

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 14. Selected papers from the 46th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Stony Brook, NY.*

Edited by Lori Repetti and Francisco Ordóñez.

© 2018. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at www.benjamins.com

Dimensions of variation

The inflected construction in the dialect of Delia (Caltanissetta)

Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro and Giuliana Giusti

Ca' Foscari University of Venice

This paper provides an overview of the different dimensions of variation found in the Inflected Construction (IC) (cf. Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003) arising with motion verbs in most Sicilian dialects. It does so by discussing data from the dialect of Delia (Caltanissetta) at face value with the dialect of Marsala (Trapani). The micro-variation emerging from the discussion challenges Cruschina's (2013) morphomic account; while it is easily captured by Cardinaletti and Giusti's (to appear) hypothesis that a semi-functional V1 fills a remerged functional head (*t*-T, *c*-C). Merger in *t* or *c* is not only restricted to lexically specified forms of V1 but, in given feature combinations, also to lexically specified forms of V2 in T or C.

Keywords: inflected construction, pseudo-coordination, sicilian dialects, cartographic syntax, motion verbs, restructuring verbs

1. Introduction

Cardinaletti and Giusti (henceforth, C&G) study a pseudo-coordination construction in the dialect of Marsala (in the province of Trapani), which they call the Inflected Construction (henceforth, IC) (C&G 2001, 2003).¹ They show that, parallel to pseudo-coordinations previously studied in English and Swedish, the IC in Marsalese features the following components: (i) a verb (V1), usually of motion,

1. Previous literature on Italo-Romance has labelled this construction in different ways. Traditional literature emphasises its paratactic origin (cf. Ascoli 1896, 1901, Sorrento 1950, Rohlf's 1969, Stefanini 1970, Leone 1973, 1978 and Sornicola 1976); Cruschina (2013) calls it the Doubly Inflected Construction; Ledgeway (2015) treats it as one of different grammaticalized pseudo-coordinations in the dialects of Apulia.

taken from a restricted class of restructuring verbs; (ii) a sometimes optional connecting element *a*; (iii) a lexical verb (V2), sharing mood, tense and person features with V1.

C&G (2001, 2003) report the following restrictions in the dialect spoken in Marsala (Trapani):

- i. The IC is only possible in the 1/2/3SG and 3PL of the indicative present and in the 2SG of the imperative;
- ii. The only possible V1s are the most basic motion verbs ‘go’ and ‘come’, together with ‘come by’ and the motion causative verb ‘send’.

C&G (2001: 383–5) also note that the IC in Marsalese can display invariant forms of ‘go’ as V1, similarly to what happens with auxiliary verbs ‘have’ and ‘stay’ (cf. (1)–(3)), where the invariant form is allowed with the three singular persons of the present indicative and is incompatible with the plural persons and with tenses other than present indicative:

- (1) a. *Vaju / va a ppigghju u pani.*
go.1SG / go a fetch.1SG the bread
‘I go and fetch the bread.’
- b. *Vannu / va a ppigghjanu u pani.*
go.3PL / go a fetch.3PL the bread
‘They go and fetch the bread.’
- (2) a. *Un ci haju / ha statu mai.*
not there.CL have.1SG / have been never
‘I have never been there.’
- b. *Un ci hai / ha statu mai.*
not there.CL have.2SG / have been never
‘You have never been there.’
- (3) a. *Ci staju / sta ennu.*
there.CL stay.1SG / stay going
‘I’m going there.’
- b. *Ci stai / sta ennu.*
there.CL stay.2SG / stay going
‘You’re going there.’

C&G’s (2001: 397–407) account for these restrictions proposing that V1 is a semi-lexical verb, namely a lexical verb that loses its argument structure, being merged as a functional head. In a parametric perspective, they claim that V1 in the IC is merged at the point where the language realizes the inflected V2, which is subject to parametric variation: in Marsalese it is merged in T, like in Italian and unlike

English or Swedish (where it is merged lower). From this high vs low merging position of the semi-lexical verb, they derive a number of macro-parametric differences between Marsalese and the Germanic languages, which cannot be dealt with here due to space reasons.

C&G propose that the lexicon specifies which forms of given verbs can fill the V1 position of the IC, which generally appear to be “less rich” in inflection.² C&G therefore predict that it is possible to find variation on single verbal forms that can enter the IC as V1, as is in fact the case. Their framework does not make any prediction on possible restrictions on V2, which in Marsalese can be any lexical verb compatible with andative aspect.

