *mi va llavu* ‘I go and wash myself’, where GO can retain its semantics of motion if the sentence is uttered in a room different than a bathroom, but loses it if the sentence is uttered in a bathroom) depends on the nature of V2. If V2 is durative and is marked with the feature [+intentionality], V1 is still lexically meaningful.

Interestingly, Sornicola (1976: 71) points out that the Imperative neutralises this distinction in the presence of the right situational context (à la Hymes 1968), so that the sentences in (57a’, b’) can be semantically equivalent to the ones in (57a, b):

- (57) a. *Va’ pigghia sta cosa!*  
 go.IMP.2SG fetch.IMP.2SG this thing  
 ‘Go fetch this thing!’
- b. *Va’ talia u mari!*  
 go.IMP.2SG watch.IMP.2SG the sea  
 ‘Go contemplate the sea!’
- a’. *Pigghia sta cosa!*  
 fetch.IMP.2SG this thing  
 ‘Fetch this thing!’
- b’. *Talia u mari!*  
 watch.IMP.2SG the sea  
 ‘Contemplate the sea!’

[Sornicola 1976: 71; Santo Stefano di Camastra (Messina)]

In order to test Rohlfs's (1969: §740) claim that V1 GO in Sicilian parataxis has an inchoative / ingressive value, Sornicola replaced the Italian version of examples such as *mi va llavu* 'I go and wash myself' with the counterparts in the Indicative Present and featuring the ingressive V1 START (e.g. *incomincio a lavarmi* 'I start washing myself') or a different periphrasis (e.g. *sono in procinto di lavarmi* 'I'm about to wash myself'). Then she asked speakers to judge whether the meaning of the inceptive versions overlapped with the previous sentences. Not only did the speakers reject this overlapping, but, when asked, they added that the most suitable semantic interpretation of those sentences was that of a sudden resolution or decision of the subject to perform the action expressed by the V2 (as in 'I'll wash myself now'), something that, according to Sornicola, can be explained by Keniston's concept of subjective integrative aspect, which applies in this reading.

Sornicola (1976: 72) excludes that Sicilian PseCo could ever coincide with the utterance time (i.e. it cannot have a progressive meaning): PseCo is more likely to express something happening soon after the utterance time, and sometimes – and that is the case of what will be referred to as the 'Surprise Effect' in the following literature – something happened just before the utterance time (cf. the examples in (56)).

In the final part of her paper, Sornicola (1976: 73-74) verifies whether the Italian InfCo can have a global interpretation too, i.e. whether V1 and V2 can act as a whole. She reports that the GDLI (I: 453) attributes to Italian verb combinations *andare a fare, a dire, a pensare* 'to go to do, to say, to think' a value of wonder, possibly mixed with condemnation, and she provides the examples in (58), as part of the data collected throughout Italy in a non-systematic way:

- (58) a. *Guarda che va a pensare!*  
 look.IMP.2SG what go.3SG to think.INF  
 'What's got into him!'
- b. *In che brutto guaio si è andato a cacciare!*  
 in what bad trouble REFL.CL be.3SG go.PAST.PART to put.INF  
 'What has he got himself into!'
- c. *È andato a credere a quell' amico!*  
 be.3SG go.PAST.PART to trust.INF to that friend  
 'Unfortunately, he put trust in that friend of his!'

[Sornicola 1976: 73; *Italian*]

Sornicola admits that cases like the ones in (58) could have an intensive, emotional or even negative value. Nevertheless, she limits this semantically marked reading to few cases in Italian, and adds that diatopic factors play an important role in determining whether this reading is to be applied or not, since in her survey speakers from Southern Italy were more likely to recognise a surprise effect (not necessarily a positive one) in some of the sentences they were asked to judge.

Although in line with the previous contributions to the study of Sicilian PseCo – i.e. few varieties considered, examples from the Indicative Present and the Imperative only, no fully-fledged paradigms checked –, Sornicola’s work features the first semantic analysis of the construction in which a process pointing towards the grammaticalisation of V1 GO as an emphatic marker is signalled, setting PseCo apart from the InfCo.

### 3.1.3 Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001)

The work by Cardinaletti & Giusti on Sicilian PseCo represents a turning point in the relevant literature for more than just one reason.<sup>28</sup> Although their paper of 2001 is in line with the previous literature in that it considers only one Sicilian variety, namely Marsalese<sup>29</sup>, they provide for the first time a thorough syntactic account of PseCo – which however is referred to as the *Inflected Construction* in their work. In particular, they focus on the semi-lexical nature of V1, for which other motion verbs, namely COME and COME BY, together with the causative SEND, are taken into account.

Moreover, they compare Sicilian PseCo (cf. (59a)) not only with the InfCo in both Sicilian (cf. (59b)) and Italian, but also with instances of PseCo in Germanic, namely American English (for which they consider the work by Shopen 1971, Carden & Pesetsky 1977 and Jaeggli & Hyams 1993) and Swedish (Wiklund 1996, 1998, and Josefsson 1991), paving the road to future macro-comparative analyses of that kind (cf. e.g. Di Caro 2015, 2019).

- (59) a. *Vaju a pigghiu u pani.*  
 go.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I go and buy the bread.’
- b. *Vaju a pigghiari u pani.*  
 go.1SG to fetch.INF the bread

<sup>28</sup> Cardinaletti & Giusti’s first work on Marsalese dates back to 1998, but its revised version was published in 2003.

<sup>29</sup> Although the authors only consider Marsalese, they (2001: 373) refer to Rohlf’s (1969b: §710, §761) to point out that PseCo is also found in Eastern Sicilian dialects, in Southern Apulian, and in Southern Calabrian.

‘I go to buy the bread.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 373; Marsala (Trapani)]

c. *I go and buy bread.*

d. *I go buy bread.*

e. *I go to buy bread.*

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 373; *American English*]

f. *Jag går och gör mig en grogg.*

I go.PRES and make.PRES myself a grogg

‘I go and make myself a grogg.’

g. *Jag går för att göra mig en grogg.*

I go.PRES for to fetch.INF myself a grogg

‘I go to make myself a grogg.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 373; *Swedish*]

As will be clear from the discussion below, a crucial contribution by the paper into consideration is a complete account of the Mood, Tense and Person restrictions found in Marsalese which consequently refutes both the classical view (cf. Ascoli 1896, 1901; Sorrento 1915, 1950; Sornicola 1976) that Sicilian PseCo displays fully-fledged paradigms with no Mood/Tense restrictions, and the idea that PseCo is found in the singular persons only.

Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 372) open with a clear statement regarding the syntactic behaviour of the motion verbs involved as V1s in PseCo: they are “lexical categories merged as functional heads” in the extended projection of V2. As *semi-lexical verbs* – as they propose to call these verbs – their functional properties are to be considered as “lack or suppression of their canonical lexical properties”.<sup>30</sup> The authors point out that the difference between semi-lexical motion verbs and auxiliaries lies in the fact that the latter always lose their lexical meaning, while the former can retain their semantics of motion and, thus, can display part of their argument structure – phenomenon which is subject to macro-variation across Sicilian, American English and Swedish.

From this insight about the nature of motion verbs in PseCo, some important considerations on the characteristics that these verbs share with auxiliaries emerge. First, few verbs can occur as

---

<sup>30</sup> According to the syntactic behaviour of the V1s (especially GO and COME) in American English PseCo, Shopen (1971: 255) proposes calling them *quasi-modal verbs*, i.e. lexical verbs that are “caught in the act” of “moving into the modal category” (1971: 263).



V1s in PseCo: Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 375) refer to Ritter & Rosen’s (1996) notion of *weak verbs* – that is verbs which are semantically basic – to determine what verbs can enter PseCo. Therefore, it is not by chance that GO and COME are found in all of the three languages considered<sup>31</sup>, whereas verbs such as RUN and BEGIN, which are semantically ‘heavier’, are subject to macro-variation<sup>32</sup>.

Second, semi-lexical motion verbs share with auxiliaries another feature, which will turn out to be crucial to account for the defectivity of PseCo in Marsalese in terms of Mood, Tense and Person restrictions: both of them can optionally occur in an invariable form. Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 383-385) propose an internal comparison for Marsalese where they show for the first time that the invariable V1 GO *va* in PseCo (as in (60a-c)) – but never in the InfCo – behaves as the verbs *aviri* ‘have’ and *stari* ‘stay’ when they are used as functional verbs in, respectively, the Indicative Present Perfect (cf. (61)) and the Indicative Present Progressive (cf. (62)). These verbs can occur as the invariable *ha* and *sta*, and are available only for the three singular persons of the Indicative Present.

- (60) a. *Vaju / va a pigghiu u pani.*  
 go.1SG / go a fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I go and fetch the bread.’
- b. *Vai / va a pigghi u pani.*  
 go.2SG / go a fetch.2SG the bread  
 ‘You go and fetch the bread.’
- c. *Vannu / va a pigghianu u pani.*  
 go.3PL / go a fetch.3PL the bread  
 ‘They go and fetch the bread.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 383; Marsala (Trapani)]

- (61) a. *Un ci haju / ha statu mai.*  
 NEG there.CL have.1SG / have be.PAST.PART never  
 ‘I have never been there.’

<sup>31</sup> As a matter of fact, GO and COME are always available in all of the Sicilian varieties that I could study during the different stages of my fieldwork, with COME featuring generally more Person restrictions cross-dialectally.

<sup>32</sup> Note that semantically basic verbs are also the best candidates for auxiliarihood, so that BE and HAVE are always found as auxiliaries in the Romance and Germanic languages.

- b. *Un ci hai / ha statu mai.*  
 NEG there.CL have.1SG / have be.PAST.PART never  
 ‘You have never been there.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 384; Marsala (Trapani)]

- (62) a. *Ci staju / sta ennu.*  
 there.CL stay.1SG / stay go.GER  
 ‘I’m going there.’

- b. *Ci stai / sta ennu.*  
 there.CL stay.1SG / stay go.GER  
 ‘You’re going there.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 384; Marsala (Trapani)]

Contrary to what had been generally stated in the previous literature on the paradigmatic full-fledgedness of Sicilian PseCo, according to which no Mood and Tense restrictions are reported for this construction, Cardinaletti & Giusti clearly show the high defectiveness of PseCo. The relevant claim is that PseCo is possible only with the less marked forms of a verbal paradigm (2001: 382)<sup>33</sup>, so that the Indicative Present 1PL, 2PL, the Imperative 2PL and all other Moods and Tenses are out because they display the marked allomorph of the V1.

For the V1 *iri* ‘go’, the less marked form amounts to the consonant-initial allomorph, i.e. *va-* (as in (63a, b)), whereas the marked forms are the ones starting with the vowel *e-* or *i-* (as in (63a’, b’, c, d)). For V1 *vènniri* ‘come’, the less marked form is *ve-* and the marked form is *vi-*. For *passari* ‘come by’, which displays no overt allomorphy in the Indicative Present paradigm, Cardinaletti & Giusti postulate two homophonous allomorphs and the same can apply to *mannari* ‘send’.

---

<sup>33</sup> This is in line with what Carden & Pesetsky (1977: 84) say about English PseCo, where the only factor that determines the grammaticality of PseCo is “whether a given tense/person combination is morphologically marked”. In the examples in (i), only the bare form ‘go’ can enter PseCo:

- (i) a. \*John goes visit Harry every afternoon.  
 b. \*John goes visits Harry every afternoon.  
 c. \*John go visits Harry every afternoon.  
 d. Does John go visit Harry on weekends?  
 e. John doesn’t go visit Harry every day, does he?

[Carden & Pesetsky 1977: 84; *English*]

- (63) a. *Vaju a pigghiu u pani.*  
 go.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I go and fetch the bread.’
- a’. *\*Emu a pigghiamu u pani.*  
 go.1PL a fetch.1PL the bread  
 ‘We go and fetch the bread’
- b. *Va pigghia u pani!*  
 go.IMP.2SG fetch.1SGIMP.2SG the bread  
 ‘Go (and) fetch the bread!’
- b’. *\*Iti pigghiati u pani!*  
 go.IMP.2PL fetch.IMP.2PL the bread  
 ‘Go (and) fetch the bread!’
- c. *\*Ii a pigghiai u pani.*  
 go.PAST.1SG a fetch.PAST.1SG the bread  
 ‘I went to fetch the bread.’
- d. *\*Ia a pigghiava u pani.*  
 go.IMPRF.1SG a fetch.IMPERF.1SG the bread  
 ‘I used to go and fetch the bread.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 380-381; Marsala (Trapani)]

Nevertheless, they are aware of the fact that “allomorphy cannot be taken as the ultimate cause of the inflection restrictions” of PseCo, but “must thus be the result of some general property of the verbal inflectional system which interacts with syntactic principles” (2001: 381).

Third, in describing the functional behaviour of semi-lexical motion verbs, Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 376-378) report that verbs used functionally as V1s in a PseCo cannot project their arguments, while their lexical counterparts are always compatible with motion verb arguments. This argument restriction is a property that they have in common with auxiliaries.<sup>34</sup> When *iri* ‘go’, *aviri* ‘have’ and *stari* ‘stay’ are used as lexical verbs – as in, respectively, (64a-c), (65a) and (65c) – they

<sup>34</sup> In Cardinaletti & Giusti’s analysis (2001: 375-376), a more straightforward common point between semi-lexical verbs and auxiliaries as elements merged as functional heads regards the fact that both of them must precede the lexical V2, the opposite order (i.e. V2 and V1) being impossible (compare *vaju a pigghiu u pani* ‘I go and fetch the bread’ vs. *\*pigghiu u pani a vaju*).

can occur with locative clitics or clitic clusters, elements which contribute nothing to the meaning of those verbs.

On the other hand, when they are used as functional verbs – as in the PseCo in (64d), in the Present Progressive in (65b) and in the Present Perfect in (65d) – the insertion of clitics as their arguments is impossible.

- (64) a. *Minni*                      *vaju*.  
 REFL.CL+LOC.CL    go.1SG  
 ‘I’m leaving.’
- b. (*Minni*)                      *vaju*            *a*            *casa*.  
 REFL.CL+LOC.CL    go.1SG        to-the        home  
 ‘I’m going home.’
- c. (*Minni*)                      *vaju*            *a*            *mangiari*.  
 REFL.CL+LOC.CL    go.1SG        to            go.INF
- d. (*\*Minni*)                      *vaju*            *a*            *mangiu*.  
 REFL.CL+LOC.CL    go.1SG        *a*            go.1SG  
 ‘I’m going to eat.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 377; Marsala (Trapani)]

- (65) a. (*Minni*)                      *staju*            *a*            *casa*.  
 REFL.CL+LOC.CL    stay.1SG        at-the        home  
 ‘I’m staying at home.’
- b. (*\*Minni*)                      *staju*            *mangiannu*    *a*            *casa*.  
 REFL.CL+LOC.CL    go.1SG        eat.GER            at-the        home  
 ‘I’m eating at home.’
- c. *Ci*            *haju*            ‘*na*            *soro*.  
 there.CL    have.1SG    a            sister  
 ‘I have a sister’
- d. (*\*Ci*)            *haju*            *mangiatu*            *a*            *casa*.  
 there.CL    have.1SG    eat.PAST.PART    at-the        home  
 ‘I have eaten at home.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 378; Marsala (Trapani)]

The properties of motion verbs accounted for in Marsalese are the same found in American English (which, however, requires an animate subject), while Swedish allows for locative arguments of the

motion verbs in PseCo to occur (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 378-379). This has ultimately to do with the exact position in which the lexical verb is merged as functional head.<sup>35</sup> The difference between semi-lexical motion verbs and auxiliaries lies precisely in the fact that the former can retain their semantics of motion and this property is expressed to different degrees in the three different languages considered.

Adjuncts of the V1 (such as *c'a machina* 'by car' in *Peppe va a mangia c'a machina* 'Peppe goes to eat by car') in Marsalese are impossible as well and for the same syntactic reason (2001: 379-380).

However, the impossible insertion of arguments or adjuncts of V1 in Cardinaletti & Giusti's analysis is just one of the properties that characterise motion verbs in PseCo. The authors point out that V1 and V2 in all of the three languages considered "must share inflectional features" (2001: 385), so that, for example, an Indicative Imperfect V1 *ia* 'I went' / 'I used to go' in Marsalese cannot combine with an Indicative Present V2, and vice-versa. Moreover, they apply different diagnostics from the previous literature on English to Marsalese to find out that the two constructions behave in the same way, ultimately displaying monoclausal properties.

First, Shopen (1971: 257-258) notes that PseCo in American English (in both V1 *and* V2 and V1 V2 configurations) is not semantically equivalent to the V1 *to* V2 InfCo, in that only the former is always subject to the obligatory single event interpretation of V1 and V2. That means that in PseCo it is not possible to negate only the action expressed by the lexical verb in V2. In the examples Shopen proposes, the construction in (66b) asserts that vegetables are actually purchased, so the fact that vegetables are not available to purchase makes the sentence contradictory. On the

---

<sup>35</sup> The insertion of a directional argument such as 'all the way there' in PseCo (in both V1 *and* V2, and V1 V2 configurations) yields ungrammatical results for American English speakers – who have to turn to the InfCo –, whereas Swedish allows for directional argument like *hit* 'here' in V1 *och* V2 PseCo:

- (i) a. I go all the way there to eat.
- b. #I go all the way there and eat.
- c. \*I go and eat all the way there.
- d. \*I go all the way there eat.
- e. \*I go eat all the way there.

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 378-379; *American English*]

- (ii) *Vem kom du hit och besökte?*  
       who come.PAST you here and visit.PAST  
       'Who did you come here to visit?'

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 396; *Swedish*]

other hand, in the InfCo in (66a), which does not assert that the vegetables are purchased, the every day shortage of vegetables does not conflict with the previous sentence.<sup>36</sup>

- (66) a. They go to buy vegetables every day, but there never are any vegetables.  
 b. \*They go buy vegetables every day, but there never are any vegetables.

[Shopen 1971: 258; *American English*]

Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 387) add that replacing the V1 V2 PseCo in (66b) with the V1 *and* V2 alternative still yields ungrammatical results, and report that the same single event interpretation – which is proof of the monoclausality of PseCo – holds for Swedish and Marsalese PseCo, where if the purchase does not take place, then only the InfCo is possible (2001: 387).

Second, in Marsalese, the semi-lexical motion verbs in PseCo share with the auxiliaries HAVE and STAY the property of displaying the obligatory procliticisation onto V1 of clitic pronouns that are arguments of the V2 (cf. 67a, b), while clitic climbing is only optional in the Italian InfCo and, according to the authors (2001: 388-389), not “strictly obligatory” in the Marsalese InfCo (cf. 67c, d).<sup>37</sup>

- (67) a. \**Vaju a pigghiulu.*  
 go.1SG a fetch.1SG+it.CL
- b. *U vaju a pigghiu.*  
 it.CL go.1SG a fetch.1SG
- c. ?*Vaju a pigghiallu.*  
 go.1SG to fetch.INF+it.CL

---

<sup>36</sup> The same line of reasoning is proposed by Carden & Pesetsky (1977: 87) for the ‘try and’ PseCo, where both V1 and V2 must refer to the same event. Infact, if we read the sentence in (i) as a real coordination and not as PseCo, then the failure described in the continuation is not coherent:

- (i) #Every time they’ve tried and hit the Red Baron, they missed and he shot them down.

[Carden & Pesetsky 1977: 87; *English*]

<sup>37</sup> According to my fieldwork in Sicily, encliticisation onto V2 in the InfCo is extremely disfavoured cross-dialectally and among speakers of all ages. I believe that the fact that clitic climbing in the Marsalese InfCo (or in other varieties) is not as impossible as in PseCo could be due to the influence of the Italian InfCo, where *vado a prenderlo* and *lo vado a prendere* ‘I go and fetch it’ are basically equivalent.

- d. *U vaju a pigghiari.*  
 it.CL go.1SG to fetch.INF  
 I go and fetch it.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 388; Marsala (Trapani)]

An important note is proposed in this passage by the authors, with respect to clitic climbing: the monoclausality of the construction is further confirmed by the impossibility of the fully inflected V2 to retain its clitic.<sup>38</sup> This will be used as a good argument in favour of the different analysis of Sicilian PseCo and FinCo (where the intermediate placing of the clitic pronoun is attested) in the following literature (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2019).

Third, syntactic material intervening between V1 and V2 is not allowed: the insertion of sentential adverbs (cf. (68a)) or floating quantifiers (cf. (68b)) between the two verbs is not possible, whereas it is in the corresponding InfCo.<sup>39</sup>

- (68) a. *I picciotti vanno (\*tutti) a pigghiano (tutti) u pani*  
 the boys go.3PL all a fetch.3PL all the bread  
*ne sta butìa.*  
 In this shop  
 ‘The boys all go to buy the bread in this shop.’

- b. *Un vaju (\*mai) a pigghiu (mai) u pani*  
 NEG go.1SG never a fetch.1SG never the bread  
*ne sta butìa.*  
 In this shop  
 ‘I never go to buy the bread in this shop.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 390; Marsala (Trapani)]

<sup>38</sup> Later on in the paper (2001: 399), Cardinaletti & Giusti consider the case of the impossible clitic intermediate placing in Marsalese PseCo, as in *\*vaju a u pigghiu* ‘I go and fetch it’, by claiming that the clitic pronoun is merged only after the motion verb has been merged in the extended projection of the lexical verb.

<sup>39</sup> Proof of the monoclausality of PseCo in terms of impossible insertion of material had already been provided by Carden & Pesetsky (1977). In English PseCo, the pseudo-coordinator ‘and’ is homophonous to the real coordinator ‘and’ (which is the case for all Germanic languages featuring PseCo). Therefore, English V1 *and* V2 PseCo, such as ‘try and catch’, has always what Carden & Pesetsky (1977) call the “real-*and* reading”. They note (1977: 86) that parentheticals, such as ‘unfortunately’, can only appear in the real-*and* reading, so that sentences like ‘John will try, unfortunatly, and catch me’ is possible only when we force the reading in which John’s catching is successful.

As regards the discussion in the literature concerning the different constructions coexisting with the InfCo, in Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) Sicilian PseCo is structurally set apart from the InfCo, for the former is (always) monoclausal. Moreover, it is also considered as a different structure with regard to the Sicilian FinCo generally found in the province of Messina (e.g. *vaju mi pigghiu u pani* ‘I go to fetch the bread’; cf. *supra* (13), (17a, b) and (18)), which displays a biclausal behaviour and, as is the case of the dialect spoken in Milazzo (in the province of Messina), can co-occur with PseCo in one and the same variety.

Placing their analysis in the generative framework available at that time (cf. Chomsky 1995, 1998), Cardinaletti & Giusti propose a bottom-up bare phrase structure procedure in which “the motion verb immediately precedes the lexical verb which has reached its spell-out position in the derivation” (2001: 397), starting from a VP-Shell (in the sense of Larson 1988) and going up the extended projection of the verb. Depending on this merging position – which is subject to language variation – the motion verb can or cannot project (part of) its own lexical arguments or adjuncts.

As regards Marsalese, the motion verb is merged higher than the merging point of adjuncts – following the general property of verbs in Sicilian of reaching higher structural positions than American English and Swedish – so there is no room for any element pertaining the thematic structure of the motion verb to be merged.<sup>40</sup> Once the building procedure of PseCo is explained, a more precise claim about the motion V1 is made: since it is merged in a head whose position is higher than the one of the checking domain of the lexical verb, it “cannot have all the features of an inflected verb” and, as a consequence, its “features are checked in a parasitic way, by copying the features of the inflected lexical verb onto the motion verb”.

A further significant highlight of Cardinaletti & Giusti’s work regards a cartographic analysis of the motion V1s in PseCo, which are clearly distinguished from Cinque’s (2003)<sup>41</sup> andative verb in the functional hierarchy of the sentence. In fact, the andative verb in Marsalese is as low as the one in Italian, and lower than the causative verb. But V1 GO is higher than the causative and, being a different element than the andative verb, can co-occur with it in one and the same sentence, as shown in (69)<sup>42</sup>:

---

<sup>40</sup> By using the applicable part of Cinque’s (1999) hierarchy for the positioning of verbs and adverbs in Italian (some adverbs such as ‘usually’ and ‘often’ are not generally found in Sicilian), Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 398) demonstrate that the lexical verbs in Marsalese reach at least the same high position in the functional structure as the Italian lexical verbs.

<sup>41</sup> Cinque (2003) appeared in the same volume as Cardinaletti & Giusti (2003) and was available to the latter authors through a draft of 1999.

<sup>42</sup> I propose here a slightly different version than the one found in Cardinaletti & Giusti’s original paper as regards the labels in the hierarchy of (69a) and the glosses and the translation in (69b).



(69) a. PseCo V1 > Causative > Andative > V2

b. *U va(ju) a fazzu iri a pigghiari a Paola.*  
it.CL go.1SG a do.1SG do.1SG to fetch.INF to Paola

‘I’ll go and have Paola go and fetch it.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 401; Marsala (Trapani)]

Unfortunately, Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) take into consideration only one Sicilian variety, thus ignoring the number of different possible configurations found in Sicily. In this way, the Mood, Tense and Person restrictions are misleadingly generalised to all Sicilian varieties. Moreover, their claim that V1s “maintain their motion meaning and do not contribute any aspectual information to the clause” (2001: 393) not always holds true and ignores what had been previously reported about the sense of astonishment, wonder, regret, or irritation that V1s can contribute in some emphatic usage of PseCo cross-linguistically (cf. Sornicola 1976: 69).

Nevertheless, as we have seen in this section, their contribution to the comprehension of Sicilian PseCo, and especially of the syntactic behaviour of the V1s involved, is highly valuable. The main contents of their work that represent a step forward in the relevant research can be summarised as follows:

i) PseCo in Marsalese is different from both the coexisting InfCo and FinCo, but shares many points in common with some constructions found in American English and Swedish which display a motion V1 followed by a connecting element and a lexical V2;

ii) The single event interpretation of the verbs involved, the obligatory clitic climbing onto V1, the obligatory *phi*-feature sharing between V1 and V2, and the impossible insertion of floating quantifiers and frequency adverbs between V1 and V2 all demonstrate the PseCo in Marsalese is monoclausal;

iii) PseCo in Marsalese is possible only with GO, COME, COME BY and SEND in V1 position, and only in those persons of the Indicative Present and the Imperative displaying the less marked forms of V1;

iv) V1s in PseCo behave like functional verbs such as auxiliaries with many respects: both of them belong to a restricted class, must precede the lexical verb, can display invariable forms for some of the persons of the paradigm, lose their argument structure. But contrary to what

happens to pure functional verbs, motion V1s in PseCo can retain their motion semantic content and thus can be referred to as semi-lexical;

v) The motion verbs in PseCo are syntactically higher than Cinque's (1999) andative verb in the functional hierarchy, so that they can co-occur in the same sentence.

All subsequent work on Sicilian PseCo cannot – and as a matter of fact does not – ignore Cardinaletti & Giusti's analysis, although, as is discussed in the following sections, not always agreeing with their assumptions (cf. e.g. *infra* Manzini & Savoia 2005 and Cruschina 2013).

### 3.1.4 Manzini & Savoia (2005)

The work by Manzini & Savoia is known for a massive amount of data collected on several Italo-Romance syntactic constructions. For Southern Italo-Romance they take into account a larger group of syntactic constructions featuring two inflected verbs and an optional connecting element *a*, which are found in Sicilian, Calabrian and Salentino, thus treating PseCo and the FinCo as the same construction.

Manzini & Savoia (2005: 689) report the aspectual verbs GO and COME as possible V1s for all the varieties, to which the aspectual STAY and the modal WANT are added in some Salentino varieties (cf. *supra* (14a-c), (16b, e), (22) and (23)). They confirm that V1 can optionally occur in an invariable form but maintain that this is not normally the case for Sicilian, which prefers the full inflection on V1, and add that some Apulian dialects display partially inflected forms.

The claim on Sicilian preference for full inflection on V1 seems to be biased by the data they report from Modicano, the dialect spoken in Modica (in the province of Ragusa), as the only variety considered for Eastern Sicily. In fact, as will be discussed later on in the present work (see also (39)), an invariable V1 GO is preferred to a fully inflected one in many Eastern varieties (cf. Di Caro 2015, 2019; Di Caro & Giusti 2015).

However, the data on Modicano prevent Cardinaletti & Giusti's analysis on the Tense and Person restrictions of Marsalese from being applicable to all Sicilian varieties. PseCo in Modicano, in fact, is also found in the Indicative Imperfect (cf. (71)) and Preterite (cf. (72)). Moreover, those paradigms – along with the Indicative Present one (cf. (70))<sup>43</sup> – are fully-fledged. Unfortunately, the

---

<sup>43</sup> For the Indicative Present PseCo in Modicano I report only the 1PL and the 2PL, i.e. the two slots of the paradigm which are not possible in Marsalese (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 380-381). However, Manzini & Savoia (2005: 696) report the fully-fledged paradigm. On the contrary, the complete Indicative Preterite paradigm is missing in their work, the only persons displayed being the 1SG and the 3PL, as shown in (72).

data provided for Modicano are complete only for the Indicative Present and Imperfect and only with the V1 GO.

(70) a. 'jemu a mmanɲ'tfamu  
 go.1PL a eat.1PL  
 'We go and eat.'

b. 'iti a mmanɲ'tfati  
 go.2PL a eat.2PL  
 'You go and eat.'

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 696; Modica (Ragusa)]

(71) a. u 'ia a ffa'jia  
 it.CL go.IMPRF.1SG a do.IMPRF.1SG  
 'I used to go and do it.'

b. u 'jeutu a ffa'jieutu  
 it.CL go.IMPRF.2SG a do.IMPRF.2SG  
 'You used to go and do it.'

c. u 'ia a ffa'jia  
 it.CL go.IMPRF.3SG a do.IMPRF.3SG  
 'He/She used to go and do it.'

d. u 'jeumu a ffa'jieumu  
 it.CL go.IMPRF.1PL a do.IMPRF.1PL  
 'We used to go and do it.'

e. u 'jeubbu a ffa'jieubbu  
 it.CL go.IMPRF.2PL a do.IMPRF.2PL  
 'You used to go and do it.'

f. u 'jeunu a ffa'jieunu  
 it.CL go.IMPRF.3PL a do.IMPRF.3PL  
 'They used to go and do it.'

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 696; Modica (Ragusa)]



- (74) a. 'viɲɲ            a    m'maɲdzu    n    a    tɔ            'kasa  
           come.1SG    a    eat.1SG        in    the    your    home  
           'I come and eat at your place.'
- b. 'viəni            a    m'maɲdʒə  
           come.2SG    a    eat.2SG  
           'You come and eat.'
- c. 'vɛni            a    m'maɲdʒa  
           come.3SG    a    eat.3SG  
           'He/She comes to eat.'
- d. 'vɪnɪnɔ        a    m'maɲdʒanɔ  
           come.3PL    a    eat.3PL  
           'They come and eat.'

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 695; Villadoro (Enna)]

Besides providing data that do not comply with the restrictions found in Marsalese, another point of departure from Cardinaletti & Giusti's (2001, 2003) work is a different analysis of the connecting element *a* and, as a consequence, the treating of such constructions as biclausal. While Cardinaletti & Giusti, in referring to Rohlf's (1969: §761), follow a tradition tracing back to Ascoli (1896) which derives *a* from Latin coordinator AC (cf. *supra* (29) and (30)), Manzini & Savoia (2005: 688-689) treat *a* as the preposition (i.e. *a* > Lat. AD) introducing the infinitival complement of V1. This implies that the inflected V2 shares with an infinitival complement a crucial characteristic, such as the restructuring instantiated by clitic climbing onto V1.

According to Manzini & Savoia (2005: 698), it is restructuring that determines the fact that V1 and V2 must share the same time reference and this explains for the sharing of the argument structure by the two verbs. Being the inflected V2 much like an infinitival V2, the presence of the prepositional *a* is justified by its being sensitive to the property of event indefiniteness (2005: 699). This also explains why the complementiser *che* 'that', which would introduce definite events expressed by tensed V2s, is never found in such constructions.

Considering cases of PseCo and FinCo as instantiating the same (biclausal) construction, in which the position of the clitic pronoun arguments of the V2 can be either placed before the V2 or before the V1 (compare the position of the clitic *u* 'it' in (71) and (72) with the position of *lu* 'it' in *ulia lu fattsu* 'I wanted to do it' in the Salentino dialect spoken in Carmiano (Lecce) (cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005: 699), has the shortcomings of missing some monoclausal properties of the motion V1

in PseCo, which can lose its semantics of motion to become an emphatic marker (as discussed in Sornicola 1976).

In fact, in the purely syntactic account of the data provided by Manzini & Savoia (2005) such a possibility is not mentioned, although they focus on V1s GO and COME only. Nor is insertion of elements (other than the connecting element *a*) between the two verbs tested to discern PseCo, where this is impossible, from the FinCo, which admit it. But the data from Modicano have the merit to revive the discussion on the richness of the paradigmatic configurations found in Sicilian PseCo, which has received important updates ever since and is still ongoing.

### 3.1.5 Cruschina (2013)

Cruschina (2013) draws on data from the previous literature, both diachronically (i.e. the work by Wilson 1999 on the collection of Sicilian tales and short stories by Giuseppe Pitrè; cf. Pitrè 1993 [1875]) and synchronically (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003; Manzini & Savoia 2005), and adds new data from the dialect spoken in his hometown Mussomeli, in the province of Caltanissetta, and from Pantelleria, in the province of Trapani (via Tropea 1988). In his study of Sicilian PseCo – which Cruschina calls the ‘Doubly Inflected Construction’ along the lines of Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) – the idea that this construction always displays full paradigms across Moods and Tenses (cf. Ascoli 1901; Sornicola 1976) is definitely abandoned.

While Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003) offer a thorough syntactic account of PseCo and focus on the nature of motion V1s, Cruschina’s (2013) contribution focusses on PseCo as a verbal periphrasis and offers both a morphological analysis and a semantic one (which considers first PseCo with a semantically full V1 and then PseCo with a desemantised V1). In his work, the status of PseCo as a periphrasis is analyzed as an entity which challenges both morphology and syntax.

Cruschina (2013: 262-263) first identifies two main approaches. On the one hand, generative syntacticians (cf. Belletti 1990; Giorgi & Pianesi 1997; Cinque 1999) generally consider verbal periphrases as the product of ordinary syntax, which features one or more functional elements. This ‘reductionist approach’, which mistakenly leads to systematic overgeneralisation, does not take into consideration those periphrases characterised by semantic opacity of their components. That means that the meaning of their components does not contribute to the meaning of the whole periphrases.

On the other hand, other scholars follow an *inflectional integration approach* within the framework known as *Paradigm Function Morphology* (cf. Sadler & Spencer 2001; Spencer 2001; Ackerman & Stump 2004) according to which an inflectional periphrasis is a “multiword combination that fills a cell in the inflectional paradigm of a lexeme” (cf. Brown *et al.* 2012) and its

integration within the inflectional paradigm is the relevant factor to be considered. This approach comes with its shortcomings too, including ruling out all those multiword constructions displaying no links to an inflectional paradigm, and more generally its overlooking syntax.

Then, Cruschina reports that it is not always an easy task to distinguish between periphrastic and non-periphrastic formations. He highlights the gradient nature of periphrases in a grammaticalisation continuum that goes from open syntactic combinations (such as Latin *est amans* ‘is loving’) to full morphologised lexical entries (such as Italian Conditional *amerebbe* ‘he/she would love’ < Latin *amare habuit*), and refers to Vincent (2011: 424) who provides a four-degree tool to classify periphrases according to their degree of grammaticalisation: i) purely syntactic constructions; ii) morphological exploited but transparent periphrases; iii) opaque periphrases; iv) morphologised periphrases.

By taking into account these four patterns and the fact that there is evidence of many intermediate combinatory stages in Romance and in other languages (cf. Vincent 1987; Hopper & Traugott 2003), Cruschina (2013: 264) reports that the morphological status of a periphrasis increases with the increase in the degree of grammaticalisation it displays. In particular, the analysis of Sicilian PseCo is of great interest because, although not suitable to be considered as an inflectional periphrasis, according to the *Paradigm Function Morphology* framework, PseCo i) typically behaves like highly grammaticalised constructions, and ii) displays an irregular paradigmatic distribution well known to morphology at the levels of stem and inflection, i.e. of the structure of one-word verbs. These elements make PseCo a phenomenon of interest for both morphology and syntax. The analysis of the grammaticalisation of PseCo allows Cruschina (2013: 264) to state that the degree of grammaticalisation of a periphrasis must determine whether a construction must be treated morphologically.

As regards the analysis of the data on PseCo, Cruschina reports that verbal periphrases with motion V1s are very common in Romance (cf. Squartini 1998; Taylor 2011) but have developed very different meanings cross-linguistically.<sup>45</sup> Of all the Romance periphrases, however, PseCo is interestingly the only one that features an inflected V2, instead of an infinitival one. Cruschina embraces Cardinaletti and Giusti’s (2001, 2003) diagnostics which demonstrate that PseCo in

---

<sup>45</sup> For example, while V1 GO is generally used in verbal periphrases to express Future, as in French and in Spanish (cf. Bybee *et al.* 1994; see also the examples in (2) and (3)), in Catalan it is used as a narrative Past marker. Pérez Saldanya & Hualde (2003: 48 via Cruschina 2013: 281) report that the use of GO as a narrative Past marker is not an isolated case, since it is attested diachronically in medieval French, Spanish and Occitan.

Marsalese is a monoclausal construction and extends the results to Mussomelese<sup>46</sup>, although he treats the connecting element *a* as a preposition meaning ‘to’, à la Manzini & Savoia 2005 (cf. Cruschina 2013: 264)<sup>47</sup>. Contrary to Manzini & Savoia (2005), however, Cruschina (2013: 268) reports as ungrammatical the positioning of the clitic argument of V2 between the two verbs, thus keeping cases of FinCo (cf. (24a) and (25c)) away from his analysis.

After the discussion of the data on the monoclausal status of Sicilian PseCo, Cruschina focusses on its degree of grammaticalisation and on the difficult task of defining PseCo as an inflectional periphrasis (in the sense of Ackerman & Stump 2004). In fact, PseCo fails to conform to the three criteria that determine whether a construction is an inflectional periphrasis:

- a) PseCo is completely analytical, so it does not follow the criterion of ‘feature intersection’, according to which there must be the possibility to express the same set of properties of the periphrasis in a synthetic way in the same language;
- b) PseCo displays *phi*-features on both verbs, whereas according to the criterion of ‘distributed exponence’ the marking of grammatical meaning of an inflectional periphrasis must be distributed across a number of smaller pieces of the word, each of which contribute a subcomponent of that meaning;
- c) According to the criterion of ‘non-compositionality’, the grammatical features of an inflectional periphrasis cannot be built by the combination of the grammatical features of its parts, which on the contrary is mostly the case for Sicilian PseCo.

Cruschina (2013: 269-270), therefore, turns to a tradition in the study of grammaticalisation (cf. Lehmann 1995: 29; Bybee *et al.* 1994: 133) that offers a wider definition of periphrasis according to which “any structure that expresses a grammatical meaning through a multiword construction” can

---

<sup>46</sup> Clitic climbing onto the V1 is among those diagnostics and is confirmed for Mussomelese. Interestingly, as in Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 389), Cruschina confirms that clitic climbing is preferred – but not obligatory – in the InfCo too (cf. the position of the clitic pronoun *lu* ‘him’ in *?veni a pigliarlu dopu* ‘he is coming to pick him up later’). However, Cruschina claims that the presence of the InfCo in Sicilian is likely to be due to the influence of Italian. This could explain for the mild acceptability of enclisis onto the infinitival V2 in Sicilian.

<sup>47</sup> But later on in his paper, Cruschina (2013: 271) demonstrates that the origin of the connecting element is irrelevant for the analysis of PseCo because it is optional in the Imperative 2SG with V1s GO and COME – as well as in the Indicative Present of varieties such as Pantesco – and contributes no meaning to the construction. This argument belongs to a wider discussion on Serial Verb Constructions that is dealt with in a dedicated section in the present dissertation.



be considered as a periphrasis. In particular, he refers to Heine’s (1993) analysis of the mechanisms of grammaticalisation in auxiliaries – i.e. i) desemanticisation of the original lexical value; ii) morphosyntactic decategorisation of the verb; iii) cliticisation, and iv) phonological erosion – to demonstrate that the motion V1s in PseCo behave like auxiliaries and, thus, that PseCo is definitely a periphrasis.

Once the status of PseCo as a periphrasis proper is determined, Cruschina can finally tackle the problem of its paradigmatic defectiveness. He claims that the irregular distribution of PseCo cannot be explained by any morphosyntactic restrictions or semantic principles (2013: 273), in open contrast with Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003), who postulate for all the V1s which enter PseCo the property of displaying two sets of allomorphs of which only the less marked (corresponding to the 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and the 3PL of the Indicative Present, and the 2SG of the Imperative) are available to occur in such a construction, a “costly hypothesis” which needs to posit for *passari* ‘come by’ and *mannari* ‘send’ some homophonous allomorphs.

Cruschina acknowledges that the stem allomorphy of GO and COME in Marsalese and Mussomelese corresponds to the defective distribution of the PseCo in which they occur, but refers to Sornicola (1976), Leone (1995), and Manzini & Savoia (2005) for synchronic evidence of the fact that some eastern Sicilian varieties display fully-fledged paradigms (see the examples from Modicano in (71)). Moreover, also the analysis of diachronic data from Pitrè (1993[1875]) suggests that there are reasons to believe that the paradigm of PseCo was more extended in the past:

(75) a. *Ci lu iju a dissì.*  
to-him.CL it.CL go.PAST.3SG a tell.PAST.3SG  
‘He went to tell him.’

[Pitrè III, 229 cited in Wilson 1999: 23; *Sicilian*]

b. *Iju a vitti lu Cummentu.*  
go.PAST.3SG a see.PAST.3SG the monastery  
‘He went to see the monastery.’

[Pitrè III, 232 cited in Wilson 1999: 23; *Sicilian*]

Cruschina, therefore, suggests that we refer to morphemes, first described in Aronoff (1994), to account for the defectiveness of PseCo paradigms.<sup>48</sup> He claims that grammaticalised periphrases are

<sup>48</sup> A *morphome* is a structure or pattern that exists at the ‘morphomic level’, i.e. at the level of morphology, which is to be considered as an autonomous level of linguistic structure, rather than just as the simple intersection of syntax and

subjects to the same distributional irregularity, in terms of morphomic split, of other morphological formations, such as simple verbs (Cruschina 2013: 274). In particular, the morpheme at stake here is the N-Pattern (cf. Maiden 2004, 2005, 2011; see also Maiden & O’Neill 2010). According to Maiden (2004), the N-Pattern owes its name to the fact that the cells of the paradigms that select that morpheme form an N. The other morphomic patterns (namely the L-Pattern and the U-Pattern) are also classified with the letters of the alphabet that most resemble the shape of their paradigmatic distribution.

Table 3 provides an alternative representation of the N-Pattern in PseCo as discussed in Cruschina (2013: 265). Note that the grey cells are the only grammatical cells of the entire paradigm, the white cells being available for the InfCo only.

**Table 3. The N-Pattern of PseCo with V1 GO + V2 EAT**

Indicative Present						Imperative	
1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL	2SG	2PL
<i>vaju</i>	<i>va(i)</i>	<i>va</i>			<i>vannu</i>	<i>va</i>	
<i>a mangiu</i>	<i>a mangi</i>	<i>a mangia</i>			<i>a mangianu</i>	<i>(a) mangia</i>	

Cruschina (2013: 275) notes that there is a contrast between PseCo – whose defectiveness is internally motivated – and two other types of verbal periphrases in Sicilian. On the one hand the progressive construction with V1 STAY + gerundive V2 (cf. English ‘I am working’), whose defectiveness is motivated by external, semantic reasons, namely the incompatibility with perfective Tenses (cf. Squartini 1998). On the other hand, the deontic construction with V1 HAVE + infinitival V2 (cf. English ‘I have to work’), which is fully regular, is the only way these varieties display to express the deontic modality, being modal ‘must’ not used in Sicilian.<sup>49</sup>

phonology (cf. Aronoff 1994). The term ‘morpheme’, then, refers to “a systematic distribution of morphological material within the paradigm which has no unique functional (or phonological) correlate” (Smith 2013: 247).

<sup>49</sup> This is not always the case in Sicilian, cross-dialectally. In fact, in my recent fieldwork I have found that this deontic periphrasis displays an interesting case of paradigmatic defectiveness in the Indicative Preterite, where it conforms to another morphomic pattern, namely the W-Pattern, described for the first time in PseCo in Deliano (cf. Di Caro 2015, 2019; Di Caro & Giusti 2015, 2018), which rules out the 2SG and the 2PL. In this deontic periphrasis in Deliano, the second Persons are deviant for most speakers and utterly impossible for some speakers:

- (i) a. *Ajiri appi / àppimu a gghjiri a la posta.*  
yesterday have.PAST.1SG / have.PAST.1PL to go.INF to the post-office  
‘I/We had to go to the post office yesterday.’

Four interesting cases of periphrastic suppletion following the N-Pattern in Romance are discussed in the paper, two of which within Southern Italo-Romance PseCo. First, in the dialect of Fundătura and in some other Romanian dialects (cf. Maiden 2004: 240-242), the Indicative Present paradigm of the verb *a merge* ‘go’, which is synthetic, is defective: the missing 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and 3PL cells are replaced by the reflexive forms of the verb *a duce* ‘bring’ (namely, *a se duce* ‘take oneself’, ‘go’), i.e. by a periphrastic paradigm (see Table 14.4 in Cruschina 2013: 276).

**Table 4. The Indicative Present of GO in the Romanian dialect of Fundătura**

Indicative Present					
1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
mə duk	tʰe duk	sə 'duce	'mərəm	'mərəts	sə duk

Second, a similar case is found in Northern Italo-Romance and discussed in Pellicciardi (1977). In Romagnolo (spoken in the region of Emilia Romagna) the 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and 3PL of the Indicative Present, together with all the Persons of the Subjunctive Present and of the Imperative of the verb *dvér* ‘must’ are replaced by the deontic periphrasis meaning ‘have to’.

- (76) *Tè t' è da stêr zèt.*  
 you SCL have.2SG to stay.INF silent  
 ‘You have to be quiet.’

[Pellicciardi 1977: 135 cited in Cruschina 2013: 275; *Romagnolo*]

Third, Cruschina considers the case of the progressive periphrasis with V1 STAY + inflected V2 found in the dialect of Putignano (Apulia). In this dialect the invariable V1 *sta* occurs in all the cells of the paradigm with the exception of the 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and 3PL of the Indicative Present, where it

- 
- b. *??Ajiri avisti / avistivu a gghjiri a la posta.*  
 yesterday have.PAST.2SG / have.PAST.2PL to go.INF to the post-office  
 ‘You had to go to the post office yesterday.’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

Interestingly, different dialects fill the ungrammatical cells of the Preterite paradigm in different ways: some of them, such as Deliano, resort to another verbal periphrases, namely *mi/ti/cci/nni/vi tuccà* (‘it was up to me/you/him, her or them/us’, literally ‘it touched me/you/him, her or them/us’) + infinitival V2, while others, such the one spoken in Sinagra (in the province of Messina), exceptionally use the modal *duviri* ‘must’, i.e. *duvisti* ‘you had to’ (2SG) and *duvistivu* ‘you had to’ (2PL).

is replaced by the inflected forms of the same verb, respectively *stok*, *ste*, *ste* and *ston* (cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005: 689)<sup>50</sup>. That means that e.g. the 1SG displays full inflection on both verbs in the Indicative Present (cf. (77a)) and full inflection on V2 in the Imperfect (cf. (78c)).