In this paper, we concentrate on the dialect of Delia (in the province of Caltanissetta). This dialect presents some interesting points of micro-variation, confirming C&G’s general framework and leading us to a more precise formulation of the syntactic structure of the IC and to positing further lexical restrictions on V2.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 presents subsequent literature on Sicilian and other Southern-Italian varieties and briefly discusses possible competing hypotheses. Section 3 presents the morphology of the IC in Deliano and shows that there are different lexical restrictions on V1 and further restrictions on V2. Section 4 provides a formal structural representation of the IC in Deliano. Section 5 deals with the interaction of the IC with Cinque’s (2006) hierarchy of restructuring verbs. Section 6 draws the conclusions.

2. Subsequent literature on the inflected construction

Manzini and Savoia (2005: 688–701) provide a very wide overview of the phenomenon and show that in Southern Italian dialects, V1 can be filled by other verbs that behave as restructuring verbs in the Italian infinitival construction. The IC in Sicilian, Apulian, and partially Calabrian dialects, can display other moods, tenses and persons but is crucially always limited to simple forms. Manzini and Savoia (2005: 689) also show that verbs other than ‘go’ (notably ‘stay’ but also ‘come’) can display invariant forms. This kind of variation is predicted by C&G (2001, 2003).

2. In recent terms, this can be defined as a “nano-parameter” in the sense of Biberauer and Roberts (2012: 268), who propose that parametric variation displays different degrees of variation. (i) Macro-parameters regulate all elements of a given type. (ii) Meso-parameters regulate a featurally specifiable subset of the elements of a given type. (iii) Micro-parameters regulate the smallest definable sub-class of elements of a given type. (iv) Nano-parameters regulate one or more individual lexical items; this is the case of the Sicilian IC, as further argued in this paper.

Cruschina (2013) observes that the inflectional restrictions described by C&G (2001, 2003) for Marsalese correspond to Maiden's (2004) N-pattern (see also Dressler and Thornton 1991, Thornton 2007) and proposes to treat the IC as a Serial Verb Construction (cf. Aikhenvald and Dixon 2006), which in some varieties but not in others, is restricted to this morphomic pattern. Cruschina's purely morphomic analysis however does not predict the following facts, that will be exemplified in this paper on the basis of Deliano: (1) the restriction to simple tenses of the paradigm even in the most liberal varieties; (2) the restrictions to what restructuring verbs can fill V1; (3) the different morphomic patterns for different tenses;³ (4) the different behaviour of invariant forms in different dialects.

There is no space in this paper to do justice to the theory of morphemics, arising from Aronoff's (1994) hypothesis of the autonomy of morphology. For what is relevant to our discussion, it is sufficient to know that it gives autonomous value to given patterns created by the inflectional morphology of a given lexical item. Thus, if a given variety attributes a given pattern to the IC, it is not predicted that different V1s or different combinations of V1 and V2 should display different patterns.

Ledgeway (2015) concentrates on the dialects of Apulia, where the IC is attested with 'go', 'stand', and 'want' as V1s. In particular, 'stand' and 'go' display different degrees of reduction of the inflected forms, throughout the region, while 'want' never does. According to Ledgeway, different degrees of reduction correspond to different degrees of grammaticalization of V1. For reasons of space, we cannot deal with the Apulian cases, thus referring to Cardinaletti and Giusti (to appear) who note that there is no difference in behavior of invariant vs. inflected forms with respect to clitic climbing, which can safely be taken as a clear diagnostics of monocausality. We will see that Deliano does not generally allow for invariant forms except for one single combination of V1-V2 in the imperative.

3. The morphology of the inflected construction in Deliano

The IC in Deliano is possible with the four V1s, namely 'go', 'come', 'come by' and 'send', found in Marsalese (cf. C&G 2001, 2003) and with a fifth V1, *accuminciari* 'start'. These five verbs do not display a homogenous behavior in their morphological distribution.

With the four motion verbs, the IC follows the N-pattern, as in Marsalese; namely, it is restricted to 1/2/3SG and 3PL in the indicative present and to the 2SG in the imperative:

3. See Di Caro and Giusti (2015) for a discussion of the facts in (1)–(3) which Cruschina's (2013) analysis does not take into consideration.