- (77) a. u        stok            a    ffattsə  
           it.CL    stay.1SG        a    do.1SG  
           ‘I’m doing it.’
- b. u        ste            ffaʃə  
           it.CL    stay.2SG        do.2SG  
           ‘You’re doing it.’
- c. u        ston            a    ffaʃənə  
           it.CL    stay.3PL        a    do.3PL  
           ‘They’re doing it.’

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 689 cited in Cruschina 2013: 276; Putignano (Bari)]

- (78) a. u        sta            ffaʃeimə  
           it.CL    stay            do.1PL  
           ‘We’re doing it.’
- b. u        sta            ffaʃeitə  
           it.CL    stay            do.2PL  
           ‘You’re doing it.’
- c. u        sta            ffaʃevə  
           it.CL    stay            do.IMPRF.1SG  
           ‘I was doing it.’
- d. u        sta            ffaʃivə  
           it.CL    stay            do.IMPRF.2SG  
           ‘You were doing it.’
- e. u        sta            ffaʃivənə  
           it.CL    stay            do.IMPRF.3PL  
           ‘They were doing it.’

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 689 cited in Cruschina 2013: 276; Putignano (Bari)]

---

<sup>50</sup> Note that the Indicative Present 3SG is homophonous to the 2SG shown in (77b).

Finally, Cruschina refers to a fourth example found in Southern Italo-Romance, i.e. in the Apulian dialect of Mesagne (in the province of Brindisi), in which both GO and STAY occur as invariable V1s, as the result of a process of grammaticalisation reminiscent of the one found in the invariable V1 GO of Sicilian PseCo. As regards V1 GO in Mesagnese, the paradigmatic alternation following the N-Pattern distribution concerns two invariable allomorphs, namely *va* and *sa/fa*, with the former filling only the 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and 3PL of the Indicative Present.<sup>51</sup>

- (79) a. lu        va        f'fattsu  
           it.CL    go.1SG   do.1SG  
           'I go and do it.'
- b. lu        va        f'fatʃi  
           it.CL    go.2SG   do.2SG  
           'You go and do it.'
- c. lu        va        f'fannu  
           it.CL    go.3PL    do.3PL  
           'They go and do it.'

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 691 cited in Cruschina 2013: 277; Mesagne (Brindisi)]

- (80) a. lu        sa        /        ʃa        fa'tʃimu  
           it.CL    go        /        go        do.1PL  
           'We go and do it.'
- b. lu        sa        /        ʃa        fa'tʃiti  
           it.CL    go        /        go        do.2PL  
           'You go and do it.'
- c. lu        sa        /        ʃa        fa'tʃia  
           it.CL    go        /        go        do.IMPRF.1SG  
           'I used to go and do it.'
- d. lu        sa        /        ʃa        fa'tʃivi  
           it.CL    go        /        go        do.IMPRF.2SG  
           'You used to go and do it.'

---

<sup>51</sup> The data on Mesagnese provided by Manzini & Savoia (2005: 691) show the Indicative Present and Imperfect only. If the distribution of the two allomorphs follow the N-Pattern, as is clear from the two Tenses considered, it is reasonable to suppose that the 2SG of the Imperative is built with the allomorph *va*.

- e. lu sa / ja fa'tʃiunu  
 it.CL go / go do.IMPRF.3PL

‘They used to go and do it.’

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 691 cited in Cruschina 2013: 277; Mesagne (Brindisi)]

In concluding his morphological analysis on PseCo, Cruschina addresses the difficult question as to whether it is grammaticalisation – and the consequent phonological erosion of V1s – to be directly responsible for the patterns observed. He proposes (2013: 278) that the paradigms of the verbs in the cases considered were more likely to be attracted to the N-Pattern – i.e. to a very recurrent pattern for irregular paradigms in Romance – during the process of grammaticalisation they underwent.

The second part of Cruschina’s work is dedicated to the semantic interpretation of Sicilian PseCo. The focus here is in the meaning of V1 GO, which in the examples provided from Mussomelese and in the one taken from Sornicola (1976: 68; cf (56)), loses its semantics of motion and thus the PseCo in which it occurs cannot be replaced by the InfCo.

- (81) a. *Cuannu u vitti ca sunava nna banna,*  
 when himCL see.PAST.1SG that play.IMP.3SG in-the band  
*vaju a pruvu nna gioia!*  
 go.1SG a feel.1SG a joy

‘When I saw him play in the band, I felt such a joy!’

- b. *Arrivammu dda, nn’u ristoranti, e mi vannu a*  
 arrive.PAST.1PL there in-the restaurant and to-me.CL go.3PL a  
*dunanu nna pizza accussì ladia!*  
 give.3PL a pizza so ugly

‘We arrived there, at the restaurant, and they gave me such a bad pizza!’

[Cruschina 2013: 279; Mussomeli (Caltanissetta)]

As already observed by Sornicola (1976), in cases like the ones in (81), V1 GO is used as an emphatic marker expressing an “emotional involvement of the speaker” – a positive one in (81a) and a negative one in (81b) – that requires the relevant sentence to be uttered with an exclamative intonation. Another noteworthy phenomenon is the past reference of the Indicative Present V1s in the semantically emphatic examples of PseCo under analysis, which is clear from the Indicative Preterite (i.e. *vitti* ‘I saw’, *arrivammu* ‘we arrived’) or Imperfect (*sunava* ‘he was playing’)

inflection of the other verbs involved. This, according to Cruschina (2013: 280-281), is a major difference with similar constructions featuring desemanticised motion V1s, which usually develop as future markers. On the other hand, the main difference with PseCo with V1 COME is that this V1 always entails a venitive meaning.<sup>52</sup>

To sum up, as is the case for all the previous literature, the focus of Cruschina's work is again on the V1s GO and COME. And again, nothing is said about the lexical requirements and restrictions of the V2. Nevertheless, Cruschina (2013) represents another important contribution to the understanding of Sicilian PseCo in that it suggests that, no matter the nature of V1 – be it a verb like GO (or COME), which displays allomorph alternation, or like COME BY which does not – the paradigmatic defectiveness of PseCo is nothing new to Romance morphology, since it replicates at a level of verbal periphrases what is a common morphological property of single verbs, namely that of displaying paradigmatic suppletion following the N-Pattern. The more a periphrases gets grammaticalised, the more it will be attracted by the N-Pattern. This holds true for the variety like Marsalese and Mussomelese whose model Cruschina considers as widespread in all Western and Central Sicily.

### **3.1.6 Di Caro & Giusti (2015)**

The work by Di Caro & Giusti (2015) is the first attempt of applying Protocol Linguistics to dialectal fieldwork about Southern Italo-Romance Multiple Agreement Constructions, with a focus on Sicilian PseCo.<sup>53</sup> Therefore, their work, which is syntactic in nature, emerges from the previous literature because it adds a new socio-linguistic feature to the research on PseCo. The consideration at the basis of the use of protocols is that when it comes to Italian dialects there is a tension between two tendencies. If, on the one hand, many communities fuelled by local cultural pride would like their own dialects to enjoy a higher status (e.g. by having them taught in schools) at the expense of the national language, on the other hand the supposed superiority of that national language, which most people consider a monolithic standard variety, still produces strong cultural biases against dialects. Therefore, by proposing protocols, Di Caro & Giusti's (2015) aim is to refute the idea that learning different languages (or dialects, or registers of the same language) could go to the detriment of the language speakers are supposed to be competent in, i.e. Italian.

---

<sup>52</sup> But note that in Italian V1 COME can be fully desemanticised as is the case for passive periphrases (see e.g. the discussion in Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 392-393)

<sup>53</sup> For a definition of Protocol Linguistics and its mission, see the description in Section 1.3.

At the beginning of their paper, Di Caro & Giusti (2015:401) propose a very general protocol which takes into account the fact that it is possible to detect a continuum among the varieties spoken in Sicily that goes from Italian, which displays the InfCo only, to the two Italo-Balkan varieties found in the island, namely Griko and Arbëresh (cf. Mišeska Tomić 2006), which display the FinCo only. Between these two edges, Marsalese, Palermitan and Deliano (as well as most Sicilian dialects) display both the InfCo and PseCo, while Milazzese is the only variety where all of the three constructions co-occur. The ‘?’ mark in the horizontal axis indicates that there might be a Sicilian variety where PseCo and the FinCo are found but the InfCo is not.

**Table 5. Different constructions with motion V1 in Sicily**

	Italian	Marsala	Palermo	Delia	Milazzo	?	Italo-Balkan
InfCo	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
PseCo	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
FinCo	-	-	-	-	+	+	+

Besides considering the data from the traditional literature (Sornicola 1976; Leone 1973, 1978; Calabrese 1993; Ledgeway 1997, 2005; Manzini & Savoia 2005), V1s other than GO and COME, lexical restrictions on V2, and new configurations of V1 and V2 are taken into account, mainly drawing from Di Caro’s (2015) fieldwork in the Sicilian provinces of Caltanissetta, Agrigento, Enna and Ragusa.

As regards the other possible V1s found in PseCo, data from Deliano show that *accuminciari* ‘start’ can occur as V1 (cf. (54)), but in a less productive way than the N-Pattern (cf. *supra* the discussion in Cruschina 2013) would predict, i.e. the grammatical slots of the paradigm are the 1SG of the Indicative Present and, only to some speakers, the 3PL (hence the ‘%’ before (82b)).<sup>54</sup>

- (82) a. *Ora accuminciu a bbìu cchi puizzu fari.*  
 now start.1SG a see.1SG what can.1SG do.INF  
 ‘I’ll start thinking about what I can do now.’
- b. %*Ora accumincianu a bbìdinu cchi puinnu fari.*  
 now start.3PL a see.3PL what can.3PL do.INF  
 ‘They’ll start thinking about what they can do now.’

[Di Caro & Giusti 2015: 403-404; Delia (Caltanissetta)]

<sup>54</sup> However, according to my recent fieldwork in Delia with a wider set of speakers, the status of *accuminciari* ‘start’ as possible V1 is tenuous and so is the pattern suggested in (82) (see Chapter 5).



Another possible V1, namely *turnari* ‘come back’ is attested in Deliano, but it is also found diachronically in Catanese in some verses by the Sicilian poet Nino Martoglio.<sup>55</sup>

- (83) a. *Tuirnu a ppigliu lu pani.*  
 come-back.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I come back to fetch the bread.’

[Di Caro & Giusti 2015: 403; Delia (Caltanissetta)]

- b. *Ti lu tornu a scrivu.*  
 to-you.CL it.CL come-back.1SG a write.1SG  
 ‘I write it to you again.’

[Martoglio 1948: 153 cited in Di Caro & Giusti 2015: 403; *Catanese*]

We have seen above, in the sections concerning the previous literature on PseCo, that the lexical requirements of V2s have been generally disregarded because of the fact that V1s have been believed to be the only verbs in the construction to determine what slots of the paradigm can enter PseCo. Di Caro & Giusti 2015 interrupt this tendency to ignore V2 lexical requirements.

On the one hand, they note that some V2s, such as modals and aspectual verbs like WANT, CONTINUE, and TRY – all verbs selecting an infinitival complement – are not compatible with PseCo in Marsalese, and propose a rather preliminary protocol, shown in Table 5, where the gap between Marsalese and a possible variety in which all the considered V2s are allowed is to be conceived as a space where more varieties can be accommodated, which allow for more V2s than Marsalese to occur in PseCo.<sup>56</sup> The tentativeness of this protocol, according to the authors (2015: 407), is due to

<sup>55</sup> The status of *turnari* ‘come back’ as possible V1 in Delia is as questionable as the one of *accuminciari* ‘start’ (see fn. 53). Note that COME BACK as V1 can lose its semantics of motion and be used to realise an iterative Aspect cross-linguistically, as is the case in (83b) (see e.g. the use of COME BACK in Arabic PseCo in D. Ross (*forthcoming*)).

<sup>56</sup> The ‘+/-’ mark in the central column indicates that PseCo in Marsalese is sensitive to just one type of psychological verbs with subject stimulus (cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2015: 406; see also Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 395), i.e. those like DISTURB. Psychological verbs such as LIKE, on the other hand, are now allowed as V2s (cf. (ib)):

- (i) a. *A musica va a ngueta i cristiani djassupra.*  
 the music go.3SG a bother.3SG the people upstairs  
 ‘The music goes to disturb the people upstairs.’  
 b. *\*A musica va a piace ai cristiani djassupra.*  
 the music go.3SG a like.3SG to-the people upstairs  
 ‘The music goes to please the people upstairs.’

[Di Caro & Giusti 2015: 406; Marsala (Trapani)]

the lack of data. In fact, a more fine-grained protocol on this issue would entail months of dedicated fieldwork (see the discussion in Chapter 5), which is exactly what protocols like the one in Table 5 are conceived for.

- (84) a. *Peppe va a \*vole accattari u pani.*  
 Peppe go.3SG a want.3SG buy.INF the bread  
 ‘Peppe goes to want to buy the bread.’
- b. *Peppe va a \*continua a accattari u pani.*  
 Peppe go.3SG a continue.3SG to buy.INF the bread  
 ‘Peppe goes to continue to buy the bread.’
- c. *Peppe va a \*cerca d’ accattari u pani.*  
 Peppe go.3SG a try.3SG to buy.INF the bread  
 ‘Peppe goes to try to buy the bread.’

[Di Caro & Giusti 2015: 406; Marsala (Trapani)]

**Table 6. The distribution of V2 in Sicilian PseCo**

	Palermo	Marsala (Trapani)	?
lexical verbs			
transitive	+	+	+
psychological	-	+/-	+
intransitive	-	+	+
unaccusative	-	+	+
aspectual verbs			
andative	-	+	+
causative	?	+	+
repetitive	-	-	+
continuative	-	-	+
terminative	-	-	+
other	?	?	
modal verbs			
volitional	?	-	+
permissive	?	?	+
evidential	?	-	+
other	?	?	+

On the other hand, they refer to Di Caro (2015), who reports two interesting restrictions on V2 in the PseCo of two different varieties. First, he refers to Sorrisi's (2010) claim that in Palermitan PseCo – where V1 CO can optionally occur in the invariable form as in Marsalese (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003) –, intransitive V2s limit the construction to the 1SG of the Indicative Present and the 2SG of the Imperative, with invarbiale *va-* as obligatory V1. Second, Di Caro (2015: 46-50) reports that in Deliano PseCo is possible in the Indicative Preterite with only a restricted class of V2s. The grammatical cells of the Preterite paradigm, i.e. the 1SG, 3SG, 1PL and 3PL, are the ones in which V2 displays rhizotonic (i.e. root-stressed) forms. In this unprecedented distribution, referred to as the W-Pattern, Preterite PseCo in Deliano is also possible with *accuminciari* 'start' as V1.<sup>57</sup>

With regard to Cruschina's criticism on Cardinaletti & Giusti's (2001) account of the paradigmatic restrictions in PseCo in Marsalese, Di Caro & Giusti (2015) claim that Maiden's N-pattern is not in contrast to Cardinaletti & Giusti's hypothesis that PseCo is a property of given lexemes. On the contrary, it may explain the fact that these restrictions also hold for the other two available V1s, namely *passari* 'come by' and *mannari* 'send', which display no allomorph alternation in their paradigms. According to the morphomic account, the stress pattern is a substantive component of the allomorph. But then the N-pattern analysis should be extended to the every possible V1, since all verbs in Southern Italo-Romance generally display two different stress patterns consisting of forms with stressed roots (as in the Indicative 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and 3PL and in the Imperative 2SG) and forms with unstressed roots (cf. Dressler & Thornton (1991); Thornton (2007)). Since this, of course, is not the case, there must be something in the lexical specification of each verb that determines whether it can enter PseCo or not.

Finally, as regards different possible V1 and V2 configurations, Di Caro & Giusti (2015: 415-418) consider the data of the PseCo found in the dialects spoken in Acireale (in the province of Catania) and Marina di Ragusa (Ragusa) from Di Caro (2015) to propose another tentative protocol conceived to guide future research (cf. Table 7). In these varieties, V1 GO occur as a prefix-like invariable form which is fused with the connecting element *a* (covert, but detectable thanks to RF on V2) and V2, and can display various allomorphs. This configuration is available, with a fully-fledged paradigm, in the Indicative Present, Imperfect, Preterite, in the Imperative and in the Subjunctive (cf. *supra* the examples in (39) and (40)).

---

<sup>57</sup> The Indicative Preterite PseCo in Deliano would be further explored in a dedicated paper (cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2018) and is dealt with more in detail in Chapter 5.

**Table 7. The distribution of prefixed V1 GO in Eastern Sicilian PseCo**

	?	M. di Ragusa (RG)	Acireale (CT)	?
mandatory	-	+	+	+
coexisting with other motion verbs in PseCo	+	+	-	?
fully productive	?	+	+	-
with Person restrictions	?	0	0	?
with Mood/Tense restrictions	?	0	0	?

In Table 7, the ‘?’ mark on the left edge indicates a possible variety in which the prefixed V1 GO can coexist with a reduced or a full counterpart (as is the case of the Apulian varieties accounted for by Manzini & Savoia 2005). A related research question, should this be the case, is whether this would affect the productivity of the prefixed form. The right edge is for a possible variety in which the prefixed V1 GO can present any restrictions in the paradigm.

In the final part of the paper, Di Caro & Giusti reaffirm the ecumenic nature of protocols – which are meant to enhance the awareness on the importance of local varieties, i.e. on the fact that they are as important as other varieties or as national languages – by proposing to extend the comparison of the Multiple Agreement Constructions discussed to other European languages. The result is the protocol proposed in Table 8, which shows i) that the connecting element can be omitted in American English (AE) but not in British English (BE) or Swedish (cf. Carden & Pesetsky 1977; Jaeggli & Hyams 1993; Wiklund 1996), and ii) that the Sicilian Italo-Balkan varieties (Griko and Arbëresh) behave like Greek and Albanian in displaying only the FinCo. Among the varieties considered, in the Salentino dialect of Torre S. Susanna (cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005: 693) both PseCo and the FinCo are possible, but not the InfCo, hence its positioning next to Greek and Albanian on the right edge of the protocol.

**Table 8. Different constructions with motion V1s across Europe**

	Italian	Swedish / BE	AE	Western / Central Sicilian	Milazzo	Torre S. Susanna	Greek/ Albanian
InfCo	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
PseCo	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
with a linker	0	+	+	+	+	+	0
without linker	0	-	+	+	?	?	0
FinCo	-	-	-	-	+	+	+

To sum up, Di Caro & Giusti (2015) is an original contribution to the study of Sicilian PseCo, in the sense that it addresses a wider readership, including researchers of different theoretical persuasion and linguistic fields. Although few new data are discussed and nothing is said on the

grammaticalisation of V1 as an emphatic marker, the paper provides the researcher on PseCo with easily accessible tools aimed at pinpointing the main parameters of microvariation this construction displays and, consequently, suggesting different alleys of future research, such as the nature of the possible V1s and V2s, new paradigmatic patterns and Mood/Tense restrictions of the construction.

### 3.1.7 Todaro & Del Prete (2019)

In this recent addition to the study of Sicilian PseCo, Todaro & Del Prete analyse the syntactic and semantic properties of what they label the *Doubly Inflected Construction* (cf. Cruschina 2013), and focus on a V1, namely *mannari* ‘send’, whose characteristics have been widely neglected by the previous literature. They discuss the example reported here in (85), which they consider problematic for Cardinaletti & Giusti’s (2001, 2003) claim that it is only the V2, i.e. the lexical verb, that has interpreted inflectional features.

In (85a) the V1 *mannu* ‘I send’ and the V2 *ddicu* ‘I say’ display the same inflectional features, being PseCo subject to Feature Matching (see *infra* Section 3.3.2 for the discussion on Feature Matching in similar syntactic constructions). However, the 1SG feature seems to be interpreted only on V1, since the agent of the action of saying expressed by V2 does not correspond to the same agent of V1. The authors provide the example in (85b), which is fully grammatical, to make this fact clearer. In (85b), in fact, if the agent of the negated V1 *ddicu* corresponded to the one of *mannu*, the continuation would be inconsistent, which is not the case.

(85) a. *Ti mannu a ddicu ddra cosa.*  
 to-you.CL send.1SG a say.1SG that thing  
 ‘I’m sending someone to say that thing to you.’

b. *Un ti lu mannu a ddicu, ti lu ricu iu.*  
 NEG to-you.CL it.CL send.1SG a say.1SG to-you.CL it.CL say.1SG me  
 ‘I do not send anyone to say it to you, I say it to you myself.’

[Todaro & Del Prete 2019: 145; Trapani]

Todaro & Del Prete (2019) maintain that the best formal account for Sicilian PseCo, and especially for the morpho-syntactic mismatch of V1 *mannari* + V2, is the one that considers V1 and V2 as lexical verbs that are combined according to

“an operation of Lexical Concatenation building complex event predicates out of a motion event predicate V1 and an event predicate V2, whose semantic counterpart is an operation of event concatenation which builds complex events sharing thematic participants.”

(Todaro & Del Prete 2019: 151-152)

Todaro & Del Prete (2019) propose that in PseCo the inflectional person features apply not to the two verbs involved individually but to the complex verb predicate [V1 ac V2] as a result of Lexical Concatenation. In this way, these features are interpreted only once with respect to the external argument of the complex [V1 ac V2]. At the level of morpho-phonological structure, however, the features are realised twice, once on the V1 component and once on the V2 component, by a mechanism of ‘feature spread’ known to operate also in other complex predicate constructions. As a consequence, insertion of spatial adverbs and adjuncts are allowed in PseCo only if they are semantically and pragmatically compatible not just with V2 (as previously stated by Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003) but with both V1 and V2, as clearly demonstrated by the ungrammaticality of (86), where the adjunct *c’a furchetta* ‘with the fork’ is absolutely compatible with the meaning of V2 *mmancia* ‘he eats’, but not with that of the motion V1.

- (86) \**Peppe va a mmancia c’ a furchetta.*  
 Peppe go.3SG a eat.3SG with the fork  
 ‘I’m sending someone to say that thing to you.’

[Todaro & Del Prete 2019: 140; Trapani]

In discussing the nature of V1 with respect to grammaticalisation, Todaro & Del Prete (2019) note that the expected status of V1 GO and COME as Tense or Aspect marker is not borne out. In fact, while in the French InfCo – where GO and COME have become, respectively, future and past Tense markers – there are no restrictions as regards the actional type of V2 (cf. (87)), Sicilian PseCo does not allow purely stative V2s (cf. (88)) (cf. Accattoli & Todaro 2017):

- (87) a. *Je vais être malade.*  
 I go.1SG be.INF sick  
 ‘I’m going to be sick.’  
 b. *Je vais le savoir.*  
 I come.1SG it.CL know.INF  
 ‘I’m going to know that.’

c. *Je viens d'être malade.*  
 I come.1SG from be.INF sick  
 'I've just been sick.'

d. *Je viens de le savoir.*  
 I come.1SG from it.CL know.INF  
 'I've just learnt that.'

[Todaro & Del Prete 2019: 138; *French*]

(88) a. *\*Vaju a ssugnu malatu.*  
 go.1SG a be.1SG sick  
 'I go to be sick.'

b. *\*U vaju a ssacciu.*  
 it.CL go.1SG a be.1SG  
 'I go to know that.'

c. *\*Vegnu a ssugnu malatu.*  
 come.1SG a be.1SG sick  
 'I come to be sick.'

d. *\*U vegnu a ssacciu.*  
 it.CL come.1SG a be.1SG  
 'I come to know that.'

[Todaro & Del Prete 2019: 138-139; *Trapani*]

According to Todaro & Del Prete (2019: 138-141), the ban on stative V2s in PseCo depends on the incompatibility of lexical motion verbs with purely stative complements cross-linguistically (compare e.g. 'Mary went to the casino to win enough money to pay off her debts' vs. '\*Mary went to the casino to have enough money to pay off her debts'), which is the crucial argument against the grammaticalisation of V1 in PseCo.

The paper ends with an open question concerning the productivity of Sicilian PseCo and, in particular, the reasons why the general operation of the event concatenation they postulate for PseCo is restricted to those combinations with V1s GO, COME, COME BY and SEND only, considered that impossible combinations (at least in the varieties covered by the relevant literature) such as *scinnu a ppigghiu u pani* 'I go down to fetch the bread' or *curru a pigghiu u pani* 'I run to fetch the bread' are equally clearly intelligible to the speaker (Todaro & Del Prete 2019: 152).

To conclude, the recent contribution by Todaro & Del Prete to a deeper understanding of Sicilian PseCo confirms the monoclausality of the construction by proposing a formal semantic account, and offers an explanation for the feature mismatch that characterises the presence of *mannari* ‘send’ as V1.

### 3.1.8 Cardinaletti & Giusti (2019)

The paper by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2019) follows the stimulating discussion on the uniqueness of Sicilian PseCo among Southern Italo-Romance Multiple Agreement Constructions, brought forward in different ways by Manzini & Savoia (2005), Cruschina (2013), Di Caro & Giusti (2015) and Ledgeway (2016), that their previous papers (2001, 2003) had favoured.

In summary, they provide an overview of different instances of MACs found in Southern Italy and test several morpho-syntactic properties (namely the restricted class of available V1s, the Tense and Person restrictions, the possible reduced morphology on V1 or on V2, the presence or absence of arguments of V1, the anaphoric vs. disjoint reference of the subject of V2, and the presence or absence of clitic climbing onto V1) to demonstrate that PseCo must be kept separate from the InfCo, since the former always displays a monoclausal behaviour.

In their paper, a more fine-grained structural description of Sicilian PseCo is given (cf. (89a)), according to which the V1 is merged in *t*, a head immediately higher than T (see also Di Caro & Giusti 2018), and parasitically copies its features onto the features of V2. On the other hand, in the FinCo the V1 selects a reduced subordinate clause (FinP in Rizzi’s 1997 terms) with an independent TP, hence the possibility for the two verbs to display different Mood and Tense features.

- (89) a.  $[_{IP} V1 [a [_{TP} V2 [_{VP} \bar{V}2$   
 b.  $[_{TP} V1 [_{VP} \bar{V}1 [_{FinP} \mu / ku [_{TP} V2 [_{VP} \bar{V}2$

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2019]

The two constructions also differ for the number of V1s that are allowed, in the sense that the FinCo is much more liberal and in addition to the possible V1s found in various combination in Southern Italo-Romance PseCo, namely GO, COME, COME BY, COME BACK, SEND, WANT, STAND and START, it also allows for GO OUT, GO UP, GO DOWN, ARRIVE, RUN, JUMP, COME IN, HURRY UP, TRY, SIT, CAN, MUST and FINISH.

Moreover, Cardinaletti & Giusti (2019) return to the debate on the syntactic (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003) vs. morphological (cf. Cruschina 2013) account for the PseCo Mood, Tense



and Person restrictions, in a more elaborate way than the one sketched in Di Caro & Giusti (2015). They reiterate the idea that a purely morphological account is not sufficient to explain for the irregular distribution of PseCo, idea which is corroborated by Corbett (2015: 179-180), who comments on the irregular distribution of PseCo in Marsalese by labeling it as a case of externally (i.e. motivated by syntactic reasons) relevant morphological irregularity in a paradigm.

However, the authors maintain that the morphological account is not incompatible with Cardinaletti & Giusti's (2001, 2003) hypothesis that only the less marked forms of the verbal paradigm can enter PseCo in Marsalese. According to Thornton (2007), in fact, it is possible to distinguish two types of forms in the N-pattern: the 'less marked' forms are built on the bare stem of the verb, while the 'more marked' forms are built on the theme or display suppletion. Table 9 shows the stem distribution in some Italian verbs, namely *sedere* 'sit', *udire* 'hear', *finire* 'end, finish' and *andare* 'go' (cf. Thornton 2007: 44).<sup>58</sup>

**Table 9. The paradigm partition of an Indicative Present in Italian**

Indicative Present					
1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
stem 2	stem 2	stem 2	stem 1	stem 1	stem 2
<i>siedo</i>	<i>siedi</i>	<i>siede</i>	<i>sediamo</i>	<i>sedete</i>	<i>siedono</i>
<i>odo</i>	<i>odi</i>	<i>ode</i>	<i>udiamo</i>	<i>udite</i>	<i>odono</i>
<i>finisco</i>	<i>finisci</i>	<i>finisce</i>	<i>finiamo</i>	<i>finite</i>	<i>finiscono</i>
<i>vado</i>	<i>vai</i>	<i>va</i>	<i>andiamo</i>	<i>andate</i>	<i>vanno</i>

The Italian verbs in Table 9 are all irregular. The verb *sedere* alternates a stem 2 containing a diphthong with a stem 1 which only features the corresponding vowel. The verb *udire* displays a specific-lexeme allomorphy. The partition in the verb *finire* is more complicated, since it displays the *-sk-* infix in stem 2 (pronounced /sk/ in the 1SG and the 3PL, and /ʃʃ/ in the 2SG and in the 3SG). Finally, the verb *andare* is characterised by high suppletion (cf. Thornton 2007: 44).

Thornton (2007: 45) refutes Maiden's (2005) claim that regular verbs in Italian do not display the N-Pattern, and refers to Dressler & Thornton (1991), who on the contrary maintain that even Italian regular verbs display the N-Pattern in the Indicative Present.<sup>59</sup> In fact, Stem 2 is built on the

<sup>58</sup> For reasons of space, the data in Table 9 are not reported in Cardinaletti & Giusti (2019).

<sup>59</sup> Thornton (2007: 49) points out that Dressler & Thornton's (1991) proposals to posit an N-Pattern for all Italian regular verbs in the Indicative Present is in sharp contrast with the one put forward by Vito Pirrelli (cf. Pirrelli 2000),

radical base, has stress on the root and does not contain any theme vowel, while stem 1 is built on the thematic base, which bears the stress. In Dressler & Thornton’s (1991) analysis, the regular first conjugation verb *amare* ‘love’ (shown in Table 10) is used as an example. The Indicative Present of this verb displays the alternation of the radical base 'am- and the thematic base a'ma-.

**Table 10. The N-Pattern of the Indicative Present of *amare* ‘love’**

Indicative Present					
1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
stem 2	stem 2	stem 2	stem 1	stem 1	stem 2
'amo	'ami	'ama	a'mjamo	a'mate	'amano

Dressler & Thornton’s analysis of the Italian verbal system holds for Sicilian too. This means that, in principle, any Sicilian verb displaying that kind of alternation could enter PseCo. But on the contrary, only few verbs are good candidates to occupy the V1 position in PseCo. Furthermore, not all the Sicilian varieties display the N-Pattern in their paradigms (cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005; Di Caro 2015; Di Caro & Giusti 2015), and when they do, as is the case for the V1 COME in the Indicative Present in Deliano, there can be a mismatch between the N-Pattern distribution of the whole periphrasis and the own morphomic pattern displayed by the V1, which for COME is an L-Pattern, i.e. the 1SG of the Indicative Present patterns with all the persons of the Subjunctive Present (which is however absent in Deliano and in most Sicilian dialects).

For that reason, Cardinaletti & Giusti (2019) claim that there must be further lexical specifications which decide what forms of V1 can check their features on the Tense+Agr features of V2 in a parasitic way (see also Di Caro & Giusti 2018), thus surmising a more “intricate interaction between syntax and morpho-phonology”.

An interesting amendment is proposed in the paper with regard to the alleged impossibility for V1s different than GO to display reduced forms in Marsalese (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003). To a more accurate scrutiny, in fact, *viniri* ‘come’, *passari* ‘come by’, and *mannari* ‘send’ can also display reduced forms in the grammatical slots of the Indicative Present paradigms allowed by the N-Pattern distribution. Cardinaletti & Giusti (2019) show the reduced forms of V1 COME and COME BY only, whose grammatical forms are proposed in (90) and (91):

---

who, on the contrary, claims that there is no partition at all in the Indicative Present of Italian regular verbs, since these are characterised by a unique basic stem (cf. Pirrelli 2000: 14).

- (90) a. *Vegn(u)* / \**ven a pigghiu u pani.*  
 come.1SG / come *a* fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I come and fetch the bread.’
- b. *Ven(i)* / *ven a pigghi u pani.*  
 come.2SG / come *a* fetch.2SG the bread  
 ‘You come and fetch the bread.’
- c. *Ven(a)* / *ven a pigghia u pani.*  
 come.3SG / come *a* fetch.3SG the bread  
 ‘He/She comes to fetch the bread.’
- d. *Venn(u)* / *ven a pigghianu u pani.*  
 come.3PL / come *a* fetch.3PL the bread  
 ‘They come and fetch the bread.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2019; Marsala (Trapani)]

- (91) a. *Pass(u)* / *pass a pigghiu u pani.*  
 come-by.1SG / come-by *a* fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I come by and fetch the bread.’
- b. *Pass(i)* / *pass a pigghi u pani.*  
 come-by.2SG / come-by *a* fetch.2SG the bread  
 ‘You come by and fetch the bread.’
- c. *Pass(a)* / *pass a pigghia u pani.*  
 come.3SG / come *a* fetch.3SG the bread  
 ‘He/She comes by to fetch the bread.’
- d. *Passan(u)* / *pass a pigghianu u pani.*  
 come.3PL / come *a* fetch.3PL the bread  
 ‘They come by and fetch the bread.’

[Cardinaletti & Giusti 2019; Marsala (Trapani)]

It is always possible cross-dialectally to have phonological elision of the ending vowel of V1 in (90) and (91), which is triggered by the adjacent connecting element *a*. This holds true for *mannari* ‘send’ too. In the 2SG and 3SG forms of *viniri* ‘come’ and in the three persons singular of *passari* ‘come by’, the elided forms are homophonous to the bare stem of the two verbs, which are

respectively *ven-* and *pass-*. However, only the elided form of the 1SG of *viniri* is possible while the bare stem is impossible. On the contrary, the 3PL forms can display both the elided form and the bare stem. According to Cardinaletti & Giusti, this fact demonstrates that phonological reduced forms and invariable forms should be kept separated, and that both may be possible in the same persons of the verbal paradigm.

This is an argument against Ledgeway’s (2016) and Cruschina’s (2013) claim that the presence of invariable forms signals the final step of grammaticalisation due to “inflectional attrition” or “phonological erosion”. That the availability of invariable forms of V1 is orthogonal to the possibility for them to occur in a PseCo is demonstrated by the fact that in some varieties that display the invariable form *sta* for V1 *stari* ‘stay’, such as Marsalese, progressive PseCo is not allowed, while in others, such as Salentino (cf. Ledgeway 2016), it is.<sup>60</sup>

Finally, the fact that PseCo and the FinCo must be considered as distinct syntactic constructions does not mean that they cannot be found in the same sentence. In the example from the Salentino dialect spoken in Lecce (cf. (92)), the FinCo with the complementiser *cu* embeds a PseCo with invariable GO.

- (92) *E ssu’ sciuti cu bba ffatianu.*  
 and be.3PL go.PAST.PART.M.PL *cu go work.3PL*  
 ‘And they went to work.’

[Ledgeway 2016: 173; *Leccese*]

---

<sup>60</sup> In this respect, Cardinaletti & Giusti do not agree with Ledgeway’s (2016) split analysis of PseCo with V1 STAY, according to which, in Apulia, only PseCo displaying unvariable V1s is monoclausal (cf. (ib)), while the one with full inflected V1s (cf. (ia)) is biclausal and selects a CP. In fact, if Ledgeway’s analysis were correct, the V1 *stoc* in (ia) should behave as a lexical verb and therefore have its own arguments. This, Cardinaletti & Giusti observe, is not attested in the literature.

- (i) a. *Stoc’ a ffazzu.*  
 stay.1SG *a do.1SG*  
 ‘I’m doing.’

[Ledgeway 2016: 170; *Northern Apulian*]

- b. *Sta ffazzu.*  
 stay do.1SG  
 ‘I’m doing.’

[Ledgeway 2016: 170; *Salentino*]

In conclusion, the paper by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2019) is one of the most recent contribution to the study of PseCo and develops the line of research that deals with the syntactic distinction between PseCo and the FinCo found in Extreme Southern Italy. With their diagnostics aimed at testing different properties of the two constructions, they demonstrate that PseCo is a monoclausal structure where V2 carries the bundle of Tense and Agreement features and V1 is parasitically inflected on the features of V2. In PseCo a restricted number of verbs can occur as V1s, the full Tense+Agr realisation is on V2, V1 can occur in an invariable form and cannot project its own arguments. Finally, clitic climbing is onto V1. The FinCo, on the other hand, is a biclausal structure where it is V1 that carries the bundle of Tense and Agreement features and allows for a reduced T on V2.

### **3.2 PseCo in non-Romance languages**

In this section, I give an overview of what the literature has proposed as cases of PseCo in non-Romance languages. Most of the discussion focusses on Germanic languages, where the phenomenon is found in many varieties, has received wide coverage, and is still a very active area of research. In the final part of this section, I deal with PseCo in the Semitic languages, with Arabic and the Arabic dialects in particular. The reason behind this choice is that on the one hand the study of Sicilian PseCo has benefitted from the previous works on Germanic (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001), and on the other hand the syntactic tools (e.g. the monoclausality diagnostics) developed to detect PseCo are now being used on some Semitic languages.

For a complete overview of instances of PseCo in other languages of the world, both synchronically and diachronically, see D. Ross (*forthcoming*) and the literature cited there.

#### **3.2.1 PseCo in the Germanic languages**

PseCo is a phenomenon well-known in Germanic languages, where it is attested in many varieties and dialects. However, scholars have used a number of different labels for this construction, which are listed e.g. in Wiklund (2007: 9): *Double Verb Construction*, *Fake Coordination* (Carden & Pesetsky 1977), *Subcoordination* (Johnsen 1988), *Verb-Verb Agreement*, *Agreeing complements* (Anward 1988), *Quasiserial Verb Construction* (Pullum 1990), *Asymmetric coordination* (Déchaine 1993), *Verbal Hendiadys* (Donaldson 1993) and *Contiguous Coordination* (de Vos 2005). As we have seen in the previous sections, the labels *Inflected Construction* (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001,

2003, 2019; Di Caro 2015; Di Caro & Giusti 2015, 2018) and *Doubly Inflected Construction* (Cruschina 2013; Todato & Del Prete 2019) also apply to PseCo types.<sup>61</sup>

D. Ross (*forthcoming*) reports that the term *Pseudo-Coordination* is used for Swedish by Teleman (1974) for the first time, where it appears as *pseudokoordination*. Quirk *et al.* (1985) first apply that term to their work on English, and Josefsson (1991) first uses the English term for all the Scandinavian languages (see Kvist Darnell 2008 for the alternative labels used for the Scandinavian languages and, more generally, for a thorough bibliography on PseCo in Swedish and Norwegian).

D. Ross (*forthcoming*) attributes the earliest systematic analyses on Germanic PseCo to Aasen's (1848) grammar of contemporary spoken Norse – a language which could be considered the ancestor to what became Danish or Norwegian today – where verbs meaning GO, WALK, TAKE, SIT, LIE, LAY and, interestingly, CONTINUE are identified as possible V1s. De Bo (1873: 302), who observes some cases of PseCo in Flemish featuring V1 LIE with probably a progressive value, proposes a comparison with the equivalent Flemish InfCo introduced by *en* 'and'.

A first macro-comparative analysis in Germanic is found in Storm (1879: 132), who finds examples in English with TRY and COME in V1 position and notes the similarity with some Norse constructions. The first observations of PseCo in Middle Dutch are found in Van Helten (1881, 57) and Stoett (1889, 121).

As regards Danish, Kjeldahl (2010: 22-23) reports the brief analyses of two influent Danish grammarians. The first one is Mikkelsen (1911) who treats PseCo as a coordination of two verbs in which V1 expresses a condition for the action of V2, or its introduction.<sup>62</sup> Mikkelsen (1911: 693) notes that in this particular case of coordination in which V2 presupposes V1 – thus showing traits of subordination (cf. Kjeldahl 2010: 22) –, adverbials are adjacent to the first verb. The other Danish grammarian is Diderichsen (1946: 72), who offers some considerations on the nature of the connecting element *og* 'and' in PseCo. This element is considered as a conjunction joining verbs which make up a closer unit and is neutral with respect to the distinction between hypotaxis vs. parataxis, since *og* and the infinitive marker *at* 'to' are homophonous in unmarked speech (i.e. they are both pronounced as [ɔ]). V2 is thus compared to an embedded infinitive (Diderichsen 1957: 156).

---

<sup>61</sup> What Kuteva (1999) calls *sit/stand/lie auxiliation* in Bulgarian, with 'and' as connecting element between V1 and V2, refers to the same phenomenon, to the extent that she refers to some examples of PseCo from Norwegian and Danish as cases of sit/stand/lie auxiliation found in other languages (cf. Kuteva 1999: 195).

<sup>62</sup> But D. Ross (*forthcoming*) reports that Mikkelsen (1894) already has some notes on Germanic PseCo. In fact, he provides a discussion of what he calls "confusion of coordination and subordination" in Norse, which is longer than the discussions found in the previous literature (Mikkelsen 1894: 412-414).

The first work entirely dedicated to PseCo (focusing on Germanic but with many non-Germanic comparisons) is Jespersen (1895), who provides a thorough descriptive analysis on the nature of the connecting elements *at* ‘to’ and *og* ‘and’ in Norse. In particular, he focusses on whether the phenomenon of PseCo depends on the phonological merger and confusion of these two elements.

D. Ross (*forthcoming*) attributes the first modern theoretical work on PseCo to Gleitman (1965, 293), who observes that the element *and* with V1 TRY does not work as a real coordinator and that there are morphological restrictions on this construction. Besides the already cited works by Shopen (1971), Carden & Pesetsky (1977) and Jaeggli & Hyams (1993), other theoretical syntactic accounts on PseCo in American English are found in Lakoff (1986) and in Culicover and Jackendoff (1997).

As regards the Scandinavian languages, the first generative account of PseCo – set within the Principles and Parameters framework – is Josefsson (1991). Josefsson discusses cases like that in (93) to show that PseCo is a VP + VP coordination, which is thus not subject to the Coordinate Structure Constraint (J. Ross 1967: 161). On the contrary, she considers a real coordination as a CP + CP coordination.

- (93) *Kalle sitter förmodligen och fisker aborre.*  
 Kalle sit.PRES probably and catch.PRES perch  
 ‘Kalle is probably fishing for perch.’

[Josefsson 1991: 142; *Swedish*]

Moreover, Josefsson notes that only a very limited number of V1s are available for PseCo, namely the V1s that can create a single scene with V2 (Josefsson 1991: 146), thus allowing for the single event interpretation of the construction, in the sense of Shopen (1971).

The most exhaustive analysis of PseCo in Germanic is Wiklund (2007), who focusses on Swedish. Wiklund considers Swedish PseCo as a construction to be analysed within a wider surface phenomenon of TMA (i.e. Tense, Mood and Aspect) copying, which involves complementation and the semantically vacuous TMA inflection on V2. She proposes the example reported in (94a) as a case of TMA copying construction, while (94b) and (94c) are, respectively, cases of participle copying construction and PseCo.

According to Wiklund, the possibility for copy to occur depends on the size of the verbal complement: while participle copying applies to bare VP-complements, TMA-copying requires a full CP.

- (94) a. *Han försökte o skrev ett brev.*  
 he try.PAST & write.PAST a letter  
 ‘He tried to write a letter.’
- b. *Han hade kunnat skrivit.*  
 he have.PAST can.PAST.PART write.PAST.PART  
 ‘He had been able to write.’
- c. *Han satt o skrev dikter.*  
 he sit.PAST & write.PAST poem.PL  
 ‘He was writing poems (in a sitting position).’

[Wiklund 2007: 1; *Swedish*]

With this respect, Wiklund (1996) is her first attempt of unifying all three constructions in (94) under a subordination/agreement approach, following the analysis proposed by Anward (1988).

Swedish PseCo displays a wider set of available V1s than Danish. This is reminiscent of the different size of the class of possible V1s in Sicilian where, for example, Deliano allows for more V1s than Marsalese (cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2015).

According to Wiklund (2007: 68) “copying is a reflex of dependencies between functional heads of the same label” and takes place only if the corresponding functional projection is present in the embedded clause. This means that since V2 in PseCo shows TAM features, it must necessarily have TMA-projections. Participle copying is very restricted. It only applies to the Past Participle, and V2 is never preceded by any kind of connecting element, because V2 is a bare VP and since it lacks all functional projections, it is not able to appear in any other variants. In order for copying to take place, the relevant projection must be present in the copying verb. This explains why some V2s only allow copying of the past participle.

As in the previous literature on Germanic PseCo, Wiklund offers a syntactic analysis of the nature of the connecting elements in Swedish PseCo and InfCo. The connecting element [ɔ] is the unmarked pronunciation of both the coordinator *och* and the infinitival marker *at*. Wiklund, citing Holmberg (1986, 1990) and Platzack (1986), claims that the Swedish finite clause complementiser *att* and the infinitival marker *att* are both complementisers merged in C. Platzack’s (1986) assumes that the Norwegian and Danish infinitival marker is generated in I, while in Swedish and Icelandic it is generated in C. In fact, Swedish adverbials may intervene between *att* and the Infinitive.

As regards the semantic analysis of PseCo, Wiklund’s view is in line with what has been reported in the previous literature since Shopen (1971). The two sentences in (95) are superficially similar, but (95b) is ambiguous between two readings.



- (95) a. *Lars sjöng o drack kaffe.*  
 Lars sing.PAST & drink.PAST coffee  
 ‘Lars sang and had a coffee.’
- b. *Lars gick o drack kaffe.*  
 Lars go.PAST & drink.PAST coffee  
 I. ‘Lars walked and had a coffee.’  
 II. ‘Lars went and had a coffee.’

[Wiklund 2007: 97; *Swedish*]

The two events of singing and having a coffee in (95a) are always perceived as independent from each other. On the contrary, the two events in (95b), i.e. walking and having a coffee, can either be perceived as being independent or as expressing one single complex event. In this complex event, V1 expresses the inceptive aspect, while V2 expresses another subevent. Wiklund (2007: 97) refers to the former reading as the ‘independent-event reading’, and to the latter as the ‘pseudocoordination reading’, which expresses one single but complex event (cf. the reading II in (95b)).

Wiklund claims that each property that allows for the pseudocoordination reading of (95b) are properties that aspectual PseCos share with TMA-copying constructions (cf. (96a)) and the InfCo (cf. (96b)). Thus, PseCo involves a structure where V1 selects the clause introduced by the connecting element *o*. Basically, Jespersen (1895), Carden and Pesetsky (1977), Anward (1988), Wiklund (1996), Johannessen (1998), and Lødrup (2002) came to the same conclusion.

- (96) a. *Lars började o drack kaffe.*  
 Lars start.PAST & drink.PAST coffee
- b. *Lars började att dricka kaffe.*  
 Lars start.PAST to drink.INF coffee  
 ‘Lars started drinking coffee.’

[Wiklund 2007: 98; *Swedish*]

An aspect of Wiklund’s work that is particularly relevant for the study of Sicilian PseCo is her analysis of the V1s as light verbs. While simple verbs like SIT are found as V1s in Germanic PseCo, heavier V1s like e.g. SIT-with-legs-astride (or any other combination adding details to the manner of

the verb) used as progressive markers are not allowed, since it is the locative use of those verbs that allows for them to be used as markers.