- (4) a. *Vaju / vjignu / passu / mannu a ppigliu lu pani*
 go.1SG / come.1SG / come-by.1SG / send.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread
 ‘I go / come / come by/ send somebody to fetch the bread.’
- b. **Jammu / *vinjimmu / *passammu / *mannammu a ppigliammu lu*
 go.1PL / come.1PL / come-by.1PL / send.1PL a fetch.1PL the
 pani.
 bread
 ‘We go / come / come by/ send somebody to fetch the bread.’
- (5) a. *Va / vjini / passa / manna (a)*
 go.IMPR.2SG / come.IMPR.2SG / come-by.IMPR.2SG / send.IMPR.2SG a
ppiglia lu pani!
 fetch.IMPR.2SG the bread
 ‘Go / come / come by/ send somebody to fetch the bread!’
- b. **Jiti / *viniti / *passati / *mannati a*
 go.IMPR.2PL / come.IMPR.2PL / come-by.IMPR.2PL / send.IMPR.2PL a
ppigliati lu pani!
 fetch.IMPR.2PL the bread
 ‘Go / come / come by/ send somebody to fetch the bread!’

The inceptive verb *accuminciari* is instead limited to 1SG and 3PL of the indicative present:

- (6) a. *Accuminciu a ffazzu la spisa.*
 start.1SG a do.1SG the shopping
 ‘I start doing the shopping.’
- b. *Accumincianu a ffannu la spisa.*
 start.3PL a do.3PL the shopping
 ‘They start doing the shopping.’
- c. **Accumincia a ffa la spisa.*
 start.3SG a do.3SG the shopping
 ‘(S)he starts doing the shopping.’

In a morphomic perspective, one is led to note that the restrictions in (6) are reminiscent of Maiden’s (2004) U-pattern, with the proviso that Deliano does not have subjunctive (which is instead part of the U-pattern). Cruschina’s hypothesis that the IC is associated to the N-pattern in Marsalese should be reformulated for Deliano assuming the N-pattern with motion verbs and the U-pattern with the inceptive verb. This weakens the predictive power of a framework that attributes independent predictive power to given patterns.

Unlike Marsalese, the IC in Deliano is also possible in the indicative preterite with the five VIs already cited and a crucial restriction on V2. Interestingly, the

preterite displays a third pattern, which is not present in the morphomic literature, with ungrammatical 2SG/PL:

- (7) 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
 ‘(S)he 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.’

In Di Caro and Giusti (2015: 410–11), we call this the W-pattern for purely descriptive reasons, attributing no explicatory value to this label.

Di Caro (2015: 50) observes that the possible V2 forms in the preterite are all rhizotonic forms of verbs that come from Latin third conjugation:⁴

- (8) a. *fari* (‘do’ or ‘make’) < *facĕre*
 b. *viviri* (‘drink’) < *bibĕre*
 c. *scriviri* (‘write’) < *scribĕre*
 d. *mintiri* (‘put’) < *mittĕre*
 e. *diri* (‘say’ or ‘tell’) < *dicĕre*
 f. *pèrdiri* (‘lose’) < *perdĕre*
 g. *chjùiri* (‘shut’) < *cludĕre*
 h. *nchjùiri* (‘shut in’) < *includĕre*

These verbs are different from the regular first conjugation verbs, such as *pigliari* ‘fetch’, which display six arhizotonic forms (e.g. *pigliàvu*, *pigliàsti*, *piglià*, *pigliàm-mu*, *pigliàstivu*, *pigliàru*).

4. The verb *vidiri* ‘see’, although diachronically derived from a verb of Latin second conjugation, i.e. *vidĕre*, displays the same inflection of the verbs listed in (8).

In fact, two additional lexical verbs appear in the indicative preterite, which do not derive from Latin third conjugation, but synchronically pattern as irregular verbs of the first conjugation, like *fari* ‘do’ above; namely, *stari* ‘stay’ and *dari* ‘give’. The entire paradigm of these two verbs is made of rhizotonic forms, but the W-pattern is still manifested, as shown in (9):

- (9) a. *Ci jivu a ddetti nna manu d’ajutu.*
to-him go.PAST.1SG a give.PAST.1SG a hand of help
‘I went to give him a hand.’
- b. **Ci jisti a ddasti nna manu d’ajutu.*
to-him go.PAST.2SG a give.PAST.2SG a hand of help
‘You went to give him a hand.’
- c. *Ci ji a ddetti nna manu d’ajutu.*
to-him go.PAST.3SG a give.PAST.3SG a hand of help
‘(S)he went to give him a hand.’
- d. *Ci jammu a ddjittimu nna manu d’ajutu.*
to-him go.PAST.1PL a give.PAST.1PL a hand of help
‘We went to give him a hand.’
- e. **Ci jistivu a ddàstivu nna manu d’ajutu.*
to-him go.PAST.2PL a give.PAST.2PL a hand of help
‘You went to give him a hand.’
- f. *Ci jiru a ddjittiru nna manu d’ajutu.*
to-him go.PAST.3PL a give.PAST.3PL a hand of help
‘They went to give him a hand.’

In this case, the W-pattern correlates with the forms displaying apophony (the root vowel turns from *-a-* to *-e-* / *-ji-*). It must be observed that there are verbs, like *sapiri* ‘know’, featuring preterite rhizotonic forms but no apophony (i.e. *-a-* is the root vowel in all the paradigm) for 1/3SG, 1/3PL, which do not display the IC in the preterite at all:

- (10) a. **Vinni a ssappi di sta novità.*
come.PAST.1SG a know.PAST.1SG of this news
- a. *Vinni a ssappiri di sta novità.*
come.PAST.1SG to know.INF of this news
‘I was made aware of this news.’
- b. **Vinnimu a ssàppimu di sta novità.*
come.PAST.1PL a know.PAST.1PL of this news
- b. *Vinnimu a ssappiri di sta novità.*
come.PAST.1PL to know.INF of this news
‘We were made aware of this news.’

It is not clear to us how syllable structure and apophony may correlate with this. C&G (2001, 2003) reduce all restrictions to lexical information on V1. In their perspective, it is not expected that phonology be directly relevant to these restrictions.

Finally, a further verb can occur only in the preterite, namely *arristari* ‘remain’, it also follows the W-pattern, but only in a fixed combination with ‘give’ as V2, which is interpreted as ‘still owing something to somebody’, as in (11):

- (11) a. *Ci arristavu a ddetti deci euro.*
to-him remain.PAST.1SG a give.PAST.1SG ten euro
‘I still owe him ten euro(s).’
- b. **Ci arristasti a ddisti deci euro.*
to-him remain.PAST.2SG a give.PAST.2SG ten euro
‘You still owe him ten euro(s).’
- c. *Ci arristà a ddetti deci euro.*
to-him remain.PAST.3SG a give.PAST.3SG ten euro
‘(S)he still owes him ten euro(s).’
- d. *Ci arristammu a ddjittimu deci euro.*
to-him remain.PAST.1PL a give.PAST.1PL ten euro
‘We still owe him ten euro(s).’
- e. **Ci arristàstivu a ddàstivu deci euro.*
to-him remain.PAST.2PL a give.PAST.2PL ten euro
‘You still owe him ten euro(s).’
- f. *Ci arristarù a ddjittirù deci euro.*
to-him remain.PAST.3PL a give.PAST.3PL ten euro
‘They still owe him ten euro(s).’

Note that *arristari* in the IC cannot be interpreted as having its literal meaning of ‘remaining in the same place’. With this interpretation, it can only select the infinitive, as in (12b):

- (12) a. **M' arristavu a bbitti la partita nn'iddru*
REFL remain.PAST.1SG a see.PAST.1SG the match at him
- b. *M' arristavu a bbidiri la partita nn'iddru.*
REFL remain.PAST.1SG to see.INF the match at him
‘I stayed to watch the match at his place.’

Note that even in the metaphorical meaning, *arristari* cannot enter the IC in the indicative present (13) or in the imperative (14):

- (13) a. **Ci arrjistu a ddugnu sempri sordi a ma frati.*
to-him remain.1SG a give.1SG always money to my brother
- b. *Ci arrjistu a ddari sempri sordi a ma frati.*
to-him remain.1SG to give.INF always money to my brother
‘I always owe my brother some money.’