Wiklund (2007: 141) proposes that a V1 involving a heavy description of the process component associates its *proc* feature to syntactic structure by default and thus does not allow for that verb to be used as a light verb.<sup>63</sup> According to Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003), only a very restricted class of motion verbs can enter PseCo in Marsalese, i.e. the most basic ones. This holds true for Sicilian dialects in general and is in line with Wiklund’s proposal on the ban of heavy verbal lexical items, such as verbs with elaborate manner components, as V1 candidates for PseCo in Swedish. However, Swedish PseCo allows for heavy V1s whose semantics is further specified by use of particles such as *runt* ‘around’ (cf. Anderson 1979), because particles can somehow “withdraw focus from the verb action itself”, as first noted by Josefsson (1991), and thus in this case the independent event reading is not obligatory (cf. Wiklund 2007: 142).

Finally, in her overview of PseCo in Germanic, Wiklund proposes some cases with a V1, START, which only occurs in the Imperative in Danish and is highly limited in Sicilian PseCo, as well (cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2015).

- (97) a. *Begynd*      *og*      *læs!*  
           start.IMP    &      read.IMP  
           ‘Start reading!’

[Wiklund 2007: 6; *Danish*]

- b. *Jeg*    *begynder*    *og*    *leser.*  
       I        start.PRES    &    read.PRES

---

<sup>63</sup> Wiklund (2007: 131-134) refers to Ramchand’s work on the identification of the syntactic components of event structure building, in which she proposes that verbal lexical items carry category features, namely *init* (causation/initiation), *proc* (process), and *res* (result). These category features may associate with their corresponding projections in the verb phrase structure (cf. (i)), which instantiate possible subparts of the whole structure. (cf. Ramchand 2008).

(i)      [*init*P [*proc*P [*res*P ]]]

The *Init*P corresponds to vP, is connected to causation and licenses the external argument, the INITIATOR. The *proc*P specifies the process and licenses the UNDERGOER. Its head is the only obligatory component in a dynamic verbal event (Ramchand 2008: 108). Finally, the *res*P expresses the Result State of the process and licenses the argument which is the holder of that state, the RESULTEE (Ramchand 2008: 40). According to Ramchand, a verb can be bleached either by missing a category feature in the lexical specification, or by having that feature unassociated (i.e. by ‘underassociation’). Wiklund (2007: 134) claims that V1s in Swedish PseCo are bleached by underassociation.

I start reading.’

[Wiklund 2007: 6; *Gudbrandsdalen and Romsdal Norwegian*]

The recent study on PseCo in Danish and Afrikaans by Biberauer & Vikner (2017) considers Germanic PseCo as a syntactic phenomenon which goes in the opposite direction than all the strategies of gapping and VP ellipses (cf. Johnson 2013) speakers resort to. In a sense then, PseCo involves “an excess of verbal material” (Biberauer & Vikner 2017: 87).

In line with the previous literature, the authors first consider the fact that PseCo does not exhibit the symmetrical properties generally associated with real coordination and discussed in Johannessen (1998), Munn (1993), and Haspelmath (2007), a.o. In particular, they claim that V1 is not always a full lexical verb, as is the case of V1 *gå* ‘go’ in (98a) and *loop* ‘walk’ in (98b), where neither walking nor physical change of location or even movement need to take place.

- (98) a. *Desværre gik de hen og glemte tidsfristen!*  
Unfortunately went they over and forgot deadline.DET  
‘Unfortunately, they went and forgot the deadline.’

[Biberauer & Vikner 2017: 77; *Danish*]

- b. *Hulle loop (en) vertel ons dit is grammatikaal!*  
they walk and tell us it is grammatical  
‘They go and tell us it’s grammatical (when that was really not what we wanted to hear)!’

[Biberauer & Vikner 2017: 77; *Afrikaans*]

That a certain degree of grammaticalisation affects V1 in PseCo is further demonstrated by the fact that in some PseCo configurations the connecting element is optional, as in the Afrikaans example in (98b) (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003; Cruschina 2013 for Sicilian PseCo with regard to the optionality of the connecting element).<sup>64</sup> Nevertheless, Biberauer & Vikner (2017: 78-79) demonstrate that PseCo V1s cannot be classified as auxiliaries proper, since they can co-occur with

---

<sup>64</sup> Biberauer (2017) adds another example of the optional *en* dropping in Afrikaans with the V1 *loop*:

- (i) *Hulle het die boek loop (en) verloor!*  
they have the book walk and lose  
‘They went and lost the book!’

[Biberauer 2017; *Afrikaans*]

auxiliaries (as in (99))<sup>65</sup>, can but do not have to add aspectual meanings to the construction, and can be involved in quirky V2 structures in Afrikaans (cf. Biberauer & Vikner 2017: 79).<sup>66</sup>

- (99) a. *Desværre var de gået hen og blevet ret glemsomme!*  
Unfortunately were they gone over and become rather forgetful.PL  
'Unfortunately, they had become rather forgetful!'

[Biberauer & Vikner 2017: 78; *Danish*]

- b. *Hulle het sowaar loop en sê dis grammatikaal!*  
they have so-true.MP walk and say it's grammatical  
'They actually went and said it's grammatical!'

[Biberauer & Vikner 2017: 78; *Afrikaans*]

According to Biberauer & Vikner (2017: 80-81) PseCo V1s in Danish and Afrikaans are minimally grammaticalised elements – i.e. they are “semi-lexical” in the sense of Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001 (cf. Biberauer 2017) –, whereas auxiliaries are highly bleached, as is always the case for highly grammaticalised elements (cf. Hopper & Traugott 2003; Traugott & Trousdale 2010). This difference can be captured by the contrast between motion and posture V1s in Danish and Afrikaans and *come-* and *go-*based light verbs serving aspectual purposes in other languages (but also with *loop* ‘walk’ in Afrikaans), since the latter combine with lexical verbs without any connecting element (cf. Devos & Van der Wal 2014).<sup>67</sup>

It is the comparison between PseCo V1s and light verbs that allow Biberauer & Vikner to hypothesise the location of the former very low in the clausal structure. If motion light verbs occupy a low position in Cinque’s hierarchy, then the position of V1s must be lower, since PseCo is monoclausal (see Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001 and D. Ross *forthcoming* for monoclausality diagnostics applied to PseCo, and Kjeldahl 2010 for Danish in particular).

---

<sup>65</sup> As in Biberauer & Vikner (2017: 78, fn. 1), the MP in the glosses indicates a modal particle, a feature which is very recurrent in Germanic PseCo.

<sup>66</sup> A fourth argument in favour of the difference between PseCo V1s and auxiliaries is given by Biberauer & Vikner (2015), who point out, citing Vagstad (2010), that in a repetition of an auxiliary verb construction in Danish and Afrikaans it is the auxiliary verb that is repeated, and this cannot be replaced by the pro-verb DO. On the other hand, in a repetition of a PseCo, V1 cannot be repeated but can be replaced by the pro-verb DO.

<sup>67</sup> With this respect, Biberauer (2017) distinguishes between two kinds of *loop* ‘walk’: the *en*-requiring *loop* which is found in PseCo, and the *en*-less *loop* which behaves like the other Afrikaans motion light verbs *kom* ‘come’ and *gaan* ‘go’.

Another argument in favour of the low position of V1 in Afrikaans, Biberauer & Vikner argue (2017: 82), is its possibility to undergo predicate-doubling (cf. (100)). In fact, as Biberauer (2017) points out, predicate doubling in Afrikaans is clause bounded.

- (100) *Staan en teëstribbel sal hulle maar staan en teëstribbel!*  
 stand and against-argue will they but.MP stand and against-argue  
 ‘They will just always raise objections (no matter what)!’

[Biberauer & Vikner 2017: 82; *Afrikaans*]

Biberauer & Vikner then turn to the semantic analysis of PseCo with respect to the contribution of the V1 as an Aspect marker. They point out that PseCo seems to convey a meaning related to the speaker perspective – phenomenon that has been noted since Schmerling (1975) and Carden & Pesetsky (1977) –, and that it is always linked to items featuring deictic components, such as the itive verbs *gå* ‘go’ in Danish and *gaan* ‘go’ in Afrikaans (a light verb which is usually associated with the V1 *staan* ‘stand’).<sup>68</sup> They also point out (Biberauer & Vikner 2017: 83) that Danish and Afrikaans PseCo usually come along with modal and perspectival particles, such as Afrikaans *sowaar* ‘so true’ in (99b) and Danish *Desværre* ‘unfortunately’ in (98a). In fact, although these elements are optional, they are considered as expected components of PseCo by native speakers. The natural presence of these particles in PseCo is motivated by Biberauer & Vikner (2017: 85), who ground their account on Chomsky’s (2001) and Marantz’s (2007) phase theory, by claiming that PseCos “necessarily activate the left periphery of the lower clausal phase”.

To conclude the present overview on Germanic PseCo, other recent works are Tonne (2001) and Lødrup (2002) for Norwegian, Jørgensen (2003) for Norwegian in comparison with Spanish, Bjerre & Bjerre (2007) and Kjeldahl (2010) for Danish, de Vos (2005) for English and Afrikaans, Heycock & Petersen (2012) and D. Ross (2015) for Faroese. For Icelandic see Wiklund (2007) and Jóhannsdóttir (2011). Hebert (2000) proposes different examples of PseCo for non-standard varieties such as Frisian, while some cases of PseCo with motion V1s in German dialects are treated by Donhauser (1982). Taube (*forthcoming*) deals with PseCo with motion V1s in Yiddish. An in-depth analysis of the surprise effect on Swedish PseCo is Wiklund (2009).

A general overview of different instances of PseCo with the relevant analysis is offered by Weisser (2015), who however refers to them with the term ‘Asymmetric Coordination’. Finally, for some diachronic studies on PseCo in Germanic see Postma (2005, 2006) for Middle Dutch. D. Ross

<sup>68</sup> The term ‘itive’ indicates motion away from the speaker.



‘He went and studied.’

[Ross 2016; *Egyptian Arabic*]

- d. ʔaʕad                      ji-ħki.  
sit.PERF.3SG.M.            3.M.+talk.IMPRF.SG  
‘He kept talking.’

[Ouali & Al Bukhari 2016: 174 cited in Ross 2016; *Jordanian Arabic*]

Moreover, D. Ross (*forthcoming*) proposes an interesting case of head-final PseCo in Harari, an Ethiopian Semitic language (the glosses in (102) are slightly different from those found in Leslau 1970).<sup>69</sup>

- (102) *Zātbēsāla-ma            zihēlādo-sa.*  
taught+and.CL            finished+when.CL  
‘When he finished teaching.’

[Leslau 1970: 265 cited in D. Ross *forthcoming*; *Harari*]

Let us now consider, a recent proposal to compare Sicilian PseCo with different instances of MACs in Modern Arabic and in the Arabic dialects put forward by Di Caro’s (2018). This work focusses on the V1 GO, which is found in every Sicilian and Arabic variety, and in particular on its tendency to grammaticalise into an Aspect marker (cf. Sornicola 1976 and Cruschina 2013 for Sicilian PseCo).

The starting point in Di Caro (2018) is the consideration that when a grammaticalised motion verb becomes a Tense or Aspect marker, it undergoes structural, phonological and semantic change, and loses its argument structure (see Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003 for Marsalese). In particular, Di Caro describes the two instances of PseCo that display the same path of grammaticalisation that turns GO into an Aspect marker serving different purposes, namely, the expression of surprise, astonishment and regret in Sicilian, and the expression of futurity in Arabic.

Di Caro’s (2018) is a refinement of Di Caro (2015), where this macro-comparison was first formulated in syntactic terms. It takes into account a similar but rather sketchy proposal by Sgroi (1986), and new data from some Levantine dialects by Jarad (2014) and from Moroccan dialects by

---

<sup>69</sup> D. Ross (*forthcoming*) reports that language contact has forced the shift from the original VSO word order to the SOV word order in the Ethiopian Semitic languages. He takes the fact that PseCo may vary with respect to the head-complement order cross-linguistically as further evidence that PseCo does not have the structure of a coordination, as demonstrated by the rare case in (102).

Di Caro & El Hansali (2017). In his most recent proposal, Di Caro takes the every-day contact between Arabic speaking people and the native people in Sicily, both during the Sicilian Emirate (9th-11th centuries) and during the following Norman rule (11th-13th centuries), as a possible factor which helped Sicilian dialects retain a structure which has lost its full productivity elsewhere in Romance, with the exception of some areas of Calabria and Apulia.

Sgroi (1986) bases his comparison on the similarity of the Arabic and Sicilian dialects with respect to the construction under analysis just by relying on the fact that both display two inflected verbs, but some of the examples he provides could also be considered as instances of verbal serialisation (see *infra* the discussion in Section 3.3). Note that, as in Di Caro (2018), I have kept the transcriptions and translations as originally found in Sgroi (1986) and I have added the English translation of the examples where necessary.

(103) a. *Jīt nšūfək.*

‘Je suis venu te voir.’

(‘I came to see you.’)

b. *Nji nšūfək.*

‘Je viens (ou je viendrai) te voir.’

(‘I come [or I will come] and see you.’)

[Sgroi 1986 cited in Di Caro 2018; *General Maghreb Arabic*]

(104) a. *Mâšī netġaddā.*

‘Vado a pranzare.’

(‘I go and have lunch.’)

b. *Émšī éšbaḥ.*

‘Va a vedere.’

(Go and have a look.’)

c. *T`ala ya `li ġā`miz.*

‘Hey, Ali, come and sit!’

[Sgroi 1986 cited in Di Caro 2018; *Libyan Arabic of Tripoli*]



(105) a. *Žā ḥdā el-kētāb u `addā yéžrī.*  
 ‘Venne a prendere il libro e andò via correndo.’  
 (‘He came to take the book and ran away.’)

b. *`Addī nādī-h.*  
 ‘Va a chiamarlo.’  
 (‘Go and call him.’)

[SgROI 1986 cited in Di Caro 2018; *Libyan Arabic of Benghazi*]

(106) a. *Rūḥ indah Maḥmūd.*  
 ‘Va a chiamare Mahmud.’  
 (‘Go and call Mahmud.’)

b. *Ta`āla ḥod kursī*  
 ‘Vieni a prendere una sedia.’  
 (‘Come and take a chair.’)

[SgROI 1986 cited in Di Caro 2018; *Egyptian Arabic*]

In SgROI (1986) examples from the Algerian Arabic spoken in Algiers, Moroccan Arabic, Syrian Arabic and Maltese are also reported.

Additionally, Di Caro provides some other relevant examples: in (107) the asyndetic PseCo with V1 GO in what can be rendered with the Indicative Present is displayed. The instances of PseCo in (108), all in the Imperative 2SG, display the same behaviour of their Sicilian counterparts, where the connecting element *a* is usually absent cross-dialectally when V1 is GO (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003, Di Caro & Giusti 2015 and the examples in (33a, b)).

(107) a. *Nemši njīb xobz.*  
 go.1SG fetch.1SG bread  
 ‘I go and fetch the bread.’

[Di Caro 2015: 82 cited in Di Caro 2018; Tunis (Tunisia)]

b. *Maši injīb el-xəbza.*  
 go.1SG fetch.1SG the.CL+bread

‘I go and fetch the bread.’

[Di Caro 2015: 82 cited in Di Caro 2018; Benghazi (Libya)]

- (108) a. *Imši*            *jīb*            *xobz!*  
go.IMP.2SG      fetch.IMP.2SG    bread  
‘Go (and) fetch the bread!’

[Di Caro 2015: 85 cited in Di Caro 2018; Tunis (Tunisia)]

- b. *Maši*            *injīb*            *el-xəbza.*  
go.IMP.2SG      fetch.IMP.2SG    the.CL+bread  
‘Go (and) fetch the bread!’

[Di Caro 2015: 85 cited in Di Caro 2018; Benghazi (Libya)]

- c. *Sīr*            *jīb*            *xobz!*  
go.IMP.2SG      fetch.IMP.2SG    bread  
‘Go (and) fetch the bread!’

[Di Caro 2018; Casablanca (Morocco)]

- d. *Rūh*            *jīb*            *el-xebez!*  
go.IMP.2SG      fetch.IMP.2SG    the.CL+bread  
‘Go (and) fetch the bread!’

[Di Caro 2015: 85; Beirut (Lebanon)]

The Sicilian varieties which display most features in common with the Arabic dialects with respect to PseCo are those of the Eastern Coast of Sicily, like e.g. the dialects of Acireale (in the province of Catania) and Marina di Ragusa (in the province of Ragusa). First, these varieties have a lower degree of Mood, Tense and Person restrictions with respect to Marsalese (cf. Cardinaletti and Giusti, 2001, 2003), to the extent that they display a fully-fledged paradigm in the Indicative Present, Imperfect and Preterite, in the Subjunctive, and in the Imperative 2SG and 2PL. Second, in these varieties V1 GO generally occurs as a prefixed and invariable form, namely: *va-*, *vo-*, *uo-* or *o-*. (cf. *supra* (39)).

Di Caro reports that in Eastern Sicily, V1 GO in PseCo generally preserves its semantics of motion and thus competes with the InfCo (see Section 2.1). However GO can sometimes undergo

desemanticisation and become either a progressive marker, as in (109a), or an emphatic marker involving emotional participation of the speaker, as in (109b) and (109b).<sup>70</sup>

(109) a. *Ora ottravagghju e poi u chjamu.*  
 now o-work.1SG and then him.CL call.1SG  
 ‘I’m going to work now. I’ll call him later.’

b. *Ci oddesi un pugnu...*  
 to-him.CL o-give.PAST.1SG a punch  
 ‘I suddenly punched him...’

c. *Ottrovu a casa allagata / anniata!*  
 o-find.1SG the house flooded / flooded  
 ‘I found my house flooded!’

[Di Caro 2018; Acireale (Catania)]

As regards the Arabic side of the comparison, Di Caro refers to Jarad (2014) who reports that Syrian Arabic *raḥ* ‘go’ can be used as a lexical item (cf. (110)) but can also occur as a prospective future marker V1 of a PseCo, where it can surface as a full verb (110b) or in its phonetically eroded version (110c), thus instantiating the unidirectional grammaticalisation tendency discussed in Bybee *et al.* (1994): content word > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix.

(110) a. *Rāḥa l-ḥadiqata li-l-nuzḥa.*  
 go.PAST.3SG the.CL-park to.CL+the.CL+outing  
 ‘He went to the park for an outing.’

[Jarad 2014: 110 cited in Di Caro 2018; *Syrian Arabic*]

---

<sup>70</sup> The interpretation of the V1 in (109a) as a progressive marker is rather problematic and the English translation of that example does not help disambiguate between a progressive and an inchoative interpretation. On the one hand, most speakers who find a semantic difference between Sicilian InfCo and PseCo tend to attribute to the latter a progressive aspect. On the other hand, all Sicilian dialects display a regular Present Progressive (e.g. *Ora staju travagghjannu* ‘I am working now.’) which, however, would not be a good option for (109a). In fact, the speaker in (109a) cannot make the call required not because she is working at that very moment, but because she will be busy working very soon. I think that a dedicated study would be of great help in order to establish whether the grammaticalisation of V1 GO in Type 3 PseCo as a progressive marker holds true.

- b. *Rāḥ*      *yūʔaʕ*.  
*rah*      fall.3SG

‘He is going to fall.’ (said of a clown walking on a rope)

[Jarad 2014: 107 cited in Di Caro 2018; *Syrian Arabic*]

- c. *L-madrasa*      *ḥa-təʕlin*      *n-nətāyij*      *bukra*.  
the.CL+school      *ha*+announce.3SG      the.CL+results      tomorrow

‘The school is going to announce the results tomorrow.’

[Jarad 2014: 102 cited in Di Caro 2018; *Syrian Arabic*]

The prefixation of the V1 *raḥ* ‘go’ is actually widespread in all the Arabic speaking world. Jarad (2014: 111-113) provides further evidence from Lebanese, Jordanian and Palestinian Arabic (the so-called Levantine Arabic dialects), from Egyptian and Iraqi Arabic, and from Maltese.

Another interesting point in common between the two groups of languages regards the possibility to develop different allomorphs of V1 GO with specialised functions. On the one hand, Di Caro & El Hansali (2017) report that in the Moroccan dialect spoken in El Jadida (in the region of Casablanca-Settat) V1 GO is realised following three different roots:

- i) the verb *yadi*, which occurs as a Present Participle, comes from the Classical Arabic root *yada* meaning ‘go away’ (cf. Caubet 1993; Rubin 2005; Benmamoun 2000);
- ii) the verb *məša* occurs in the Preterite and in the Present (as *ymši*);
- iii) the verb *sīr* occurs in the Imperative.

The Present Participle in (i) undergoes a process of grammaticalisation to convey the sense of futurity, thus completely losing its semantics of motion (a phenomenon reminiscent of the English progressive periphrasis). This is demonstrated by its co-occurrence with a lexical GO, as shown in (111). Curiously, in its most phonologically reduced form, this instance of GO occurs as *a-* (*yadi* > *ya-* > *a-*).

- (111) a. *yadi*      *nməši*      *l-mdrassa*.  
FUT      go.1SG      (to)the.CL+school

b. *ya-nmāši l-mdrassa.*  
 FUT+go.1SG (to)the.CL+school

c. *A-nmši l-mdrassa.*  
 FUT+go.1SG (to)the.CL+school  
 ‘I’ll go to school.’

[Di Caro & El Hansali 2017 cited in Di Caro 2018; El Jadida (Morocco)]

On the other hand, in some Eastern Sicilian varieties that allow for more than one invariable V1, some of these specialise to become dedicated forms for the Imperative. In Pachino (in the province of Syracuse), for example, the V1 allomorph *o-* is used for the Imperative, while *va-* is used elsewhere. Something similar happens in Ispica (province of Ragusa).

To conclude his analysis, Di Caro (2018) proposes a protocol in which he summarises the features that make PseCo in Sicilian and in the Arabic dialects comparable. The dialects considered for the protocol, shown in Table 11, are the Sicilian varieties of Marsala (in the Western Coast of Sicily), Delia (in Central Sicily) and Acireale, and the Arabic variety of El Jadida (Morocco), Levantine Arabic and Egyptian Arabic.

As in the spirit of Protocol Linguistics, the dialect of Acireale (in this case representative of many other dialects of the Eastern Coast) is displayed in the middle of the protocol because it is the closest to the Arabic dialects in terms of features shared. Note that, with the exception of Acireale and other dialects of Eastern Sicily where GO seems to be the only available V1 (cf. Di Caro 2015, 2019; Di Caro & Giusti 2015), other motion V1s, especially COME, are attested in both Sicilian and Arabic PseCos, although this is not the focus of the study.

**Table 11. A protocol for PseCo in Sicilian and Arabic dialects**

	Marsala	Delia	Acireale	Morocco	Levant. Ar.	Egyptian Ar.
V1 other than GO	+	+	-	+	+	+
Fully-fledged paradigm	-	-	+	+	+	+
PseCo in the Preterite	-	+	+	+	+	+
Invariable V1	+	+	+	+	+	+
V1 as an Aspect marker	+	+	+	+	+	+

In conclusion, verbal constructions featuring two inflected verbs in the Semitic languages have been attested both diachronically and synchronically. Nevertheless, a syntactic analysis of such constructions as instances of PseCo – i.e. as monoclausal constructions in which V1 can lose its

semantics to become an Aspect marker – suffers from shortage of contributions. Di Caro (2018) is the first macro-comparative analysis that tries to shed some light on this phenomenon, by means of syntactic tools that have been used in Germanic and Romance with convincing results.

### **3.3 Serial Verb Constructions**

This section is divided into two parts. In the first part I give an overview of some syntactic constructions found in many and unrelated languages of the world, referred to as Serial Verb Constructions (henceforth SVCs) and list their defining properties. In the second part I discuss the main attempts proposed in the literature of determining whether PseCo – and in particular Sicilian PseCo – can be considered as an instance of SVC; a question that is far from being answered definitely.

#### **3.3.1 What are SVCs**

SVCs are a group of multi-verb constructions that has received wide coverage in the literature, yet it is still difficult to give SVCs a uniform definition, since they come in disparate guises and are found in a number of unrelated and very different languages across West Africa, South Asia, Amazonia, Oceania, New Guinea, and in Creole languages. Nevertheless, it is possible to detect some general properties – shared by most scholars – for all SVCs. For that purpose, I propose here the definition by Aikhenvald (2006) (but see also Hagermeijer 2001: 415ff):

“A serial verb construction (SVC) is a sequence of verbs which act together as a single predicate, without any overt marker of coordination, subordination, or syntactic dependency of any other sort. Serial verb constructions describe what is conceptualised as a single event. They are monoclausal; their intonational properties are the same as those of a monoverbal clause, and they have just one tense, aspect, and polarity value. SVCs may also share core and other arguments. Each component of an SVC must be able to occur on its own. Within an SVC, the individual verbs may have same, or different, transitivity values.”

(Aikhenvald 2006: 1)

Aikhenvald (2006: 3) defines SVCs as “a grammatical technique covering a wide variety of meanings and functions” and, in this regard, she cites an interesting observation by Matisoff (1969), who describes the purposes of SVCs. According to Matisoff, SVCs

“serve to provide in a uniform way the sort of information that in the surface grammar of languages like English is handled by a formally disparate array of subordinating devices: complementary infinitives, *-ing* complements, modal auxiliaries, adverbs, prepositional phrases, even whole subordinate clauses.”

(Matisoff 1969: 71)

It is clear from Aikhenvald’s (2006) definition of SVCs that it is reasonable to compare them with the instances of PseCo found in Italo-Romance and Germanic languages.<sup>71</sup> In fact. Although the selection of which verbs can enter SVCs can differ cross-linguistically, there is a striking commonality between SVCs and PseCo in that in both constructions motion verbs, or causative verbs implying motion, are very frequent. TAKE is another frequent verb used in SVCs as well as in (Germanic) PseCo.

Let us see some examples of SVCs cited in Kjeldahl (2010), whose work focusses on the syntax of quirky verbal morphology (and especially on PseCo) in Germanic languages.<sup>72</sup> In (112) GO and COME are used as V2s but the V1 in (112a) is another verb of motion, namely RUN. In both the V1s in (113) a sense of motion is involved. In particular, the V1 in (113a) is SEND, which is also one of the few possible V1s in Sicilian PseCo. Finally, the sentence from São Tomense (a Portuguese Creole) in (114) exemplifies another very common strategy in SVCs, i.e. the combination of a directional V1 with a manner-of-motion V2.

(112) a. *Di pikni ron kom hoom.*  
 the child run come home  
 ‘The child ran home.’

b. *Mieri kyari di pikni go a skuul.*  
 Mary carried the child go to school  
 ‘Mary carried the child to school.’

[Winford 1993: 184 cited in Kjeldahl 2010: 104; *Jamaican Creole*]

(113) a. *Kofi ari a ston puru na ini a olo.*  
 Kofi pull the stone remove LOC in the hole  
 ‘Kofi pulled the stone out of the hole.’

<sup>71</sup> Note that, in principle, SVCs can stack up more than two verbs. PseCo generally combines two verbs, and only exceptionally three (cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2015, 2018 for Sicilian PseCo and Shopen 1971 for PseCo in American English). The examples of SVCs provided in this section all regard the combination of two verbs.

<sup>72</sup> I have kept the glosses in SVC examples very close to the original glosses in the works cited. These could differ from the ones I have used in the rest of this dissertation, especially as regards the description of verb features.

- b. *Kown seni wan boskopu gi Tigri.*  
 King send a message give Tiger  
 ‘King sent a message to Tiger.’

[Baker 1989: 516 cited in Kjeldahl 2010: 105; *Sranan*]

- (114) *Bisu vwa subli.*  
 bird fly go-up  
 ‘The bird flew upwards.’

[Hagemeijer 2001: 416 cited in Kjeldahl 2010: 106; *São Tomense*]

Other possible candidates for SVCs are positional verbs such as LIE which, as is also the case for some PseCos in Germanic, act as aspectual markers conveying a progressive sense to the construction. The example in (115), originally in George (1975), is from Nupe, a language spoken in Nigeria.

- (115) *Tsoda èlele ci kata o.*  
 Tsoda sleep lie house LOC  
 ‘Tsoda is sleeping in the house.’

[Baker 1991: 80 cited in Kjeldahl 2010: 106; *Nupe*]

The possibility to be interpreted as real coordinations, typical of PseCo, holds for some SVCs too. In (116), extraction acts as a diagnostic to demonstrate that it is a real case of SVC and that the coordination reading ‘Kofi took a knife and cut the bread’ is not correct.<sup>73</sup>

- (116) *Kofi teki a nefi koti a brede.*  
 Kofi take the knife cut the bread  
 ‘Kofi cut the bread with the knife.’

[Sebba 1987: 89 cited in Kjeldahl 2010: 107; *Sranan*]

- (117) a. *San<sub>i</sub> Kofi teki a nefi koti t<sub>i</sub>?*  
 what Kofi take the knife cut  
 ‘What did Kofi cut with the knife?’

- b. *San<sub>i</sub> Kofi teki t<sub>i</sub> koti a brede?*  
 what Kofi take cut the bread

<sup>73</sup> Note, however, that in SVCs extraction of the object is possible from both verbs, while in PseCo only extraction from V2 is possible.



‘What did Kofi cut the bread with?’

[Sebba 1987: 101 cited in Kjeldahl 2010: 107; *Sranan*]

The identification of two broad classes within SVCs is particularly relevant for the macro-comparison with PseCo discussed in this section. According to Aikhenvald (2006: 21-22) – who takes into account only two verbs in her description for the sake of simplicity – SVCs can be grouped in asymmetrical or symmetrical. The former (cf. Aikhenvald 1999) consist of a verb taken from a large or unrestricted class, and a verb taken from a semantically or grammatically restricted class. Aikhenvald (2006: 22) proposes that we refer to the verb from the open class as the ‘major’ verb, and to the verb from the grammatically restricted class as the ‘minor’ verb (in the sense of Durie 1997).

Asymmetrical SVCs denote a single event described by the major verb, while the minor verb provides a modificational specification. The latter is often a motion or posture verb which can either express direction or give the SVC a tense-aspect meaning. Very interestingly, minor verbs in asymmetrical SVCs tend to get grammaticalised but can still retain full lexical status in the language outside the SVCs, which is exactly what Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003) claim for motion V2s in Sicilian PseCo.

The syntactic composition of symmetrical SVCs is different in that all the verbs involved come from unrestricted classes and none, individually, determines the general semantic or syntactic properties of the construction. Unlike asymmetrical SVCs, which tend towards grammaticalisation, symmetrical SVCs tend to get lexicalised and develop idiomatic meanings (cf. Aikhenvald 2006: 30).

A thorough description of the syntactic and semantic properties of SVCs with all the possible subdivisions suggested in the literature goes beyond the scope of this section. I limit myself to proposing here a protocol in Table 9 summarizing the main features of SVCs, divided into two subgroups, and how many of them are shared by PseCo. The mark ‘?’ indicates a theoretically possible type of PseCo which is closer to SVCs in that it features object sharing.<sup>74</sup> PseCo is not generally prone to lexicalisation. Nevertheless, the ‘+/-’ value on the relevant property refers to the fact that a once productive Imperative PseCo in (regional) Italian has lexicalised as a fixed

---

<sup>74</sup> As Jaeggli & Hyams (1993) point out, since V1s in PseCo are intransitive (unaccusative) verbs, the shared objects should be a prepositional object, as in (i) which however are ungrammatical in English.

- (i) a. \*I will go with my son travel to Europe.  
b. \*I will go to my advisor talk to about my dissertation.

[Jaeggli & Hyams 1993: 322, fn. 7; *American English*]

expression, namely *vattelappesca* ‘goodness knows!’ (lit. ‘go and fish it!’) (cf. Ledgeway 1997: 256).

What is relevant for the present discussion is the possibility for some verbs, usually of motion, to occur in combination with other verbs to express a single event, something which SVCs share with PseCo. On the basis of this consideration, different works on PseCo have dealt with this comparison, although hardly ever as the focal point of their analysis. A summary of the works that have taken SVCs into consideration while proposing an account of PseCo is proposed in Section 3.3.2.

**Table 12. A protocol for Serial Verb Constructions**

	Symmetrical SVCs	Asymmetrical SVCs	?	PseCo
Object sharing	+	+	+	-
Single event interpretation	+	+	+	+
Overt linker	-	-	+/-	+/-
Grammaticalisation	-	+	+	+
Lexicalisation	+	-	-	+/-

### 3.3.2 Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination as a particular type of SVCs

There is no general consensus on the fact that PseCo could be considered as a case of verbal serialisation. This broadly depends on the more or less restrictive interpretation that scholars give to what should be considered as a SVC.<sup>75</sup> In the literature on Sicilian PseCo, the first to tackle this problem are Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001), who – perhaps too quickly – reject this hypothesis, on the basis that according to the literature available at the time (cf. Baker 1989; Lee 1992; Collins 1997) object sharing between the two verbs is a requisite for a construction to be classified as a SVC. Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 374) claim that the same holds for Swedish and report that the same conclusion has been pointed out for American English PseCo by Baker (1989: 519, fn. 3), Jaeggli & Hyams (1993: 322, fn. 7), and Pollock (1994: 303, fn. 19). Moreover, they refer to an anonymous

<sup>75</sup> See the overview on SVCs offered by Anne Kjeldahl and her proposal to analyse PseCo in Germanic as SVCs (Kjeldahl 2010: 103-127). According to Kjeldahl (2010: 111), SVCs represent “an overt spell-out of individual components of complex events”. What some languages do by means of verbal serialisation, other languages do in different ways. For example, in some languages these components may be inherent in an individual verb, while in some other languages, they may be expressed by adverbial modification.

reviewer who points out that the presence of the connecting element *a* is further evidence that Sicilian PseCo cannot be a SVC<sup>76</sup>.

Manzini & Savoia (2005: 700-701) acknowledge that, under the restrictive interpretation given by scholars such as Baker (1989) and Collins (1997), all the constructions in Southern Italo-Romance they account for cannot be considered as SVCs, since according to these interpretation SVCs must share an internal argument. Nevertheless, Manzini & Savoia point out that, following this line of reasoning, double verb constructions with motion V1s like those found in English and, more generally, in the Germanic languages should be considered as typical coordinations, except that they allow for the extraction of the object of the V2. In this regard, Manzini & Savoia cite Déchaine's (1993) consideration on 'non serializing languages' and propose the examples in (118), where despite the coordination-like look of the sentence in (118a), the extraction of 'whisky' from the V2 is allowed.<sup>77</sup>

- (118) a. *Ann went to the store and bought some whisky.*  
b. *What did Ann go to the store and buy?*

[Déchaine 1993: 801 cited in Manzini & Savoia 2005: 701; *English*]

In Cruschina (2013) the comparison of Sicilian PseCo with SVCs finds more space for some considerations. Cruschina refutes two arguments against the SVC reading of PseCo. First, he considers Baker's (1989) influential claim that SVCs must share the object as too strict, and refers to Aikhenvald (2006: 12) for a less rigid interpretation of SVCs. For Aikhenvald, *contra* Baker (1989), SVCs with no shared argument, although rare, can be found. Moreover, prototypical SVCs must share at least one argument, and this is the case for Sicilian PseCo, whose verbs must share the subject.

Second, as regards the connecting element – another feature that prototypical SVCs do not have –, Cruschina (2013: 271) observes that the *a* found in Sicilian PseCo, which is a monoclausal construction, can be now considered just as a desemanticised linker. Once again, he refers to Aikhenvald's (2006: 20) claim that, although SVCs cannot contain any marker of syntactic dependency, there is a special type of SVCs featuring a desemanticised marker, as is the case e.g. of Khwe (a language spoken in Namibia, Angola, Botswana, South Africa, and parts of Zambia), where every verb in an SVC except the last one takes a morpheme whose only function is marking

---

<sup>76</sup> But this, again, depends on the more or less restrictive interpretation on whether SVCs can feature a connecting element or not.

<sup>77</sup> See the discussion in Déchaine (1993: 801) where further examples of possible extraction from what she calls 'superficially coordinate VPs' without an overt V2 subject in Swedish and Norwegian are presented.

the verb as being part of the SVC. In support of this argument, Cruschina reports that in Pantesco PseCo (cf. (34)) the connecting element can be omitted with V1s GO and COME in the Indicative Present (besides the most widespread omission in the 2SG of the Imperative with V1 GO). Were this connecting element meaningful, its optional omission should not be possible.

Finally, Cruschina recalls Aikhenvald's (2006: 21-22) subdivision of SVCs into Symmetrical and Asymmetrical, and underlines the similarity between the minor verbs in Asymmetrical SVCs and motion V1s in Sicilian PseCo, since both can retain their lexical status when not used in the relevant constructions.

In Di Caro & Giusti (2015), the possibility that Sicilian PseCo could be included in the group of SVCs (for which they refer to Joseph & Zwicky 1990 and Aikhenvald & Dixon 2006) is not actually discussed in detail, but it is made clear from the beginning, when they observe that in both constructions the verbs involved must share Tense and Person features.

On the contrary, Todaro & Del Prete (2019) provide a more detailed comparative analysis of SVCs in reference to PseCo and, again, refer to Aikhenvald's (2006) subdivision of SVCs to suggest that PseCo is an Asymmetrical Contiguous SVC with Feature Matching. They report an example in Yoruba from Bámgbósé (1974) where V1 and V2 share the subject *ó* 'he' and the morpho-syntactic 3SG feature – which however in Yoruba are not overtly expressed – and make up a single event structure.

- (119)    *Ó*      *mú*    *ìwé*    *wá*.  
           he      take    book    come  
           'He brought the book.'

[Bámgbósé 1974: 17 cited in Todaro & Del Prete 2019: 141; *Yoruba*]

Todaro & Del Prete (2019: 142) consider in turn each of the defining properties of (both symmetrical and asymmetrical) SVCs identified by Aikhenvald (2006):

- i) SVCs contain no marker of syntactic dependency between the verb components;
- ii) unlike idiomatic double verb sequences, they have no restrictions on their Mood, Tense and Aspect choices;
- iii) their verb components share arguments;
- iv) their verb components may have concordant marking;

v) they describe one integrated situation or one single event, which may be composed of a series of sub-events.

As regards the marker found in PseCo, Todaro & Del Prete (2019: 142-143) agree with Cruschina (2013) on the fact that the connecting element *a* does not mark any syntactic dependency and, thus, can be considered as an ‘empty marker’ in the sense of Aikhenvald (2011: 21). As regards the non-idiomaticity of PseCo, they observe that PseCo is the result of morphosyntactic processes that make it available in the Indicative and in the Imperative in different Sicilian varieties, while on the contrary idiomatic double verb sequences are frozen and non-compositional. As for the argument sharing in (iii), they observe that the verbs in PseCo systematically share arguments, which is usually the subject but not in the case of V1 *mannari* ‘send’, which forces the PseCo to a different pattern of argument sharing. As for the concordant marking in (iv), Todaro & Del Prete claim that PseCo corresponds to the subclass of SVCs showing concordant marking of inflectional features (cf. Aikhenvald 2006: 39ff.).

Finally, with regard to the single event interpretation, Todaro & Del Prete (2019: 144-145) believe that, although there is a motion component to be considered in the interpretation of PseCo with motion V1s, PseCo can be said to involve a single event interpretation. To be more specific, they believe that PseCo has what Bohnemeyer *et al.* (2011: 48) call the *Macro-Event Property* (MEP), defined as a property that an event-denoting construction has if and only if it combines exclusively with those time-positional or durational operators, such as Tenses, time adverbials, temporal clauses, that have scope over all the sub-events this construction entails.

To prove that PseCo has the MEP, they propose the example in (120), where the time adverbial *rumani* ‘tomorrow’ has to refer to the whole predicate *vaju a ppigghiu* in (120a), while in (120b) it can selectively scope over the V1 *vaju* only. In the first case, the picking up of the kid must necessarily take place in the day following the utterance time, otherwise the sentence is ill-formed. In the second case, since only the event of going must refer to *rumani* ‘tomorrow’, the unsuccessful picking up of the kid described by the continuation of the sentence is absolutely acceptable.

- (120) a. *?Vaju a ppigghiu u picciriddro rumani ma*  
 go.1SG *a* take.1SG the kid tomorrow but  
*mi lu runano vènnare.*  
 to-me.CL him.CL give.3PL Friday  
 ‘I go pick up the kid tomorrow but they’ll give him to me on Friday.’

- b. *Vaju a ppigghiari u picciriddro rumani ma*  
go.1SG to take.INF the kid tomorrow but  
*mi lu runano vènnare.*  
to-me.CL him.CL give.3PL Friday

‘I go to pick up the kid tomorrow but they’ll give him to me on Friday.’

[Todaro & Del Prete 2019; Trapani]

To conclude, although there are different views on what properties a SVC must have, it seems clear from the recent literature that the features that SVCs and PseCo share are such that the latter can be said to instantiate a particular type of SVCs.

## Chapter 4. New insights on Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination

Sicilian PseCo is a phenomenon so rich in microvariation and challenging from the morphosyntactic viewpoint, that many phenomena that characterise it need further research. In this chapter, I consider some of the properties of Sicilian PseCo that have been accounted for in the previous chapters in order to propose some hierarchies in the selection of V1, of V2, and of the Mood, Tense and Person restrictions PseCo displays. I also discuss cases of dialects whose configurations straddle upon different types of PseCo.

### 4.1 Di Caro's (2019) proposal: three types of Pseudo-Coordination

In this chapter I follow the proposal put forward in Di Caro (2019) in which three types of configurations of PseCo are identified in the Sicilian dialects. Based on my recent fieldwork on different areas of the region (mainly in the East Coast and the area around Palermo), I provide insights on the new data collected and propose some more fine-grained protocols to address in future research.

The criterion according to which the three types are defined in Di Caro (2019) follows the increasing possibility for a given dialect to allow for more paradigms of PseCo, from the very common highly restrictive combination of Indicative Present and Imperative to the much wider set of Moods and Tenses found in a restricted number of dialects. Since all the other parameters of microvariation are orthogonal to the possibility for PseCo to occur in a given Mood and Tense, as will become clear in the following sections, they have not been considered as relevant factors for the makeup of the types proposed. The three types identified in Di Caro (2019) are the following:

- i) Type 1 PseCo coincides with that found in Marsalese and first accounted for by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003). It features GO, COME, COME BY and SEND as available V1s, the 1SG, 2SG, 3SG, 3PL of the Indicative Present and the 2SG of the Imperative as available cells of the paradigm, and an optional invariable form of V1 GO;
- ii) Type 2 PseCo is found in some dialects from Central Sicily such the ones spoken in Delia, Camastra and Campobello di Licata. It features the same characteristics of Type 1 with the addition of a special paradigm for the Indicative Preterite (1SG, 3SG, 1PL and 3PL) and invariable forms of GO as V1 which are generally limited to singular persons;
- iii) Type 3 PseCo is found in some dialects of Eastern Sicily, such the ones spoken in Catania,

Acireale, Giarre and Marina di Ragusa. It features GO as the only available V1, the possible loss of the semantics of motion of V1, the prefixation of V1 and complete six-person paradigms in the Indicative Present, Imperfect and Preterite, together with the Subjunctive and the 2SG and 2PL of the Imperative.

Some clarification is needed here. With respect to the characteristics of Type 1, it is important to note that the restriction to GO, COME, COME BY and SEND as available V1s is not a necessary condition for a given PseCo to belong to this type. As already stated above, the restrictions on the selection of V1 is orthogonal to the possibility for a PseCo to occur in a certain Mood and Tense. Thus, if a dialect displayed a PseCo with only one or some of the V1s available in Marsalese (or more than those) but could only occur in the Indicative Present and in the Imperative, that would still be a Type 1 PseCo.

As regards Type 2, the possibility for the dialect of Delia – the most representative of this type – to display invariable forms of V1 GO went unnoticed in the previous literature (i.e. Di Caro 2015, Di Caro & Giusti 2015) and is dealt with in Chapter 5, together with a detailed discussion on the particular paradigmatic configuration of the Indicative Preterite. In any case, the mere presence of an Indicative Preterite PseCo, no matter what cells of the paradigm are available and what verbs are involved in the construction, determines whether a PseCo belongs to Type 1 or Type 2. Finally, as regards Type 3 PseCo, new data from my recent fieldwork have confirmed that for most speakers in many towns and villages of the East Coast of Sicily, the PseCo with COME as V1 is accepted, but only GO as a prefixed V1 gives rise to the fully-fledged paradigms. Moreover, it is important to clarify that the possible loss of the semantics of motion of V1, although very frequent in the dialects of Type 3, is also always available in the other types of PseCo (cf. Cruschina 2013 for Mussomelese and Di Caro 2019 for the dialects of the province of Catania).

Di Caro (2019) also briefly discusses the case of some dialects that display a ‘hybrid’ PseCo, i.e. a PseCo that behaves in different ways according to what (kind of) V1 is selected, such as that found in Mazzarino (in the province of Caltanissetta). In this dialect, the inflected V1 GO follows the Type 1 PseCo, while the invariable V1 GO (i.e. *va-*) instantiates a Type 3 PseCo. Moreover, Mazzarinense features an invariable COME as V1 in the Indicative Preterite (i.e. *vinn-*) which interestingly displays a fully-fledged paradigm with some V2s such as DO and patterns with the defective paradigm of Deliano (i.e. 1SG \*2SG 3SG 1PL \*2PL 3PL) with some other V2s such as FETCH (cf. Chapter 5), as shown in (121) and (122).



- (121) a. *Vinn a ffici / ffacisti / ffici a spisa.*  
 come a do.PAST.1SG / do.PAST.2SG / do.PAST.3SG the shopping  
 ‘I/you/he/she went to do the shopping.’
- b. *Vinn a fficimu / ffacistivu / fficiru a spisa.*  
 come a do.PAST.1PL / do.PAST.2PL / do.PAST.3PL the shopping  
 ‘We/you/they went to do the shopping.’
- (122) a. *Vinn a ppigghjaju / \*ppigghjasti / ppigghjà u pani.*  
 come a fetch.PAST.1SG / fetch.PAST.2SG / fetch.PAST.3SG the bread  
 ‘I/you/he/she went to fetch the bread’
- b. *Vinn a ppigghjammu / \*ppigghjàstivu / ppigghjaru u pani.*  
 come a fetch.PAST.1PL / fetch.PAST.2PL / fetch.PAST.3PL the bread  
 ‘We/you/they went to fetch the bread.’

[Mazzarino (Caltanissetta)]

Note, however, that in Mazzarinese V1 COME in the Indicative Present patterns with Marsalese (i.e. 1SG 2SG 3SG \*1PL \*2PL 3PL). This demonstrates that, although the Sicilian dialects can generally be easily attributed to one of the three types proposed – i.e. they always follow the one rigid Mood/Tense hierarchy – some of them can display different paradigmatic configurations according to the V1 selected.

#### 4.2 The selection of V1

As we have seen in the overview of the available literature in Chapter 3, Sicilian PseCo generally occurs with the motion V1s GO, COME, COME BY and the causative motion V1 SEND. With the exception of COME BY, which to the best of my knowledge was included in the lot for the first time in Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003), the other three V1s have been attested since the first accounts of Italo-Romance PseCo (cf. Ascoli 1896, 1901). In particular, SEND has received minor coverage (just a hint in Sorrento 1915, cf. (36), and a dedicated study in Todaro & Del Prete 2019), while GO has been the main focus of all the remaining studies. According to the relevant literature, PseCo in Southern Italo-Romance outside Sicily (mainly Apulia and Calabria) features V1s GO, STAND, and

WANT (cf. Ledgeway 2016; Andriani 2017), thus leaving GO as the *trait d'union* between the two groups of PseCo.<sup>78</sup>

Let us see some examples from, respectively, Sicilian (123) and Apulian (124).

- (123) a. *Vaju / Vegnu / Mannu / Passu a ppigghju u pani.*  
 go.1SG / come.1SG / send.1SG / come.by.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I go / come / send (someone) / come by to fetch the bread.’

[Marsala (Trapani)]

- b. *Vaju / Vjignu / Mannu / Passu a ppigliu lu pani.*  
 go.1SG / come.1SG / send.1SG / come.by.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I go / come / send (someone) / come by to fetch the bread.’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

- (124) a. *va(u) a d'dormu*  
 go.1SG a sleep.1SG  
 ‘I’m gonna sleep.’

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 694; Nociglia (Lecce)]

- b. *nə llu va ffatʃi*  
 NEG it.CL go do.2SG  
 ‘You don’t go to do it.’

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 691; Mesagne (Brindisi)]

- c. *stək a b'beivə*  
 stand.1SG a drink.1SG  
 ‘I am drinking.’

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 692; Taranto]

- d. *ti lu ʃta d'dau*  
 to-you.CL it.CL stand give.1SG

<sup>78</sup> Note that VI COME is also present in the Apulian dialect of Putignano, in the province of Bari, and Mesagne, in the province of Brindisi, as shown in Manzini & Savoia (2005: 689-692), but this does not seem to be a common V2 in Apulian PseCo. Furthermore, note that some varieties outside Sicily, like e.g. the Calabrian dialects spoken in Umbriatico, in the province of Crotona (cf. 35c, d), and in Rossano, in the province of Cosenza (cf. (35e, f)), behave like the Sicilian ones and allow for COME to occur, while STAND and WANT are not possible.

‘I am giving it to you.’

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 693; Brindisi]

- e. lu            'vɔʝju    'veʃu  
him/it.CL    want.1SG   see.1SG  
‘I want to see him/it.’

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 691; Mesagne (Brindisi)]

- f. u            vɔʝʝ        a    v'veku  
him/it.CL    want.1SG   a    see.1SG  
‘I want to see him/it.’

[Manzini & Savoia 2005: 692; Monteparano (Taranto)]

Other attested V1s in Sicilian are *START* and *COME BACK*, which are rare but found in more than one variety (see *supra* (54) and (82)), and a series of other V1s, i.e. *ARRIVE* and *REMAIN*, which have been documented for a specific Indicative Preterite PseCo in Deliano (cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2018, and the discussion in Chapter 5). If we compare these data with what the literature on Germanic PseCo tells us about the available V1s, i.e. mainly *GO*, *COME*, *TRY*, *STAND*, *SIT* and *START*, two facts come to mind:

- i) once again *GO* is the common factor of all these constructions;
- ii) all available V1s are either motion verbs, aspectual verbs, or modal, in other words they all belong to the class of restructuring verbs (cf. Rizzi 1976a, b, 1978, 1982; Cinque 2001, 2003, 2004, 2006).

We have already seen that a possible explanation for the reason why certain verbs are suitable to appear in a PseCo while others are not lies in their being prototypical, or ‘less marked’ in the sense of Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001), a fact that is supported by evidence in Germanic PseCo (see the discussion in Wiklund (2007: 141) reported in Section 3.2.1). I link this property of the V1s to the frequency of such verbs. In the Sicilian dialects motion verbs are the favourite V1 candidates. The more frequent a motion verb is, the more likely it will be featured in a PseCo as V1.<sup>79</sup>

In a comparative study concerning Italian and some Italo-Romance dialects, Egerland (2009) analyses which verbs are the best candidates to allow restructuring by asking seven speakers from different parts of Italy, who can both speak Italian and the dialect of their area. He states that the

---

<sup>79</sup> I claim that the frequency of use also plays a crucial role in the selection of V2 in the Indicative Preterite PseCo of Type 2. See the discussion in Chapter 5.

ability of some verbs to enter restructuring, and thus to display clitic climbing, auxiliary change in compound Tenses (where allowed by V2) and long passive, relies on the property of their being ‘prototypical’ with respect to the classes of semantically functional verbs they belong to.<sup>80</sup> Moreover, these verbs are crucially also the most frequently used.<sup>81</sup> Thus, modals corresponding to MUST and CAN, together with motion verbs GO and COME are more prototypical than other verbs in their classes and also the most used. Interestingly, he postulates a double base of restructuring in which Italian does not interfere with dialects with respect to the grammaticality judgements of the speakers interviewed and a given verb can feature restructuring in a dialect without necessarily doing so in Italian, too.

The fact that the most recurring V1s in PseCo are also the most frequently used representatives of a specific class of verbs in a given variety is also confirmed by a Southern American dialect of Spanish. D. Ross (2014: 126) reports that in the socio-linguistic study by Álvarez (1995) on the dialect of Caracas (Venezuela), the most recurring V1s in PseCo – where, however, V2 is an Infinitive – are *llegar* ‘arrive’ 55%, *agarrar* ‘catch’ 24%, *ir* ‘go’ 12% and *venir* ‘come’ 9% (1995: 167). As is clear from the digits, the first most frequent basic motion V1 GO ranks higher than the other basic motion verb COME. Moreover, a recent account of Spanish PseCo by Arnaiz & Camacho (1999), set within Chomsky’s (1995) Minimalist framework, focusses exclusively on the V1 *ir* ‘go’.

As a matter of fact, there is no Sicilian variety in which PseCo is not possible with GO as V1, and when a dialect allows for only one V1 that verb is always GO. This is demonstrated by the dialects of Type 3 PseCo, which generally display only one productive (usually invariable) V1, i.e. GO. On the contrary, no dialect has been found so far that allows for only one V1 in which that verb is different than GO. V1 COME generally follows GO, i.e. it is always found in those varieties allowing for more than one V1. This is not only true for PseCo of Type 1 and 2, but also for those dialects of Type 3 whose speakers, most of the time, accept a possible (fully or partially inflected) V1 COME (see the discussion on partially inflected vs. invariable V1s in Cardinaletti & Giusti 2019).

Let us now consider the third possible V1. Since Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003), the order of appearance of the four V1s has always been reported as GO, COME, COME BY and SEND, being the latter the only causative verb of the lot (cf. Sorrisi 2010, Cruschina 2013, Di Caro 2015, Di Caro &

---

<sup>80</sup> Note that the verbs involved in restructuring can display only one or two of the three phenomena taken into consideration. Therefore Egerland (2009) does not consider them as being part of a macroparameter.

<sup>81</sup> Egerland (2009) refers to the work by De Mauro *et al.* (1993) on spoken Italian to show that *andare* ‘go’ (26th in the ranking), *potere* ‘can’ (31), *volere* ‘want’ (35), *dovere* ‘must’ (36), *sapere* ‘know (how)’ (47) and *venire* ‘come’ are the most recurring restructuring verbs and among the most used verbs in general.

Giusti 2015, a. o.). However, a more thorough scrutiny suggests that the third V1 in the hierarchy should be SEND, not COME BY. This is confirmed diachronically by the data discussed in Sorrento (1915: 109; see also (36)), where together with GO the other possible V1 in the Imperative PseCo in Latin is SEND. Another reasonable explanation is that COME BY is the only verb of the restricted class of V1s found in most Sicilian dialects that has a simpler, less specified counterpart, namely COME, while the other three V1s are in a sense semantically basic, even though SEND implies both a motion and a causative semantics (a similar argumentation for Swedish PseCo V1s is, *mutatis mutandis*, Wiklund 2007: 141).<sup>82</sup>

Different, less common V1s compete to occupy the fifth place in the hierarchy. I propose that COME BACK follows COME BY in the hierarchy (and not START) because the former is likely to grammaticalise into an iterative Aspect marker and, thus, to be used more frequently (we have seen similar cases e.g. in Arabic; cf. D. Ross *forthcoming*). The hierarchy for the selection of V1 is then shown in (125):

(125) GO > COME > SEND > COME BY > COME BACK > START...

The hierarchy proposed in (125) is intentionally left open. In fact, it is impossible to determine the order of other possible V1s for lack of a consistent amount of data and thus further research is greatly needed.

According to the hierarchy in (125), if a PseCo accepts only one motion verb as V1, this must be GO. If it accepts only two motion verbs, these must be GO and COME, and so on. However, whatever reason should prevent GO from featuring in the PseCo of a given variety (which is something not found in any variety so far), the following first candidate to that position must be COME. This hierarchy also allows us to make a prediction regarding which V1 is more likely to grammaticalise, more specifically to be phonetically reduced, and thus to occur in an invariable form. This seems to be a prerogative of GO, which can surface as an invariable form in many Sicilian and non-Sicilian dialects. But if another V1 can share the same destiny, according to the hierarchy in (125), that verb must be COME. This prediction is borne out: Cardinaletti & Giusti (2019) claim that Marsalese displays invariable forms of COME (see Section 3.1.8 and the examples

---

<sup>82</sup> Another possible explanation for the hierarchy regulating GO, COME, SEND and COME BY in Sicilian PseCo is that COME BY is the only motion verb of the lot that does not express a direct motion. In other words, while GO, COME and SEND all involve the idea of motion to a location, COME BY seems to involve the idea of motion through a location. I thank Fabio Del Prete for pointing this out to me.

in (90)). Mazzarinese also has such invariable forms, which however occur in the Indicative Preterite (cf. Di Caro 2019).

With this respect, an in-depth study on the hierarchy of V1 selection in non-Sicilian Southern Italo-Romance PseCo would be of great interest. What seems to be immediately possible, thanks to the data reported in Manzini & Savoia (2005: 689-695), is to exclude V1 WANT from the highest position in the relevant hierarchy.

I propose in Table 13 a revised and extended Protocol of the one discussed in Di Caro & Giusti (2015: 404-405) where I have added the Eastern dialects of Giarre (in the province of Catania) and Sinagra (in the province of Messina). The column at the left edge marked ‘?’ is the very restrictive variety hypothesised by Di Caro & Giusti, with just one or both of the more basic motion verbs GO and COME. This variety is actually instantiated by the dialect spoken in Giarre, where the only available V1 is GO.<sup>83</sup> The dialect of Catania is displayed to the right of that of Giarre in that the former is also possible with V1 COME BACK used as an aspectual iterative marker in the sense of ‘do something again’. As in Di Caro & Giusti (2015: 404), the +/- value indicates that there are further restrictions for the given V1 beyond those that apply to all verbs. The dialect of Sinagra displays a more robust use of aspectual COME BACK, which surfaces as an invariable V1 and is never used as an actual motion verb. This holds true also for other dialects of the area, such as the dialect of Raccuja, another *comune* in the Metropolitan City of Messina. The dialect of Delia is, to date, the most liberal dialect, allowing for a series of aspectual V1s in combination with specific V2s and only in the Indicative Preterite. The ‘+’ value on the voice ‘other’ of the aspectual V1s indicates that the particular PseCo that Deliano displays in the Indicative Preterite can additionally allow for theoretically all transitive V1s in the special, semantically emphatic combination shown in (168). As usual, the other column at the right edge marked ‘?’ indicates a possible dialect, more liberal than Deliano, where all the V1s considered in the Protocol are allowed.

**Table 13. The distribution of lexical items as V1 in Sicilian PseCo**

	?	Giarre	Catania	Marsala	Canicattì	Sinagra	Delia	?
Motion V1s								
GO	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
COME	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
SEND	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+

<sup>83</sup> It is always difficult to exclude with certainty the verb COME as V1 in a given dialect. My data on Giarrese are based on the judgements of 10 speakers of different age range. Only one speaker out of ten has judged COME as a grammatical V1 in PseCo. This could well be due to some interference phenomena with other dialects. In any case, further extensive research is needed to determine whether COME is a less common V1 in Giarrese PseCo or not.

COME BY	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
COME BACK	-	-	-	-	-	-	+/-	?
GO IN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
GO OUT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
RUN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
JUMP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
Aspectual V1s								
DO AGAIN	-	-	+	-	+/-	+	+/-	+
START	-	-	-	-	-	-	+/-	+
ARRIVE	-	-	-	-	-	-	+/-	+
REMAIN	-	-	-	-	-	-	+/-	+
other	-	?	?	-	?	?	+	+

The data of Sinagrese are worth considering, because the verb *COME BACK* is found rarely as both motion and aspectual V1 in Sicilian PseCo, and also because of its particular syntactic behaviour. The verb *turnari* ‘come back’ is grammaticalised into the invariable V1 *torna* (which for some speakers becomes *tonna*), which completely loses its semantic of motion, i.e. it conveys the iterative meaning only, and thus can co-occur with the lexical V2 *turnari*, as in (126b, d). Note that Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico on the V2 is evidence of the presence of the connecting element *a*, but whether the final vowel of the invariable V1 is *a* is still to be ascertained.<sup>84</sup>

- (126) a. *Tornappigghju u pani.*  
 come-back+a+fetch.1SG the bread  
 ‘I fetch the bread again.’
- b. *Dumani tornattornu a scola.*  
 tomorrow come-back+a+come-back.1SG to+the school  
 ‘I’m going back to school again tomorrow.’
- c. *Ti tornaccurchi?*  
 REFL.CL come-back+a+lay-down.2SG  
 ‘Are you going to bed again?’
- d. *Tornattornimi i sordi!*  
 come-back+a+give-back.IMP.2SG+to-me.CL the money  
 ‘Give me my money back again!’

<sup>84</sup> I am greatly indebted to Lea Spanò for providing me with her BA thesis (cf. Spanò 2017), where the first instances of PseCo in Sinagrese are documented, and especially for being an extremely patient informant and also allowing me to interview other Sinagrese speakers.

- e. *Vi tornafficiunu a multa?*  
 REFL.CL come-back+a+make.PAST.3PL the fine  
 ‘Have they given you a traffic fine again?’
- f. *Maria tornappigghjò a frevi.*  
 Maria come-back+a+catch.PAST.3SG the fever  
 ‘Maria caught the fever again.’
- g. *Quannu faceva i scoli medii non era tanta brava  
 when do.IMPRF.1SG the schools middle NEG be.IMPRF.1SG very good  
 ‘nta matematica e tornaffaceva sempre i cunti  
 in+the mathematics and come.back+a+do.IMPRF.1SG always the calculations  
 pi essiri sicura chi èrunu giusti.  
 to be.INF sure that be.IMPRF.3PL correct  
 ‘When I attended the Middle School, I was not that good at Mathematics, so I used to  
 check my digits twice to be sure they were correct.’*
- h. *‘Nta ddu ristoranti a pizza era troppu bona.  
 in that restaurant the pizza be.IMPRF.3SG too good  
 M’ a tornammanciassi natra vota dda.  
 to-me.CL it.CL come.back+a+eat.SUBJ.1SG another time there  
 ‘The pizza was so tasty in that restaurant. I would surely eat it there again.’*

[Sinagra (Messina)]

The data from Sinagrese in (126) also show that that particular PseCo is available in different Moods and Tenses, the same found in Type 3 PseCo typical for the Eastern Sicilian dialects. This property is discussed more in detail in the following Section.

### 4.3 The selection of Mood and Tense

Since the first accounts of Sicilian PseCo (cf. Ascoli 1896, 1901; Sorrento 1915; Leone 1973, 1978; Sornicola 1976) we have known that the Indicative and the Imperative are the Moods in which PseCo is widespread cross-dialectally (with much debate about which of the two Moods is more frequent in Sicilian PseCo). For dialects such as Marsalese, which is representative of many Sicilian dialects in terms of Mood and Tense restrictions, the Indicative Present and the Imperative are the only paradigms that can host PseCo. The Indicative Preterite, typical of Type 2 PseCo such as that



of Deliano (cf. Di Caro 2018; Di Caro & Giusti 2018), follows as the third most occurring Mood/Tense combination. Finally, the East Coast Sicilian dialects, which belong to Type 3, also display PseCo in the Indicative Imperfect and in the Subjunctive Imperfect (which in most Sicilian dialects also serves as Conditional).

Irrespective of the early discussions on this topic, contemporary studies suggest, cross-linguistically, that in PseCo the Imperative is hierarchically higher than the Indicative in terms of occurrence. There are three main arguments in favour of the supremacy of the Imperative in PseCo. First, PseCo in the Imperative is much more widespread in the languages of the world both diachronically and synchronically. Diachronically, we have already seen examples of Imperative PseCo in Latin (cf. (36)), Old Sicilian (cf. (33b, c)) and Old Tuscan (cf. (33b, c)). Ledgeway (1997: 261) further provides examples from Venetian, Cosentino, Reggino and Catanzarese (three Calabrian dialects), all featuring the invariable V1 GO *va*.

As regards the Germanic languages, D. Ross (*forthcoming*) reports that Imperative forms of PseCo are attested in spoken Standard German and in some German dialects (cf. (127)). Moreover, English PseCo with V1 TRY was used in the Imperative (together with the Infinitive) but not in the Indicative until the early 1800s, and D. Ross reports that for Waddy (1889: 147-148) this PseCo is still acceptable, at the end of the century, only in the Infinitive and the Imperative.

(127) a. *Sei so gut und komm!*  
 be.IMP.2SG so good and come.IMP.2SG  
 ‘[Please,] be good and come!’

[Wackernagel 1920: 63 cited in D. Ross *forthcoming*; *Spoken Standard German*]

b. *Gang und hol mir d Zytig!*  
 go.IMP.2SG and get.IMP.2SG me.DAT the newspaper  
 ‘Go and get me the newspaper!’

[Weber 1964: 303 cited in D. Ross *forthcoming*; *Zurich German*]

Synchronically, according to Heycock & Petersen (2002: 28-29, 30-31), in Faroese the V1 TRY surfacing as *royna* or *prøva* (taken from Danish) can be used in the Imperative but not in the Indicative.

(128) a. *Royn / prøva og les bókina!*  
 try.IMP.SG / try.IMP.SG and read.IMP.SG book.DEF.ACC  
 ‘Try and read the book!’

- b. *Roynið / prøvið og les bókina!*  
 try.IMP.PL / try.IMP.PL and read.IMP.SG book.DEF.ACC  
 ‘Try and read the book!’
- c. *\*Hann roynir / prøvar og lesur bókina.*  
 he try.PRES.3SG / try.PRES.3SG and read.PRES.3SG book.DEF.ACC  
 ‘He tries to read the book.’

[Heycock & Petersen 2002: 31; *Faroese*]

De Vos (2005: 131) reports some data from the Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch Dialects (SAND 2005) showing that in some modern Dutch dialects, namely in the West Flemish of Bruges (cf. (129a)) and in East Flemish of Eeklo (cf. (129b)), PseCo survives in the Imperative.

- (129) a. *Goan halt e keer n pintje!*  
 go.IMP.2SG get.IMP.SG a time a beer  
 ‘Just go and get a beer!’

[De Vos 2005: 131; *West Flemish*]

- b. *Gaan halt die bestellinge maar ne keer!*  
 go.IMP.2SG get.IMP.SG that order just a time  
 ‘Just go and get that order!’

[De Vos 2005: 131; *East Flemish*]

Outside the Germanic languages, Bjorkmann (2009) reports that Modern Greek displays asyndetic PseCo, but for some speakers this is limited to the Imperative (cf. (130a, b)), and for all speakers it is impossible with all particle-verb construction, such as *tha* used for the Future (cf. (130)).

- (130) a. *Ela htipise ti bala.*  
 come.IMP.2SG kick.IMP.2SG the ball  
 ‘Come kick the ball.’
- b. *Pigene stasu eki grigora.*  
 go.IMP.2SG stand.IMP.2SG there quickly  
 ‘Go stand there quickly.’
- c. *%Kathe kirjaki, i Maria erhiete majirevi*  
 every Sunday the Maria come.IMPRF.3SG cook.IMPRF.3SG

*ja tin jaja tis.*  
 for the grandmother her.GEN  
 ‘Every Sunday Maria comes cooks for her grand mother.’

- d. \**Avrio i Maria tha erthi majirepsi ja tin jaja tis.*  
 tomorrow the Maria FUT come cook for the grandmother her.GEN  
 ‘Tomorrow, Maria will come cook for her grand mother.’

[Bjorkman 2009; *Modern Greek*]

Furthermore, the Imperative PseCo generally allows for more V1s than in all other Moods. For American English, Shopen (1971: 255) provides an example with V1 RUN (cf. (131)). For Swedish, Wiklund (2007: Appendix 1) reports that *våga* ‘dare’ can be found as V1 in the Imperative PseCo but it yields ungrammatical or deviant results in the Indicative (cf. (132)). Also consider the Imperative PseCo example with V1 START in Danish shown in (97).

- (131) *Run hide in the woods!*

[Shopen 1971: 255; *American English*]

- (132) *Våga (o) skriv!*  
 dare.IMP and write.IMP  
 ‘Dare to write!’

[Wiklund 2007; *Swedish*]

An example in Sicilian is found in the dialect of Marineo (in the province of Palermo), where PseCo in the Imperative 2SG also allows for V1 *curriri* ‘run’ to occur.

- (133) *Curri a ppigghja u pani!*  
 run.IMP.2SG a fetch.IMP.2SG the bread  
 ‘Run to fetch the bread!’

[Marineo (Palermo)]

Second, in those dialects of the province of Messina that generally resort to the FinCo with the connecting element *mi*, PseCo is preferred when it comes to the Imperative, even though in principle the Imperative FinCo is always available (recall the example in (51) from San Piero Patti). This means that the first instance of PseCo to be borrowed by dialects that use other constructions is the Imperative. Further evidence of this phenomenon comes from Sinagrese, where PseCo and the FinCo co-occur in the Indicative Present but in the Imperative only PseCo is used.

The third argument in favour of the supremacy of the Imperative in PseCo has to do with acquisition and is worth developing in further research. The Imperative is generally used to give instructions and orders, or for exhortations, and thus it is very frequently used with children from the moment of their birth. That means that speakers are exposed to Imperative input very early, including PseCo occurrences. This is confirmed by the discussion in Stockwell (2015: 20ff.) on the high frequency of Imperatives in child-directed speech and the data cited there from Salustri & Hyams (2006) for Italian and German, and from Newport *et al.* (1977) for English.

As regards the rest of the Mood/Tense hierarchy, the Present is the Indicative Tense common to the PseCo of all the Sicilian dialects discussed in the literature. Moreover, there is an important consideration to make: there is no Sicilian dialect that displays PseCo in the Indicative Imperfect without allowing it in the Preterite as well. Regardless of the Person restrictions in the Preterite PseCo (cf. Di Caro 2015, 2019; Di Caro & Giusti 2015, 2018), this Tense can be found in different varieties (i.e. Type 2 PseCo in Di Caro's terms) in which, however, PseCo is not found in the Imperfect. In other words, if we postulate that the order of appearance of PseCo is Preterite > Imperfect, we do not expect a dialect to display PseCo in the Indicative Imperfect but not in the Preterite. This is confirmed by all the available data in the published literature on Sicilian PseCo. Note that in the Calabrian dialect of Rossano, where PseCo is Sicilian-like (i.e. it does not have STAND and WANT as V1s), this is found in the Indicative Imperfect (cf. (134c)) but not in the Preterite (cf. (134b)). However, this is due to the fact that the Preterite is not in use anymore in general.

- (134) a. *Vajə fazzə a spisa.*  
 go.1SG do.1SG the shopping  
 'I go to do the shopping.'
- b. \**Jivi fici a spisa.*  
 go.PAST.1SG do.PAST.1SG the shopping  
 'I went to do the shopping.'
- c. *Jia facìa a spisa.*  
 go.IMPRF.1SG do.IMPRF.1SG the shopping  
 'I used to go and do the shopping.'

[Rossano (Cosenza)]

Finally, the dialects of Eastern Sicily identified as Type 3 are the only ones where PseCo is found in the Subjunctive (which is used as a Conditional too). Note, however, that this is restricted to the

Subjunctive Imperfect, since the Subjunctive Present is generally not in use in Sicilian. As a matter of fact, if a dialect displays PseCo in the Indicative Imperfect, it also displays it in the Subjunctive (cf. (135) from Catanese and the examples in (126h) from Sinagrese).

(135) a. *Uoppigghjava u pani.*  
 go+a+fetch.IMPRF.1SG the bread  
 ‘I used to go and fetch the bread.’

b. *Uoppigghjassi u pani.*  
 go+a+fetch.SUBJ.1SG the bread  
 ‘I would go and fetch the bread.’

[Di Caro 2019; Catania]

(136) a. *Offaceva a spisa.*  
 go+a+do.IMPRF.1SG the shopping  
 ‘I used to go and do the shopping.’

b. *Offacissi a spisa.*  
 go+a+do.SUBJ.1SG the shopping  
 ‘I would go and do the shopping.’

[Acireale (Catania)]

After considering all these facts, we are now in a position to outline two hierarchies, one for the selection of the Mood and one for the selection of the Tense (within the Indicative Mood), and to unify them (cf. (138)) in order to get the order of appearance of PseCo across Moods and Tenses.

- (137) a. The selection of the Mood: Imperative > Indicative > Subjunctive  
 b. The selection of the Tense: Present > Preterite > Imperfect

- (138) The selection of the Mood/Tense of Sicilian PseCo: Imperative > Indicative Present  
 > Indicative Preterite > Indicative Imperfect > Subjunctive Imperfect

To sum up, the hierarchy in (138) predicts that if in a given Sicilian dialect PseCo is found in only one case, that will be the Imperative (as is the case of some dialects of the province of Messina which resort to the FinCo elsewhere). If it is also found in a second case, that will be the Indicative Present (as is the case for many Western and Central Sicilian dialects). If a dialect allows for a third

paradigm to occur, that will be the Indicative Preterite (as in some central dialects such as those of Delia, Canicattì, Camastra and Campobello di Licata). Finally, if a more liberal dialect allows for more paradigms, those will be the Indicative Imperfect and the Subjunctive Imperfect (as is the case of the dialects of Catania, Acireale, Giarre and Marina di Ragusa). A protocollar overview is given in Table 14. The ‘?’ value at the left edge indicates a variety in which only the Imperative PseCo is available. This could be the case of those dialects of the province of Messina where the FinCo is used in non-Imperative contexts. Palermo and Marsala represent Western Sicily and Delia represents Central Sicily. The wider area of Eastern Sicily is present in the protocol with representatives of three provinces, namely Messina (with Sinagra), Ragusa (with Marina di Ragusa) and Catania (with Acireale).

**Table 14. A protocol for the selection of Moods and Tenses in Sicilian PseCo**

	?	Palermo	Marsala	Delia	Sinagra	M. di Rag.	Acireale
Imperative	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Indicative							
Present	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
Preterite	-	-	-	+	+	+	+
Imperfect	-	-	-	-	+	+	+
Subjunctive							
Imperfect	-	-	-	-	+	+	+

It is important to point out that all these predictions about the Mood and Tense selection are made regardless of which cells of the paradigms are allowed, which is another, orthogonal parameter of microvariation.

#### 4.4 The selection of V2

The published literature on Sicilian PseCo has rarely focussed on the characteristics of V2, as we have seen in Chapter 3, the restrictions on it being limited to those few verbs semantically incompatible with motion V1s (see the examples in (88) and the brief discussion in Accattoli & Todaro 2017), such as other motion verbs.<sup>85</sup> A first interesting, although rather sketchy, discussion on remarkable lexical restrictions on V2 is in Sorrisi (2010), who focusses on PseCo in Palermitan. This dialect shares most of its features with the Type 1 PseCo, such the one in Marsalese: it is only possible in the Indicative Present (in the 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and 3PL) and in the Imperative (only in the

<sup>85</sup> Note, however, that a desemanticised V1 GO in the Imperative can be followed by a motion V2 (cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2018: 63).

2SG) with GO, COME, COME BY and SEND as V1s.<sup>86</sup> It can be replaced by the InfCo, obligatorily in the ungrammatical cells of the relevant PseCo paradigms and optionally in the grammatical ones. With Marsalese, it also shares the optional invariable V1 *va* ‘go’, as shown in (139b).

However, with intransitive V2s Palermitan PseCo is highly constrained, being limited to the 1SG of the Indicative Present, with invariable GO as V1 and without the connecting element *a* (cf. (140b, c)).<sup>87</sup> According to Sorrisi (2010: 117-118), this PseCo is structurally similar to the one of the Imperative 2SG (compare (140b, c) with (141a, b)).

(139) a. *Vaju a mmanciu a pasta.*  
 go.1SG *a* eat.1SG the pasta  
 ‘I go and eat pasta.’

[Sorrisi (2010: 111); Palermo]

b. *Vammanciu a pasta.*  
 go+*a*+eat.1SG the pasta  
 ‘I go and eat pasta.’

[Sorrisi (2010: 112); Palermo]

(140) a. *\*Vaju a ttravagghju.*  
 go.1SG *a* work.1SG  
 ‘I go to work.’

[Sorrisi (2010: 111); Palermo]

b. *Vatravagghju.*  
 go+work.1SG  
 ‘I go to work.’

[Sorrisi (2010: 112); Palermo]

c. *Varuormu.*  
 go+sleep.1SG

---

<sup>86</sup> It is important to note, however, that according to Di Caro (2019) displaying PseCo only in the Imperative and in the Indicative Present is the only condition for a dialect to belong to Type 1, regardless of which V1s are allowed and of the dialect-specific restrictions in the paradigms.

<sup>87</sup> In case of invariable V1, when the connecting element *a* is covert, it regularly triggers Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico on V2. This is clearly not the case for (140b, c).

‘I go to sleep.’

[Sorrisoni (2010: 113); Palermo]

- (141) a. *Va*                    *travagghja!*  
          go.IMP.2SG        work.IMP.2SG  
          ‘Go to work!’
- b. *Va*                    *ruormi!*  
          go.IMP.2SG        sleep.IMP.2SG  
          ‘Go to sleep!’

[Sorrisoni (2010: 118); Palermo]

The paradigmatic restriction with intransitive V2s seems to be very specific to the area of Palermo. Unfortunately, the work by Sorrisi does not offer many instances of intransitive V2s, only *travagghjari* ‘work’ and *ruormiri* ‘sleep’ are discussed, and crucially no unaccusative V2s are tested. However, this particular highly constrained PseCo has been confirmed in subsequent fieldwork (cf. Di Caro 2019).

Di Caro (2015) contains another contribution to the analysis of the lexical restrictions on V2. He describes the lexical characteristics of the restricted class of V2s in the PseCo of Deliano in the Indicative Preterite (discussed in more detail in Di Caro & Giusti 2018 and dealt with in Chapter 5). However, the restrictions on the lexical verbs in Deliano do not directly regard their argument structure. In fact, the Indicative Preterite allows for a very restricted class of verbs, whose crucial feature is the alternation of rhizotonic and arhizotonic forms, regardless of their being transitive or intransitive verbs. On the other hand, transitivity plays a crucial role in determining which V2s can enter PseCo in Palermitan.

My enquiry on this topic has concerned some villages and small towns in the province of Palermo (i.e. Marineo, Corleone, Termini Imerese and Cefalù), to assess whether these restrictions could also be found in other varieties, and, subsequently, in the eastern provinces of Messina, Catania, Ragusa and Siracusa, after noticing that some speakers of that area did not accept intransitive verbs either.<sup>88</sup>

There are a couple of observations that are worth noting on this issue. First, the restrictions on V2 observed by Sorrisi are common in Palermitan but it is still possible to find speakers who judge

---

<sup>88</sup> On the whole, I interviewed more than 70 speakers in my recent fieldwork. I wish to thank Francesco Aiello, Giusy Branchina, Chiara Calderone, Maddalena and Raffaella Carnemolla, Selene Casale, Giulia Di Stefano, Marianna Friulla, Floriana Giardina, Paola Grasso, Francesco Guerrera, Simona Ruisi and Delia Trentacosti for giving me the possibility to contact so many informants.



sentences like *vaju a gghjocu* ‘I go to play’ (instead of the expected *vajocu*) as grammatical. This suggests that the phenomenon under consideration could be a recent innovation and that earlier versions of Palermitan allowed for intransitive V2s in a more liberal way. In any case, none of the speakers interviewed would accept sentences like *\*vaju a ssugnu malatu* ‘I go to be sick’, which is out cross-dialectally (cf. (88)). However, further research, with a more fine-grained questionnaire/set of oral questions, is needed to verify whether those speakers who accept PseCo in the Indicative Present with intransitive V2s do so for the 1SG only or if they accept more slots of the paradigm, the prediction being the they should accept at most the N-Pattern of Marsalese (i.e. 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and 3PL).

Second, it is important to distinguish between a PseCo in which V1 GO retains its semantics of motion and a PseCo with a grammaticalised V1 GO expressing the Surprise Effect (cf. Cruschina 2013, and *infra* the discussion in Section 4.6). I argue that the lexical restrictions on V2 are generally stronger when the relevant motion V1 has not lost the semantic interpretation as a motion verb. Let us consider the examples with transitive V2s in (142), with unergative V2s in (143), and with unaccusative V2s in (144), all grammatical in Deliano:<sup>89</sup>

(142) a. *Vaju a ffazzu la spisa.*  
 go.1SG a do.1SG the shopping  
 ‘I go to do the shopping.’

b. *Vaju a gghjittu la munnizza.*  
 go.1SG a throw.1SG the garbage  
 ‘I go to throw the garbage.’

c. *Vaju a accattu lu vinu.*  
 go.1SG a buy.1SG the wine.  
 ‘I go to buy the wine.’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

(143) a. *Vaju a ccurru tutti li jorna.*  
 go.1SG a run.1SG all the day  
 ‘I go running every day.’

---

<sup>89</sup> For the example in (143c) the following context was provided: a group of friends are having beer and roasted meat at a country house. One of them, who was telling stories, decides to take a break to go to the toilet.

- b. *Vaju a ppassiju.*  
 go.1SG a walk.1SG  
 ‘I go to take a walk.’
- c. *Vaju a ppisciu e tuirnu.*  
 go.1SG a piss.1SG and come-back.1SG  
 ‘I’ll go piss. I’ll be back soon.’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

(144) a. *Vaju a ccadu sempri ddruicu.*  
 go.1SG a fall.1SG always there  
 ‘I always end up falling in that very spot.’

b. *Nun va a mmori propriu oi?*  
 NEG go.3SG a die.3SG right today  
 ‘He just had to go and die today...’

c. *Era quarantacincu chila e nun va a ‘ngrassa tutta*  
 be.IMPRF.3SG forty-five kilos and NEG go.3SG a get-fat.3SG all  
*a nna vota du simani prima di la sfilata?*  
 to a time two weeks before of the runway-show  
 ‘She only weighed forty-five kilos but she suddenly got fat two weeks before her runway show!’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

Generally, unaccusative V2s are not compatible with motion V1s cross-dialectally. So, sentences like *vaju a ccadu* ‘I go to fall’, *vaju a mmuiru* ‘I go to die’, and *vaju a ‘ngrassu* ‘I go to get fat’ are not grammatical with a motion interpretation of V1. But in all the examples in (144), V1 does not imply any motion. The correct contexts for these examples are the following: (144a) is uttered by a speaker who is playing a platform computer game (such as e.g. the world famous *Super Mario Bros*) and is complaining about the fact that the character they control always falls off a specific platform in the game (and, consequently, dies)<sup>90</sup>. In (144b) the speaker is complaining about the fact that a famous rockstar has died a few days (or hours) before their most important concert, which

<sup>90</sup> Another possible context for (144a) is the one in which an athlete is watching the video of their training session and is complaining of the fact that they always fall in the same point of the pitch/track. I have used this latter context with older speakers.

had to be called off. Finally, in (144c) the speaker is surprised to see that a famous top model had to forfeit an important show because she has gained weight in no time.

I have adapted all these examples to Palermitan with the help of some native speakers – and taking into account the invariable V1 and the absence of the connecting element in the unergative and the unaccusative sets – and then tested them with my informants of the different areas of that province. All of the informants accepted the transitive V2 set, as expected. Almost half of them also accepted the unergative V2 set, which suggests that the restrictions discussed in Sorrisi (2010) are still a relevant phenomenon but do not apply to all speakers. Since, as noted, unaccusative V2s are not taken into consideration by Sorrisi, I did not have expectations with regard to the grammaticality judgements about the set in (144). Although for most of my informants the InfCo counterpart of (144b, c) was preferred – but with V1 in the Indicative Preterite (cf. (145)) –, they were absolutely fine with the PseCo examples they were proposed.

(145) a. *Nun ghìu a mmòriri propriu stajinnata?*  
 NEG go.PAST.3SG to die.INF right today  
 ‘He just had to go and die today...’

b. *Era quarantacincu chila e nun ghìu a 'ngrassari tuttu*  
 be.IMPRF.3SG forty-five kilos and NEG go.PAST.3SG to get-fat.INF all  
*'nsemmula du simani prima da sfilata?*  
 together two weeks before of-the runway-show  
 ‘She only weighed forty-five kilos but she suddenly got fat two weeks before her runway show!’

[Palermo]

It is not possible to tell with certainty which other dialects in the province of Palermo share with Palermitan these particular restrictions in terms of (in)transitivity of V2 and of limitation to the 1SG of the Indicative Present. However, what the data of my recent fieldwork suggest is that there is a general problem in accepting intransitive V2s in PseCo. In fact, before asking for grammaticality judgements, I requested that my twenty-three informants from the province of Palermo (ten of them from Marineo) provided some examples of PseCo with intransitive V2s themselves, and I gave them *travagghjari* ‘work’ as an example. As a result, with the exception of one *vaju a giocu* ‘I go to play’, all the other (very few) examples I was provided with featured V2s such as *vìviri* ‘drink’, *manciarì* ‘eat’ and *sturjari* ‘study’, which are actually transitive verbs with their internal argument

unexpressed. The difficulty my informants have shown to find the examples requested could tell us something about the restrictions on the selection of unergative V2s discussed by Sorrisi (2010).

Furthermore, I have tested the same sets of sentences, adapted to the dialect of Catania, with fifty speakers from Eastern Sicily to discover that intransitive V2s in PseCo are problematic for most speakers of that area, as well. Very surprisingly, none of them could provide an original example of PseCo with an unergative or unaccusative V2. Few of them just confirmed the unergative *travagghjari* ‘work’ as in *ottravagghju* ‘I go (and) work’ or proposed transitive V2s with their internal argument missing, i.e. *ommangiu* ‘I go (and) eat’ and *ovvivu* ‘I go (and) drink’. As for the set of unaccusative V2s, once again, the sentences the speakers were asked to judge were fine but Infinitival V2s would have been the first option for most of them.

To conclude, even though it is more difficult to determine any hierarchy for the selection of V2 than it was for the hierarchies proposed in (125) and (138), because of lack of dedicated research, it is possible to establish that transitive V2s are greatly preferred to intransitive ones. If we also observe that unaccusative V2s are allowed only in a highly emphatic context, we can then consider the tentative hierarchy in (146) as highly plausible.

(146) Transitive V2s > Unergative V2s > Unaccusative V2s

Naturally, further research is needed to establish the extent to which unergative verbs are allowed in Sicilian PseCo and with what kind of possible paradigmatic restrictions, and whether unaccusative V2s are also allowed in non-emphatic contexts. Nevertheless, after considering the data in the available literature and the data from my recent fieldwork, the hierarchy in (146) is likely to hold true when new data from different, unaccounted varieties are collected.

#### 4.5 The selection of Person

Detecting a univocal hierarchy for the selection of the Person in the paradigms of PseCo has to face the problem of Person defectiveness in the Mood that has been identified in (125) as the most occurring one in this construction across the Sicilian dialects, namely the Imperative. As we have seen in Section 4.3, PseCo in the Imperative:

- i) is found in all the Sicilian varieties accounted for in the literature;

ii) is also found in those Southern Italo-Romance dialects (including the dialects in the Northern part of the province of Messina) which generally resort to the FinCo (see Section 2.2);

iii) has survived in very few (generally crystallised) forms in some Central and Northern Italo-Romance varieties where the only productive construction displays an Infinitival V2;

iv) in Germanic, allows for more V1s than those generally found in the Indicative;

v) cross-linguistically, is found in languages where non-Imperative PseCo is not attested or less frequent (when not involving the emphatic reading, i.e. the Surprise Effect).

As regards the Sicilian dialects, the only available Person of the Imperative paradigm is generally the 2SG, with the exception of the Eastern dialects of Type 3 (cf. Di Caro 2019) where the 2PL and, in principle, the 1PL of the Indicative Present – which is used as an exhortative Imperative – are also accepted. But the Imperative 1PL and 2PL are never found without the 2SG being also available. This consideration allows us to establish the first hierarchy with respect to the Persons in the Imperative:

(147) The selection of the Person for the Imperative PseCo:  $2SG > 2PL > 1PL$

According to the hierarchy in (147), we do not expect to find cases of Imperative PseCo which prevent the 2SG from being allowed. But things change radically when it comes to paradigms in which six slots are, in principle, available. These are, for PseCo, all simple Tenses: the Indicative Present, Preterite, Imperfect, and the Subjunctive Imperfect. Diachronically, the study by Wilson (1999) on the collection of Sicilian tales and short stories by Pitre (1993 [1875]) can help us have a grasp on the distribution of PseCo across Tenses and Moods. Table 15 and Table 16 correspond to Wilson's (1999:12) Table 2 and 4 with some adjustments.<sup>91</sup> These must be compared with Table 17 (corresponding to Table 1 in Wilson 1999), which shows the occurrences of what she calls 'hypotaxis' (i.e. the InfCo) in the same corpus, consisting of volume III and IV of Pitre's (1993 [1875]) work.

**Table 15. The distribution of PseCo with *a* across Moods and Tenses in Pitre (1993 [1875])**

	<b>Ind. Present</b>	<b>Ind. Preterite</b>	<b>Ind. Imperfect</b>	<b>Sub. Imperfect</b>	<b>Imperative</b>
1SG	30				
2SG	4				13

<sup>91</sup> In the original tables in Wilson (1999: 12) the Indicative Perfect and Pluperfect are also considered to account for the occurrences of the InfCo in those Tenses. Since PseCo never occurs in the Perfect and Pluperfect, I have left those paradigms out of the tables.

3SG	60	5			
1PL					
2PL					
3PL	5				

**Table 16. The distribution of asyndetic PseCo across Moods and Tenses in Pitrè (1993 [1875])**

	Ind. Present	Ind. Preterite	Ind. Imperfect	Sub. Imperfect	Imperative
1SG					
2SG					27
3SG	2				
1PL					1
2PL					14
3PL					

**Table 17. The distribution of the InfCo across Moods and Tenses in Pitrè (1993 [1875])**

	Ind. Present	Ind. Preterite	Ind. Imperfect	Sub. Imperfect	Imperative
1SG	4	4	1	1	
2SG	5	3			
3SG	32	159	24	2	
1PL	2	1			4
2PL	1	1			9
3PL	5	34	7	1	

It is possible to draw some simple conclusions from the observation of Tables 15-17. First, the occurrences of PseCo (both with and without the connecting element *a*) in the Imperative confirm the hierarchy proposed in (147) and clearly show that there is no actual Infinitival counterpart of PseCo in the Imperative 2SG. Second, as regards the Indicative Present, at first glance it seems that the 3SG is preferred to the 1SG, since we can count 62 occurrences of 3SG PseCo (60+2) and only 30 occurrences of 1SG PseCo. But if we take into account the fact that there are also 32 occurrences of 3SG InfCo, i.e. half the number of the occurrences of 3SG PseCo, while only 4 occurrences of 1SG InfCo are found (cf. Table 17), we can infer that the higher number of occurrences of 3SG PseCo depends on the fact that 3SG, irrespective of the syntactic construction considered, is more frequently used in a narrative context, and that, proportionally, PseCo outnumbers the InfCo in the 1SG of the Indicative Present.

In Wilson's corpus, the number of occurrences of 2SG and 3PL for PseCo and the InfCo in the Indicative Present is too low (on the whole, 4 occurrences of PseCo vs. 5 occurrences of the InfCo for the 2SG and 5 vs. 5 for the 3PL) for us to decide whether PseCo is more frequent in the 2SG or in the 3PL Indicative Present. Finally, as regards the other Tenses of the Indicative, only 5 occurrences of PseCo in the 3SG of the Preterite are found (while the Infinitival counterpart in that very slot

counts 159 occurrences), a digit too low for us to make statements about the predominance of the 3SG over the 1SG. In general, however, the data in Wilson (1999) seems to confirm the trend discussed in the early literature (cf. Ascoli 1896, 1901; Sorrento 1915, 1950; Sornicola 1976) that, diachronically, PseCo is generally preferred in the singular Persons.

Naturally, since Pitrè's work is shaped by anthropological and historical purposes and is not an in-depth syntactic survey on Sicilian verbal constructions, the corpus based on his collections cannot be fully representative of the rich panorama of the microvariation of PseCo in Sicilian dialects. Nevertheless, the tales and short stories collected are from different areas of Sicily and the orthography used to transcribe them is intentionally faithful to the spoken versions. Thus, they can be considered a good starting point for further investigations, as Wilson (1999: 9) herself suggests. Interestingly, the patterns that emerge from Tables 15 and 16 extend to a number of varieties what Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003) have reported for Marsalese and Cruschina (2013) has confirmed for Mussomelese, namely the tendency of PseCo to exclude the 1PL and the 2PL, or, in other words, to distribute along the N-Pattern in the Indicative Present and the Imperative.

We can try to propose a provisional hierarchy for the selection of the Person in the paradigms of the Indicative and the Subjunctive based on the data just discussed. In (148) it is not possible to determine the hierarchical order between 1PL and 2PL. They are just listed in the same position, at the bottom of the hierarchy to indicate that, theoretically, there could be a variety that has not been considered in Wilson's corpus and in the early literature that fills more than 4 cells of a given paradigm in the Indicative (and in the Subjunctive).

(148) A provisional hierarchy for the selection of the Person for the Indicative and the Subjunctive  
PseCo: 3SG > 1SG > 2SG > 3PL > 1PL / 2PL

As already seen early on in this section, the data from Wilson's (1999) corpus indicate that the 3SG occurs more frequently than the 1SG, but this could well be due to the fact that the corpus is based on traditional fables, i.e. it regards a narrative context where the 3SG is generally favoured.

Let us now have a look at the synchronic data to see whether the provisional hierarchy in (148) needs some refinements or amendments. We know from Di Caro (2019) that the dialects of Type 2 display PseCo in the Indicative Preterite and that those of Type 3 further display PseCo in the Indicative Imperfect and in the Subjunctive Imperfect (see also Di Caro 2015; Di Caro & Giusti 2015). What is crucial for the present discussion is the particular paradigmatic configurations that these dialects display, which all depart from the Person restrictions typical of the N-Pattern. In fact, the dialects of Type 3 have fully-fledged paradigms when V1 is GO (and, more rarely, also with V1 COME). This enables the 1PL and the 2PL, which had been put hypothetically at the bottom of the

hierarchy in (148). Moreover, in the Indicative Preterite of Type 2, PseCo usually displays the W-Pattern, where the 2SG and the 2PL are ungrammatical. This means that if a PseCo paradigm allows for the 2PL to occur, the 1PL must occur too, but the other way around is not necessarily true.

Finally, the only case that is known from the literature on PseCo in which a paradigm that could potentially host six Persons only allows for one is Palermitan PseCo with intransitive V2s in the Indicative Present (cf. Sorrisi 2010). In that case, only the 1SG is possible. A Sicilian dialect allowing for only the 3SG to occur has not been found yet. All these facts considered, we can now examine a more fine-grained hierarchy for the selection of the Person than the one in (148).

(149) The selection of the Person for the Indicative and the Subjunctive PseCo: 1SG > 3SG > 2SG  
> 3PL > 1PL > 2PL

Basically, the hierarchy in (149) respects the long established idea that the singular Persons are more frequently found in PseCo than the plural ones, but it places the 1SG, and not 3SG, in the highest position. Moreover, it establishes an order between the 1PL and the 2PL, which are indistinctly paired together in the previous hierarchy (cf. (148)).