- (14) a. **Tu arrèstacci a ddùna sordi, accusì s' inzigna.*
 you remain.IMPR.2SG-to-him a give.IMPR.2SG money so REFL
 teach.3SG
- b. *Tu arrèstacci a ddari sordi, accusì s' inzigna.*
 you remain.IMPR.2SG-to-him to give.INF money so REFL teach.3SG
 'Don't pay him back completely, that will teach him!'

We can detect an increasing degree of lexical restriction in the examples provided so far, which cannot even be captured by a hierarchy among the patterns or tenses. Some lexical items enter the IC in one pattern in the present, some in others in other patterns in the present and preterite, other still appear only in the preterite in a combination of V1 and V2. This appears to be a step towards idiomaticization reminiscent to the more extreme idiomatic status of Italian *vattelapesca* (lit. 'go and fish it!') and of regional Italian *vattelaccerca* (lit. 'go and look for it!'), which both have the meaning of 'goodness knows' and can be reconstructed as imperative forms.

These intricacies can be captured by reformulating C&G's proposal so that the lexical restrictions are not only on V1 but also on V2. A morphomic account would have to assume that different combinations of V1 and V2 enter the IC according to different patterns, for no obvious reasons.

4. The structural representation of the IC

C&G (to appear) suggest that, in the IC, V1 is merged in *t*, a functional head immediately higher than T parasitically checking its Tense and Agreement on T, as in (15):

- (15) $[_{tP} t [a [_{TP} T [_{VP} V \dots]]]]$

In Deliano, when *t* and T share [PRES] features and 1SG and 3PL agreement, V1 is limited to 'go', 'come', 'come by', 'send', and 'start', as in (16a); when *t* and T share [PRES] features and 2SG and 3SG agreement, V1 is limited to 'go', 'come', 'come by', 'send' and cannot include 'start', as in (16b). In both cases, V2 can be any lexical verb semantically compatible with the andative semantics:

- (16) a. $[_{tP} [_{V1} \text{go/come/come by/send/start}] + t_{[PRES; 1SG/3PL]} [a [_{TP} V2 + T_{[PRES; 1SG/3PL]}]]]$
- b. $[_{tP} [_{V1} \text{go/come/come by/send}] + t_{[PRES; 2/3SG]} [a [_{TP} V2 + T_{[PRES; 2/3SG]}]]]$

With different person specifications, the construction is ungrammatical. Deliano can express the same andative aspect with a restructured infinitive, whose structure, we assume, is the same as in Italian (cf. Cinque 2006, Cardinaletti and Shlonsky 2004).

When *t* and T share [PAST] features and 1/3SG, 1/3PL agreement, V1 is still limited to ‘go’, ‘come’, ‘come by’, ‘send’, and ‘start’, as in the present, but V2 is restricted to the verbs listed in (8) and ‘start’, as in (17):

- (17) $[_{tP} [_{V1} \text{go/come/come by/send/start}] + t_{[PAST; 1/3SG/1/3PL]} [a [_{TP} [_{V2} \text{do/drink/write/put/tell/lose/shut/stay}] + T_{[PAST; 1/3SG/1/3PL]} [_{VP} \text{V2} \dots]]]]]$

Insertion of ‘give’ as V2 extends the range of V1 to ‘remain’, as in (18):

- (18) $[_{tP} [_{V1} \text{go/come/come by/send/start/remain}] + t_{[PAST; 1/3SG/1/3PL]} [a [_{TP} [_{V2} \text{give}] + T_{[PAST; 1/3SG/1/3PL]} [_{VP} \text{V2} \dots]]]]]$

C&G (to appear) do not provide the structure of the IC in the imperative but C&G (2001: 399) claim that the imperative is merged in a higher functional head in the complementizer layer, parallel to Jussive proposed by Zanuttini (2008: 196). Thus, the imperative should generate a complex *cP*-*CP* system, as in (19), which *mutatis mutandis* behaves like the *tP*-*TP* in (15) above:

- (19) $[_{cP} V1 [(a) [_{CP} V2 [_{TP} \text{V2} [_{VP} \text{V2}]]]]]]]$

The presence of the connecting element *a* depends on the selection of V1. The variation in (20) is therefore expected. In (20a) ‘go’ and ‘come’ in the imperative do not take the connecting element. In (20b) ‘come by’ and ‘send’ must display the connecting element, as shown by the obligatory syntactic doubling on the following syllable:

- (20) a. *Va / Vjini (*a) piglia lu pani!*
 go.IMPR.2SG / come.IMPR.2SG *a* fetch.IMPR.2SG the bread
 ‘Go / Come and fetch the bread!’
- b. *Passa / Manna a ppiglia lu pani!*
 come-by.IMPR.2SG / send.IMPR.2SG *a* fetch.IMPR.2SG the bread
 ‘Come by / Send somebody to fetch the bread!’