In conclusion, I propose a protocol in Table 18 which summarises the selection of the Person in four Sicilian varieties representative of Type 1 (Palermitan and Marsalese), Type 2 (Deliano), and Type 3 (Catanese) for PseCo with GO, the V1 for which more data are available. Furthermore, an analogous protocol for PseCo with V1 COME is proposed in Table 19, although whether the same lexical restrictions on V2 in the Indicative Present holds true with V1 COME is still to be ascertained. For any protocols considering other V1s to be proposed, further research is needed. These, however, would be of great help in fine-tuning the general hierarchies for the selection of the Person in the Imperative and in the Indicative/Subjunctive. As regards the protocol in Table 18, the ‘0’ value indicates that that Person is not available regardless of the variety considered, the ‘+/-’ value indicates that the selection of a given Person is possible but depends on other factors. These factors are for the Indicative Present of Palermitan the [+transitive] feature of V2 (cf. Sorrisi 2010), and for the Indicative Preterite of Deliano, the fact that the V2, which must display the alternation of rhizotonic and arhizotonic forms, selects the rhizotonic form for that Person (cf. Di Caro 2015; Di Caro & Giusti 2018; see also Chapter 5 for an in-depth analysis of this phenomenon).



**Table 18. A protocol for the selection of the Person in Sicilian PseCo with V1 GO**

		1SG	3SG	2SG	3PL	1PL	2PL
<b>Palermo</b>							
Imperative		0	0	+	0	-	-
Indicative							
	Present	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	-
	Preterite	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subjunctive							
	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Marsala (Trapani)</b>							
Imperative		0	0	+	0	-	-
Indicative							
	Present	+	+	+	+	-	-
	Preterite	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subjunctive							
	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Delia (Caltanissetta)</b>							
Imperative		0	0	+	0	-	-
Indicative							
	Present	+	+	+	+	-	-
	Preterite	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	-
	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subjunctive							
	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Catania</b>							
Imperative		0	0	+	0	+	+
Indicative							
	Present	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Preterite	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Imperfect	+	+	+	+	+	+
Subjunctive							
	Imperfect	+	+	+	+	+	+

**Table 19. A protocol for the selection of the Person in Sicilian PseCo with V1 COME**

		1SG	3SG	2SG	3PL	1PL	2PL
<b>Palermo</b>							
Imperative		0	0	+	0	-	-
Indicative							
	Present	+	+/?	+/?	+/?	-	-
	Preterite	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-

Subjunctive	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-
<hr/>							
<b>Marsala (Trapani)</b>							
Imperative		0	0	+	0	-	-
Indicative	Present	+	+	+	+	-	-
	Preterite	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subjunctive	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-
<hr/>							
<b>Delia (Caltanissetta)</b>							
Imperative		0	0	+	0	-	-
Indicative	Present	+	+	+	+	-	-
	Preterite	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	-
	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subjunctive	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-
<hr/>							
<b>Catania</b>							
Imperative		0	0	+	0	+	+
Indicative	Present	+	+	+	+	-	-
	Preterite	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subjunctive	Imperfect	-	-	-	-	-	-

The hierarchies I have proposed in (125), (138), (146), (147) and (149) are characterised by a decreasing degree of accuracy, as they deal with topics that necessitate further investigations with possibly more fine-grained feature-specific questionnaires or set of questions for oral interviews. In the next section I discuss a last possible hierarchy concerning the grammaticalisation of V1, which is probably the most difficult to establish according to the available data.

#### 4.6 The grammaticalisation of V1 GO

In this section, I discuss the property of the verb GO to grammaticalise and lose its semantics of motion when used as V1 in a PseCo, and the nature of this grammaticalisation, in order to determine whether it is possible to establish a hierarchy between the use of PseCo with a motion V1 and that with a desemanticised V1. In other words, I try to determine whether, in a possible, undocumented Sicilian variety displaying only one kind of PseCo (either with a V1 GO retaining its motion semantics or with a grammaticalised V1 GO serving as an aspectual marker), the first verb is

more likely to be used for its original meaning or not to entail any movement at all and to add aspectual nuances to the action expressed by V2. This latter case could be justified by the fact that the InfCo is always available to the speakers, so that a grammaticalised PseCo with a desemantised V1 would be a reasonable explanation for its co-occurring with the InfCo.

Let us first consider what functions Sicilian PseCo can fulfil and discuss some diachronic data to establish the different uses of GO. I have divided the diachronic data into two sets, since the grammaticalisation of GO follows different paths in the Indicative and in the Imperative.<sup>92</sup> First, PseCo with V1 GO, like its infinitival counterpart, can instantiate a real andative construction, where the action of going somewhere is followed by the action expressed by the lexical V2. This holds true for any kind of Mood/Tense combination. In the Imperative 2SG, where GO and V2 are always juxtaposed without the connecting element *a*, GO is usually ambiguous between a real andative and an exhortative marker, so that in (150a, b) it can entail a real motion aimed at, respectively, looking for a person and selling some animals, or it can just express an exhortation to act (the same holds for the example in (33b)).<sup>93</sup> But the 2SG Imperative form of GO in Pitrè's collection can also be found with plural V2s, as in (150c). In this case, the motion reading is not available because it is incompatible with the semantics of V2, and thus V1 has to be read as an exhortative marker.

- (150) a. *Va*            *cerca*            *a*    *tò*    *patri*.  
 go.IMP.2SG look.IMP.2SG to your father  
 'Go (and) look for your father.'

[Pitrè III: 345 cited in Wilson 1999: 15; *Sicilian*]

- b. *Va*            *vinni*            *sti*    *scecchi*.  
 go.IMP.2SG sell.IMP.2SG these donkeys  
 'Go (and) sell these donkeys.'

[Pitrè III: 350 cited in Wilson 1999: 15; *Sicilian*]

- c. *Va*            *stativi*            *unni*    *siti*    *vui*,    *San*    *Giuseppi*.  
 go.IMP.2SG stay.IMP.2PL+ REFL.CL where be.2PL you San Giuseppe  
 'Go on, stay where you are San Giuseppe.'

[Pitrè IV: 150 cited in Wilson 1999: 15; *Sicilian*]

<sup>92</sup> The Subjunctive patterns with the Indicative as regards the grammaticalisation path. Nevertheless, no Subjunctive PseCo examples are found in Pitrè (1993 [1875]).

<sup>93</sup> In fact, Wilson (1999: 43) proposes the exhortative reading of GO for (150a, b) (examples (4) and (5) in her original work), namely 'go on, look for your father' and 'go on, sell these donkeys', respectively.

Second, in the Indicative, GO can be used as a real motion verb as in the Imperative (cf. (151a, b and c)). However, there are two alternative uses of this V1 which are widespread cross-linguistically. The first non-motion use of GO in PseCo is that of an inchoative marker.<sup>94</sup> The inchoative value of GO is clear in (151d, e), for which Wilson (1999: 34-35) highlights the presence of a preceding verb, i.e. GO and COME BACK respectively, functioning as a real motion verb and, for that reason, being incompatible with the motion reading of the following V1.

Finally, the examples in (151f, g) represent an isolated case in Wilson’s corpus, in which V1 is not used as a motion verb but it is not used as an inchoative marker either. In these examples GO is impersonal and becomes an emphatic marker underlining the ‘unexpected nature of the action’. In other words, it instantiates a particular case of the Surprise Effect (SE henceforth) discussed in Sornicola (1976) and Cruschina (2013), in which the subjective view can only be on the part of the narrator but not of the subject of the utterance. Interestingly, Wilson (1999: 35) points out that all of the few examples displaying the SE in Pitrè (1993 [1875]) come from the dialect spoken in Polizzi Generosa, a small *comune* located in Northern Central Sicily in the province of Palermo, an area where this particular PseCo could have become fossilised.

- (151) a. *E si nni va a curca 'ntra un chianu.*  
 and REFL.CL LOC.CL go.3SG a lay-down.3SG in a plain  
 ‘And he goes and sleeps on a plain.’

[Pitrè IV: 158 cited in Wilson 1999: 34; *Sicilian*]

- b. *Va a 'ffaccia a la finestra.*  
 go.3SG a appear.3SG at the window  
 ‘He goes and appears at the window.’

[Pitrè IV: 216 cited in Wilson 1999: 34; *Sicilian*]

- c. *E lu va a jetta a mari.*  
 and it.CL go.3SG a throw.3SG at sea  
 ‘And he goes to throw it in the sea.’

[Pitrè III: 216 cited in Wilson 1999: 31; *Sicilian*]

---

<sup>94</sup> For Danish, Kjeldahl (2010: 21, 33) reports that V1 in directional PseCo can have an inchoative reading, while V1 in positional PseCo grammaticalises as a progressive marker, as is also the case of PseCo in Apulian with V1 STAND (cf. Ledgeway 2016; Andriani 2017). Wiklund (2007: 117-118) discusses cases of inchoative V1 in Swedish PseCo. Moreover, a case of inchoative V1 in Afrikaans is discussed in De Vos (2005: 180). Finally, Cordin (1997: 98) includes the V1 GO of Sicilian PseCo among the inchoative periphrases in her overview of the verbal constructions in the Italian dialects.

- d. *E si ni iju e si va a spenni tutti*  
 and REFL.CL LOC.CL go.PAST.3SG and REFL.CL go.3SG a spend.3SG all  
*li grana a pasta e ficatelli.*  
 the money in pasta and ficatelli

‘And he went away and spends all his money in pasta with ficatelli.’

[Pitrè III: 202 cited in Wilson 1999: 35; *Sicilian*]

- e. *Torna e si va a pigghia li cavuli.*  
 come-back.3SG and REFL go.3SG a fetch.3SG the cabbages

‘He comes back and goes to fetch the cabbages.’

[Pitrè IV: 216 cited in Wilson 1999: 34; *Sicilian*]

- f. *Si va a cummina ca passanu ‘na vota pi ‘na strata.*  
*si go.3SG a combine.3SG that pass-by.3PL a time for a strett*

‘It goes on to happen that they pass through a certain street.’

[Pitrè III: 229 cited in Wilson 1999: 35; Polizzi Generosa (Palermo)]

- g. *Va a succedi ca a la Riggina ci arrubbaru*  
 go.3SG a happen.3SG that to the queen to-her.CL steal.PAST.3PL  
*n’ aneddu di brillanti.*  
 a ring of diamonds

‘It happened that they stole a diamond ring from the Queen.’

[Pitrè III: 271 cited in Wilson 1999: 35; Polizzi Generosa (Palermo)]

Let us now examine some synchronic data from Deliano. In (152a) the order to fetch the playing cards must imply the motion towards another room. On the other hand, in (152b) V1 can retain its semantics of motion if the studying is to take place in a different place than that where the addressee is. If this is not the case, i.e. if the addressee can study in the same place where they are, V1 is to be considered as an exhortative marker. Finally, in (152c) the motion interpretation of V1 could, potentially, be available, since the meaning of *caminari* ‘walk’ in V2 position is not incompatible with that of V1. Nevertheless, the translation of the sentence and, above all, the presence of a second *va* at the end of PseCo clearly indicate that V1 has completely lost its meaning to become an emphatic marker.

(152) a. *Va piglia li carti ca su' ddra intra*  
 go.IMP.2SG fetch.IMP.2SG the cards that be.3PL here inside  
*nni lu cascuni.*  
 in the drawer

'Go (and) fetch the cards that are in the drawer, in the other room.'

b. *Va studia!*  
 go.IMP.2SG study.IMP.2SG  
 'Go (and) study!'

c. *Va camina, va!*  
 go.IMP.2SG walk.IMP.2SG go.IMP.2SG  
 'Give me a break!'

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

An analysis of the examples in (153), all in the Indicative Present, takes us to the same conclusions we have drawn for the diachronic data. In (153a) PseCo features a real andative V1: the subjects of the sentence have to go shopping in another shop (in a quarter called *La Cruci* 'The Cross'), when their favourite one is closed. The example in (153b), which I have personally recorded from a real life conversation, is the annoyed reaction of a person who wanted to buy a new television set, had an oral deal with the skilled seller of his reference store but, later on that day, found out that another store was selling a more up-to-date product for less than the price he was going to spend. In this situation, therefore, the andative meaning of V1 is not required at all, and an emphatic value conveying a bit of resentment is intended instead. The example in (153c) is very similar to (153b) and is another piece of evidence I could record myself during a conversation. This PseCo, which is crucially repeated at the end of the utterance for a stronger emphatic effect, is used here to express the bitter surprise in finding out that the bread the speaker was going to purchase was not as fresh as the seller had claimed it was.<sup>95</sup> Once again, the motion meaning of V1 is not required at all here.

---

<sup>95</sup> Note that the reduplicated Imperative V1 *va* acting as an exhortative particle can also be found in the Indicative Present 1SG, as in *ora vaju a mmangiu, va* 'OK, I'll go and eat now' (see also Sorrisi (2010: 118) for a similar case in Palermitan). For this reason, this particle could also be glossed as an invariable *va*.

(153) a. *Quannu sta putìa jè chjusa, vannu a ffannu la spisa*  
 when this shop be.3SG closed go.3PL a do.3PL the shopping  
*a la Cruci.*  
 at the Cruci

‘When this shop is closed, they go and do the shopping at the Cruci.’

b. *E sicunnu tia, cci vaju a ddugnu milli euru*  
 and according you to-him.CL go.1SG a give.1SG thousand euro  
*ppi nna televisjoni vecchja?*  
 for a television-set old

‘Do you really think that I’m going to pay one thousand euro(s) for an old television set?’

c. *Cchi mi vaju a mmangiu lu pani duru mi vaju a mmangiu?*  
 what REFL go.1SG a eat.1SG the bread hard REFL go.1SG a eat.1SG

‘Why in the world would I eat day-old bread?’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

It is worth noting at this point that V1 GO is also prone to getting grammaticalised with an infinitival V2, and, more generally, that the most basic motion V1s are commonly used as markers for a number of aspectual and temporal functions in Italo-Romance periphrases. For example, besides the InfCo and PseCo, Sicilian dialects can also resort to what Cruschina (2018) calls the ‘go for’ Construction (GFC henceforth), in which V1 GO is followed by the preposition (*p*)*pi* ‘for’ and an infinitival V2. In the GFC, which is found in the Indicative Present, Imperfect and Preterite, GO loses its lexical content and becomes a conative marker describing the attempt made by the speaker to do something which cannot be fully accomplished. PseCo and the GFC share the characteristic of being monoclausal and the possibility to express surprise and unexpectedness.

Moreover, Amenta & Strudsholm (2002: 24-25) point out that GO can also grammaticalise in the InfCo, in both Italian and Sicilian, where it is desemanticised and becomes a resolute marker (cf. (154)). In this grammaticalised form, V1 allows for inanimate subjects, and the whole construction is much less prone to the insertion of lexical element between the two verbs (temporal adverbials are generally the only elements allowed). Amenta & Strudsholm (2002: 23) also report that in Old Sicilian the V1 is desemanticised to the extent that another andative verb in V2 is allowed without any redundancy (cf. (154b)).

(154) a. *Ma cosa va a combinare alla sua età?*  
 but what go.3SG to go.INF at+the his age

‘What does he plan to do at his age?’

[Rainieri 188; Amenta & Strudsholm 2002: 24; *Italian*]

b. *Tutti vannu ad andari addossu di li inimichi.*

all go.3PL to go.INF against of the enemies

‘Everybody resolves to go against the enemies.’

[Conq., 56,1; Amenta & Strudsholm 2002: 23; *Old Sicilian*]

Lastly, GO is also used as a passive V1 in Italian, as a future V1 in French and English, and as a progressive V1 in Swedish, whereas COME is used as a progressive V1 in Italian and as a retrospective V1 in French (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 392; see also Squartini 1998). With this respect, the fact that languages have different ways to convey an aspectual value by means of periphrastic constructions is confirmed by Biberauer & Vikner (2017: 80) for Danish and Afrikaans. In these languages, the andative V1 in PseCo can be used as a progressive marker but PseCo is not the only progressive construction at the speakers’ disposal, and among them, it is the one whose V1 is minimally grammaticalised, if we consider that desemanticisation is one of the first steps in the grammaticalisation path (cf. Hopper & Traugott 2003; Traugott & Trousdale 2010).

The Deliano data shown in (152) and (153) are representative of many varieties across Sicily and, basically, confirm the diachronic data in (150) and (151) with regard to the behaviour of V1 GO in PseCo. To sum up, GO can function as a real motion verb or can become an aspectual marker. Its interpretation mostly depends on the semantics of the following lexical V2. Additionally, it can depend on the presence of other emphatic devices, such as the reduplication of the whole construction in (153c) or, more generally, on the context of the sentence. The picture gets more complicated in the Imperative, where, in fact, PseCo is the only construction found for the 2SG, while the InfCo is preferred for the 2PL in most dialects. This amounts to saying that, in the Indicative, it is unlikely that V1 GO with only a desemanticised function is found in the PseCo of a Sicilian variety, and, in the Imperative, that this is even more unlikely. As a matter of fact, none of the several varieties covered by the existing literature displays instances of PseCo in which GO cannot optionally take a motion interpretation.

We can now consider the hierarchies which describe the order according to which the andative V1 GO and the desemanticised V1 are found in the PseCo in, respectively, the Imperative (cf. (155)) and the Indicative/Subjunctive (cf. (156)).

(155) Imperative: V1 retaining its semantics of motion > V1 with an exhortative function



- (156) Indicative/Subjunctive: V1 retaining its semantics of motion > V1 with inchoative meaning  
> V1 conveying the Surprise Effect

Two crucial considerations are necessary at this point. First, even when V1 GO retains its motion semantics, PseCo differs from the InfCo in that the movement expressed by V1 and the action expressed by the lexical V2 are to be considered as a whole (cf. Sornicola 1976), to the extent that neither adverbs nor floating quantifiers can intervene between V1 and V2, and that V2 cannot be negated separately (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003). Second, even in those dialects of the East Coast (all belonging to Type 3 PseCo, cf. Di Caro 2019) where V1 GO displays a higher degree of grammaticalisation – in the sense that it occurs as an invariable prefix and displays phonetic erosion –, the motion reading is always possible. In fact, although in this case GO displays the same grammaticalisation path that, cross-linguistically, turns verbs into temporal (e.g. French, Spanish and Catalan) and aspectual (e.g. English) markers, and can reduce them to a single vowel prefix (as is the case for some Arabic dialects; cf. Jarad 2014 and Di Caro *forthcoming*), the motion reading in the Eastern Sicilian dialects is always possible, provided V2 is semantically compatible.<sup>96</sup>

In conclusion, we can consider the generalised hierarchy in (157), which regards the Imperative and the Indicative/Subjunctive, as well.

- (157) V1 retaining its semantics of motion > grammaticalised V1 functioning as an aspectual marker

This hierarchy indicates that, if a Sicilian dialect displays PseCo with V1 GO – which, according to the V1 hierarchy in (125), amounts to saying that a Sicilian dialect displays PseCo at all –, this V1 can always be used with its semantics of motion and can optionally be used also as an aspectual (i.e. exhortative, inchoative or emphatic) marker, either in its fully inflected, reduced or invariable form.

---

<sup>96</sup> Wilson (1999: 39) points out that this property of letting the grammaticalised meaning of V1 GO emerge only when the context requires no movement at all is also found in the English ‘be going to’ construction, as explained in Hopper & Traugott 1993: 3). We could say that the PseCo of Eastern Sicilian dialects never reaches the grammaticalisation degree instantiated by the English ‘be gonna’ construction (where the motion reading is completely lost), although it shares with the latter a phonetically eroded V1 GO (i.e. *va-*, *vo-*, *uo-*, *o-* and *a-*, cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2015; Di Caro 2019).

## 4.7 Conclusions and open questions

In Chapter 4, I have discussed the main parameters of microvariation that account for the fact that PseCo occurs in a number of different configurations across Sicily. The hierarchies proposed throughout the chapter indicate i) which V1s are more likely to occur and in what order; ii) in which Moods and Tenses PseCo is more likely to occur and iii) in which Person of each paradigm; iv) which restrictions prevent a verb from being a V2 candidate; v) whether there are some dialects whose PseCo is found only with a desemanticised V1 GO or not.

Naturally, these hierarchies need to be further fine-tuned. For example, the hierarchy in (125) establishes the order of occurrence among V1s GO, COME, SEND, COME BY and COME BACK, but cannot be that accurate as regards the order of the other attested V1s, such as START, for lack of sufficient data. Moreover, the restrictions on V2 are summarised in the hierarchy in (146), which establishes the primacy of transitive V2s over intransitive V2s. Nevertheless, as discussed in Chapter 3, the study of the morpho-syntactic and semantic characteristics of V2 in Sicilian PseCo cannot rely on many contributions yet, and it could well be the case that other features of V2 could play a role in the acceptability of PseCo in a given dialect. Further investigation is required, based on more phenomenon-specific tools of research. In this respect, the hierarchies proposed in this dissertation could hopefully function as points of reference.

Furthermore, other parameters of microvariation could be taken into account and interact with the hierarchies under analysis. One of them regards the presence vs. absence of the connecting element *a*. According to the available data, the possible omission of *a*, with consequent lack of RF, seems to be exclusive to V1 GO and, to a lesser extent, to V1 COME, and preferred in the Imperative 2SG.

Let us consider some data from the dialects of Catania and Delia. In Catanese, the connecting element *a* is obligatory in the Indicative Present (cf. (158a)), Imperfect (cf. (158b)) and, more generally in all the available Tenses of the Indicative and Subjunctive. In the Imperative, *a* is usually omitted in the 2SG, although the younger speakers I could interview accept both versions (cf. (158c)). In the 2PL, however, only PseCo with *a* is accepted (cf. (158d)). The same holds true for the dialects of Acireale and Giarre. In all these dialects, PseCo with V1 COME is not accepted by all speakers. When it is, it patterns with Marsalese, where the connecting element *a* is obligatory with V1 COME.

- (158) a. *Uoppigghju* / \**Uopigghju* *u pani tutti i jonna.*  
go+a+fetch.1SG / go+fetch.1SG the bread all the days  
'I go (and) fetch the bread every day.'

- b. *Uoppigghjava* / \**Uopigghjava*    *u*    *pani*    *tutti*    *i*    *jonna*.  
 go+a+fetch.IMPRF.1SG / go+fetch.IMPRF.1SG    the    bread    all    the    days  
 ‘I used to go (and) fetch the bread every day.’
- c. *Uoppigghja* / *Uopigghja*    *u*    *pani!*  
 go+a+fetch.IMP.2SG / go+fetch.IMP.2SG    the    bread  
 ‘Go (and) fetch the bread!’
- d. *Uoppigghjati* / \**Uopigghjati*    *u*    *pani!*  
 go+a+fetch.IMP.2PL / go+fetch.IMP.2PL    the    bread  
 ‘Go (and) fetch the bread!’

[Catania]

In Deliano, the connecting element *a* is obligatory in the Indicative Present (cf. (159a)) and Preterite but can be omitted in some cases in the Imperative. With V1 GO, *a* is never found in the Imperative 2SG, as shown in (159b) (the Imperative 2PL is always ungrammatical, regardless of the V1 selected). With V1 COME, *a* is optional in the Imperative 2SG (cf. (159c)). With this respect, younger speakers tend to prefer the version with *a*, which is in fact found everywhere else in PseCo in Deliano (see the relevant data in Chapter 5).

- (159) a. *Vaju*    \*(*a*)    *ppigliu*    *lu*    *pani*    *tutti*    *li*    *jorna*.  
 go.1SG    *a*    fetch.1SG    the    bread    all    the    days  
 ‘I go (and) fetch the bread every day.’
- b. *Va*    (\**a*)    *piglia*    *lu*    *pani!*  
 go.IMP.2SG    *a*    fetch.IMP.2SG    the    bread  
 ‘Go (and) fetch the bread!’
- c. *Vjini*    (*a*)    *piglia*    *lu*    *pani!*  
 come.IMP.2SG    *a*    fetch.IMP.2SG    the    bread  
 ‘Come (and) fetch the bread!’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

Lack of the connecting element *a* in the Imperative 2SG with V1 GO is widespread cross-dialectally (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003; Cruschina 2013; Di Caro 2015; Di Caro & Giusti 2015, 2018). It would be reasonable to suppose that *a* is likely to appear in this specific Imperative context in the new generations of speakers, as a consequence of an analogical process. Otherwise, the

persistence of the lack of *a* in the Imperative 2SG with V1 GO as a peculiar construction within PseCo could be explained by the high frequency of GO. A dedicated study, across Sicily, would be of great help in this case to evaluate the actual contribution of *a* in PseCo. With this respect, I agree with Cruschina (2013: 271), who claims that the connecting element *a* has no specific meaning or function in Sicilian PseCo. Furthermore, the optionality of *a* does not seem to be sensitive to a specific Mood, Tense or Person, since there are dialects such as Pantesco (cf. Cruschina 2013: 271) or Ennese (cf. Di Caro 2015: 84) in which it can be omitted in all the available paradigms. For this reason, I have not proposed a hierarchy for the occurrence of the connecting element *a* in this dissertation.

Another interesting and unsolved question regards the nature of the relationship between PseCo and the FinCo with the connecting element *mi* in those dialects of the North-Eastern corner of Sicily (broadly corresponding to the province of Messina) where they co-occur, along with the InfCo. Whether PseCo and the FinCo have specialised to occur in specific Mood/Tense configurations, or they just overlap for reasons connected to language contact is still to be determined. However, I believe that the starting point, as discussed in Section 4.2, is the fact that PseCo in the Imperative 2SG with V1 GO seems to be the highly preferred option in these varieties.

A further possible avenue of research regards the argument structure of V1. We know from Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 377-378) that V1 in Marsalese PseCo cannot have any argument structure. For example, the pleonastic clitic cluster consisting of a reflexive pronoun and the locative *ni* ‘from here’, which typically occurs when GO is used as a lexical verb, is not possible when GO is the V1 of a PseCo. This restriction, however, does not hold for all dialects. In Deliano, for example, the clitic cluster is accepted in PseCo by some speakers (see the relevant data in Chapter 5).

Finally, we could even go further and wonder whether Sicilian PseCo behaves in the same way when found in a main clause or in an embedded clause, or, put it differently, whether there are any restrictions that prevent PseCo from occurring in embedded clauses. Once again, the available data are insufficient to determine if such restrictions are found in any Sicilian variety. As a matter of fact, this aspect has not been investigated in the published literature. Nevertheless, some data that I could record from Deliano, shown in (160) suggest that PseCo is perfectly fine in embedded clauses.

- (160) a. *Vuigliu sapiri quannu la va a ppiglia.*  
 want.1SG know.INF when her.CL go.3SG *a* fetch.3SG  
 ‘I want to know when he will go (and) pick her up.’

b. *Si va a ppigli lu vinu, iju apparjicchju.*  
 if go.2SG a fetch.2SG the wine I set-the-table  
 ‘If you go (and) fetch the wine, I’ll set the table.’

c. *Nun ci criju ca vannu a mmàngianu nn’ iddru!*  
 NEG LOC.CL believe.1SG that go.3PL a eat.3PL at him  
 ‘I can’t believe they go (and) have lunch at his place!’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

As is clear from the above considerations, the study of Sicilian PseCo still has many aspects that necessitate more in-depth research, in order to get a clearer picture of this multi-faceted phenomenon. The quantitative study proposed in Chapter 5 goes in this direction. It explores how productive PseCo is among the speakers of one small Sicilian village, namely Delia, by testing the emergence of some expected paradigms in the Moods and Tenses available in this dialect. The results of the study, among other things, contribute to confirm the hierarchy in (125) on the selection of Person, in the sense that i) singular Persons are preferred to plural Persons and ii) the 1PL is hierarchically higher than the 2PL, which actually never occurs in Deliano.

More such contributions from other Sicilian dialects would help us fine-tune that hierarchy. And, naturally, the same holds for all the other parameters of microvariations that have been considered in this dissertation.

## **PART II**

## **Chapter 5. Quantitative research on Pseudo-Coordination in the dialect of Delia: some preliminary remarks and the case of the Preterite W-Pattern**

The second part of this thesis presents the results of the first quantitative study on Sicilian PseCo to date. The main dimension of variation considered in the study (see Section 4.5) is the restriction on the Person that results in defective paradigms, basically following the morphomic N- and W-Patterns for, respectively, the Indicative Present/Imperative and the Indicative Preterite. This part focusses on the survey conducted in 2017 in Delia, in the central province of Caltanissetta, and highlights: i) the high degree of productivity of the construction among speakers of all ages; ii) the robustness of the expected paradigmatic patterns; iii) the unexpected higher productivity of a less common configuration found in the Indicative Preterite (i.e. the W-Pattern).

This part is divided into two chapters. Chapter 5 provides some introductory information, such as a definition of ‘morpheme’ and of the morphomic patterns, a brief description of the place where the study was conducted and of the speaking characteristics of its community, and the features of the W-Pattern in the Indicative Preterite PseCo found in Deliano. In the final part of Chapter 5, some problems in eliciting PseCo, in general, and the Preterite W-Pattern, in particular, and the way these problems were solved are discussed.

### **5.1 What are morphemes and the morphomic patterns**

A ‘morpheme’ is a structure or pattern that exists at the ‘morphomic level’, i.e. at the level of morphology, which is to be considered as an autonomous level of linguistic structure, rather than just as the simple intersection of syntax and phonology (cf. Aronoff 1994). The term ‘morpheme’, then, refers to “a systematic distribution of morphological material within the paradigm which has no unique functional (or phonological) correlate” (Smith 2013: 247).

We have seen in Section 3.1.5 that Cruschina (2013: 273) reports that the defectiveness of the PseCo paradigms displayed by dialects such as Marsalese and Mussomelese, where only the 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and 3PL of the Indicative Present, and the 2SG of the Imperative are allowed, corresponds to a recurrent verbal morphomic pattern in Romance. This pattern is dubbed the N-pattern (cf. Maiden 2004, 2005, 2011; see also Thornton 1997, Dressler & Thornton 1991) and is also present in defective paradigms (cf. Maiden & O’Neill 2010). Maiden (2004) calls the pattern shown in Table 20 the N-Pattern due to the N-shape (in Morse Code, cf. Maiden 2004: 249, fn. 7) resulting from the cells of the paradigms that select the morpheme *va-*. The other morphomic patterns (namely the L-

Pattern and the U-Pattern) are also classified with the letters of the alphabet that most resemble the shape of their paradigmatic distribution.

Table 20 shows the inflection of V1 GO following the N-Pattern in Deliano, which basically corresponds to that of Marsalese, Mussomelese, and of most other Sicilian varieties.

**Table 20. The N-Pattern of V1 GO in Deliano**

Indicative Present						Imperative	
1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL	2SG	2PL
<i>vaju</i>	<i>va</i>	<i>va</i>	<i>jammu</i>	<i>jiti</i>	<i>vannu</i>	<i>va</i>	<i>jiti</i>

The reason why Cruschina (2013: 272-274) suggests extending the morphomic analysis to periphrases is that (grammaticalised) periphrases show the same behaviour of other morphological formations, i.e. they are subject to the same distributional patterns of irregularity. As a matter of fact, the same types of morphome and morphomic split found in inflectional morphology are also found at the level of periphrasis as shown by Sicilian PseCo.

Turning to a morphomic analysis seems to provide a better account of PseCo paradigmatic defectiveness. However, some Sicilian varieties display a particular configuration of grammatical cells of the paradigm that does not fall into any of the morphomic patterns accounted for in Romance. In other words, they would require the assumption of new morphomic patterns (cf. Di Caro 2015; Di Caro & Giusti 2015). Section 5.3 describes one of these new patterns, which is an important feature of the quantitative research under discussion.

We have seen in Section 3.1.8 that Cardinaletti & Giusti (2019) bypass the problem of possible homophonous allomorphs of V1s by citing Thornton (2007), who underlines the fact that the grammatical cells of the N-Pattern share a feature: they are all rhizotonic, that is root-stressed. Therefore, the N-pattern should be extended to all the regular verbs, since they all display the alternation of rhizotonic forms (i.e. 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and 3PL) and arhizotonic forms (i.e. 1PL and 2PL). According to Cardinaletti & Giusti, if we followed this hypothesis, we should expect that any verb in Sicilian could theoretically be a V1 candidate for PseCo. But, of course, this is not the case, and which forms can enter PseCo is subject to lexical specification. That means that a purely morphomic approach does not predict the intradialectal variation found in Sicilian PseCo and a syntactic account of the phenomenon is still needed.

Nevertheless, since morphomic patterns allow us to seize the internal configuration of any PseCo paradigm in a straightforward way, notions such as N-Pattern are used in the rest of this chapter and in Chapter 6 for their descriptive power, without implying any endorsement of



Cruschina's purely morphomic account. Furthermore, since data from the Imperative side of the N-Pattern will prove to be extremely robust as regards the research dealt with in this dissertation, this term is mostly used to refer to the Indicative Present paradigm only.

Before moving on to the analysis of the relevant cases in which Sicilian PseCo displays non-conventional morphomic patterns and thus calls for a different explanation, in the next section I briefly introduce the setting where the quantitative research took place.

## 5.2 Some information about Delia

Delia is a small village situated in the province of Caltanissetta, with a population of about 4,500. Its dialect belongs to the subgroup called 'Central Metafonetica', which clusters the varieties spoken in the central provinces of Caltanissetta and Enna and in some peripheral areas of the provinces of Agrigento, Messina and Palermo.<sup>97</sup> Central Metaphonetica dialects owe their name to a phonological feature they display, namely metaphony: a process of assimilation that affects non-adjacent vowels in a word according to which a change in the quality of a vowel takes place under the influence of the following vowel. This phenomenon, in Deliano, gives rise to the metaphonic diphthongs that in the present dissertation are graphically rendered as *ji* and *ui*.<sup>98</sup>

A first sketch of Delia's linguistic profile is proposed in Di Caro (2015) where two trends are considered:

- i) a national trend concerning the actual use of the dialect in everyday communication. This trend shows a decrease in the percentage of young generations of speakers who learn to speak the dialects of their own communities with their families and friends, to the extent that their knowledge of the native dialects is limited when compared with that of older speakers who have access to a richer lexical set (i.e. younger speakers tend to speak a dialect in which nouns and adjectives are taken from Italian and adjusted phonetically);
- ii) another trend, particularly true for Northern Italy, that shows how young people tend to speak Italian rather than their own dialects when they live in cities or towns more than when they live in small villages, as highlighted by Marcato (2007);

---

<sup>97</sup> See Vårvaro (1988) and Ruffino (1984, 1991, 1997b, 2001: 45) for a recent, more fine-grained categorisation of Sicilian dialects with respect to the one in Piccitto (1950, 1959).

<sup>98</sup> Along with *ui* [wi], there is another metaphonic outcome of Latin *Ō* in Deliano, namely [wʊ]. Deliano speakers either use the former or the latter consistently. For this reason, I do not take this difference into consideration.

The use of dialect in informal contexts, in particular among speakers of the same age group, is nonetheless still lively in Sicily, and Deliano provides a good example, especially because, as pointed out by Di Caro (2015: 8), this dialect features a great deal of speakers outside Italy who do not have Italian as their second language and, in most cases, can barely understand it (but, of course, their dialect suffers from interference with the languages of their countries, such as English, French, German and Spanish).<sup>99</sup> What seems to act as a guarantee in favour of the preservation of the dialectal lexicon of Deliano (as well as of other Sicilian dialects sharing the same emigration history) is the presence of very active organisations that promote and fund cultural events, such as dialectal theatre performances, poetry contests, and marching band shows, in Delia and in their homeland.

Finally, being a small village logistically well connected to many others in the surrounding area and being situated on a mild hill, Delia is not the typical mountain village that displays conservative traits in its dialect. On the contrary, many speakers are exposed to other varieties on a daily basis for reasons of work or study (and some of them have parents or other relevant members of their families who were not raised in Delia). This can be observed in many aspects of their Deliano utterances, such as the realisation of the above-mentioned diphthongs, the use of different verbal suffixes, and some lexical choices. These phenomena have all emerged during my preparatory fieldwork. In the making of the questionnaire, I had to take into consideration the fact that PseCo could be affected by this exposure to other Sicilian dialects.

Nevertheless, PseCo in Deliano has proven to be a phenomenon that is not easily influenced by other dialects, especially with regard to the paradigmatic patterns, that were one of the main features of the present questionnaire. The next section provides an overview of the paradigms under consideration.

### **5.3 Pseudo-Coordination in the dialect of Delia: the Preterite W-Pattern**

The Mood and Tense restrictions accounted for by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003) for Marsalese apply to all those varieties that Di Caro (2019) groups under Type 1 PseCo. Deliano represents what in Di Caro's terms is a dialect displaying Type 2 PseCo, namely a dialect in which this construction is extended to the Indicative Preterite. The main features that make Deliano Preterite PseCo noteworthy are listed in (161).

---

<sup>99</sup> See Di Caro (2015: fn. 3) for the description of the three main areas of the world where Deliano second generation speakers are generally found.

- (161) a. the particular distribution of the grammatical cells of its paradigms;  
 b. the lexical restrictions on V2;  
 c. the fact that some V1s that do not generally enter PseCo in the Indicative Present and in the Imperative can do so in the Indicative Preterite.

As regards the point in (161a), Di Caro (2015) notes that PseCo in the Preterite is not possible in the 2SG and the 2PL. That means that the 1PL, which is out in the Present, is grammatical in this context. In morphomic terms, as suggested by Di Caro & Giusti (2018), this configuration follows a W-Pattern, a pattern not attested in any other Romance periphrases. As for the lexical restrictions in (161b), Preterite PseCo is possible only with a restricted class of V2s, listed in (162a-h), which display the alternation of rhizotonic and arhizotonic forms (cf. Di Caro 2015; Di Caro & Giusti 2015, 2018), together with two verbs, namely *dari* ‘give’ and *stari* ‘stay’, which display all rhizotonic forms but with apophony (i.e. the root vowel turns from *-a-* to *-e-* / *-ji-*) on all the cells of the paradigm but the 2SG and the 2PL.

(162) Verbs that can enter Preterite PseCo as V2 in Deliano

- a. *chjùiri* ‘shut’ < Lat. *cludĕre* (and its compounds, such as *nchjùiri* ‘shut in’ < Lat. *includĕre*, etc.);  
 b. *diri* ‘say’ or ‘tell’ < Lat. *dicĕre*;  
 c. *fari* ‘do’ or ‘make’ < Lat. *facĕre*;  
 d. *mìntiri* ‘put’ < Lat. *mittĕre* (and its compounds, such as *purmìntiri* ‘promise’ < Lat. *promittĕre*, etc.);  
 e. *pèrdiri* ‘lose’ < Lat. *perĕre*;  
 f. *rùmpiri* ‘break’ < Lat. *rumpĕre*;  
 g. *scrìviri* ‘write’ < Lat. *scribĕre*;  
 h. *vìviri* ‘drink’ < Lat. *bibĕre*;  
 i. *dari* ‘give’ < Lat. *dare*;  
 j. *stari* ‘stay’ < Lat. *stare*.

The points in (161a, b) are related, since only the V2s in (162) display the alternation of rhizotonic and arhizotonic forms and only the rhizotonic forms of these V2s allow for PseCo to occur, as shown in (163).

- (163) a. *Jivu a ffici la spisa du voti.*  
 go.PAST.1SG a do.PAST.1SG the shopping two times  
 ‘I went to do the shopping twice.’
- b. \**Jisti a ffacisti la spisa du voti.*  
 go.PAST.2SG a do.PAST.2SG the shopping two times  
 ‘You went to do the shopping twice.’
- c. *Ji a ffici la spisa du voti.*  
 go.PAST.3SG a do.PAST.3SG the shopping two times  
 ‘He/She went to do the shopping twice.’
- d. *Jammu a fficimu la spisa du voti.*  
 go.PAST.1PL a do.PAST.1PL the shopping two times  
 ‘We went to do the shopping twice.’
- e. \**Jistivu a ffacistivu la spisa du voti.*  
 go.PAST.2PL a do.PAST.2PL the shopping two times  
 ‘You went to do the shopping twice.’
- f. *Jiru a fficiru la spisa du voti.*  
 go.PAST.3PL a do.PAST.3PL the shopping two times  
 ‘They went to do the shopping twice.’

[Di Caro & Giusti 2018: 58; Delia (Caltanissetta)]

Table 21 shows the complete paradigms of the verbs *diri* ‘say/tell’, *mìntiri* ‘put’, and *vìviri* ‘drink’ in the Indicative Preterite, consistently behaving like *fari* ‘do/make’ in (163) in displaying the W-Pattern. Table 22 compares the Preterite paradigm of the verb *vidiri* ‘see’, which comes from the Latin II conjugation verb *vidēre* ‘see’ but nonetheless behaves like the verbs in (162), with *sèntiri* ‘hear’ and *crìdiri* ‘believe’, which on the other hand display no rhizotonic forms that could enter PseCo in Deliano and thus can only enter the InfCo (cf. (164b, c))<sup>100</sup>.

<sup>100</sup> As for the form *bbitti* instead of *vitti* in (164), see Di Caro (2015: 15-16) for an overview of the sandhi effects of Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico on some V2s.

**Table 21. The Indicative Preterite of *fari* ‘do/make’, *mìntiri* ‘put’ and *vìviri* ‘drink’**

Ind. Present	<i>diri</i> ‘say / tell’	<i>mìntiri</i> ‘put’	<i>vìviri</i> ‘drink’
1SG	<i>dissi</i>	<i>misi</i>	<i>vippi</i>
2SG	<i>dicisti</i>	<i>mintisti</i>	<i>vivisti</i>
3SG	<i>dissi</i>	<i>misi</i>	<i>vippi</i>
1PL	<i>dìssimu</i>	<i>mìsimu</i>	<i>vìppimu</i>
2PL	<i>dicìstivu</i>	<i>mintìstivu</i>	<i>vivìstivu</i>
3PL	<i>dìssiru</i>	<i>mìsiru</i>	<i>vìppiru</i>

**Table 22. The Indicative Preterite of *vìdiri* ‘see’, *sèntiri* ‘hear’ and *crìdiri* ‘believe’**

Ind. Present	<i>vìdiri</i> ‘see’	<i>sèntiri</i> ‘hear’	<i>crìdiri</i> ‘believe’
1SG	<i>vitti</i>	<i>sintivu</i>	<i>crividu</i>
2SG	<i>vidisti</i>	<i>sintisti</i>	<i>cridisti</i>
3SG	<i>vitti</i>	<i>sintì</i>	<i>cridì</i>
1PL	<i>vittimu</i>	<i>sintjimmu</i>	<i>cridjimmu</i>
2PL	<i>vidìstivu</i>	<i>sintìstivu</i>	<i>cridìstivu</i>
3PL	<i>vittiru</i>	<i>sintjiru</i>	<i>cridjiru</i>

(164) a. *Lu jivu a bbitti ajiri.*  
 him.CL go.PAST.1SG a see.PAST.1SG yesterday  
 ‘I went to see him yesterday.’

b. \**Jivu a ssintivu cchi dissì.*  
 go.PAST.1SG a hear.PAST.1SG what say.PAST.3SG

b’. *Jivu a ssèntiri cchi dissì.*  
 go.PAST.1SG to hear.INF what say.PAST.3SG  
 ‘I went to listen to what he/she said.’

c. \**Cci jivu a ccrividu.*  
 it.CL.DAT go.PAST.1SG a believe.PAST.1SG

c'. *Cci jivu a ccrìdiri.*  
 it.CL.DAT go.PAST.1SG to believe.INF  
 'I ended up believing that.'

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

Table 23 displays the Preterite paradigm of *dari* 'give' and *stari* 'stay'. Finally, in Table 24 the paradigms of *pigliari* 'fetch', *capiri* 'understand' and *muriri/mòriri* 'die' are shown, which do not feature any rhizotonic forms. In all these tables, the grey cells indicate the forms of the paradigms that can enter PseCo.

**Table 23. The Indicative Preterite of *dari* 'give' and *stari* 'stay'**

Ind. Present	<i>dari</i> 'give'	<i>stari</i> 'stay'	
1SG	<i>detti</i>	<i>stetti</i>	
2SG	<i>dasti</i>	<i>stasti</i>	
3SG	<i>detti</i>	<i>stetti</i>	
1PL	<i>djittimu</i>	<i>stjittimu</i>	
2PL	<i>dàstivu</i>	<i>stàstivu</i>	
3PL	<i>djittiru</i>	<i>stjittiru</i>	

**Table 24. The Indicative Preterite of *pigliari* 'fetch', *capiri* 'understand', *muriri/mòriri* 'die'**

Ind. Present	<i>pigliari</i> 'fetch'	<i>capiri</i> 'understand'	<i>muriri/mòriri</i> 'die'
1SG	<i>pigliavu</i>	<i>capivu</i>	<i>murivu</i>
2SG	<i>pigliasti</i>	<i>capisti</i>	<i>muristi</i>
3SG	<i>piglià</i>	<i>capì</i>	<i>murì</i>
1PL	<i>pigliammu</i>	<i>capjimmu</i>	<i>murjimmu</i>
2PL	<i>pigliàstivu</i>	<i>capìstivu</i>	<i>murìstivu</i>
3PL	<i>pigliaru</i>	<i>capjiru</i>	<i>murjiru</i>

Generally, Sicilian Infinitives ending in *-iri* are known to display a double pronunciation, namely paroxytone and proparoxytone, regardless of their original Latin counterpart. This phenomenon in Deliano is limited to some verbs, such as *finiri/fèniri* 'end' (the alternation in this verb is going to

disappear in favour of the paroxytone option), *muriri/mòriri* ‘die’, *viniri/vèniri* ‘come’, *valiri/vàliri* ‘be worth’, *vuliri/vòliri* ‘want’.

Moreover, some verbs display allomorphs in some of the cells of their Indicative Preterite paradigm. Two cases are relevant for the present discussion: *sèntiri* ‘hear’ (cf. Leone 1980: 38) and *muriri/mòriri* ‘die’. The former features a mixed paradigm in which the cells corresponding to the 1SG, 3SG, 1PL and 3PL are filled by the suppletive rhizotonic forms taken from the Latin verb *intendĕre* ‘head to’ (which is productive in Italian with the meaning of ‘understand’, but not in Deliano), together with a paradigm entirely construed with the forms from Latin verb *sentĭre* ‘hear’, as shown in Table 25.

**Table 25. Regular and suppletive Indicative Preterite of *sèntiri* ‘hear’**

Ind. Present	<i>sèntiri</i> ‘hear’	<i>sèntiri</i> ‘hear’
1SG	<i>sintivu</i>	<i>ntisi</i>
2SG	<i>sintisti</i>	<i>sintisti</i>
3SG	<i>sintì</i>	<i>ntisi</i>
1PL	<i>sintjimmu</i>	<i>ntisimu</i>
2PL	<i>sintìstivu</i>	<i>sintìstivu</i>
3PL	<i>sintjiru</i>	<i>ntisiru</i>

As for *muriri/mòriri*, this verb displays a regular Preterite paradigm featuring only arhizotonic forms, and an alternative Preterite paradigm in which the 1SG, 3SG, 1PL and 3PL cells are filled with rhizotonic forms, as shown in Table 26. These Preterite forms are shared by the reflexive verb *mòvirsi* ‘remain’, that has *muvistì* in the 2SG and *muvistivu* in the 2PL.

**Table 26. Regular and suppletive Indicative Preterite of *muriri/mòriri* ‘die’**

Ind. Present	<i>muriri/mòriri</i> ‘die’	<i>muriri/mòriri</i> ‘die’
1SG	<i>murivu</i>	<i>morsi</i>
2SG	<i>muristi</i>	<i>muristi</i>
3SG	<i>murì</i>	<i>morsi</i>
1PL	<i>murjimmu</i>	<i>muìrsimu</i>
2PL	<i>murìstivu</i>	<i>murìstivu</i>
3PL	<i>murjiru</i>	<i>muìrsiru</i>

Interestingly, the rhizotonic alternative forms of these V2s can enter PseCo, while the arhizotonic ones cannot, as expected by the W-Pattern:<sup>101</sup>

- (165) a. *Tutta a nna vota, lu ji a ntisi.*  
 all at a time it.CL go.PAST.3SG a hear.PAST.3SG  
 a'. \**Tutta a nna vota, lu ji a sinti.*  
 all at a time it.CL go.PAST.3SG a hear.PAST.3SG  
 'All of a sudden, he heard it.'
- b. *Ji a mmorsi propriu oi.*  
 go.PAST.3SG a die.PAST.3SG right today  
 b'. \**Ji a mmuri propriu oi.*  
 go.PAST.3SG a die.PAST.3SG right today  
 'He died today of all days.'

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

Let us now come back to the selection of V1. The examples in (163)-(165) all feature GO as V1. But COME, SEND and COME BY, i.e. the other V1s traditionally allowed in Type 1 and 2 PseCo, are all possible:

- (166) a. *Vinniru a bbittiru a ma ma'.*  
 come.PAST.3PL a see.PAST.3PL to my mum  
 'They came to see my mother.'
- b. *Cci lu mannammu a scrissimu arsira.*  
 him/her.CL.DAT it.CL send.PAST.1PL a write.PAST.1PL last-night  
 'We sent somebody to write it to him/her last night.'

<sup>101</sup> In both grammatical examples in (165a, b), the andative meaning of V1 is lost in favour of a Surprise Effect (cf. Sornicola 1976, Cruschina 2013), as already seen in (144b). The same holds true for *mòvirsi* 'remain' which, however, does not feature any alternative Preterite forms for the 1SG, 3SG, 1PL and 3PL:

- (i) a. *Ma pirchi si jiru a mmuirsiru ddruicu?*  
 but why REFL.CL go.PAST.3PL a remain.PAST.3PL there  
 'Why on Earth did they stay there?'
- b. *Giustu giustu si ji a mmorsi intra.*  
 right right REFL.CL go.PAST.3SG a remain.PAST.3SG home  
 'He/She happened to stay at home.'



- c. *Cci passavu a ddissi nna cosa.*  
 him/her.CL.DAT come-by.PAST.1SG a hear.PAST.3SG a thing  
 ‘I came by to tell him/her something.’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

Moreover, Deliano Preterite PseCo enables some more V1s to occur, which are either strongly deviant or not allowed at all elsewhere in the conjugation. These V1s are *accuminciari* ‘start’ (cf. Di Caro 2015: 90-91; Di Caro & Giusti 2015: 411), *arristari* ‘remain’ (only in combination of V2 *dari* ‘give’; cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2018), *arrivari* ‘arrive’ and *nescirisinni* ‘end up’ (lit. ‘get out of somewhere’) (cf. Di Caro 2019):

- (167) a. *Allura, cci accuminciaru a ddissiru paroli.*  
 then him.CL.DAT start.PAST.3PL a say.PAST.3PL words  
 ‘Then, they started insulting him.’

[Di Caro 2018: 69; Delia (Caltanissetta)]

- b. *Cci arristavu a ddetti deci euru.*  
 him.CL.DAT remain.PAST.1SG a give.PAST.1SG ten euro  
 ‘I still owe him ten euro(s).’

[Di Caro & Giusti 2018: 60; Delia (Caltanissetta)]

- c. *Nun l’ arrivà a ffici.*  
 NEG it.CL arrive.PAST.3SG a do.PAST.3SG  
 ‘He/She didn’t end up doing it.’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

- d. *Sinni niscì a ddissi ca...*  
 REFL+LOC.CL go-out.PAST.1SG a say.PAST.3SG that  
 ‘He/She went and say that...’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

Finally, Deliano displays an instance of rhetorical question Preterite PseCo consisting of a fixed formula that can host any kind of transitive V1 followed by V2 *fari* ‘do/make’. Its structure is ‘What did 1SG/3SG/1PL/3PL V it for?’, where the subject must be in one of the persons allowed by the W-Pattern, and V stands for any V1, as in (168):

(168) a. *Cchi lu chjamavu a ffici?*  
 what him.CL call.PAST.1SG a do.PAST.1SG  
 ‘What did I call him for?’

b. *Cchi l’ ammintaru a fficiru?*  
 what it.CL invent.PAST.3PL a do.PAST.3PL  
 ‘What did they invent it for?’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

The rhetorical construction exemplified in (168) could cast some light on the comprehension of Type 2 Preterite PseCo, since the presence of a very high frequency verb on V2 such as *fari* ‘make/do’ is able to allow for the construction to feature any transitive V1, something which is rather uncommon in the rest of Sicily, where this construction can generally only occur with an infinitival V2.<sup>102</sup>

Before turning to the sections that introduce and discuss the quantitative study in question, let us consider some insights on the nature of the restricted class of V2s that allow for the Indicative Preterite PseCo in Deliano.

#### 5.4 The morphological characteristics of the Indicative Preterite in Deliano

In this section, I discuss the paradigm organisation of the Indicative Preterite in Deliano, which, as most Sicilian varieties, is morphologically similar although not identical to that of Standard Italian. For that purpose, I refer to the account of the Italian Indicative Preterite in Magni (2001). The Indicative Preterite in Deliano, as well as in Standard Italian, continues the Latin Perfect Tense form and displays two different inflectional paradigms, a regular and an irregular one. The regular paradigm only displays arhizotonic forms, whereas the irregular paradigm displays stem alternations featuring both vocalic and consonantal allomorphy. The main difference between Standard Italian and Deliano with this respect is that, on the one hand, the irregular paradigm in Standard Italian unexpectedly tends to progressively gain ground, instead of losing productivity in favour of analogical levelling, as time goes by (cf. Magni 2001). On the other hand, in Deliano, most of the verbs that should display this irregular pattern in the Indicative Preterite have been analogically levelled and now follow the regular pattern, so that few verbs more than the ones listed

<sup>102</sup> I have tested the rhetorical construction with the V1 INVENT with the twenty-three speakers from the province of Palermo and the fifty speakers from Eastern Sicily. Only two speakers from the first group and three speakers from the second group judged the example provided as grammatical.

in (162) follow the irregular pattern (compare the rhizotonic Italian Preterite *lessi* ‘I read’ vs. the arhizotonic Deliano Preterite *liggivu* ‘I read’).

Table 27 illustrates the forms of the arhizotonic Indicative Preterite of the verbs LOVE and SLEEP in, respectively, Latin (here written in small caps), Italian and Deliano. Table 28 illustrates the pattern of the Indicative Preterite of the verb WRITE in the same languages, which features the alternation of rhizotonic and arhizotonic forms (cf. Magni 2001: 77).

**Table 27. The arhizotonic Indicative Preterite in Standard Italian and Deliano**

	AMÀRE	<i>amàre</i>	<i>amàri</i>	DORMÌRE	<i>dormìre</i>	<i>dòrmiri</i>
1SG	AMÀV-I	<i>amài</i>	<i>amàvu</i>	DORMÌV-I	<i>dormìi</i>	<i>durmìvu</i>
2SG	AMAV-ÌSTI	<i>amàsti</i>	<i>amàsti</i>	DORMIV-ÌSTI	<i>dormìsti</i>	<i>durmìstu</i>
3SG	AMÀV-IT	<i>amò</i>	<i>amà</i>	DORMÌV-IT	<i>dormì</i>	<i>durmì</i>
1PL	AMÀV-IMUS	<i>amàmmo</i>	<i>amàmmu</i>	DORMÌV-IMUS	<i>dormìmmo</i>	<i>durmjìmmu</i>
2PL	AMAV-ÌSTIS	<i>amàste</i>	<i>amàstivu</i>	DORMIV-ÌSTIS	<i>dormìste</i>	<i>durmìstivu</i>
3PL	AMAV-ÈRUNT	<i>amàrono</i>	<i>amàru</i>	DORMIV-ÈRUNT	<i>dormìrono</i>	<i>durmjìru</i>

**Table 28. The rhizotonic Indicative Preterite in Standard Italian and Deliano**

	SCRÌBERE	<i>scrìvere</i>	<i>scrìviri</i>
1SG	SCRÌPS-I	<i>scrìss-i</i>	<i>scrìss-i</i>
2SG	SCRIPS-ÌSTI	<i>scriv-ésti</i>	<i>scriv-ìsti</i>
3SG	SCRÌPS-IT	<i>scrìss-e</i>	<i>scrìss-i</i>
1PL	SCRÌPS-IMUS	<i>scriv-émmo</i>	<i>scrìss-imu</i>
2PL	SCRIPS-ÌSTIS	<i>scriv-éste</i>	<i>scriv-ìstivu</i>
3PL	SCRIPS-ÈRUNT	<i>scrìss-ero</i>	<i>scrìss-iru</i>

As is clear from Table 28, the 1PL of the Preterite in Deliano has retained the rhizotonic form found in the Latin paradigm, which make up the W-Pattern, while the Italian counterpart displays a new, arhizotonic 1PL, which according to De Dardel (1958: 97) is the result of the influence of the 2PL.

Magni (2001:77) reports that the origin of the paradigmatic allomorphy in the Italian verb system, which holds true for Deliano as well, partially traces back to Latin. With this respect, she cites Palmer (1954:266), according to which in Latin the three aspects of the Indo-European verbal system (i.e. durative, aoristic and perfect) were reduced to two, so that the Latin verbal system

shows a contrast only between the Infectum and the Perfectum. The Perfectum combines the functions of the original Aorist and the Perfect, i.e. it displays forms that express the imperfective aspect and forms that express the perfective aspect.

The Preterite paradigms in Table 27 and Table 28 show how the Perfect stem is formed in Italian and Deliano. But Latin could form the Perfect stem in four different ways. These are listed in (169) (cf. Magni 2001: 78).

(169) Types of Perfect formation in Latin

- a. with lengthening of the root vowel (as in *fēci* ‘I did’ < Pres. *facio* ‘I do’);
- b. with the reduplication of the Present stem (as in *cecidi* ‘I fell’ < Pres. *cado* ‘I fall’);
- c. with the insertion of the suffix *-s-* (as in *dixi* < \**dic-s-i* ‘I said’ < Pres. *dico* ‘I say’);
- d. with the insertion of the suffix *-u-*. This suffix has two allomorphs: the first one, spelled *-v-* and pronounced */-w-/*, occurs after a vowel (as in *laudavi* ‘I praised’ < Pres. *laudo* ‘I praise’), while the other one, pronounced */-u-/*, occurs after a consonant (as in *volui* ‘I wanted’ < Pres. *volo* ‘I want’).

Of the four ways of forming the Perfect stem in Latin, the first two are less frequent and tend to disappear in Proto-Romance, with the consequent expansion of the other two types (cf. Magni 2001: 78-79). With the exception of the verb *fari* ‘do/make’ featuring the Preterite *fici* ‘I did/I made’, which continues the Latin first type of Preterite formation by lengthening of the root vowel, all the other Deliano V2s in (162) are either cases of sigmatic Perfects (as those in (169c)), such as *dissi* ‘I said’ and *scrissi* ‘I wrote’, or, more generally, cases of Preterite forms featuring the segment *-CC-*, such as *ruppi* ‘I broke’, *vippi* ‘I drank’, *detti* ‘I gave’ and *stetti* ‘I stayed’.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> Magni (2001: 79-82) reports that there are Italian verbs featuring a geminate consonant in the Indicative Preterite, such as *ruppi* ‘I broke’ and *bevvi* ‘I drank’, which cannot be explained through regular phonological change, such as the regressive assimilation in consonantal clusters (e.g. *ps* > *ss*, *x* > *ss*, as in (169c)), or the lengthening of the consonants before the glide [w] (as in (169d)). These Indicative Preterite geminate forms are traditionally explained by postulating the widespread occurrence of the suffix *-u-* in Proto-Romance, which replaced two of the four ways found in Latin for the Perfect formation (i.e. the lengthening of the root vowel shown in (169a) and the reduplication shown in (169b)), so that Latin *rūpi* ‘I broke’ was replaced in Proto-Romance by \**rupui*, Latin *cecidi* ‘I fell’ was replaced by Proto-Romance \**cadui*, etc. (cf. Meyer-Lübke 1895a, De Dardel 1958, Lausberg 1971, Tekavčić 1980 and Maiden 1995). However, Magni (2001: 80-81) claims that this traditional explanation is not tenable, because it requires too many reconstructed hypothetical forms that are not confirmed in Romance outside Italian, and because it postulates inconsistent criteria,

Now that the picture of the Indicative Preterite formation in Deliano is clearer, we can consider the nature of the paradigm displaying rhizotonic and arhizotonic forms, i.e. the one characterizing the verbs in (162a-h), which is the only one allowing for the Preterite PseCo to occur in Deliano. The Latin paradigm of the verb WRITE in Table 28 shows that this kind of Latin Perfect displayed the perfective root for all the six Persons, regardless of their being rhizotonic or arhizotonic. On the other hand, the corresponding Deliano paradigm displays the alternation of the perfective and the imperfective roots (i.e. *scriss-* vs. *scriv-*).

Once again, the analysis of the Italian verbal system in terms of evolution from Latin is helpful for the understanding of the Deliano counterpart. According to Maiden (1995), the fact that only the arhizotonic forms of the paradigm display the non-perfective roots is probably accidental and can be explained in morphological terms. At a certain point in the evolution of Classical Latin, the Subjunctive Pluperfect and the Indicative Perfect are the only Tenses in which the perfective roots survive, once the Future Perfect, the Indicative Pluperfect and the Perfective Infinitive have declined. Then, the perfective root undergoes analogical levelling under the pressure of the more widespread non-perfective root and disappears from the Subjunctive Pluperfect and from the arhizotonic forms of the Indicative Perfect. Maiden (1995) justifies the resistance of the rhizotonic Indicative Perfect forms to this levelling with the fact that the introduction of the non-perfective root in the rhizotonic slots of the paradigm would have produced forms identical to those of the Indicative Present. Thus, he refers to those rhizotonic forms as “island of resistance to this analogical change”.

We know that the W-Pattern excludes the 2SG and the 2PL from Deliano PseCo, but besides the fact that these two Persons are the only arhizotonic slots of the paradigm, another factor could now be worth considering, namely the fact that they are also the only Persons featuring the imperfective root. Since the perfective, rhizotonic Preterite forms – which have resisted levelling, and in Italian have also spread to other verbs – are unpredictable, they must be stored in the lexicon of the speakers as autonomous forms (cf. Magni 2001: 82). It could well be, then, that the PseCo Preterite forms are stored in the lexicon of Deliano speakers in the same way.

---

according to which two similar Latin Perfect forms would follow different strategies of Perfect formation in Proto-Romance. Therefore, she proposes that these innovations can be explained by the spread of morphologically and cognitively base generalisation: since most Italian rhizotonic Preterite forms feature a double consonant, these forms may have been considered as a consistent class in Proto-Romance morphology, according to which an irregular Preterite may have a segment with a double consonant. According to Magni (2001: 84), then, the Italian verbs featuring a rhizotonic Preterite with geminate forms were created *ex novo* and did not develop from Latin following regular paths. I believe that Magni’s explanation could hold for Deliano rhizotonic Preterite forms as well, where however the phenomenon is more restricted.

This hypothesis is in line with what Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) say, *mutatis mutandis*, about the selection of V1 in Marsalese PseCo, namely that the possibility for a V1 of being part of PseCo is specified in the lexicon for some forms of the paradigm. This, as Di Caro & Giusti (2018: 55, fn. 2) suggest, can be considered as a ‘nano-parameter’ in the sense of Biberauer & Roberts (2012: 268), i.e. a parameter that regulates one or more individual lexical items. The restriction of Deliano Preterite PseCo to the verbs in (162) is regulated by another nano-parameter (cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2018: 66). I suppose that this V2 nano-parameter does not depend on the rhizotonicity of the V2 (as stated in Di Caro 2005), but on its being built on the perfective root, the latter already being an independent entry in the lexicon of the speakers.

We will see later on in this chapter that the questionnaire under analysis was not designed to test this perfective vs. non-perfective V2 root hypothesis, but the data on the Preterite PseCo W-Pattern are so robust that further research on that topic is definitely worth doing.<sup>104</sup>

## 5.5 Why quantitative research is needed

The urge to do quantitative research on such a restricted area as is Delia comes from some consideration of the impressive degree of microvariation displayed by Sicilian PseCo, which sets it apart from the other typical syntactic construction found in Sicilian, namely the deontic construction with *aviri a* ‘have to’ followed by an Infinitive. The behaviour of the latter construction, which is widespread in Southern Italo-Romance varieties, is rather uniform throughout Sicily. It features neither Mood/Tense nor V2 selection restrictions and is used consistently by speakers of all ages, since there are generally no competing constructions (the word *duviri* being used only as a noun meaning ‘duty’ and never as the modal verb ‘must’ in most varieties)<sup>105</sup>. Moreover, its V1 is fully functional, not projecting any argument structure.

When it comes to PseCo, however, the picture is far from being uniform. The answers on PseCo vary considerably and in many respects, not only in speakers of different varieties but even in speakers living within the same household. Being a native speaker of Deliano, I could experience

---

<sup>104</sup> We have seen that the deontic construction *aviri a* ‘have to’ + infinitival V2 (discussed in fn. 49), in which the V1 HAVE is the only inflected verb, displays the W-Pattern. As already noted, the two ungrammatical slots of the Preterite paradigm can be replaced by a different periphrasis or, sometimes, by the (very uncommon) modal verb *duviri*. Moreover, some speakers, cross-dialectally, also replace the 2SG and the 2PL forms *avisti* and *avistivu* with forms such as *àppitu* and *àppivu*, or *appisti* and *appistivu*, clearly modelled on the other Persons of the paradigm, such as the 1SG *appi* ‘I had’. Interestingly, these alternative forms are different as regards the [+rhizotonic] feature, but they all feature the perfective root.

<sup>105</sup> See, however, fn. 49 for the case of Sinagrese.

such a fact myself. Thus, taking into consideration a small sample that is meant to be representative of speakers of almost all of the age groups, allowed for details on PseCo to emerge that could have never emerged by interviewing a group of four or five speakers, which is basically what all synchronic literature on Sicilian PseCo was based on so far.

But, if on the one hand the participants' answers have shown that the PseCo of Deliano speakers can vary with respect to, for example, the semi-lexical status of V1 or the acceptability of V1s that are not generally allowed elsewhere, on the other hand the present study has confirmed the overall productivity of the construction in general, and the emergence of the expected patterns in particular. All the aspects of the variation just hinted at here are treated in detail in the following sections.

## **5.6 The survey**

This section explains the rationale behind the choice of administering a paper questionnaire mainly based on grammaticality judgements. During the year preceding the quantitative research study, I have conducted different stages of fieldwork in Delia, by means of both oral interviews and written activities, to evaluate which research tools would be worth using in such a context of high microvariation and, consequently, the best timing for the administration of the questionnaire and the best location for such a task. Thanks to this previous work with speakers, and to the piloting of the questionnaire, many of the problems that gathering data on Sicilian PseCo had to face were neutralised.

### **5.6.1 Problems in gathering the data**

The main outcome of the preliminary fieldwork was that eliciting PseCo is hardly ever an easy task. Collins *et al.* (2009), citing Clifton *et al.* (2006: 56), state that “there are different sources of data, which ultimately must yield converging results if we are to have confidence in what we are doing”. The main sources of data to consider are generally:

- i) Corpus studies;
- ii) Translations;
- iii) Grammaticality judgements.

Corpus studies are very important because they allow the researcher to understand the nature of a construction and the range of variation found among speakers. The use of a particular kind of natural language corpus such as the search engine Google has become a tool every syntactician relies on. The same holds true for Social Networks such as Facebook and Twitter (see e.g. Gonçalves & Sanchez 2014 and Gallego's project ASinEs 2015). As Collins *et al.* (2009) point out, the researcher can also consult oral texts that have been transcribed to establish the basic generalisations and then approach more specific questions. Unfortunately, the use of written texts in Sicilian dialects on the Internet is usually restricted to short messages with emphatic purposes. Moreover, on a synchronic basis, only a few comedy scripts for amateur theatre and some short poems are available for Deliano.

The only possible solution to this problem was interviewing speakers in order to let them produce spontaneous speech. This solution, however, proved to be rather ineffective since, on average, in one hour of oral production by the native speakers interviewed only one or two occurrences of PseCo were generally recorded. This has to do with the fact that PseCo in Deliano never occurs in the main Tense used for narration, i.e. the Indicative Imperfect, as is described in Section 5.6.1.2.

With regard to translations, asking speakers who are completely bilingual to translate sentences from a language to another is also a particularly rich source of data (cf. Collins *et al.* 2009: 2-3). Once again, this tool proved to be ineffective for reasons due to the defective nature of PseCo and the constant competition with the alternative InfCo, as is accounted for in the following section.

#### **5.6.1.1 Eliciting Pseudo-Coordination: competing constructions**

As seen early on in this dissertation, PseCo is a construction that never occurs in compound Tenses, regardless of the variety considered, and usually features defective paradigms. The ungrammatical cells of these defective paradigms are always replaced by the InfCo. But even grammatical cells of PseCo can almost always be replaced by the InfCo (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 372-373). The fact that the InfCo is the only possible construction in Italian for Sicilian speakers, who are to a great extent bilingual and for whom Italian is the only language available in national mass media, proved to be a problem for the elicitation of PseCo.

In the different stages of my fieldwork preceding the quantitative research in Delia, speakers were asked to translate some Italian sentences featuring a motion V1 followed by an infinitival V2 (cf. 170) into Deliano, which in principle were all good candidates for PseCo:



- (170) a. *Vado a prendere il pane.*  
 go.1SG to fetch.INF the bread  
 ‘I go to fetch the bread.’
- b. *Vengono a fare la spesa.*  
 come.3PL to do.INF the shopping  
 ‘They come to do the shopping.’
- c. *Va’ a lavorare!*  
 go.IMP.2SG to work.INF  
 ‘Go to work!’
- d. *Ieri sera sono andato a fare la spesa.*  
 yesterday evening be.1SG go.PAST.PART to do.INF the shopping  
 ‘I went to do the shopping last evening.’

[*Italian*]

None of the speakers interviewed produced the expected PseCo counterparts of (170): they all translated the examples provided with the Deliano InfCo, with the striking exception of the Imperative in (170c). Only after having heard the PseCo translations of the Italian examples from the interviewer did the speakers recognise them as possible and, actually, as their favourite option. This made the translating task useless for the documentation of PseCo in contexts different from the Imperative 2SG.

Due to widespread lack of dialectal self-awareness – which ultimately is the result of decades of official discredit on Sicilian dialects in all the schools of Sicily at all levels in favour of Italian as the sole socially acceptable language –, the participants needed to be provided with instances of PseCo in order to be able to recognise it and use it productively.<sup>106</sup>

### 5.6.1.2 Eliciting the Preterite W-Pattern: the narrative Tense

Letting speakers produce spontaneous speech in Deliano was the immediate answer to the problem described in Section 5.6.1.1. If participants could have spoken their dialect without having to translate from Italian, they would have hopefully produced some instances of PseCo during their

<sup>106</sup> I could experience the same problem with all the speakers of the many Sicilian varieties I have interviewed. With this respect, in past fieldwork in Eastern Sicily (cf. Di Caro 2015: 63), I could witness how difficult it was for Catanese and Acese speakers to recognise a particular form of PseCo with invariable V1 GO (see Type 3 PseCo in Di Caro 2019) as being the actual counterpart of the InfCo.

talks. But, as a matter of fact, when speakers are free to talk about their life, a great deal of the oral text produced is about their past.

The narrative Tense used in Romance is generally the Indicative Imperfect (cf. (171a, b)), but PseCo in Deliano is never found in this Tense (cf. (171c)). The only possibility to get some occurrence of PseCo in the past was then to ask participants to talk about a precise past moment, like, for example, about what they had done the previous day. The Tense used to talk about actions that are considered concluded in the past, even few seconds before the utterance time, in Deliano, as in most Sicilian dialects, is the Indicative Preterite (cf. (171d)), unlike Italian where the Indicative Present Perfect is used instead (cf. (171d)).

- (171) a. *Quand' ero piccolo, giocavo sempre*  
 when be.IMPRF.1SG young play.IMPRF.1SG always  
*con le macchinine.*  
 with the toy-cars  
 'When I was a child, I used to play with toy cars.'

[Italian]

- b. *Quann' era nicu, jucava sempri*  
 when be.IMPRF.1SG young play.IMPRF.1SG always  
*ccu li machiniceddri.*  
 with the toy-cars  
 'When I was a child, I used to play with toy cars.'

- c. *\*Quann' era nicu, jiva a gghjucava*  
 when be.IMPRF.1SG young go.IMPRF.1SG a play.IMPRF.1SG  
*sempri ccu li machiniceddri.*  
 always with the toy-cars  
 'When I was a child, I used to go and play with toy cars.'

- d. *Arsira, jivu a ffici binzina.*  
 last-night go.PAST.1SG a do.PAST.1SG petrol  
 'I went for petrol last night.'

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

Even in this very specific context, in which, however, participants were not always that comfortable to speak, it was very hard to elicit instances of PseCo, because of the restricted class of V2s that allow PseCo in the Preterite (see Section 5.3 and the list in (162)). The other possible option was to

ask participants to talk about an event in their life, either recent or very far in the past, that was particularly important for them and that would force them to use the Indicative Preterite. Since in this context they were free to decide what event to talk about, any privacy issues would be overcome. Nevertheless, once again, PseCo hardly ever occurred. The few spontaneous occurrences of PseCo were thus mainly related to the Indicative Present, used by participants to talk about their daily routines (cf. (172a)) and in some direct speech they were quoting, where the Imperative was most likely to occur (cf. (172b)):

(172) a. *Ogni gghjuirnu cci vaju a ddugnu*  
 every day him.CL.DAT go.1SG a give.1SG  
*a mmangiari a lu ma gattarjiddru.*  
 to eat.INF to the my kitten

‘I go and feed my kitten every day.’

b. *Allura ma ma’ mi dissì:*  
 then my mum me.CL.DAT say.PAST.3SG  
*“Vjini mangia!”*  
 come.IMP.2SG eat.IMP.2SG

‘Then my mother told me: “Come (and) eat!’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

All these issues considered, i.e. the impossibility to ask for translations due to the interference of the InfCo and the scarcity of occurrences of Preterite PseCo in spontaneous speech, an alternative way to elicit this construction was to be tried. This alternative way turned out to be grammaticality judgements, which make up the core of the questionnaire and are described in the following chapter (see Section 6.1.3).

## **Chapter 6. Quantitative research on Pseudo-Coordination in the dialect of Delia: the questionnaire and the analysis of the data**

In the first half of the second part of this dissertation, we have considered the features of the Preterite W-Pattern in Deliano and all the problems that had to be overcome in order to collect data on PseCo. In the present chapter, the characteristics of the questionnaire are discussed. Moreover, this chapter describes the nature of the sample interviewed and the items of the questionnaire, discusses what the data reveal about the phenomenon under analysis and, finally, draws the conclusions and leaves some open questions for further research.

### **6.1 The questionnaire**

Sicilian PseCo is a phenomenon so rich in microvariation that no questionnaire of reasonable length could have tested all the aspects subject to variation, and length was indeed an issue in the present research: on the one hand, it was necessary to create a document with a number of items that participants could answer without losing concentration. On the other hand, being this the first synchronic quantitative research on Sicilian PseCo, it would be desirable to test as many aspects of the phenomenon as possible.

The main aim of the questionnaire was to test the extent to which participants recognise and use PseCo and, more in detail, to test the emergence of the expected paradigmatic patterns. For that purpose, complete six-person paradigms were to be checked. Unfortunately, the piloting of the questionnaire and following feedback by the participants revealed that having too many paradigms to check led them to confusion, with the result that part of the paradigms that would in other contexts be considered ungrammatical were sometimes judged as grammatical.

The 4 pages that made up the questionnaire, whose content is the topic of the following sections of this chapter, are thus the result of the attempt of preventing the participants from getting confused by too many paradigms to test and at the same time gather enough information to cast some light upon this multifaceted phenomenon, precisely regarding paradigms.

#### **6.1.1 The sample**

An analysis of the stratification of the population in Delia preceded the sampling, which amounts to 70 participants. The main criteria followed for the selection of the subjects are listed in (173):

(173) Criteria for the selection of the sample

- i) Participants under the age of 11 were excluded from the study;
- ii) The number of male and female participants had to be possibly equal;
- iii) Only residents in Delia were selected (i.e. Deliano speakers officially residing in other villages or towns were excluded);
- iv) Only one member within the same household was selected (i.e. two relatives who lived in different homes could be selected);
- v) Any person who had been living in Delia for long enough to be a resident and who could somehow speak Deliano but who did not have the Italian nationality was excluded.

The people who agreed to take part in the study were first explained the procedure for filling in the questionnaire and were reminded that this was not a tool for testing their knowledge of Deliano, since there would be no right or wrong answers, but only a way to provide further evidence of the way speakers use PseCo. Participants were asked to sign a form which explained the aims of the study (see Appendix A and B). By signing the form, they would give the researcher the permission to use their data, collected anonymously, for academic purposes.

### **6.1.2 The age groups**

The sample of 70 participants represents the age distribution of the population from 11 years of age on, and is divided into three age groups:

- i) Group 1 (from 11 years of age to 30);
- ii) Group 2 (from 31 years of age to 60);
- iii) Group 3 (from 61 years of age on).

Group 1 and Group 3 are made up of 20 participants each, while Group 2 features 30 participants. The same number of subjects for the first and the third age groups, which are representative of the younger and the older part of the population, favoured the comparison of the data.

Moreover, a more fine-grained subdivision of the sample is possible. In fact, the three age groups are the result of the merging of 14 micro-age groups whose interval is 5 years for the first 13 groups, i.e. from 11 to 15, from 16 to 20 and so on. The last group is an exception, since it starts with participants from 71 years of age and does not have a top (the oldest participant that could be interviewed was an 80-year-old woman).

The first 13 groups feature 5 participants each, while the last group has 10 participants in it, as the result of the fact that the number of the population aged 71 or more, according to the latest national survey of 1997, was almost double in comparison to the other age ranges. As regards the gender of the participants, the sample features 34 male and 36 female participants. Each sub-group had a balanced number of male and female subjects, i.e. three male and two female subjects or vice versa. The last subgroup is the most balanced with 5 male and 5 female participants.

Having such a fine-grained age subdivision of the sample would prevent any of the three main age groups from featuring a concentration of participants within a small age range. Furthermore, this would allow to compare the answers of very young speakers with the ones of the eldest part of the sample, which will prove to yield interesting results for the present and for further research, especially with regard to the W-Pattern.

### **6.1.3 How the questionnaire is designed**

The 4-page paper questionnaire consisted of 44 items divided into two multiple choice question Designs, a single open question, and a set of 7 demographic variables. The questions and the instructions of the questionnaire were written in Italian – but were orally translated into Deliano for those older participants who were not trained in reading and writing –, while all the examples were written in Deliano, following the orthographic conventions proposed in Di Caro (2015). However, each example was also read aloud twice by the interviewer.

Administering the whole questionnaire took, on average, 15 to 20 minutes, which added to a 10 minute briefing, including the signing of the consent form, and a 30 to 40 minute debriefing, for an overall session of 60-70 minutes per participant. The participants were not timed and were free to change their answers within the same block of items.

Design 1 is made up of 36 items on grammaticality judgements – which proved to be the best way to assess the use of PseCo (see Section 5.6.1) – grouped into 8 paradigms. Grammaticality judgements can be elicited in different ways, but whatever the specific way “judging a sentence is a deeply introspective task and not always an easy one” (cf. Collins *et al.* 2009: 5), something that many participants themselves wanted to point out during the final feedback session.

The technique used in the present study is similar to that proposed by Collins *et al.* (2009), which is a middle ground between the psychophysics methodology employed in Bard *et al.* (1996) – called «magnitude estimation» and consisting of a comparison to a yardstick sentence – and the informal methods generally exploited by Generative Grammar. In Collins *et al.* (2009: 3), participants were asked to judge each of the sentences of the questionnaire using the rating system in (174), which is an adaptation of the one used in Sobin (1987):

(174) Grammaticality judgements rating system in Collins *et al.* (2009)

- i) Sounds completely natural and it is something I would say;
- ii) Sounds kind of odd, but I wouldn't be surprised to hear someone else say it;
- iii) Sounds completely wrong and no one would say this.

In the present part of the questionnaire, Participants were asked to judge each of the sentences of Design 1 using the rating system in (175):

(175) Grammaticality judgements rating system in the PseCo questionnaire

- i) Yes, if the sentence sounds completely natural and it is something the participant would say;
- ii) I don't know (Idk), if the sentence sounds kind of odd, but the participant would not be surprised to hear someone else say it (as in Collins *et al.* 2009) or if the participant just cannot decide;
- iii) No, if the sentence sounds completely wrong and no one would say this.

The fully-fledged paradigms that could be tested were GO + FETCH and COME + FETCH in the Indicative Present, GO + FETCH in the Imperative, and GO + DO in the Indicative Preterite. Three slots of the paradigm (i.e. 1SG, 3SG and 3PL) of COME BACK + FETCH in the Indicative Present were added to test the acceptability of a V1, i.e. COME BACK, which is rarely allowed in PseCo across Sicily. The paradigms were presented in the canonical order from 1SG to 3PL for all six-person paradigms.

The Imperative included 2SG, two different types of 2SG in the politeness formula (i.e. *vossìa*), and 2PL.

Design 2 is made up of 7 items concerning the choice between PseCo and the InfCo (or both). These items served to test different phenomena. In particular:

- i) Item 21 aimed at verifying the use of COME BACK as V1 for 1SG;
- ii) Items 22 and 23 aimed at verifying the use of START as V1 for 1SG and 3PL (cf. Di Caro 2015: 90-91; Di Caro & Giusti 2015: 403-404);
- iii) Item 37 tested the productivity of Preterite PseCo (GO + WRITE) for 3SG;
- iv) Item 38 aimed at verifying if some speaker accepts FETCH as V2 in Preterite PseCo, by testing 1SG;
- v) Item 39 aimed at verifying the productivity of the fixed combination (REMAIN + GIVE) in Preterite PseCo, by testing 3SG (cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2018);
- vi) Item 44 tested the productivity of the Imperative PseCo with COME as V1 featuring the connecting element *a*.

The only open question aimed at assessing whether participants found any (even subtle) semantic difference between PseCo and the InfCo by considering the examples *vaju a ppigliu lu pani* ‘I go (and) fetch the bread’ vs. *vaju a ppigliari lu pani* ‘I go to fetch the bread. This item sometimes affected the average length of the session, according to the feedback by those participants who actually found differences between the two constructions.

Finally, the Items concerning the 7 demographic variables, grouped in the final page of the questionnaire, were:

- i) Age;
- ii) Gender;
- iii) Level of education (set in three levels);
- iv) Occupation;
- v) Level of ‘Delianity’, i.e. whether the participant’s father and mother were raised – but not necessarily born – in Delia or not (two different items);
- vi) Whether the participant had children or not.



The rationale of the demographic variable in (v) is related to the fact that in Delia, as in many other small villages of central Sicily, it is not infrequent to find people who were born either abroad (see Section 5.2), or in Italy but outside Sicily, or in other, usually bigger, towns in Sicily. But this could tell us nothing about the kind of dialectal input these speakers were exposed to. A person who was born, say, somewhere in Germany, but who came back to Delia at the age of 2 and spent there the rest of their childhood and youth, is likely to speak a dialect that is affected in no way by their birthplace. On the contrary, having one or both parents raised in places different from Delia (in a context of high microvariation as regards PseCo), i.e. having a low level of Delianity, could be crucial for the participant's answers.

## 6.2 The research hypotheses

Sicilian PseCo occurs in different configurations, depending on the variety taken into consideration. According to the available literature (i.e. Di Caro 2015, 2019; Di Caro & Giusti 2015, 2018), PseCo in Deliano displays two different patterns, depending on the Mood/Tense considered:

- i) The N-Pattern (i.e. 1SG, 2SG, 3SG, \*1PL, \*2PL, 3PL) in the Indicative Present (together with the Imperative, 2SG, \*2PL);
- ii) The W-Pattern (i.e. 1SG, \*2SG, 3SG, 1PL, \*2PL, 3PL) in the Indicative Preterite.

Even with such specific paradigmatic constraints, the overall picture is complicated by many other aspects, e.g. the selection of V1 and V2, which were not easy to evaluate, given the few and sometimes contradictory answers available at the time this study was started.

The main consideration that informed the whole research was that the Italian InfCo was to be contemplated in a population basically made up of bilingual speakers. Being the InfCo the only possible option in Italian and being Italian the only available language in official contexts – such as public offices, any mass media communication, and schools – the younger population (corresponding to Group 1 in the study) was expected to produce less PseCo than the older one (Group 3), which is generally likely to have a lower level of education, less interactions with public offices and a minor exposure to written texts.

The first research hypothesis, thus, was that participants in Group 1 would accept PseCo less frequently than the ones in Group 3, and some participants from the first group – especially the youngest – would not accept PseCo at all. The second research hypothesis was based on this

possible difference between Group 1 and 3 in accepting PseCo and aimed at assessing the emergence of the expected patterns in the Indicative Present and Preterite, and in the Imperative. The next section illustrates how this second hypothesis was verified.

### 6.2.1 How to assess the emergence of the expected patterns

As explained in Section 6.1.3, Design 1 consisted of grammaticality judgements grouped into paradigms. The participants were asked to judge each sentence that formed the paradigms following the rating system shown in (175). Table 29 and Table 30 show the grid used to test the emergence of the N-Pattern in, respectively, the Indicative Present and the Imperative with V1 GO and V2 FETCH.<sup>107</sup> As regards the Imperative, however, only Item 40 and 43 were taken into account.

The first column indicates the item number; the second column indicates the reference persons in the paradigm. In the paper questionnaire, these were replaced by the actual subject pronouns in Deliano (i.e. *iju, tu, iddru/iddra, nuantri, vuantri, iddri*); the sentences to judge are in the third column, while the possible answers (i.e. Yes, I don't know, No) fill the fourth, fifth and sixth columns, respectively.

The grid used to test the W-Pattern in the Indicative Preterite with V1 GO and V2 DO, shown in Table 31, is organised in the same way as the preceding grids.

**Table 29. Grid for testing the emergence of the N-Pattern in the Indicative Present**

Item	Person	Sentence	Yes	Idk	No
1	1SG	<i>Vaju a ppigliu lu pani</i> I go and buy the bread			
2	2SG	<i>Unni va a ppigli lu pani?</i> Where do you go and buy the bread?			

<sup>107</sup> Note that the 2SG of Item 2, that should have followed the previous example in the affirmative form – i.e. *Va a ppigli lu pani* ‘You go and fetch the bread’ – had to be proposed in the interrogative *Wh*-form because the participants’ feedback following the piloting of the questionnaire had highlighted that many participants found it particularly difficult to distinguish the Indicative 2SG from the Imperative 2SG, in the sense that any time they had to judge the original Item 2 they corrected it by proposing *Va piglia lu pani!*, which is the Imperative 2SG. This phenomenon came as a surprise, since the two verbs (i.e. *ppigli* vs. *piglia*) are not homophonous. Moreover, the Indicative form displays RF. Nevertheless, by replacing this contested form with the *Wh*-question, all of the 70 participants recognised it as an Indicative form and thus could judge it without any problems.

3	3SG	<i>Va a ppiglia lu pani</i> He/She goes to buy the bread			
4	1PL	<i>Jammu a ppigliammu lu pani</i> We go and buy the bread			
5	2PL	<i>Jiti a ppigliati lu pani</i> You go and buy the bread			
6	3PL	<i>Vannu a ppiglianu lu pani</i> They go and buy the bread			

**Table 30. Grid for testing the emergence of the N-Pattern in the Imperative**

Item	Person	Sentence	Yes	Idk	No
40	2SG	<i>Va piglia lu pani!</i> Go (and) fetch the bread!			
41	2SG	<i>Sa va a ppiglia lu pani!</i> Sir/Madam, please go (and) fetch the bread!			
42	2SG	<i>Jissi a ppigliassi lu pani!</i> Sir/Madam, please go (and) fetch the bread!			
43	2PL	<i>Jiti a ppigliati lu pani!</i> Go (and) fetch the bread!			

**Table 31. Grid for testing the emergence of the W-Pattern in the Indicative Preterite**

Item	Person	Sentence	Yes	Idk	No
31	1SG	<i>Jivu a ffici la spisa</i> I went to do the shopping			
32	2SG	<i>Jisti a ffacisti la spisa</i> You went to do the shopping			
33	3SG	<i>Ji a ffici la spisa</i> He/She went to do the shopping			
34	1PL	<i>Jammu a ffacimu la spisa</i> We went to do the shopping			

35	2PL	<i>Jìstivu a ffacìstivu la spisa</i> You went to do the shopping			
36	3PL	<i>Jiru a fficiru la spisa</i> They went to do the shopping			

The combination of the accepted and unaccepted slots of the paradigms made up the possible patterns. For the present study, all the ‘I don’t know’ (Idk) answers were considered as ‘No’. That means that in order to be able to attribute an N-Pattern in the Indicative Present to a given participant, their answer were to be as in (176):

(176) Grammaticality judgements for the Indicative Present N-Pattern to occur

- a. 1SG Yes
- b. 2SG Yes
- c. 3SG Yes
- d. 1PL No or Idk
- e. 2PL No or Idk
- f. 3PL Yes

Any ‘Yes’ in the 1PL and the 2PL slots, and any ‘No’ or ‘Idk’ in the rest of the paradigm were considered as no W-Pattern for that given participant. This holds true also for the other Indicative Present N-Pattern tested, i.e. COME + FETCH.

One may say this was probably a too strict solution, but it allowed us to deal with robust data only. Of course, as regards the first research hypothesis, any combination implying at least one ‘Yes’ in the paradigm shown in Table 29 let us consider that participant as accepting PseCo. The same applies for the paradigms in Table 30 and 31.

As for the Imperative, the relevant slots of the paradigm to be tested were the item 40 and 43 of Table 30, and in order to be able to attribute an N-Pattern in the Imperative to a given participant, his/her answers were to be as in (177):

(177) Grammaticality judgements for the Imperative N-Pattern to occur

- a. 2SG Yes
- b. 2PL No or Idk

Finally, (178) shows the only possible combinations for a given participant to be attributed a W-Pattern in the Indicative Preterite:

- (178) Grammaticality judgements for the Indicative Preterite W-Pattern to occur
- a. 1SG Yes
  - b. 2SG No or Idk
  - c. 3SG Yes
  - d. 1PL Yes
  - e. 2PL No or Idk
  - f. 3PL Yes

As is clearly presented in the discussion in Section 6.4, not only did the system devised for this study to analyse the emergence of the expected patterns allow for the researcher to discard those patterns featuring ‘Yes’ and ‘No’/‘Idk’ answers in the wrong, i.e. unexpected, places, but it was also a good way to detect what the unexpected patterns had in common.

### 6.3 Dataset

The ‘yes’ and ‘no’ values displayed in Table 32 indicate whether the expected patterns have emerged for each subject. The column ‘N-P1 Pr.’ indicates the results for the Indicative Present N-Pattern with V1 GO (the criteria for assigning a ‘yes’ to this paradigm are shown in (176)). The column ‘N-P1 Im.’ indicates the results for the Imperative N-Pattern with V1 GO (the criteria for assigning a ‘yes’ to this paradigm are shown in (177)). The column ‘N-P2’ indicates the results for the Indicative Present N-Pattern with V1 COME (it follows the same criteria as the ‘N-P1 Pr.’ in (176)). Finally, the column ‘W-P’ indicates the results for the Indicative Preterite W-Pattern with V1 GO (the criteria for assigning a ‘yes’ to this paradigm are shown in (178)).

The following tables display all the grammaticality judgements for each subject with respect to the Indicative Present PseCo with V1 GO (Table 33), the Imperative PseCo with V1 GO (Table 34), the Indicative Present PseCo with V1 COME (Table 35) and the Indicative Preterite PseCo with V1 GO (Table 36). Note that in these tables the ‘Yes’, ‘No’, and ‘Idk’ values (all beginning with a capital letter) follow the criteria shown in (175), and that the columns where a ‘Yes’ was expected, according to the relevant pattern, are displayed in grey.