Structure (19) has therefore two realizations, as in (21):

- (21) a. $[_{cP} [_{V1} \text{go/come}] + c_{[JUSS; 2SG]} [_{CP} V2 + C_{[JUSS; 2SG]} [TP \dots]]]$
 b. $[_{cP} [_{V1} \text{come by/send}] + c_{[JUSS; 2SG]} [a [_{CP} V2 + C_{[JUSS; 2SG]} [TP \dots]]]]]$

The two realizations in (21) can co-occur, with a fixed order, namely the one given in (22a), where ‘go/come’ precede ‘come by/send’, as exemplified by grammati-

cal (23). The logically possible reversed order given in (22b) gives ungrammatical results, as exemplified in (24):

- (22) a. $[_{CP} [_{V1} \text{go/come}] + c_{[JUSS; 2SG]} [_{CP} [_{V1} \text{come by/send}] + c_{[JUSS; 2SG]} [a [_{CP} V2 + C_{[JUSS; 2SG]} [TP \dots$
 b. $[_{CP} [_{V1} \text{come by/send}] + c_{[JUSS; 2SG]} [a [_{CP} [_{V1} \text{go/come}] + c_{[JUSS; 2SG]} [_{CP} V2 + C_{[JUSS; 2SG]} [TP \dots$
- (23) a. *Vjini /Va manna a ppiglia lu libbru!*
 come/go.IMPR.2SG send.IMPR.2SG a fetch.IMPR.2SG the book
 ‘Come / Go and send somebody to fetch the book!’
 b. *Vjini /Va passa a appiglia lu libbru!*
 come/go.IMPR.2SG come-by.IMPR.2SG a fetch.IMPR.2SG the book
 ‘Go and come by to fetch the book!’
- (24) a. **Manna a bbjini piglia lu libbru!*
 send.IMPR.2SG a come.IMPR.2SG fetch.IMPR.2SG the book
 ‘Send somebody to come and fetch the book!’
 b. **Passa a bba piglia lu libbru!*
 come-by.IMPR.2SG a go.IMPR.2SG fetch.IMPR.2SG the book
 ‘Come by and go to fetch the book!’

Recursion is not possible in the indicative where all verbs select the connecting element *a*, as shown in (25):

- (25) a. **Vjignu a mmannu a ppigliu lu libbru.*
 come.1SG *a* send.1SG *a* fetch.1SG the book
 ‘I come and send somebody to fetch the book.’
 b. **Vaju a ppassu a ppigliu lu libbru.*
 go.1SG *a* come-by.1SG *a* fetch.1SG the book
 ‘I go to come by and fetch the book.’

The possibility of recursion in the imperative is therefore due to the two different constructions with and without *a* emerging with the two different V1s in the imperative.

Note that the imperative displays the only uninflected form found in the IC in Deliano, namely *va* ‘go’ which can however only be combined with a 2PL imperative ‘go’, as in (26a). No other V2 is possible with *va*, as in (26b). Nor is the 2SG possible, as shown in (26c):

- (26) a. *Va jitivinni!*
 go.IMPR.2SG go.IMPR.2PL-REFL.CL-LOC.CL
 ‘Go away!’

- b. **Va* *travagliati!*
 go.IMPR.2SG work.IMPR.2PL
 ‘Go to work!’
- c. **Va* *vatinni!*
 go.IMPR.2SG go.IMPR.2SG REFL.CL-LOC.CL
 ‘Go away!’

Once again, this kind of information can only be captured by a parameter that regards the specific lexical item.

5. Interaction with the cartographic hierarchy

According to Cinque’s (2006: 90) cartographic hierarchy of clausal functional projections, the andative functional head is rather low: lower than inceptive and causative, as in (27a). This is confirmed by the infinitival construction in Deliano, as in (27b):

- (27) a. Causative > Inceptive > Andative > V
 b. *Lu fazzu accuminciari a gghjiri a ppigliari lu pani sulu.*
 him.CL make.1SG start.INF to go.INF to fetch.INF the bread alone
 ‘I’ll make him start going to fetch the bread on his own.’

In (28), violation of the hierarchy (27a) results in ungrammaticality:

- (28) a. **Lu vaju a ffari pigliari a ma ma’.*
 it.CL go.1SG to make.INF fetch.INF to my mum
 ‘I’ll go to have my mother fetch it.’
 b. **L’ accuminciu a ffari pigliari a ma ma’.*
 it.CL start.1SG to make.INF fetch.INF to my mum
 ‘I’ll start having my mother fetch it.’

We now observe how the verbs that enter the IC as V1 interact with such a hierarchy. C&G (2001, 2003) have already shown that in Marsalese the motion verbs in V1 are not part of the hierarchy, as expected in the analysis in (27) above. In fact, the hierarchy regulates the portion of structure below TP and does not regard V1 in *t* in (15)–(18) or in *c* in (19) and (21). This derives the fact that in Marsalese the motion verb in V1 can co-occur with the low andative head.

Deliano confirms this prediction. Not only the motion verb as V1 in (29a) but also the inceptive ‘start’ as V1 in (29b) can precede the highest restructuring verb considered here, namely causative ‘make’:

- (29) a. *Lu vaju a ffazzu jiri a ppigliari a ma ma'.*
 it.CL go.1SG a make.1SG go.INF to fetch.INF to my mum
 'I'm going to have my mother go and fetch it.'
- b. *L' accuminciu a ffazzu jiri a ppigliari a ma ma'.*
 it.CL start.1SG a make.1SG go.INF to fetch.INF to my mum
 'I'll start having my mother go and fetch it.'

Since Deliano displays motion and inceptive verbs as V1, it allows us a further observation. There is a hierarchy of insertion of V1 in the IC, which works in the opposite direction of Cinque's hierarchy. In (30) we see that motion must precede inceptive in the IC, unlike what we observe in (31), where inceptive precedes motion in the infinitival construction:

- (30) a. *Lu vaju a accuminciu a ffari.*
 it.CL go.1SG a start.1SG to make.INF
 'I'll go and start doing it.'
- b. **L' accuminciu a bbaju a ffari.*
 it.CL start.1SG a go.1SG to make.INF
 'I'll start going to do it.'
- (31) a. **Lu vaju a accuminciari a ffari.*
 it.CL go.1SG to start.INF to make.INF
 'I'll go and start doing it.'
- b. *L' accuminciu a gghjiri a ffari.*
 it.CL start.1SG to go.INF to make.INF
 'I'll start going to do it.'

In C&G's framework the exact point of insertion of a semi-lexical verb as V1 in the IC is independent of Cinque's (2006) hierarchy because it depends on the position in which V+T is realized in that given language. Thus, V1 is expected to immediately precede V2, and it is V2 to be the highest verb in Cinque's functional hierarchy and, as such, to be merged with the clausal T-features. This leaves the ungrammaticality of (30b) unexplained, which may be due to the fact that *accuminciari* is not fully productive in the indicative present, while 'come/go' is. Note however that such ungrammaticality would not be accounted for in any other competing analysis. We leave this small point to further research.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, we have presented a fine-grained description of the IC in Deliano, which displays interesting differences as well as substantial similarities to what has been reported for Marsalese by C&G's (2001, 2003) original work.

The variation observed in Deliano confirms C&G's analysis along the following lines. The micro-variation in the different forms (tense, mood, and persons) that can occur as V1 in the IC supports C&G's hypothesis that the lexicon of a language must specify what individual forms of the paradigm of a given verb can enter the IC as V1. This would give rise not only to the already noted N-pattern and U-pattern, but also to a novel W-pattern displayed in the preterite. The preterite has also brought up a new piece of evidence to assume that the IC is strictly related to lexical specification also as regards V2.

We have provided a formalization of what needs to be assumed in the lexicon of Deliano, showing that C&G's proposal of analysing the IC as the possible insertion of V1 in a dedicated functional head checking verbal and nominal features parasitically onto the canonical functional head hosting V2 is correct.

Moreover, we have confirmed in Deliano C&G's observation that the complex syntactic structure of the IC does not respect the cartographic hierarchy. We have also found out that there is a hierarchy in the IC that even goes in the opposite direction, namely when an inceptive verb co-occurs with a motion verb in the IC, inceptive must follow motion, while motion follows inceptive in restructured infinitives.

Acknowledgements

This paper was presented at the 42nd Incontro di Grammatica Generativa, held in Lecce at Università del Salento on February 19, 2016, and at the 46th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, held in New York at Stony Brook University on April 2, 2016. We wish to thank Andrea Calabrese, Roberta D'Alessandro, Ion Giurgea, Rita Manzini, Henk Van Riemsdijk, Ian Roberts, and two anonymous reviewers for stimulating remarks. All errors remain our own. Although the paper has been written four hands at all stages, for the sake of the Italian academic law, Giuliana Giusti is responsible for Sections 1–2 and 4, while Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro is responsible for Sections 3 and 5–6.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., and Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.). 2006. *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by Itself*. Cambridge, Mass: 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.
- Biberauer, Theresa, and Ian Roberts. 2012. "Towards a Parameter Hierarchy for Auxiliaries: Diachronic Considerations." Paper presented at DGfS. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Giuliana Giusti. 2001. "Semi-lexical Motion Verbs in Romance and Germanic." In *Semi-lexical categories*, ed. by Norbert Corver, and Henk Van Riemsdijk, 371–414. Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110874006.371>
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Giuliana Giusti. 2003. "Motion Verbs as Functional Heads." In *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, ed. by Christina Tortora, 31–49. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Giuliana Giusti. To appear. "Multiple Agreement in Southern Italian Dialects." In *Linguistic Variations: Structure and Interpretation – Studies in Honor of M. Rita Manzini*, ed. by Ludovico Franco, and Paolo Lorusso. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Ur Shlonsky. 2004. "Clitic positions and Restructuring in Italian." *Linguistic Inquiry* 35 (4): 519–557. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0024389042350523>
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2006. *Restructuring and Functional Heads: The Cartography of Syntactic Structure*, 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2013. "Beyond the Stem and Inflectional Morphology: An Irregular Pattern at the Level of Periphrasis." In *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology*, ed. by Silvio Cruschina, Martin Maiden, and John Charles Smith, 262–283. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199678860.003.0014>
- Di Caro, Vincenzo N. 2015. "Syntactic Constructions with Motion Verbs in Some Sicilian Dialects: A Comparative Analysis." M.A. Thesis, Ca' Foscari University of Venice.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo N., and Giuliana Giusti. 2015. "A Protocol for the Inflected Construction in Sicilian Dialects." *Annali di Ca' Foscari, Serie Occidentale* 49: 393–422.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U., and Anna Thornton. 1991. "Doppie basi e binarismo nella morfologia italiana." *Rivista di Linguistica* 3 (1): 3–22.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2015. "From Coordination to Subordination: the Grammaticalisation of Progressive and Andative Aspect in the Dialects of Salento." In *Coordination and Subordination*, ed. by Adriana Cardoso, Ana Maria Martins, Sandra Pereira, Clara Pinto, and Fernanda Pratas, 157–184. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leone, Alfonso. 1973. "Vattell'a pesca, vieni a piglialo." *Lingua Nostra* 34: 11–13.
- Leone, Alfonso. 1978. "Sullo scadimento semantico di andare." *Lingua Nostra* 39: 50–54.
- Maiden, Martin. 2004. "When lexemes become allomorphs – on the genesis of suppletion." *Folia Linguistica* 38: 227–56. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2004.38.3-4.227>
- Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti Italiani e Romanci: Morfosintassi Generativa*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti, vol. 3: Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Sornicola, Rosanna. 1976. "Vado a dire o vaiu a ddico problema sintattico o problema semantico?" *Lingua Nostra* 37 (3–4): 65–74.
- Sorrento, Luigi. 1950. *Sintassi romanza: Ricerche e prospettive*. Milan: Istituto editoriale cisalpino.
- Stefanini, Ruggero. 1970. "Imperativo per infinito in fiorentino." *Lingua Nostra* 31: 19–20.

- Thornton, Anna. 2007. "Is There a Partition in the Present Indicative of Italian Irregular Verbs?" *Annali Online di Ferrara – Lettere* 2: 43–61.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. 2008. "Encoding the Addressee in the syntax: Evidence from English imperative subjects." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26 (1):185–218.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-007-9029-6>