**Table 32. The emergence of the expected N- and W-Patterns**

Subj.	N-P1 Pr.	N-P1 Im.	N-P2	W-P	Subj.	N-P1 Pr.	N-P1 Im.	N-P2	W-P
1	yes	yes	no	yes	36	yes	yes	yes	yes
2	no	no	no	yes	37	yes	yes	no	yes
3	yes	yes	yes	yes	38	yes	yes	yes	yes
4	no	yes	yes	yes	39	yes	yes	no	yes
5	yes	yes	yes	no	40	no	yes	yes	yes
6	yes	yes	yes	yes	41	no	yes	yes	yes
7	yes	yes	yes	no	42	no	yes	yes	yes
8	yes	yes	yes	yes	43	yes	yes	yes	no
9	no	yes	no	yes	44	yes	yes	yes	yes
10	yes	yes	no	yes	45	yes	yes	yes	yes
11	yes	yes	yes	yes	46	yes	yes	no	yes
12	yes	yes	yes	yes	47	yes	yes	yes	yes
13	yes	yes	yes	no	48	no	yes	yes	yes
14	yes	yes	no	yes	49	yes	yes	yes	yes
15	yes	yes	yes	yes	50	yes	yes	yes	no
16	yes	yes	yes	yes	51	yes	yes	yes	yes
17	yes	yes	yes	yes	52	yes	yes	yes	yes
18	yes	yes	no	no	53	no	yes	yes	yes
19	yes	yes	yes	yes	54	yes	yes	yes	no
20	yes	yes	yes	yes	55	yes	yes	yes	yes
21	yes	yes	yes	no	56	no	no	no	yes
22	yes	yes	yes	yes	57	no	yes	no	no
23	yes	yes	yes	no	58	yes	no	yes	yes
24	yes	yes	yes	yes	59	yes	yes	yes	yes
25	yes	no	no	no	60	no	no	yes	yes
26	yes	yes	yes	yes	61	no	no	no	yes
27	yes	yes	yes	yes	62	yes	yes	yes	yes
28	no	no	no	yes	63	yes	yes	yes	yes
29	yes	yes	no	yes	64	yes	yes	yes	yes
30	yes	yes	yes	yes	65	yes	yes	no	yes
31	yes	yes	yes	yes	66	yes	yes	yes	yes

32	yes	yes	no	yes	67	yes	yes	no	no
33	no	yes	no	yes	68	yes	yes	yes	yes
34	yes	yes	yes	yes	69	yes	yes	yes	yes
35	yes	yes	no	yes	70	yes	yes	no	no

**Table 33. The results of the Indicative Present PseCo with V1 GO**

Subj.	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Idk
3	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
4	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
5	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
6	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
7	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
8	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
9	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
10	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
11	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
12	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
13	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
14	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
15	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
16	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
17	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
18	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
19	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
20	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
21	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
22	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
23	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
24	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes

25	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
26	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
27	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
28	Yes	Idk	Idk	No	No	Yes
29	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
30	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
31	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
32	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
33	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
34	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
35	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
36	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
37	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
38	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
39	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
40	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
41	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
42	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
43	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
44	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
45	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
46	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
47	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
48	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
49	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
50	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
51	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
52	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
53	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
54	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
55	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
56	Yes	Yes	Idk	No	Yes	Idk
57	Yes	Yes	Yes	Idk	No	Yes
58	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes



59	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
60	Idk	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
61	Yes	Idk	Yes	No	No	Yes
62	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
63	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
64	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
65	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
66	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
67	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
68	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
69	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
70	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes

**Table 34. The results of the Imperative PseCo with V1 GO**

Subj.	2SG	2PL	Subj.	2SG	2PL
1	Yes	No	36	Yes	No
2	Yes	No	37	Yes	No
3	Yes	No	38	Yes	No
4	Yes	No	39	Yes	No
5	Yes	No	40	Yes	No
6	Yes	No	41	Yes	No
7	Yes	No	42	Yes	No
8	Yes	No	43	Yes	No
9	Yes	No	44	Yes	No
10	Yes	No	45	Yes	No
11	Yes	No	46	Yes	No
12	Yes	No	47	Yes	No
13	Yes	No	48	Yes	No
14	Yes	No	49	Yes	No
15	Yes	No	50	Yes	No
16	Yes	No	51	Yes	No

17	Yes	No	52	Yes	No
18	Yes	No	53	Yes	No
19	Yes	No	54	Yes	No
20	Yes	No	55	Yes	No
21	Yes	No	56	Yes	Yes
22	Yes	No	57	Yes	No
23	Yes	No	58	Yes	Yes
24	Yes	No	59	Yes	No
25	Yes	No	60	Yes	No
26	Yes	No	61	Yes	Yes
27	Yes	No	62	Yes	No
28	Yes	No	63	Yes	No
29	Yes	No	64	Yes	No
30	Yes	No	65	Yes	No
31	Yes	No	66	Yes	No
32	Yes	No	67	Yes	No
33	Yes	No	68	Yes	No
34	Yes	No	69	Yes	No
35	Yes	No	70	Yes	No

**Table 35. The results of the Indicative Present PseCo with V1 COME**

Subj.	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
1	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
2	Yes	Yes	Idk	No	No	Yes
3	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
4	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
5	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
6	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
7	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
8	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
9	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No

10	Yes	Idk	Idk	No	No	Yes
11	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
12	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
13	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
14	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
15	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
16	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
17	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
18	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
19	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
20	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
21	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
22	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
23	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
24	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
25	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
26	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
27	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
28	Yes	Idk	Idk	No	No	Idk
29	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
30	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
31	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
32	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
33	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
34	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
35	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
36	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
37	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
38	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
39	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
40	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
41	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
42	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
43	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes

44	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
45	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
46	Yes	Yes	Idk	No	No	No
47	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
48	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
49	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
50	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
51	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
52	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
53	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
54	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
55	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
56	Yes	Idk	Yes	No	No	Yes
57	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
58	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
59	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
60	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
61	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
62	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
63	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
64	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
65	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
66	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
67	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
68	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
69	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
70	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes

**Table 36. The results of the Indicative Preterite PseCo with V1 GO**

Subj.	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

3	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
4	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
5	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
6	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
7	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
8	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
9	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
10	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
11	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
12	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
13	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
14	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
15	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
16	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
17	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
18	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
19	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
20	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
21	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
22	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
23	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
24	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
25	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
26	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
27	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
28	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
29	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
30	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
31	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
32	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
33	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
34	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
35	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
36	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

37	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
38	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
39	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
40	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
41	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
42	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
43	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
44	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
45	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
46	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
47	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
48	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
49	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
50	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
51	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
52	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
53	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
54	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
55	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
56	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
57	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
58	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
59	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
60	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
61	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
62	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
63	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
64	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
65	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
66	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
67	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
68	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
69	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
70	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes

The demographic data that have been taken into account in the present study are displayed in Table 37. The column ‘A.G.’ indicates the Age Group (1, 2 or 3) each participant belongs to (cf. Section 6.1.2). For the column ‘Edu.’, which displays the participant’s level of education, the value ‘1’ indicates the primary school level, ‘2’ indicates the secondary school level, and ‘3’ indicates that the participant has a University degree or a higher title. As regards the column ‘Del.’, displaying the level of Delianity of the participants, the values ‘0’, ‘1’ and ‘2’ indicate the number of the participant’s parents who were raised in Delia.

**Table 37. Demographic data of the participants**

Subj.	Age	A.G.	Edu.	Del.	Subj.	Age	A.G.	Edu.	Del.
1	40	2	3	2	36	52	2	2	1
2	17	1	2	2	37	29	1	3	2
3	49	2	2	1	38	29	1	2	1
4	51	2	2	2	39	56	2	2	1
5	79	3	1	2	40	37	2	2	1
6	63	3	2	2	41	60	2	2	2
7	61	3	2	1	42	52	2	2	2
8	31	2	3	1	43	56	2	3	2
9	43	2	2	2	44	51	2	2	2
10	17	1	1	1	45	46	2	3	2
11	66	3	2	2	46	32	2	2	2
12	20	1	2	2	47	70	3	2	2
13	26	1	2	1	48	69	3	2	2
14	78	3	1	2	49	35	2	3	2
15	12	1	1	2	50	33	2	3	1
16	61	3	2	1	51	37	2	3	2
17	63	3	2	2	52	72	3	2	1
18	63	3	2	2	53	38	2	2	1
19	22	1	2	1	54	20	1	2	2
20	71	3	2	2	55	22	1	2	2

21	41	2	2	2	56	13	1	1	2
22	72	3	3	2	57	13	1	2	1
23	54	2	2	2	58	57	2	2	2
24	26	1	2	2	59	69	3	2	2
25	34	2	2	1	60	13	1	1	1
26	11	1	1	2	61	16	1	2	0
27	23	1	3	1	62	48	2	2	1
28	21	1	2	2	63	40	2	2	2
29	50	2	2	2	64	66	3	3	2
30	47	2	2	2	65	42	2	2	2
31	43	2	2	1	66	59	2	2	2
32	17	1	1	2	67	77	3	1	2
33	43	2	2	2	68	73	3	2	2
34	71	3	2	2	69	76	3	1	2
35	26	1	2	2	70	76	3	1	0

Finally, Table 38 singles out all the ‘Idk’ answers among the grammaticality judgements produced by the participants. Note that in the Imperative GO + FETCH and in the Indicative Preterite GO + DO no ‘Idk’ answers were recorded.

**Table 38. An overview of the ‘Idk’ answers**

Subject	Ind. Pres. GO + FETCH	Ind. Pres. COME + FETCH
2	3PL	3SG
10		2SG, 3SG
28	2SG, 3SG	2SG, 3SG, 3PL
46		3SG
56	3SG, 3PL	2SG
57	1PL	
60	1SG	
61	2SG	



## 6.4 Analysis and discussion

The first straightforward result that emerged from the analysis of the data is that every participant in the study accepted PseCo, that is there was at least one occurrence of PseCo in any of the relevant paradigms described in Section 6.1.3 (i.e. Indicative Present GO + FETCH, and COME + FETCH, Imperative GO + FETCH and Indicative Preterite GO + DO). Moreover, the participants' grammaticality judgements were almost always very decisive (see Table 38). Only 8 subjects out of 70 chose an 'Idk' to judge a sentence, but also the number of 'Idk' answers per subject was very low. Of these 8 subjects, 4 of them – with three subjects from Group 1 – used it just once and 3 of them – all belonging to Group 1 – used it only twice.

The analysis of the grammaticality judgements for all the four relevant paradigms revealed that, on average, the expected patterns emerged robustly everywhere: a remarkable 50% of the sample (35 participants) accepted the expected patterns in all of the 4 paradigms.

Let us start with the Imperative, the paradigm whose analysis needs a shorter discussion. The expected N-Pattern for the Imperative emerged almost unanimously, with 67 participants out of 70 who judged the 2SG with a 'Yes' and the 2PL with a 'No' (with, significantly, no 'Idk' answers at all). The remaining 3 participants judged with a 'Yes' both 2SG and 2PL.<sup>108</sup> These results confirm a regional trend – emerged from my previous qualitative fieldwork – according to which PseCo with GO as V1 is always accepted in the Imperative 2SG cross-linguistically, no matter the age of the speaker. A possible explanation for this phenomenon, which is worth developing in further research, is the fact that the Imperative – generally used to give instructions and orders, or for exhortations – is very frequently used with children since their birth. That means that speakers are exposed to Imperative inputs very early, including PseCo occurrences.<sup>109</sup>

As regards the six-person paradigms tested, the expected N-Pattern for the Indicative Present with GO as V1 emerged in 56 participants out of 70, i.e. in 80% of the sample, with the following distribution among the age groups: 70% for Group 1, 77% for Group 2, 95% for Group 3. The expected N-Pattern for the Indicative Present with COME as V1 emerged in 48 participants out of 70

---

<sup>108</sup> Note that the difference between PseCo and the InfCo with regard to the Imperative 2PL lies only on a consonant on V2, i.e. *Jiti a ppigliati* (PseCo) vs. *Jiti a ppigliari* (InfCo). Although the examples were also read aloud by the researcher, and the Imperative 2PL PseCo is cross-dialectally ungrammatical (in Type 1 and Type 2, cf. Di Caro 2019), this aspect has to be taken into consideration. Of the 67 participants who judged Item 43 as ungrammatical, only one added, during the final feedback, that he had heard that form in another dialect.

<sup>109</sup> See the discussion in Stockwell (2015: 20ff.) on the high frequency of Imperatives in child-directed speech and the data cited there from Salustri & Hyams (2006) for Italian and German, and from Newport, Gleitman & Gleitman (1977) for English.

(68.6% of the sample) with the following distribution among the age groups: 55% for Group 1, 73.3% for Group 2, 75% for Group 3. Although the percentages of the emergence of the expected patterns were high in both cases, PseCo with COME as V1 proved to be more problematic for the participants: for 14 of the 22 subjects for whom the N-Pattern did not emerge, the slots of the paradigm were judged differently than expected in more than one slot (i.e. in two slots for 10 subjects and in 3 slots for 4 subjects). This is in contrast with what happened in the case of GO as V1, where 9 subjects out of 14 missed the expected pattern for just one slot of the paradigm (and only one subject missed it for three slots).<sup>110</sup>

Finally, the expected W-Pattern for the Indicative Preterite with GO as V1 emerged in 57 participants out of 70, i.e. in 81.4% of cases, with the following distribution: 80% for Group 1, 83.3% for Group 2, 80% for Group 3. The results for the three paradigms discussed are summarised in Table 39.

**Table 39. Emergence of the expected patterns (in percentage)**

	<b>Ind. Pres. GO + FETCH</b>	<b>Ind. Pres. COME + FETCH</b>	<b>Ind. Pret. GO + DO</b>
Group 1	70	55	80
Group 2	77	73.3	83.3
Group 3	95	75	80
Sample	80	68.6	81.4

Here two aspects are noteworthy: i) the very high overall emergence of the W-Pattern, slightly outscoring that of the two N-Patterns, even though PseCo in the Indicative Preterite is going to disappear in the varieties spoken around Delia (the nearest and most important being Canicattì, in the province of Agrigento); ii) the distribution of the percentages among the age groups which does not reflect the trend of the N-Patterns, with Group 1 scoring exactly as Group 3.

Moreover, there are other interesting aspects regarding the grammaticality judgements of the participants who did not let the Preterite W-Pattern emerge. First, 12 out of 14 participants missed

<sup>110</sup> It is possible to compare the results for the two Indicative Present paradigms tested – where the emergence of the N-Pattern with GO + FETCH outscored the one with COME + FETCH by 11.4% – with the ones for the reduced Indicative Present paradigm (1SG, 3SG and 3PL, expected to be judged with a ‘Yes’) of COME BACK + FETCH, because they feature the same V2. Only in 21.4% of the sample (15 participants) did the N-Pattern emerge. Since GO is a verb more frequently used than COME and COME is more frequently used than COME BACK, these results suggest that the V1 frequency of use could be directly linked to the emergence of PseCo and, in particular, to the N-pattern expected.

the W-Pattern by just one slot (with Subjects 25 and 54 who produced only 2 unexpected judgements). Second, this one slot was always the 1PL (this holds for Subject 25, too).

This fact needs an explanation. Consider the Indicative Present and Preterite paradigms of the verb *jiri* ‘go’ in Deliano, displayed in Table 40. There is only one form for the 1PL of both Tenses in Deliano, highlighted in grey, whereas other dialects of central Sicily, such as the ones spoken in Sommatino (in the province of Caltanissetta) or in Leonforte (in the province of Enna), display a dedicated form for the Indicative Preterite, namely *jimmu*.

**Table 40. The Indicative Present and Preterite of *jiri* ‘go’ in Deliano**

	<b>Indicative Present</b>	<b>Indicative Preterite</b>
1SG	<i>vaju</i>	<i>jivu</i>
2SG	<i>va</i>	<i>jisti</i>
3SG	<i>va</i>	<i>ji</i>
1PL	<i>jammu</i>	<i>jammu</i>
2PL	<i>jiti</i>	<i>jìstivu</i>
3PL	<i>vannu</i>	<i>jiru</i>

This mismatch between the Tense features of V1 and V2 could have prevented those speakers from producing Preterite PseCo in the 1PL. Contrary to what could be expected, only 3 of the relevant participants belonged to Group 1. One could then suppose that there might have been a *jimmu* ‘we went’ 1PL Preterite allomorph available to older speakers that has progressively disappeared but, given lack of written old texts (see Section 5.6.1), this is very difficult to ascertain.

As explained in Section 6.1.3, Design 2 of the questionnaire included items which asked the participants to choose between a sentence featuring PseCo and an alternative version with the InfCo, with the possibility to choose both of them. The items 37, 38 and 39 – all devoted to Indicative Preterite PseCo – aimed at testing, respectively, V2 WRITE (in the 3SG), V2 FETCH (in the 1SG), and the combination of REMAIN + GIVE (in the 3SG). The results are displayed in Table 41, where the digits into brackets indicate the percentage of participants for whom both PseCo and the InfCo were acceptable.

**Table 41. Acceptability of some V2s in the Ind. Pret. PseCo (in percentage)**

	WRITE as V2	FETCH as V2	GIVE as V2
Group 1	60 (95)	0 (0)	15 (45)
Group 2	66.7 (86.7)	0 (0)	26.7 (73.3)
Group 3	50 (65)	0 (0)	15 (75)
Sample	60 (82.9)	0 (0)	20 (65.7)

Naturally, the forms tested by these items are too inhomogeneous and few in number to be representative of the whole paradigms. Nevertheless, the results tell something about how Preterite PseCo works in Deliano. The most striking result is the unanimous negative judgement, tested by the item 38, of the sentence *Jivu a ppigliavu lu pani du voti* ‘I went to fetch the bread twice’, which features V2 FETCH, a verb that displays only arhizotonic forms in the Indicative Preterite (see Table 24). All of the 70 participants judged the corresponding InfCo *Jivu a ppigliari lu pani du voti* ‘I went to fetch the bread twice’ as the only possible version, hence the 0 (0) in the central column of Table 41.

The combination of the very high percentages of the emergence of the W-Pattern in all of the age groups (third column of Table 39) and this unequivocal denial to FETCH as V2 in the 1SG suggests that Deliano speakers are very resolute in judging which V2 can enter Preterite PseCo. The results of the Item 37, where another alleged possible V2 (i.e. WRITE) was tested, do not contradict this trend: Preterite PseCo is preferred by 60% of the sample and accepted, together with the InfCo, by 22.9% of the sample.

Finally, Item 39 tested the acceptability of the verb REMAIN, which is not attested as a possible V1 in any instance of PseCo in any Sicilian variety, according to the existing literature, with the exception of this particular combination with V2 GIVE in Deliano (cf. Di Caro 2019; Di Caro & Giusti 2018). This could explain why the percentage of participants judging the Preterite PseCo sentence *Cci arristà a ddetti deci euru* ‘He/She still owes him/her ten euro(s)’ (see also (167b)) as the only possible option is rather low, only 20%, but increases significantly in combination with the participants who judge it as acceptable along with the InfCo counterpart *Cci arristà a ddari deci euru* ‘He/She still owes him/her ten euro(s)’, especially for adult speakers from 31 years of age on (i.e. 73.3% for Group 2, 75% for Group 3).

Another aspect to consider here is that the verb combination tested in Item 39 is not the favourite option for speakers in general. The deontic construction with HAVE TO + infinitival V2,

shown in (179), followed by the adverb *ancora* ‘still’ is the standard solution, being the combination with V1 REMAIN (either in PseCo or in the InfCo) a marked option.

(179) *Cci*                                      *addari*                                      *ancora*    *deci*    *euru*.  
 him.CL.DAT                                      have+to+give.INF    still                      ten                      euro  
 ‘I still owe him ten euro(s).’

[Delia (Caltanissetta)]

The results discussed so far contradict the two research hypotheses and demonstrate i) that PseCo is common to the entire age range of the population, and ii) that the expected patterns emerged robustly in all the paradigms tested.<sup>111</sup> Unexpectedly, however, the relationship between the age and the expected patterns proved to be statistically significant only in one case. The Mann-Whitney non-parametric two-tailed test was run to verify if the difference between the answers of Group 1 and Group 3 was significant. The results of that test are displayed in Table 42.

**Table 42. Results of the Mann-Whitney test**

	N-Pattern GO	N-Pattern COME	W-Pattern GO
Mann-Whitney U	150.000	160.000	190.000
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.040	.173	.708
Grouping variable: Age Group			

The only significant result ( $p. <0.05$ ) regards the N-Pattern GO, where the difference in the emergence of the expected pattern is linked to the age difference of the participants. All the other paradigms tested (see Table 42), and all the other age group combinations (i.e. Group 1 and 2, Group 2 and 3) did not prove to be statistically significant. This means that, generally, the behaviour of the younger part of the sample with regard to using PseCo in Deliano is not significantly different from that of the older part of the sample. If for the younger part of the sample

<sup>111</sup> Gender, another demographic variable considered in the study, does not seem to be an explanatory factor either. In fact, the male half of the sample (34 participants) accepted the expected patterns with the following distribution: Indicative Present N-Pattern with GO 82.3%, Indicative Present N-Pattern with COME 76.5%, Indicative Preterite W-Pattern with GO 82.3%, while the female half of the sample (36 participants) scored, respectively, 77.8%, 69.4%, 77.8%. These results of the two groups are too close for us to state that gender could have made the difference in the emergence of the expected patterns.

PseCo is as common as for the older one, with the N- and the W-Pattern emerging as expected, that means that age – and the presumed link to the pressure of the Italian InfCo upon younger speakers’ judgements – cannot be taken as a relevant factor. Therefore, there must be some other factors that can explain for the high level of productivity of PseCo. Naturally, further research is needed to look for these factors, particularly when the Preterite W-Pattern is concerned. In fact, such high productivity in younger speakers is counterintuitive, especially in a construction that is not that common even in the surrounding areas.<sup>112</sup>

Here is a possible avenue worth exploring. Although there is no available frequency of use dictionary for Deliano, we can refer to Tullio De Mauro’s (1993) LIP (Lessico di frequenza dell’italiano parlato) in order to see what happens in spoken Italian. Since verbs like *fare* ‘do/make’, *dare* ‘give’, and *dire* ‘say/tell’ are ranked as some of the most frequently used verbs in Italian, this is likely to hold true for their Deliano counterparts too. Therefore, frequency of use could have played a role in licensing PseCo in the Indicative Preterite. In other words, if the Indicative Preterite PseCo – available only with the V2 listed in (162) – is so robust among Deliano speakers, irrespective of their age, there must be something in the lexical properties of those V2s that ensures great vitality to this construction.

## 6.5 Interim conclusions

The quantitative research discussed in the second part of this dissertation is the first attempt of measuring the productivity and the variation found in PseCo in a given variety, namely the dialect spoken in Delia, in the province of Caltanissetta. The study is mainly based on grammaticality judgements of sentences grouped into paradigms and on the choice between PseCo and the InfCo on given sentences. The results of the study have shown that this construction is still highly productive and that participants have very decisive judgements when it comes to PseCo (see Table 38 and Section 6.4).

Crucially, age does not seem to be a factor in accounting for the acceptance of the expected patterns. Surprisingly, the Indicative Preterite W-Pattern (which in Deliano is possible only with a restricted class of V2) is more productive than the Indicative Present N-Patterns and is robust even among very young speakers (aged 11 to 15). Frequency of use could be the reason why only a

---

<sup>112</sup> Few other dialects display this type of PseCo in the Indicative Preterite with the same restrictions on V2 (cf. Di Caro 2019). Generally, other Sicilian dialects either accept only the InfCo in the Indicative Preterite or do not display any lexical restriction on V2 (i.e. they also allow for arhizotonic V2 forms to appear in PseCo).

restricted class of V2s (especially DO/MAKE) are available in the Preterite W-Pattern in Deliano, but an oral dialectal corpus would be of great help in ascertaining such a hypothesis.

To conclude, here are some final remarks and hopes about studies such as the one described in the present work. Administering similar questionnaire surveys – edited according to the characteristics of the PseCo found in a given place – in different provinces of Sicily could help researchers have a deeper understanding of the microvariation this construction displays. Such questionnaires should be administered, when possible, by researchers who are not only native speakers, or at least have a good knowledge of the variety to be examined, but who are well-connected within the community (e.g. town hall contacts etc...), something which is, however, more difficult to accomplish in major urban areas such as Palermo or Catania.

My hope is that this study could be taken as a reference point by other researchers to extend the investigation on PseCo – and on its high paradigmatic microvariation – to as many Sicilian varieties as possible, in order to get a more fine-grained picture of this multi-faceted phenomenon.

## **PART III**



## Chapter 7. Conclusions

In this dissertation I have dealt with Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination, a syntactic construction which features two inflected verbs and, for this reason, can be considered as a particular instance of the wider phenomenon of loss of the Infinitive, which characterises many Southern Italo-Romance dialects. I analysed the different configurations that PseCo can display throughout Sicily and considered its main parameters of microvariation, by taking into account several linguistic data from a number of varieties covering all of the nine provinces of Sicily.

My main point of reference throughout my dissertation was Cardinaletti & Giusti's (2001, 2003, 2019) syntactic macro-comparative analysis of PseCo. According to Cardinaletti & Giusti, V1 is a semi-lexical verb merged as a functional head in the extended projection of V2 (which, in the case of Sicilian PseCo, corresponds to *t*), which parasitically copies its features onto the features of the lexical V2. My research also benefitted from Cruschina's (2013) morphological analysis (in terms of morphomic patterns) of the paradigm restrictions that Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003) had first highlighted for Marsalese, where PseCo is possible in the Imperative 2SG and in the Indicative Present 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and 3PL only. Furthermore, I have used Protocol Linguistics (cf. Giusti 2011; Giusti & Zegrean 2015; Di Caro & Giusti 2015) as a tool of syntactic analysis which provides researchers of different theoretical persuasion and linguistic fields with comparable and easy to handle data.

In the first part of the dissertation I presented all the other cases of Multiple Agreement Constructions found in Southern Italo-Romance, namely the Finite Construction – where two inflected verbs are connected by the connecting elements *cu/(m)u/(m)i/(m)a* – typical of Apulia, Southern Calabria and the Sicilian province of Messina (cf. Rohlf's 1969; Manzini & Savoia 2005; Damonte 2009, 2010; De Angelis 2016, 2017, Ledgeway 2007, 2012, 2013, 2015, 2016), and the Neapolitan asyndetic complementation (cf. Ledgeway 1997). Moreover, I gave a detailed overview of the available literature on PseCo, from the early papers of the end of the 19th Century (such as Ascoli 1896, 1091 and Sorrento 1915) to the freshly published studies, highlighting the major contributions to the understanding of this construction and the several related phenomena.

I also provided a brief overview of the main descriptions of PseCo as found in many Germanic languages (see Section 3.2.1) and in some Semitic languages (see Section 3.2.2), and I summarised the debate concerning the opportunity to consider PseCo as a case of Serial Verb Constructions, a non-uniform group of multi-verb constructions found in West Africa, South Asia, Amazonia, Oceania, New Guinea, and very common in Creole languages (cf. Matisoff 1969; Baker

1989, 1991; Déchaine 1993; Collins 1997; Hagermeijer 2001; Aikhenvald 1999; Aikhenvald & Dixon 2006).

At the end of the first part of the dissertation, I tried to trace back to what an original PseCo might have looked like by looking at the hierarchies that regulate the occurrence of PseCo according to which V1s are more likely to be allowed in the construction, in what Moods, Tenses and Persons, in combination with which V2s, and whether with an original andative meaning or with an exhortative/inchoative/emphatic meaning entailing no motion at all.

Here are some of the conclusions that it is possible to draw from what has been discussed in this dissertation about Sicilian PseCo in general:

- a) PseCo is a very productive construction which can occur in different configurations across Sicily, according to (at least) the following parameters of microvariation: the selection of V1, the selection of V2, the Mood/Tense/Person restrictions, the grammaticalisation of V1 as an aspect marker serving different purposes, the presence of the connecting element *a* (cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2015; Di Caro 2019);
- b) As already noted by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003) for Marsalese, and confirmed by Cruschina (2013) for Mussomelese and by Todaro & Del Prete (2019) for Trapanese, PseCo is always monoclausal, i.e. it responds positively to different monoclausality diagnostics, such as the impossible insertion of sentential adverbs or floating quantifiers between V1 and V2, clitic climbing onto the V1, the single event interpretation of V1 and V2 so that V2 cannot be negated independently, obligatory *phi*-features sharing between the two verbs, impossible inversion between the two verbs, extremely reduced argument structure projection by V1;<sup>113</sup>
- c) PseCo is a defective construction, in the sense that it occurs only in a limited number of Mood, Tense and Person configurations. The InfCo replaces PseCo in the unavailable cells of the paradigms, e.g. in the 1PL and the 2PL of the Indicative Present and in the 2PL of the Imperative (in most dialects), and more generally in any paradigm of compound Tenses (including when V1 is preceded by a modal verb). Nevertheless, PseCo is so productive that when it can co-occur with the InfCo (i.e. when a given cell of the paradigm is available and all the monoclausality conditions

---

<sup>113</sup> I have tested most of these monoclausality diagnostics with positive results in informants of all the Sicilian dialects dealt with in this dissertation.

are respected), it is usually preferred by the speakers. The productivity of PseCo is further confirmed by the fact that even those dialects of the North-East corner of Sicily (broadly corresponding to the province of Messina) in which the FinCo is the favourite option, PseCo is preferred in the Imperative 2SG;

- d) The available V1s belong to a restricted class of restructuring verbs. This class generally contains the most basic motion verbs GO and COME and the causative motion verb SEND. Most varieties also select COME BY and some of them COME BACK as V1, the latter normally being used as an iterative marker. A very limited number of varieties also feature the inchoative V1 START. All other possible V1s seems to be dialect-specific (see also Di Caro & Giusti 2015; Di Caro 2019);
- e) The selection of V2 displays less restrictions than that of V1. All the transitive verbs that are compatible with the semantics of motion of V1 are normally allowed as V2s (this condition is not necessary when V1 grammaticalises as an aspect marker). Intransitive V2s are generally allowed as well. However, some varieties, such as Palermitan (cf. Sorrisi 2010), allow for intransitive V2s only with a highly restricted paradigm (see Section 4.4). Finally, Deliano displays a PseCo in the Indicative Preterite where V2s are taken from a restricted class of verbs, such as *fari* ‘do/make’ and *diri* ‘say/tell’, displaying stem alternation between perfective and non-perfective forms (see Section 5.4 and the list in (162));
- f) PseCo can be used cross-linguistically to convey the so-called Surprise Effect (cf. Sornicola 1976; Cruschina 2013; Wiklund 2009; Josefsson 2014), which expresses the speaker’s astonishment, wonder, regret or irritation with regard to the fact that is being told. The Surprise Effect in Sicilian PseCo is obtained with V1 GO, which loses its semantics of motion. When it occurs in the Indicative Present, it can also refer to a past event. When not used as an emphatic marker, V1 GO in the Indicative Present PseCo can still lose its andative meaning to become an inchoative marker. Furthermore, in the Imperative, this V1 can be used as an exhortative marker (see Section 4.6). In this case, again, no motion is involved and the Imperative PseCo has the same meaning of its V2.

In the second part of this dissertation, I presented the making of and the results of a quantitative study concerning the PseCo found in Deliano, a variety of Central Sicily which belongs to Type 2 (where PseCo is available only in the Imperative, in the Indicative Present and in the Indicative Preterite). The study, which has involved 70 subjects covering a very wide age range (from 11-year-old participant to over-75-year-old participants), was conducted through a questionnaire mainly based on grammaticality judgements and was preceded by preliminary fieldwork by means of oral interviews to fine-tune the items of the questionnaire.

The study aimed at determining whether some expected combinations of grammatical and ungrammatical slots of the paradigms, referred to as the N-Pattern and the W-Pattern (see Section 6.2.1), would emerge consistently. The study was also aimed at assessing the role of some demographic factors, above all age, on the emergence of the expected patterns, with two predictions: i) that PseCo (whether or not occurring in the expected patterns) would be less used among younger speakers, on the presumed pressure exerted by the Infinitival Construction, which is the only available construction in Italian, and, more specifically, ii) that the N-Pattern in the Imperative and in the Indicative Present, and the W-Pattern in the Indicative Preterite would emerge more consistently among older speakers.

The results highlighted the emergence of the expected patterns and, more generally, the high vitality of PseCo among Deliano speakers, especially in the Imperative and in the Indicative Preterite. Nevertheless, the results did not confirm the research hypotheses, in the sense that age could not be taken as a crucial factor, as the answers of younger speakers were not significantly different than those of older speakers in many cases. This was particularly evident in the case of the Imperative and the Indicative Preterite. With this respect, neither the level of education of the participants, nor their level of Delianity (see Section 6.1.3) proved to play a role in the participants' grammaticality judgements. The role of the frequency of use of the verbs involved, which seems to be a reasonable alternative factor to explain for the productivity of PseCo in younger speakers, needs to be tested in a dedicated questionnaire.

More in detail, the following are some of the conclusions that it is possible to draw from the results of this quantitative study in Deliano:

- a) PseCo in Deliano is generally highly productive among speakers of the entire age range (which spanned from 11 to 80-year-old participants). During the questionnaire, the participants hardly ever showed uncertainty in judging the sentences containing PseCo as either grammatical or ungrammatical (see Table 38 and the discussion in Section 6.4);

- b) PseCo in the Indicative Present displays the N-Pattern consistently, but a difference is found in the participants' answers between the PseCo with V1 GO, where the pattern emerged more robustly (80% of the sample), and that with V1 COME (68.6% of the sample). This calls for a more fine-grained questionnaire that includes the other main V1s (i.e. SEND and COME BY) to ascertain whether the emergence of the N-Pattern in the Indicative Present could be connected to the hierarchy of the selection of V1 (i.e. GO > COME > SEND > COME BY...) discussed in Section 4.2, so that the lower a V1 is in that hierarchy, the less likely the N-Pattern will emerge;
- c) The N-Pattern in the Imperative was tested with V1 GO and emerged almost unanimously. The fact that all the 70 participants accepted PseCo in the Imperative 2SG seems to confirm the supremacy of the Imperative in the hierarchy that regulates the selection of Moods and Tenses in PseCo (i.e. Imperative > Indicative Present > Indicative Preterite > Indicative Imperfect > Subjunctive Imperfect), as discussed in Section 4.3;
- d) Surprisingly, the W-Pattern, which in the study was tested with the V1 GO, emerged consistently across the entire age range of the sample, outscoring the N-Pattern in the Indicative Present. This fact further proves the high productivity of PseCo in Deliano. The only V2 tested in a fully-fledged paradigm was DO. The high frequency of this V1 could explain for the robust results recorded. A dedicated questionnaire is needed to test the other available V2s in the Indicative Preterite (listed in (162)) and see if the frequency of use of those verbs affects the emergence of the W-Pattern.

To conclude, I hope that this quantitative survey, despite all the weaknesses that a study concerning Sicilian PseCo with no precedents necessarily has, could inspire analogous surveys in other Sicilian varieties. I also hope that this dissertation, and in particular Chapter 4 with all the new insights on PseCo discussed there, could suggest new avenues for further research, so to have a clearer picture of this very intricate and intriguing phenomenon.

## References

- Aasen, Ivar (1848). *Det Norske Folkesprogs Grammatik*. Kristiania (Oslo): Trykt hos Werner & Comp.
- Accattoli, Matilde & Todaro, Giuseppina. 2017. “Verbes de mouvement et grammaticalisation: Le cas du sicilien vaffazzu”. In Velinova, Malinka (ed.), *Normes et grammaticalisation: Le cas des langues romanes*. 187-210. Sofia: CU Romanistika.
- Ackerman, Farrell & Stump, Gregory. 2004. “Paradigms and periphrastic expression: a study in realization-based lexicalism”. In Spencer, Andrew & Sadler, Louisa (eds), *Projecting Morphology*. 111-57. Stanford (California): Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 1999. “Serial verb constructions and verb compounding: evidence from Tariana (North Arawak)”. *Studies in Language* 23. 469-508.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. “Serial Verb Constructions in Typological in Typological Perspective”. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, Robert M. W. (eds). 2006. *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. 1-68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2011. “Multi-verb Constructions: Setting the Scene”. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Muysken, Pieter C. (eds), *Multi-verb Constructions: A View from the Americas*. 1-26. Leiden: BRILL.
- AIS. Jaberg, Karl & Jakob Jud. 1928–1940. *Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz*, 8 voll., Zofingen: Ringier.
- Amenta, Luisa & Strudsholm, Erling. 2002. “Andare a + infinito in italiano: Parametri di variazione sincronici e diacronici”. *Cuadernos de Filologia Italiana* 9. 11-29.
- Andriani, Luigi. 2007. *The Syntax of the Dialect of Bari*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Anward, Jan. 1988. “Verb-verb agreement in Swedish”. In Fekete, Denise & Laubitz, Zofia (eds), *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics: Special Issue on Comparative Germanic Syntax*. 1–34. Montréal: McGill University.
- Arnaiz, Alfredo & Camacho, José. 1999. “A Topic Auxiliary in Spanish”. In Gutiérrez-Rexach, Javier & Martínez-Gil, Fernando (eds), *Advances in Hispanic Linguistics. Papers from the 2nd Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*. 317-331. Somerville (Massachusetts): Cascadilla Press.
- Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by Itself*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): The MIT Press.
- Ascoli, Graziadio I. 1896. “Un problema di sintassi comparata dialettale”. *Archivio glottologico italiano*, 14: 453-468.

- Ascoli, Graziadio I. 1901. "Appendice all'articolo Un problema di sintassi comparata dialettale". *Archivio glottologico italiano*, 15: 221-225.
- ASinEs. 2015. Cerrudo, Alba, Gallego, Ángel J., Pineda, Anna & Roca, Francesc "ASinEs: Prolegómenos de un atlas de la variación sintáctica del español". *Linguamática* 7.2. 59-69.
- ATP. *Archivio per lo studio delle tradizioni popolari italiane*.
- Austin, John Langshaw. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): Harvard University Press.
- Badawi, El-Said, Carter, Michael G. & Gully, Adrian. 2004. *Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, Mark. 1989. "Object sharing in serial verb constructions". *Linguistic Inquiry* 20. 513-553.
- Baker, Mark. 1991. "On the Relation of Serialization to Verb Extensions". In Lefebvre, Claire (ed.), *Serial verbs: grammatical, comparative and cognitive approaches*. 79-103. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bámgbósé, Ayò. 1974. "On serial verb constructions and verbal status", *Journal of West African Languages* 9. 17-48.
- Bard, Ellen Gurman, Robertson, Dan & Sorace, Antonella. 1996. "Magnitude Estimation of Linguistic Acceptability". *Language* 72 (1): 32-68.
- Belletti, Adriana. 1990. *Generalized Verb Movement*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Benmamoun, Elabbas. 2000. *The Feature Structure of Functional Categories: A Comparative Study of Arabic Dialects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bertoni, Giulio. 1916. *Italia dialettale*. Milan: Hoepli.
- Biberauer, Theresa. 2017. *Pseudo-coordination in a hybrid system: (parametric) insights from Afrikaans*. Paper presented at the PseCoMAC (Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions) 2017 Workshop. Venice: Ca' Foscari University of Venice.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Roberts, Ian. 2012. "Towards a Parameter Hierarchy for Auxiliaries: Diachronic Considerations". *Paper presented at DGfS*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Vikner, Sten. 2015. *Pseudo-coordination in Danish and Afrikaans*. SyntaxLab, Dept. of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics University of Cambridge, 19.05.2015.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Vikner, Sten. 2017. "Having the edge: a new perspective on pseudo-coordination in Danish and Afrikaans". In: LaCara, Nicholas, Moulton, Keir & Tessier, Anne-Michelle (eds). *A Schrifft to Fest Kyle Johnson*. Linguistics Open Access Publications 1. 77-90. ([http://scholarworks.umass.edu/linguist\\_oapubs/1](http://scholarworks.umass.edu/linguist_oapubs/1)).
- Bichelli, Pirro. 1974. *Grammatica del dialetto napoletano*. Bari: Edizioni Pégaso.

- Bjerre, Anne & Bjerre, Tavs. 2007. "Pseudocoordination in Danish." In Müller, Stefan (ed.), *Proceedings of the HPSG07*. 6–24. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Bjorkman, Bronwyn Moore. 2009. *The syntax of syncretism*. Talk given at the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 20), MIT.
- Bohnemeyer, Jürgen, Enfield, Nick, Essegbey, James & Sotaro, Kita. 2011. "The Macro-Event property: The segmentation of causal chains". In Jürgen Bohnemeyer & Eric Pederson (eds), *Event representation in language and cognition*. 43-67. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Dunstan, Chumakina, Marina, Corbett, Greville G., Popova Gergana & Spencer, Andrew. 2012. "Defining "periphrasis": key notions". *Morphology* 22(2): 233-275.
- Bybee, Joan Lea. 2003. "Mechanisms of Change in Grammaticalization: The Role of Frequency". In Janda, Richard & Joseph, Brian (eds), *Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. 602-23. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bybee, Joan Lea. 2007. *Frequency of Use and the Organization of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bybee, Joan Lea, Perkins, Revere Dale & Pagliuca, William. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Calabrese, Andrea. 1993. "The sentential complementation of Salentino: A study of a language without infinitival clauses". In Belletti, Adriana (ed.), *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*. 28-98. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Carden, Guy & Pesetsky, David. 1977. "Double-Verb Constructions, Markedness, and a Fake Coordination". *Papers from the Thirteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. 82-92.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 2004. "Toward a cartography of subject positions", in Rizzi, Luigi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP, The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*. 115-165. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giusti, Giuliana. 1998. "Motion verbs as functional heads", *GenGenP* 6.1, 50-60.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giusti, Giuliana. 2001. "Semi-lexical Motion Verbs in Romance and Germanic". In *Semi-lexical categories*, Norbert Corver & Henk Van Riemsdijk (eds), 371-414. Berlin: De Gruyter.



- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giusti, Giuliana. 2003. "Motion Verbs as Functional Heads". In *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, Christina Tortora (ed), 31-49. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giusti, Giuliana. 2019. "Multiple Agreement in Southern Italian Dialects". In Franco, Ludovico & Lorusso Paolo (eds), *Linguistic Variations: Structure and Interpretation - Studies in Honor of M. Rita Manzini*, SGG. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Shlonsky, Ur. 2004. "Clitic positions and restructuring in Italian", *Linguistic Inquiry* 35.4, 519-557.
- Caubet, Dominique. 1993. *L'arabe Marocaine*. 2 vols. Leuven / Paris: Peters.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1998. "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework". *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 15.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. "Derivation by phase". In Kenstowicz, Michael (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in linguistics*. 1-52. Cambridge (Massachusetts): MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2001. "Restructuring and the Order of Aspectual and Root Modal Heads". In Cinque, Guglielmo & Salvi, Paolo (eds), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. 137-155. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2003. "The Interaction of Passive, Causative, and Restructuring in Romance". In Tortora, Christina (ed.), *The Syntax of Italian dialects*. 50-66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004. "Restructuring and Functional Structure". In Belletti, Adriana (ed.), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structure, vol. 3*. 132-191. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2006. *Restructuring and Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structure, vol. 4*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clifton, Charles Jr., Fanselow, Gisbert & Frazier, Lyn. 2006. "Amnestying Superiority Violations: Processing Multiple Questions". *Linguistic Inquiry* 37 (1):51-68.
- Colasuonno, Giovanni. 1976. *Grammatica e lessico etimologico del dialetto di Grumo Appula*. Cassano Murge: Tipografia Meridionale.
- Collins, Chris. 1997. "Argument sharing in serial verb constructions". *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 3. 461-497.

- Collins, Chris, Guitard, Stephanie & Wood, Jim. 2009. "Imposters: An online survey of grammaticality judgements". In Irwin, Patricia & Vázquez Rojas Maldonado, Violeta (eds), *NYU Working Papers in Linguistics*, Volume 2. New York: New York University Press.
- Conq. 1954. Rossi-Taibbi, Giuseppe (ed.), *La Conquista di Sicilia fatta per li Normandi translata per frati Simuni da Lentini* («Collezione», 5). Palermo: Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani.
- Corbett, Greville G. 2015. "Morphosyntactic complexity: A typology of lexical splits", *Language* 91.1, 145-193.
- Cordin, Patrizia. 1997. "Tense, mood and aspect in the verb". In Maiden, Martin & Parry, Mair (eds), *The Dialects of Italy*. 87-98. London / New York: Routledge.
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1966. "'Tomo y me voy'. Ein Problem Vergleichender Europäischer Syntax". *Vox Romanica: Annales Helvetici Explorandis Linguis Romanicis Destinati* 25. 13–55.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2013. "Beyond the Stem and Inflectional Morphology: an Irregular Pattern at the Level of Periphrasis". In Cruschina, Silvio, Maiden, Martin & Smith, John Charles (eds), *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology*. 262-283. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2018. "The 'go for' construction in Sicilian". In D'Alessandro, Roberta & Pescarini, Diego (eds), *Advances in Italian Dialectology: Sketches of Italo-Romance grammars*. 292-320. Leiden: Brill.
- Culicover, Peter W. & Jackendoff, Ray. 1997. "Semantic Subordination despite Syntactic Coordination". *Linguistic Inquiry* 28 (2). 195-217.
- Damonte, Federico. 2005. "La diffusione della particella 'mi' in alcune varietà messinesi: problemi di metodo". In Marcato, Gianna (ed.), *Dialetti in città: Atti del convegno Sappada/Plodn (Belluno) 30 giugno – 4 luglio 2004*. 237-242. Padua: Unipress.
- Damonte, Federico. 2009. "La particella *mu* nei dialetti calabresi meridionali". In Pescarini Diego (ed.), *Quaderni di lavoro ASIIt, 9. Studi sui dialetti della Calabria*. 101-117. Padua: Unipress.
- Damonte, Federico. 2010. "Matching Moods: Mood Concord between CP and IP in Salentino and Southern Calabrian Subjunctive Complements". In Benincà, Paola & Munaro, Nicola (eds), *Mapping the Left Periphery. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 5*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.
- De Angelis, Alessandro. 2016. "Origini formali e funzionali della particella (m)i, (m)u, ma nell'area messinese e calabrese centro-meridionale." In Del Puente, Patrizia (ed.), *Dialetti: per parlare e parlarne. Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Dialettologia. Progetto A.L.Ba. (Potenza, Castelmezzano, Lagopesole, 6–8 novembre 2014)*. 75-95. Venosa: Osanna Edizioni.

- De Angelis, Alessandro. 2017. "Between Greek and Romance: Competing complementation systems in Southern Italy". In Piera Molinelli (ed.) *Language and Identity in Multilingual Mediterranean settings. Challenges for Historical Sociolinguistics*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter. 135-156.
- De Angelis, Alessandro & Krstić, Milena. 2014. "Perdita dell'infinito e obviation effect in alcune varietà slave e italo-romanze: per un'analisi contrastiva". In Ivica Pesa Matracki, Maslina Ljubicic, Nada Zupanovic Filipin, Vinko Kovacic (eds) *Atti del Convegno internazionale in onore del Prof. Zarko Muljacic (1922-2009)*. Zagreb: FF-press. 249-260.
- De Bo, Leonard Lodewijk. 1873. *Westvlaamsch Idioticon*. Bruges: Boek- & Steendrukkerij Edw. Gailliard & Comp.
- Déchainé, Rose-Marie. 1993. "Serial Verb Constructions". In Jacobs, Joachim, von Stechow, Armin, Sternefeld, Wolfgang & Venneman, Theo (eds) *Syntax, an International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, vol. 1. 799-825. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- De Dardel, Robert. 1958. *Le parfait fort en roman commun*. Geneva: Droz.
- De Gregorio, Giacomo. 1899. "Sopra un problema di sintassi comparata dialettale". *Studi glottologici italiani*, I. Turin: Ermanno Loescher Editore.
- De Marco, Michele. 1984. *Il teatro*. Loricca: Mide "Associazione culturale Michele De Marco".
- De Mauro, Tullio, Mancini, Federico, Vedovelli, Massimo & Voghera, Miriam. 1993. *Lessico di frequenza dell'italiano parlato*. Milan: Etaslibri.
- De Vos, Mark. 2005. *The syntax of verbal pseudocoordination in English and Afrikaans*. LOT Dissertation Series 114. Utrecht: LOT.
- Devos, Maud & Van der War, Jenneke. 2014. *COME and GO off the Beaten Grammaticalization Path*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2015. *Syntactic Constructions with Motion Verbs in Some Sicilian Dialects: a Comparative Analysis*. Master's Degree Dissertation. Ca' Foscari University of Venice.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2018. "Multiple Agreement Constructions: A Macro-Comparative Analysis of Pseudo-Coordination with the Motion Verb Go in the Arabic and Sicilian Dialects". *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*. Bucharest: University of Bucharest.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2019. "The Inflected Construction in the dialects of Sicily: parameters of micro-variation". In Cruschina, Silvio, Ledgeway, Adam & Remberger, Eva-Maria (eds) *Italian Dialectology at the Interface*. 63-78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò & El Hansali, Asmaa. 2017. *Multiple agreement verbal constructions with 'go' in the Arabic and Sicilian dialects*. Poster presented at the PseCoMAC (Pseudo-

- Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions) 2017 Workshop. Venice: Ca' Foscari University of Venice.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò & Giusti, Giuliana. 2015. "A Protocol for the Inflected Construction in Sicilian Dialects". *Annali di Ca' Foscari, Serie Occidentale*, vol. 49. 393-422.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò & Giusti, Giuliana. 2018. "Dimensions of variation: the Inflected Construction in the dialect of Delia (Caltanissetta)". In Repetti, Lori & Ordóñez, Francisco (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 14. Selected papers from the 46th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)*, Stony Brook, New York. 54-68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1946. *Elementær Dansk Grammatik*. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, Nordisk Forlag.
- Donaldson, Bruce C. 1993. *A grammar of Afrikaans*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Donhauser, Karin. 1982. "Ein Typ Mit und Koordinierter Imperative Des Deutschen". *Sprachwissenschaft* 7 (2). 220-252.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Thornton, Anna. 1991. "Doppie basi e binarismo nella morfologia italiana". *Rivista di Linguistica* 3.1. 3-22.
- Durie, Mark. 1997. "Grammatical structures in verb serialisation". In Alsina, Alex, Bresnan, Joan & Sells, Peter (eds), *Complex Predicates*. 289-354. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Ebert, Karen H. 2000. "Progressive Markers in Germanic Languages." In Dahl, Östen (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. 605-653. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Egerland, Verner. 2009. "La doppia base della ristrutturazione". In Cardinaletti, Anna & Munaro, Nicola (eds), *Italiano, italiani regionali e dialetti*. 99-114. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Gallucci, Luigi. 1862. *Raccolta di poesie calabre*. Lugano.
- GDLI. Battaglia, Salvatore. 1961. *Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana*, vol. I. Turin: UTET.
- George, Isaac. 1975. "Verb Serialization and Lexical Decomposition", in *Studies in African Linguistics*, supplement 6. 63-72.
- Gherardini, Giovanni. 1838. *Voci e maniere di dire italiane additate a' futuri vocabolaristi*, vol. I. Milan: G. B. Bianchi.
- Giorgi, Alessandra & Pianesi, Fabio. 1995. *Tense and Aspect. From Semantics to Morphosyntax*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.
- Giorgi, Alessandra & Pianesi, Fabio. 2004. "Complementizer Deletion in Italian". In Rizzi, Luigi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP, The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*. 190-210. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Giusti, Giuliana. 2011. "Structural Protocols for Linguistic Awareness Enhancing Language Identity" [online]. Research project at CRASSH. University of Cambridge, October-December 2011. Available at <http://www.crassh.cam.ac.uk/people/profile/giuliana-giusti>.
- Giusti, Giuliana & Iovino, Rossella. 2016. "A protocol for Psych Verbs". *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 18 (2). Bucharest: University of Bucharest.
- Giusti, Giuliana & Zegrean, Iulia. 2015. "Syntactic Protocols to Enhance Inclusive Cultural Identity: A Case Study on Istro-Romanian Clausal Structure". *Quaderni di linguistica e studi orientali*, 1. 129-150.
- Gleitman, Lila R. 1965. "Coordinating Conjunctions in English". *Language* 41 (2). 260-293.
- Gonçalves, Bruno & Sánchez, David. 2014. "Crowdsourcing Dialect Characterization through Twitter". *PLoS ONE* 9 (11): e112074.
- Hagemeyer, Tjerk. 2001. "Underspecification in serial verb constructions". In Corver, Norbert & van Riemsdijk, Henk, *Semi-lexical Categories*. 415-451. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Harris, Alice C. & Campbell, Lyle. 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2007. "Coordination". In Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. 2. 1-51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd. 1993. *Auxiliaries. Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heycock, Caroline & Petersen, Hjalmar. 2012. "Pseudo-coordinations in Faroese". in Braunmüller, Kurt & Gabriel, Christoph (eds), *Multilingual individuals and multilingual societies. Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism*, vol. 13. 259-280. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Holmberg, Anders. 1986. *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian languages and English*. Ph.D. thesis. Stockholm: University of Stockholm.
- Holmberg, Anders. 1990. "On bare infinitivals in Swedish". In Mascaró, Joan & Nespor, Marina (eds), *Grammar in progress: GLOW essays for Henk van Riemsdijk*. 237-245. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003. *Grammaticalization* (second edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, Dell. 1962. "The Ethnography of Speaking". In Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.) *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. 99-138. The Hague: De Gruyter Mouton.

- Jaeggli, Osvaldo & Hyams, Nina. 1993. "On the Independence and Interdependence of Syntactic and Morphological Properties: English Aspectual Come and Go". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 11. 313-346.
- Jarad, Najib Ismail. 2014. "The Grammaticalization of the Motion Verb "Raḥ" as a Prospective Aspect Marker in Syrian Arabic". *Al-‘Arabiyya*, vol. 47. 101-118.
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi. 1998. *Coordination*. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jóhannsdóttir, Kristín M. 2011. *Aspects of the Progressive in English and Icelandic*. Ph.D. dissertation. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2429/37100>.
- Johnsen, Lars. 1988. "A note on subcoordination". *Trondheim Working Papers in Linguistics*, 6. 195-201. Trondheim: University of Trondheim.
- Johnson, Kyle. 2013. Licensing Ellipsis. Ms. University of Massachusetts, Amherst (Massachusetts). <http://people.umass.edu/kbj/homepage/Content/amalgams.pdf>.
- Jørgensen, Annette Myre. 2003. "La Pseudocoordination Verbale En Norvégien et En Espagnol". *Revue Romane* 38 (1). 53-66.
- Joseph, Brian & Zwicky, Arnold (eds). 1990. "When Verbs Collide: Papers from the Ohio State Mini-Conference on Serial Verbs». *Working papers in Linguistics*, 39. Columbus (Ohio).
- Josefsson, Günlog. 1991. "Pseudocoordination - A VP + VP coordination". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 47. 130-156.
- Josefsson, Günlog. 2014. "Pseudo-coordination in Swedish with gå 'go' and the 'surprise effect'". Lund University.
- Keniston, Hayward. 1936. "Verbal Aspect in Spanish". *Hispania*, 2. 163-176.
- Kjeldahl, Anne. 2010. *The syntax of quirky verbal morphology*. Ph.D. dissertation. Aarhus: University of Aarhus.
- Korhonen, Kalle. 2012. "Contatti linguistici negli atti notarili italo-greci siciliani". In Sornicola, Rosanna & Greco, Paolo (eds), together with Giovanna Pianese, *La lingua dei documenti notarili alto-medievali dell'Italia meridionale. Bilancio degli studi e prospettive di ricerca*. 127-142. Naples: Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti, Tavolario edizioni.
- Kuteva, Tania A. 1999. "On sit/stand/lie auxiliation". *Linguistics* 37(2). 191–213.
- Kvist Darnell, Ulrika. 2008. *Pseudosamordningar i Svenska: särskilt sådana med verbena sitta, ligga och stå*. Ph.D dissertation, Stockholm: Institutionen för lingvistik, Stockholms universitet. <http://www.divaportal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:198403>.
- Lakoff, George. 1986. "Frame Semantic Control of the Coordinate Structure Constraint". *Chicago Linguistics Society* 22 (2). 152-168.

- Larson, Richard K. 1988. "On the Double Object Construction". *Linguistic Inquiry* 19. 335-391.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. 1969. *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft: Einleitung und Vokalismus*, 3 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 1998. "Variation in the Romance infinitive: the case of Southern Calabrian inflected infinitive". In *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 96: 1-61.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2007. "Diachrony of finiteness: subordination in the dialects of Southern Italy". In Nikolaeva, Irina A. (ed.), *Finiteness: theoretical and empirical foundations*. 335-365. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. "Contatto e mutamento: complementazione e complementatori nei dialetti del Salento". In Benedetti, Marina (ed.), *Lingue e grammatiche. Contatti, divergenze, confronti*, numero speciale di *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata*, 41, 3. 459-480.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2013. "Greek disguised as Romance? The case of Southern Italy". In Janse, Mark, Joseph, Brian D., Ralli, Angela, Bağrıaçık, Metin (eds), *Proceedings of the 5th international conference on Greek dialects and linguistic theory*. 184-228. Patras: Laboratory of Modern Greek dialects, University of Patras.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2015. "Reconstructing complementiser-drop in the dialects of the Salento: a syntactic or phonological phenomenon?" In Biberauer, Theresa & Walkden, George (eds), *Syntax over time: Lexical, morphological, and information-structural interactions*. 146-162. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2016. "From coordination to subordination: The grammaticalization of progressive and andative aspect in the dialects of Salento". In Pratas, Fernanda, Pereira, Sandra & Pinto, Clara (eds), *Coordination and Subordination. Form and Meaning. Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*. 157-184. Newcastle: Cambridge Publishing Scholars.
- Lee, Sook-Hee. 1992. *The Syntax and Semantics of Serial Verb Constructions*. Ph.D. dissertation. Seattle (Washington): University of Washington.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995. *Thought on Grammaticalization. LINCOS Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*. Munich: LINCOS Europa.
- Leone, Alfonso. 1973. "Vattel'a pesca, vieni a piglialo". *Lingua Nostra*, 34. 11-13.
- Leone, Alfonso. 1978. "Sullo scadimento semantico di andare". *Lingua Nostra*, 39. 50-54.
- Leone, Alfonso. 1995. *Profilo di sintassi siciliana*. Palermo: Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani.
- Leslau, Wolf. 1970. "The ma-Clause in Harari." In Cohen, David (ed.), *Mélanges Marcel Cohen: Études de Linguistique, Ethnographie et Sciences Connexes Offertes Par Ses Amis et Ses*

- Élèves À L'occasion de Son 80 Ème Anniversaire: Avec Des Articles et Études Inédits de Marcel Cohen.* 263-273. The Hague / Paris: Mouton.
- Lillas-Schuil, Rosmari. 2006. "A Survey of Syntagms in the Hebrew Bible Classified as Hendiadys". In Edzard, Lutz & Retsö, Jan (eds), *Current Issues in the Analysis of Semitic Grammar and Lexicon II: Oslo-Göteborg Cooperation 4th-5th November 2005.* 79-100. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Lillas, Rosmari. 2012. *Hendiadys in the Hebrew Bible. An Investigation of the Applications of the Term.* Ph.D. dissertation, Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/2077/29024>.
- LIP. 1993. De Mauro, Tullio, Mancini, Federico, Vedovelli, Massimo & Voghera, Miriam. *Lessico di frequenza dell'italiano parlato.* Milan: Etaslibri.
- Lopez, Davide. 1915. *Canti baresi.* Bari.
- Lødrup, Helge. 2002. "The Syntactic Structures of Norwegian Pseudocoordinations". *Studia Linguistica* 56 (2). 121-43.
- Magni, Elisabetta. 2001. "Paradigm organization and lexical connections in the development of the Italian *passato remoto*". In Booij, Geert & van Marle, Jaap (eds), *Yearbook of Morphology 1999.* 75-96. Dordrecht: Springer (originally published by Kluwer Academic Publishers in 2001).
- Maiden, Martin. 1995. *A Linguistic History of Italian.* London: Longman.
- Maiden, Martin. 2004. "When lexemes become allomorphs. On the genesis of suppletion". *Folia Linguistica* 38 (3-4). 227-256.
- Maiden, Martin. 2005. "Morphological autonomy and diachrony". In Booij, Geert. & Van Marle, Jaap. (eds), *Yearbook of Morphology 2004.* 137-175.
- Maiden, Martin. 2011. 'Morphological persistence', in Maiden, Martin, Smith, John Charles & Ledgeway, Adam (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages, Vol. 1.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 155-215.
- Maiden, Martin & O'Neill, Paul. 2010. "On morphomic defectiveness: evidence from the Romance languages of the Iberian Peninsula". In Baerman, Mathew, Corbett, Greville G. & Brown, Dunstan (eds), *Defective Paradigms: Missing Forms and What They Tell Us.* 103-124. Oxford: Oxford University Press & British Academy.
- Mandalari, Mario. 1881. *Canti del popolo reggino.* Naples: A. Morano.
- Manzini, Rita & Savoia, Leonardo. 2005. *I dialetti Italiani e Romanci. Morfosintassi Generativa,* vol. I: *Introduzione - Il soggetto - La struttura del complementatore, frasi interrogative, relative e aspetti della subordinazione.* Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.



- Marcato, Carla. 2007. *Dialetto, dialetti e italiano*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Marantz, Alec. 2007. "Phases and Words". In Choe, Sook-Hee (ed.), *Phases in the Theory of Grammar*. 191-222. Seoul: Dong-In Publishing Co.
- Martoglio, Nino. 1948. *Centona: Raccolta completa di poesie siciliane con l'aggiunta di alcuni componimenti inediti e di una prefazione di Luigi Pirandello* [online]. Catania: Giannotta Editore. Progetto Manuzio. Acc. Oct, 10, 2015. Available at <http://www.culturasiciliana.it/Page/poesia/martoglio%20nino/martoglio%20centona.pdf> (2015-12-01).
- Matisoff, James. A. 1969. "Verb concatenation in Lahu: the syntax and semantics of "simple" juxtaposition", *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 12. 69-120.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1895a [1890-1902]. *Grammaire des langues romanes* vol. 2, *Morphologie*. Paris: E. Welter Editeur.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1895b [1890-1902]. *Grammaire des langues romanes* vol. 3, *Syntaxe*. Paris: E. Welter Editeur.
- Mikkelsen, Kristian Mathias. 1894. *Dansk sproglære, med sproghistoriske tillæg: haandbog for lærere og viderekomne*. Copenhagen: Lehmann & Stages Forlag.
- Mikkelsen, Kristian Mathias. 1911. *Dansk Ordføjningslære*. Copenhagen: Lehmann & Stages Forlag.
- Mišeska Tomić, Olga. 2006. "Balkan Sprachbund Morphosyntactic Features". *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 67. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Munn, Alan Boag. 1993. *Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Coordinate Structures*. Ph.D. dissertation. College Park (Maryland): University of Maryland.
- NDC. Rohlf's, Gerhard. 1977. *Nuovo dizionario dialettale della Calabria*. Ravenna: Angelo Longo Editore.
- Newport, Elissa, Gleitman, Henry & Gleitman, Lila. 1977. "Mother I'd rather do it myself: Some effects and non-effects of maternal speech style". In Snow, Catherine & Ferguson, Charles (eds), *Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition*. 109-149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nordström, Jackie. 2010. *Modality and Subordinators*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ouali, Hamid & Al Bukhari Juman. 2016. "Motion light verbs in Jordanian Arabic and Moroccan Arabic". In Haddad, Youssef A. & Potsdam, Eric (eds), *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics XXVIII*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Palmer, Leonard R. 1954. *The Latin Language*. London: Faber and Faber.

- Pérez Saldanya, Manuel & Hualde, José Ignacio. 2003. "On the origin and evolution of the Catalan periphrastic preterite". In Pusch, Claus D. & Wesch, Andreas (eds), *Verbalperiphrasen in den (ibero-)romanischen Sprachen / Perífrasis verbals en les llengües (ibero-)romàniques / Perífrasis verbales en las lenguas (ibero-)románicas* [Beihefte zu Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart 9]. 47-60. Hamburg: Helmit Buske Verlag.
- Pellicciardi, Fernando. 1977. *Grammatica del dialetto romagnolo: la lèngva dla mi tèra*. Ravenna: Longo.
- Piccitto, Giorgio. 1950. "La classificazione delle parlate siciliane e la metaforesi in Sicilia". *Archivio storico per la Sicilia orientale* 3 (IV). 1-34. Catania: Società di storia patria per la Sicilia Orientale.
- Piccitto, Giorgio. 1959. *Il siciliano dialetto italiano*. Orbis VIII. 183-199.
- Pirrelli, Vito. 2000. *Paradigmi in morfologia. Un approccio interdisciplinare alla flessione verbale dell'italiano*. Pisa / Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali.
- Pitrè, Giuseppe. 1993 [1875]. *Fiabe, novelle e racconti popolari siciliani*, Voll. I-IV. Catania: Clio.
- Platzack, Christer. 1986. "Comp, Infl, and Germanic word order". In Hellan, Lars & Koch Christensen, Kirsti (eds), *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax*, 185-234. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1994. "Checking Theory and Bare Verbs". In Cinque, Guglielmo, Koster, Jan, Pollock, Jean-Yves, Rizzi, Luigi, Zanuttini, Raffaella (eds), *Paths towards universal grammar: Studies in honor of Richard S. Kayne*. 293-310. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Postma, Gertjan. 2005. "Infinitivale V2 in het Middeldreids en de Subjunctief". *Taal & Tongval*, 57 (1). 126-166.
- Postma, Gertjan. 2006. "IV2 in het Middelnederlands, IPI in het Fries en de distributie van Subjunctieven". *Taal & Tongval*, 58 (2). 205-224.
- Prantera, Nadia & Mendicino, Antonio. 2013. "Il complementatore mu/ma/mi nei dialetti meridionali estremi d'Italia: un caso complesso tra morfologia e sintassi". In Emili Casanova Herrero & Cesareo Calvo Rigual (eds), *Actas del XXVI Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y de Filología Románicas* (Valencia 6 – 11 septiembre, 2010), vol. VI. 205-2016. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter.
- Pratico, Gary Davis & Van Pelt, Miles V. 2001. *Basics of Biblical Hebrew Grammar*. Grand Rapids (Michigan): Zondervan.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1990. "Constraints on intransitive quasi-serial verb constructions in modern colloquial English". *Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics*, 39. 218-239. Columbus (Ohio): Ohio State University.

- Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Leech, Geoffrey & Svartvik, Jan. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Rainieri, Aurora. 2001. *Linee urbane*. Palermo: Prova d'Autore.
- Ramchand, Gillian Catriona. 2008. *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon: A First Phase Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ritter, Elizabeth & Rosen, Sara Th. 1996. "Strong and weak predicates: Reducing the lexical burden. *Linguistic Analysis* 26.1-2. 29-62.
- Rivero, Maria Luisa & Ralli, Angela (eds). 2001. *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1976a. "La MONTEE DU SUJET, le si impersonnel et une règle de restructuration dans la syntaxe italienne". *Recherches Linguistiques*, 4. 158-184.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1976b. "Ristrutturazione". *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 1. 1-54.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1978. "A Restructuring Rule in Italian Syntax," in Keyser, Samuel Jay (ed.), *Recent Transformational Studies in European Languages*. 113-158. Cambridge (Massachusetts): MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht / Cinnaminson: Foris Publications.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. "The fine structure of the left periphery". In Haegeman, Liliane (ed.), *Elements of Grammar. Handbook of Generative Grammar*. 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Roberts, Ian & Roussou, Anna. 2003. *Syntactic change. A minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1933. *Scavi linguistici nella Magna Grecia*. Milan / Halle (Saale): Hoepli.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1966. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti, vol. 1: Fonetica*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti, vol. 3: Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Ross, Allen P. 2001. *Introducing Biblical Hebrew*. Grand Rapids (Michigan): Baker Academic.
- Ross, Daniel. 2014. "El origen de los estudios sobre la pseudocoordinación verbal". *Diálogo de la Lengua*, VI. 116-132. ISSN: 1989-1334.
- Ross, Daniel. 2015. "What can Faroese pseudocoordination tell us about English inflection?" *LSO Working Papers in Linguistics*, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 10.
- Ross, Daniel. 2016. "Between coordination and subordination: Typological, structural and diachronic perspectives on pseudocoordination". In Pratas, Fernanda, Pereira, Sandra & Pinto,

- Clara (eds), *Coordination and Subordination. Form and Meaning. Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*. 209-243. Newcastle: Cambridge Publishing Scholars.
- Ross, Daniel. *Forthcoming. Pseudocoordination, Serial Verb Constructions and Multi-Verb Predicates: The Relationship between Form and Structure*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): MIT unpublished doctoral thesis.
- Rubin, Aaron D. 2005. *Studies in Semitic Grammaticalization*. Winona Lake (Indiana): Eisenbrauns.
- Ruffino, Giovanni. 1984. "Isoglosse siciliane". In Quattordio Moreschini, A (ed.) 1984. *Tre millenni di storia linguistica della Sicilia. Atti del Convegno della SIG, Palermo, 25-27 marzo 1983*. 161-224. Pisa: Giardini.
- Ruffino, Giovanni. 1991. *Dialetto e dialetti in Sicilia. Appunti e materiali del corso di Dialettologia Siciliana*. Palermo: CUSL.
- Ruffino, Giovanni. 1997a. *Materiali e ricerche dell'Atlante linguistico della Sicilia*. Palermo: Centro di studi filologici linguistici siciliani.
- Ruffino, Giovanni. 1997b. "Sicily". In Maiden, Martin & Parry, Mair (eds), *The Dialects of Italy*. 365-375. London / New York: Routledge.
- Ruffino, Giovanni. 2001. *Profili linguistici delle regioni. Sicilia*. Rome-Bari: Laterza.
- Sadler, Louisa & Spencer, Andrew. 2001. "Syntax as an exponent of morphological features". in Booij, Geert & van Marle, Jaap (eds), *Yearbook of Morphology 2000*. 71-96. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Salustri, Manola & Hyams, Nina. 2006. "Looking for the universal core of the RI stage". In Torrens, Vincent & Escobar, Linda (eds), *The Acquisition of Syntax in Romance Languages*. 159-182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- SAND. Barbiers, Sjef, Cornips, Leonie & Kunst, Jan Pieter. 2005. *The Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch Dialects: A Corpus of Elicited Speech and Text as an Online Dynamic Atlas*. Website: <http://www.meertens.nl/sand>.
- Sebba, Mark. 1987. *The Syntax of Serial Verbs - An investigation into serialisation in Sranan and other languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sgroi, Salvatore Claudio. 1986. *Interferenze fonologiche, morfo-sintattiche e lessicali fra l'arabo e il siciliano*. Palermo: Centro di Studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.

- Schmerling, Susan. 1975. Asymmetric conjunction and rules of conversation. In Cole, Peter & Morgan, Jerry L. (eds), *Speech Acts, vol. 3 Syntax and Semantics*. 211-231. New York: Academic Press.
- Shopen, Timothy. 1971. "Caught in the Act". *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. 254-263.
- Smith, John Charles. 2013. "The morpheme as a gradient phenomenon: evidence from Romance". In Cruschina, Silvio, Maiden, Martin & Smith John Charles (eds), *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology*. 262-283. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Sobin, Nicholas. 1987. "The variable status of Comp-trace phenomena". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5:33-60.
- Sornicola, Rosanna. 1976. "Vado a dire o vaiu a ddico problema sintattico o problema semantico?". *Lingua Nostra*, 37 (3-4). 65-74.
- Sorrento, Luigi. 1912. *Lat. mödö nel dialetto siciliano*. Madrid.
- Sorrento, Luigi. 1915. Note di sintassi siciliana. *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* 17(5-6). 101-117.
- Sorrento, Luigi. 1950. *Sintassi romanza: Ricerche e prospettive*. Milan: Istituto editoriale cisalpino.
- Sorrisi, Fabrizio. 2010. "Le costruzioni flesse con va + verbo lessicale in palermitano". In Garzonio, Jacopo (ed.), *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt*, 11. *Studi sui dialetti della Sicilia*. 111-120. Padova: Unipress.
- Spanò, Lea. 2017. *L'impopolarità dell'infinito nel dialetto di Sinagra (ME)*. BA thesis. Messina: Università degli Studi di Messina.
- Spencer, Andrew. 2001. "The paradigm-based model of morphosyntax". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 99 (2). 279-313.
- Spevak, Olga. 2010. *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Squartini, Mario. 1998. *Verbal Periphrases in Romance: Aspect, Actionality, and Grammaticalization*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stefanini, Ruggero. 1970. "Imperativo per infinito in fiorentino". *Lingua Nostra*, 31. 19-20.
- Stockwell, Richard. 2015. *Emergent Syntax: Insights from Imperatives*. M.Phil dissertation. University of Cambridge.
- Stoett, Frederik August. 1889. *Proeve eener beknopte middelnederlandsche syntaxis*. Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.  
<http://archive.org/details/proeveeenerbekn00stoegoog>.

- Storm, Johan. 1879. *Engelsk filologi: Anvisning til et videnskabeligt studium af det engelske sprog for studerende, laerere og viderekomne*. Kristiania (Oslo): A. Cammermeyer.  
<http://archive.org/details/engelskfilologi00storgoog>.
- Strumbo, Maria Chiara. 1996. "I costrutti della frase dipendente in alcuni dialetti meridionali". In *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Linguistica dell'Università di Firenze*, 7. 137-155.
- Taube, Moshe. *Forthcoming*. "Verbal Hendiadys in Yiddish". In Jacobs, Neil G., Aronson, Howard I. & Shannon, T. (eds). *Yiddish and Typology*.  
[http://ling.huji.ac.il/Staff/Moshe\\_Taube/docs/Hendiadys.pdf](http://ling.huji.ac.il/Staff/Moshe_Taube/docs/Hendiadys.pdf).
- Taylor, Catherine. 2011. "Periphrasis in Romance". In Maiden, Martin, Smith, John Charles, Goldbach, Maria & Hinzelin, Marc-Olivier (eds), *Morphological Autonomy: Perspectives from Romance Inflectional Morphology*. 401-416. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tekavčić, Pavao. 1980. *Grammatica storica dell'italiano*, vol. 2 *Morfosintassi*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Teleman, Ulf. 1974. *Manual för grammatisk beskrivning av talad och skriven svenska*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Thornton, Anna. 2007. "Is there a partition in the present indicative of Italian regular verbs?". *Annali Online di Ferrara – Lettere* 2. 43-61.
- Todaro, Giuseppina & Del Prete, Fabio. 2019. "The morphosyntax-semantics interface and the Sicilian Doubly Inflected Construction". In Cruschina, Silvio, Ledgeway, Adam & Remberger, Eva-Maria (eds) *Italian Dialectology at the Interface*. 131-154. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tonne, Ingebjørg. 2001. *Progressives in Norwegian and the theory of aspectuality*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Oslo.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Trousdale, Graeme. 2010. *Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tropea, Giovanni. 1988. *Lessico del dialetto di Pantelleria*. Palermo: Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani.
- Vagstad, Daniel. 2010. *Norske pseudokoordinasjoner*. MA thesis, University of Bergen.
- Van Helten, Willem Lodewijk. 1881. *Vondel's Taal: Eene Proeve van Onderzoek Naar de Grammatica van Het Nederlandsch Der Zeventiende Eeuw*. Rotterdam: Otto Petri.
- Vannebo, Kjell Ivar. 2003. "Ta Og Ro Deg Ned Noen Hakk: On Pseudocoordination with the Verb Ta 'take' in a Grammaticalization Perspective". *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26 (2). 165-93.
- Vàrvaro, Alberto. 1988. "Aree linguistiche IV. Sicilia". In Holtus, Günther, Metzeltin, Michael & Schmitt, Christian. (eds). 1988-2005. *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik* 4. 716-731. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

- Vespucci, Gerardo. 1994. *Terra nostra*. Piano Lago: Nuova Comunità.
- Vincent, Nigel. 1987. "The interaction of periphrasis and inflection: some Romance examples". In Harris, Martin & Ramat, Paolo (eds), *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*. 237-256. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vincent, Nigel. 2011. "Non-finite forms, periphrases, and autonomous morphology in Latin and Romance". In Maiden, Martin, Smith, John Charles, Goldbach, Maria & Hinzelin, Marc-Olivier (eds), *Morphological Autonomy: Perspectives from Romance Inflectional Morphology*. 417-435. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1920. *Vorlesungen über Syntax: mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Basel: Verlag Emil Birkhäuser & Cie.
- Waddy, Virginia. 1889. *Elements of Composition and Rhetoric with Copious Exercises in Both Criticism and Construction*. Cincinnati / New York: Eclectic Press, Van Antwerp, Bragg and Company.
- Weber, Albert. 1964. *Zürichdeutsche Grammatik, ein Wegweiser zur guten Mundart*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Zurich: Schweizer Spiegel Verlag.
- Weisser, Philipp. 2015. *Derived Coordination. A Minimalist Perspective on Clause Chains, Converbs and Asymmetric Coordination*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter.
- Wiese, Berthold. 1928. *Altitalienisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 1996. "Pseudocoordination is subordination". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, 58. 29-54.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2007. *The Syntax of Tenselessness. Tense/Mood/Aspect-agreeing Infinitivals*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2008. "Creating surprise in complex predication". *Nordlyd* 35. 163-187. Tromsø University.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2009. "The syntax of surprise: Unexpected event readings in complex predication". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 84: 181-224.
- Wilson, Imogen. 1999. *Paratactic complementation in Sicilian*. Unpublished M.Phil. thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Winford, Donald. 1993. "Directional serial verb constructions in Caribbean English creoles." In Byrne, Francis & Holm, John (eds), *Atlantic meets Pacific - A global view of pidginization and creolization*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.





## Appendix A: Informed consent for adult participants

MODULO DI CONSENSO DEL PARTECIPANTE MAGGIORENNE  
AL PROGETTO DI RICERCA  
Documentazione e descrizione linguistica  
Università Ca' Foscari Venezia

Il/La sottoscritto/a \_\_\_\_\_ (nome e cognome) nato/a a \_\_\_\_\_ il \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_,  
residente a \_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_

### AUTORIZZA

- a eseguire la somministrazione di un questionario di tipo misto sulla grammaticalità di alcuni enunciati del dialetto di Delia e sull'esperienza linguistica, l'uso, l'atteggiamento e la competenza dell'italiano e del dialetto di Delia;
- a utilizzare i dati raccolti tramite il suddetto questionario, in ambito accademico e di ricerca.

Il/la sottoscritto/a, inoltre,

### DICHIARA

di non avere nulla da pretendere dal Dipartimento di Studi Linguistici Culturali e Comparati dell'Università Ca' Foscari Venezia in merito all'utilizzazione a scopi di ricerca scientifica dei dati del questionario così come sopra indicato.

(Data) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Firma del/della partecipante

\_\_\_\_\_  
Firma del ricercatore

### INFORMATIVA AL TRATTAMENTO DEI DATI PERSONALI

I dati raccolti in queste sessioni saranno utilizzati per uno studio di ricerca. Questa ricerca ha unicamente uno scopo scientifico e non sarà mai usata per scopi commerciali. I nomi dei partecipanti all'esperimento non saranno mai riportati in alcuna comunicazione. Il responsabile del trattamento dei dati personali dei partecipanti alla ricerca sul dialetto di Delia tramite questionario è l'Università Ca' Foscari, con sede in Venezia - Dorsoduro n.3246. I dati saranno trattati dai soggetti specificatamente incaricati allo svolgimento delle attività di raccolta e/o trasmissione dati. I dati saranno trattati sia in formato cartaceo che con modalità informatizzata. Le informazioni relative ai/alle partecipanti verranno trattate per le sole finalità strettamente legate allo svolgimento del progetto. Rispetto ai dati personali ogni interessato/a può esercitare i diritti previsti dall'art. 7 del D.Lgs. 196/2003 ed in particolare può richiedere di avere accesso a tali dati, di aggiornarli, correggerli, ecc. Letta l'informativa sopra riportata si manifesta il consenso al trattamento dei dati.

### CONTATTI

Se ha domande su questo progetto di ricerca può contattare:

Ricercatore, dott. Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro, vincenzo.dicaro@unive.it, Cell. XXX XXXXXXXX

Tutor accademico, prof.ssa Giuliana Giusti, giusti@unive.it

## Appendix B: Informed consent for participants under 18

MODULO DI CONSENSO DEL PARTECIPANTE MINORENNE  
AL PROGETTO DI RICERCA  
Documentazione e descrizione linguistica  
Università Ca' Foscari Venezia

Il/La sottoscritto/a \_\_\_\_\_ (nome e cognome), nato/a a \_\_\_\_\_ il \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_, residente a \_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_, genitore del/la minore \_\_\_\_\_ (nome e cognome)

### AUTORIZZA

- a eseguire la somministrazione di un questionario di tipo misto sulla grammaticalità di alcuni enunciati del dialetto di Delia e sull'esperienza linguistica, l'uso, l'atteggiamento e la competenza dell'italiano e del dialetto di Delia;
- a utilizzare i dati raccolti tramite il suddetto questionario, in ambito accademico e di ricerca.

Il/la sottoscritto/a, inoltre,

### DICHIARA

di non avere nulla da pretendere dal Dipartimento di Studi Linguistici Culturali e Comparati dell'Università Ca' Foscari Venezia in merito all'utilizzazione a scopi di ricerca scientifica dei dati del questionario così come sopra indicato.

(Data) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nome e cognome del/della partecipante

\_\_\_\_\_  
Firma di un genitore o di chi ne fa le veci

\_\_\_\_\_  
Firma del ricercatore

### INFORMATIVA AL TRATTAMENTO DEI DATI PERSONALI

I dati raccolti in queste sessioni saranno utilizzati per uno studio di ricerca. Questa ricerca ha unicamente uno scopo scientifico e non sarà mai usata per scopi commerciali. I nomi dei partecipanti all'esperimento non saranno mai riportati in alcuna comunicazione. Il responsabile del trattamento dei dati personali dei partecipanti alla ricerca sul dialetto di Delia tramite questionario è l'Università Ca' Foscari, con sede in Venezia - Dorsoduro n.3246. I dati saranno trattati dai soggetti specificatamente incaricati allo svolgimento delle attività di raccolta e/o trasmissione dati. I dati saranno trattati sia in formato cartaceo che con modalità informatizzata. Le informazioni relative ai/alle partecipanti verranno trattate per le sole finalità strettamente legate allo svolgimento del progetto. Rispetto ai dati personali ogni interessato/a può esercitare i diritti previsti dall'art. 7 del D.Lgs. 196/2003 ed in particolare può richiedere di avere accesso a tali dati, di aggiornarli, correggerli, ecc. Letta l'informativa sopra riportata si manifesta il consenso al trattamento dei dati.

### CONTATTI

Se ha domande su questo progetto di ricerca può contattare:  
Ricercatore, dott. Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro, [vincenzo.dicaro@unive.it](mailto:vincenzo.dicaro@unive.it), Cell. XXX XXXXXXXX  
Tutor accademico, prof.ssa Giuliana Giusti, [giusti@unive.it](mailto:giusti@unive.it)

## Appendix C: Questionnaire

Codice intervistato/a: \_\_\_\_\_

Data: \_\_\_ / \_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

**NB:** In caso di errore, scrivere un “NO” vicino alla risposta sbagliata e indicare quella desiderata.

Si = la frase mi suona familiare / è una frase che direi

Non so = la frase mi sembra un po’ strana, ma non mi meraviglierei se qualcuno la usasse / non riesco a decidere

No = la frase non mi sembra affatto corretta / è una frase che non direbbe nessuno

### A. La seguente frase è corretta?

			Sì	Non so	No
1	(Iju)	Vaju a ppigliu lu pani	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	(Tu)	Unni va a ppigli lu pani?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	(Iddru/a)	Va a ppiglia lu pani	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	(Nuantri)	Jammu a ppigliammu lu pani	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	(Vuantri)	Jiti a ppigliati lu pani tutti li jorna	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	(Iddri)	Vannu a ppiglianu lu pani	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### B. (7) Le frasi i) “Vaju a ppigliu lu pani” e ii) “Vaju a ppigliari lu pani” hanno lo stesso significato?

- a. Sì
- b. No
- c. Non so
- d. Hanno significati leggermente diversi  (Specificare: \_\_\_\_\_)
- \_\_\_\_\_ )

### C. La seguente frase è corretta?

			Sì	Non so	No
8	(Tu)	E tu, nun lu va a ppigli lu pani?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	(Tu)	E tu, nun lu va a ppigliari lu pani?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### D. La seguente frase è corretta?

			Sì	Non so	No
10	(Tu)	E tu, nun ci va a ppigli lu pani?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	(Tu)	E tu, nun ci va a ppigliari lu pani?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**E. La seguente frase è corretta?**

			Sì	Non so	No
12	(Iju)	Vjignu a ppigliu li libbra	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	(Tu)	Li vjini a ppigli li libbra?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	(Iddru/a)	Veni a ppiglia li libbra	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	(Nuantri)	Vinjimmu a ppigliammu li libbra	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16	(Vuantri)	Viniti a ppigliati li libbra	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17	(Iddri)	Vjinnu a ppiglianu li libbra	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**F. La seguente frase è corretta?**

			Sì	Non so	No
18	(Iju)	Tuirnu a ppigliu lu sacchettu	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19	(Iddru/a)	Torna a ppiglia lu sacchettu	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20	(Iddri)	Tòrganu a ppiglianu lu sacchettu	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**G. (21) Quale delle due forme utilizzi?**

- a. Ti l'haju dittu du voti e ti lu tuirnu a ddicu: nun ci jiri!
- b. Ti l'haju dittu du voti e ti lu tuirnu a ddiri: nun ci jiri!
- c. Entrambe le forme

**H. (22) Quale delle due forme utilizzi?**

- a. Dumani mi l'accuminciu a ppigliu ssa pinnula
- b. Dumani mi l'accuminciu a ppigliari ssa pinnula
- c. Entrambe le forme

**I. (23) Quale delle due forme utilizzi?**

- a. La prossima simana iddri lu pani l'accumincianu a ppiglianu nni mia
- b. La prossima simana iddri lu pani l'accumincianu a ppigliari nni mia
- c. Entrambe le forme

**J. (24) La frase "Minni vaju a ppigliu lu pani" è corretta?**

- a. sì
- b. no
- c. non so

**K. (25) La frase "Tutti li jorna, vaju a mmangiu ccu la machina" è corretta?**

- a. sì
- b. no
- c. non so

**L. (26) La frase “Vaju a mmangiu agghjiri intra” è corretta?**

- a. sì
- b. no
- c. non so

**M. La seguente frase è corretta?**

			Sì	Non so	No
27	(Iju)	Dumani vappigliu lu pani	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28	(Nuantri)	Dumani vappigliammu lu pani	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29	(Vuantri)	Dumani vappigliati lu pani	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30	(Iddri)	Dumani vappiglianu lu pani	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**N. La seguente frase è corretta?**

			Sì	Non so	No
31	(Iju)	Jivu a ffici la spisa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32	(Tu)	Jisti a ffacisti la spisa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33	(Iddru/a)	Ji a ffici la spisa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34	(Nuantri)	Jammu a ffacimu la spisa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35	(Vuantri)	Jistivu a ffacistivu la spisa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36	(Iddri)	Jiru a ffaciru la spisa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**O. (37) Quale delle due forme utilizzi?**

- a. (Iddru) La jì a scrissi la littra?
- b. (Iddru) La jì a scriviri la littra ?
- c. Entrambe le forme

**P. (38) Quale delle due forme utilizzi?**

- a. Jivu a ppigliavu lu pani du voti
- b. Jivu a ppigliari lu pani du voti
- c. Entrambe le forme

**Q. (39) Quale delle due forme utilizzi?**

- a. Ci arristà a ddetti deci euru
- b. Ci arristà a ddari deci euru
- c. Entrambe le forme

**R. La seguente frase è corretta?**

			Sì	Non so	No
40	(Tu)	Va piglia lu pani!	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41	(Vossia)	Sa va a ppiglia lu pani!	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42	(Vossia)	Jissi a ppigliassi lu pani!	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43	(Vuantri)	Jiti a ppigliati lu pani!	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**S. (44) Quale delle due forme utilizzi?**

- a. Vjini piglia lu pani!
- b. Vjini a ppiglia lu pani!
- c. Entrambe le forme
- d. Nessuna delle due forme

**Dati anagrafici**

**(45) Anno di nascita:** \_\_\_\_\_

**(46) Sesso:** M  F

**(47) Titolo di studio:**

- fino alla licenza media (scuola secondaria inferiore)
- fino al diploma di scuola superiore (scuola secondaria superiore)
- laurea o titolo superiore

**(48) Luogo d'origine di tuo padre:**

Italia  Estero  Non so

**(49)** (se hai scelto Italia) Città: \_\_\_\_\_ Provincia: \_\_\_\_\_

**(50) Luogo d'origine di tua madre:**

Italia  Estero  Non so

**(51)** (se hai scelto Italia) Città: \_\_\_\_\_ Provincia: \_\_\_\_\_

**(52) Professione:**

Studente/ssa  Operaio/a  Impiegato/a  Insegnante   
Disoccupato/a  Casalingo/a  Pensionato/a  Libero/a professionista   
Altro  (Specificare: \_\_\_\_\_)

Se pensionato/a specificare la professione principale durante gli anni lavorativi:

\_\_\_\_\_



Università  
Ca' Foscari  
Venezia

**DEPOSITO ELETTRONICO DELLA TESI DI DOTTORATO**

**DICHIARAZIONE SOSTITUTIVA DELL'ATTO DI NOTORIETA'**

(Art. 47 D.P.R. 445 del 28/12/2000 e relative modifiche)

Io sottoscritto Di Caro Vincenzo Nicolò  
nato a Palermo (prov. PA.) il 15/12/1980  
residente a Delia in Via dei Santi n. 113.  
Matricola (se posseduta) 964012 Autore della tesi di dottorato dal titolo:  
Multiple Agreement Constructions in Southern Italo-Romanca. The Syntax of Sicilian  
Pseudo-Coordination  
Dottorato di ricerca in Lingue, culture e società moderne e Scienze del linguaggio  
(in cotutela con .....)  
Ciclo 31°  
Anno di conseguimento del titolo 2019

**DICHIARO**

di essere a conoscenza:

- 1) del fatto che in caso di dichiarazioni mendaci, oltre alle sanzioni previste dal codice penale e dalle Leggi speciali per l'ipotesi di falsità in atti ed uso di atti falsi, decado fin dall'inizio e senza necessità di nessuna formalità dai benefici conseguenti al provvedimento emanato sulla base di tali dichiarazioni;
- 2) dell'obbligo per l'Università di provvedere, per via telematica, al deposito di legge delle tesi di dottorato presso le Biblioteche Nazionali Centrali di Roma e di Firenze al fine di assicurarne la conservazione e la consultabilità da parte di terzi;
- 3) che l'Università si riserva i diritti di riproduzione per scopi didattici, con citazione della fonte;
- 4) del fatto che il testo integrale della tesi di dottorato di cui alla presente dichiarazione viene archiviato e reso consultabile via internet attraverso l'Archivio Istituzionale ad Accesso Aperto dell'Università Ca' Foscari, oltre che attraverso i cataloghi delle Biblioteche Nazionali Centrali di Roma e Firenze;
- 5) del fatto che, ai sensi e per gli effetti di cui al D.Lgs. n. 196/2003, i dati personali raccolti saranno trattati, anche con strumenti informatici, esclusivamente nell'ambito del procedimento per il quale la presentazione viene resa;
- 6) del fatto che la copia della tesi in formato elettronico depositato nell'Archivio Istituzionale ad Accesso Aperto è del tutto corrispondente alla tesi in formato cartaceo, controfirmata dal tutor, consegnata presso la segreteria didattica del dipartimento di riferimento del corso di dottorato ai fini del deposito presso l'Archivio di Ateneo, e che di conseguenza va esclusa qualsiasi responsabilità dell'Ateneo stesso per quanto riguarda eventuali errori, imprecisioni o omissioni nei contenuti della tesi;
- 7) del fatto che la copia consegnata in formato cartaceo, controfirmata dal tutor, depositata nell'Archivio di Ateneo, è l'unica alla quale farà riferimento l'Università per rilasciare, a richiesta, la dichiarazione di conformità di eventuali copie.

Data 12/12/2018

Firma

Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro

## AUTORIZZO

- l'Università a riprodurre ai fini dell'immissione in rete e a comunicare al pubblico tramite servizio on line entro l'Archivio Istituzionale ad Accesso Aperto il testo integrale della tesi depositata;
- l'Università a consentire:
  - la riproduzione a fini personali e di ricerca, escludendo ogni utilizzo di carattere commerciale;
  - la citazione purché completa di tutti i dati bibliografici (nome e cognome dell'autore, titolo della tesi, relatore e correlatore, l'università, l'anno accademico e il numero delle pagine citate).

## DICHIARO

- 1) che il contenuto e l'organizzazione della tesi è opera originale da me realizzata e non infrange in alcun modo il diritto d'autore né gli obblighi connessi alla salvaguardia di diritti morali od economici di altri autori o di altri aventi diritto, sia per testi, immagini, foto, tabelle, o altre parti di cui la tesi è composta, né compromette in alcun modo i diritti di terzi relativi alla sicurezza dei dati personali;
- 2) che la tesi di dottorato non è il risultato di attività rientranti nella normativa sulla proprietà industriale, non è stata prodotta nell'ambito di progetti finanziati da soggetti pubblici o privati con vincoli alla divulgazione dei risultati, non è oggetto di eventuale registrazione di tipo brevettuale o di tutela;
- 3) che pertanto l'Università è in ogni caso esente da responsabilità di qualsivoglia natura civile, amministrativa o penale e sarà tenuta indenne a qualsiasi richiesta o rivendicazione da parte di terzi.

A tal fine:

- dichiaro di aver autoarchiviato la copia integrale della tesi in formato elettronico nell'Archivio Istituzionale ad Accesso Aperto dell'Università Ca' Foscari;
- consegno la copia integrale della tesi in formato cartaceo presso la segreteria didattica del dipartimento di riferimento del corso di dottorato ai fini del deposito presso l'Archivio di Ateneo.

Data 12/12/2018

Firma

Vincento Nicolo Di Caro

La presente dichiarazione è sottoscritta dall'interessato in presenza del dipendente addetto, ovvero sottoscritta e inviata, unitamente a copia fotostatica non autenticata di un documento di identità del dichiarante, all'ufficio competente via fax, ovvero tramite un incaricato, oppure a mezzo posta

Firma del dipendente addetto .....

Ai sensi dell'art. 13 del D.Lgs. n. 196/03 si informa che il titolare del trattamento dei dati forniti è l'Università Ca' Foscari - Venezia.

I dati sono acquisiti e trattati esclusivamente per l'espletamento delle finalità istituzionali d'Ateneo; l'eventuale rifiuto di fornire i propri dati personali potrebbe comportare il mancato espletamento degli adempimenti necessari e delle procedure amministrative di gestione delle carriere studenti. Sono comunque riconosciuti i diritti di cui all'art. 7 D. Lgs. n. 196/03.



## Estratto per riassunto della tesi di dottorato

L'estratto (max. 1000 battute) deve essere redatto sia in lingua italiana che in lingua inglese e nella lingua straniera eventualmente indicata dal Collegio dei docenti.

L'estratto va firmato e rilegato come ultimo foglio della tesi.

Studente: Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro

matricola: 964012

Dottorato: Lingue, culture e società moderne e Scienze del linguaggio

Ciclo: 31°

Titolo della tesi: Multiple Agreement Constructions in Southern Italo-Romance. The Syntax of Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination

### Abstract:

In questa tesi sono analizzate diverse configurazioni di Pseudo-Coordinazione, una costruzione sintattica monofrasale, composta da due verbi di modo finito eventualmente separati da un connettore *a* (V1 a V2), che si inserisce nel novero delle Costruzioni ad Accordo Multiplo tipiche dei dialetti italo-romanzi meridionali. All'interno della tesi sono discussi i principali parametri di micro-variazione che caratterizzano la Pseudo-Coordinazione nei dialetti siciliani: i) i criteri di selezione del V1; ii) i Modi e i Tempi verbali in cui tale costruzione può apparire; iii) i criteri di selezione del V2; iv) l'individuazione di una gerarchia di occorrenza delle Persone (dalla 1sg alla 3pl) dei diversi paradigmi; v) la grammaticalizzazione del V2 "andare" con relativa erosione fonetica e desemantizzazione. Nella seconda parte della tesi viene presentato il primo studio quantitativo dedicato alla Pseudo-Coordinazione, condotto a Delia (Caltanissetta) con 70 partecipanti, nell'arco del 2017.

In the present thesis different configurations of Pseudo-Coordination are analysed. This is a monoclausal syntactic construction, formed by two finited verbs with an optional connector *a* between them (V1 a V2), which can be considered as an instance of the Multiple Agreement Constructions found in most southern Italo-Romance dialects. This thesis discusses the main parameters of micro-variation characterising the Pseudo-Coordination found in the Sicilian dialects: i) the criteria for the selection of the V1; ii) the Moods and Tenses in which this construction can occur; iii) the criteria for the selection of the V2; iv) the hierarchy regulating the occurrence of the Persons (from 1sg to 3pl) in the different paradigms; v) the grammaticalization of the V2 "go" with its phonetic erosion and desemantisation. In the second part of the thesis, the first quantitative study dedicated to Pseudo-Coordination, conducted in Delia (Caltanissetta) with 70 participants during 2017, is presented.

Firma dello studente

Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro