

The Inflected Construction in the dialects of Sicily:

parameters of micro-variation

Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro

(Ca' Foscari University of Venice)

Abstract

Sicilian dialects display an instance of verbal Pseudo-Coordination ($V1_{[TAM.Agr]} \text{ a } V2_{[TAM.Agr]}$), here referred to as the Inflected Construction or IC (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003), that can occur in very different configurations. Aim of this paper is to discuss the following parameters of micro-variation, by providing new data from recent fieldwork: (i) the restriction of the IC to some V2s; (ii) the possibility for the IC to occur across moods and tenses and to display complete paradigms for person features; (iii) the reduction of GO as V1, and of other possible V1s, to a prefix-like invariable form.

In the paper, three major types of IC are identified: Type 1 IC is only possible in some persons of the indicative present and in the 2SG of the imperative; Type 2 IC features the extension of the paradigm to other simple tenses of the indicative; Type 3 IC displays a full-fledged paradigm in the indicative (3 simple tenses), subjunctive and imperative.¹

¹ I would like to thank Giuliana Giusti for her remarks and comments on the data collected, Fabio Del Prete and Giusi Todaro for their stimulating questions concerning the characteristics of the different types of IC proposed, and two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank Ivana Costanza and Giusy D'Alessandro (for discussing with me examples from Camastrese), Graziella Meli (for Campobellese), Federica Cutrera and her family (for Mazzarinese), Maddalena and Raffaella Carnemolla and their family (for new data from Mazzarellese), Giusy Branchina

Keywords: Inflected Construction, Pseudo-Coordination, Sicilian dialects, motion verbs, restructuring verbs

1. Introduction

The discussion on the Sicilian verbal Pseudo-Coordination, which displays: i) a verb (V1) taken from a restricted class of restructuring verbs; ii) an optional connecting element *a*; iii) a lexical verb (V2), sharing mood, tense and person features with V1, has a long tradition in literature (cf. Ascoli 1896, 1901; Sorrento 1950; Rohlfs 1969; Stefanini 1970; Leone 1973, 1978; Sornicola 1976). Compare the examples of IC in Marsalese in (1)² with the examples in (2) showing the Infinitival Construction:³

- (1) a. *Vaju a ppigghju u pani.* (Marsala)
 go.1SG *a* fetch.1SG the bread
 ‘I go and fetch the bread.’
- b. *Vegnu a ffazzu a spisa.*

(for new data from Acese), Roberta Marletta (for Catanese), Elvira Graziano (for Rossanese), Carmelo Scarso (for Ispicese), Sabrina Debole (for new data from Ennese), Francesca Debole and Alessio Gaudesi (for Palermitano) and Delia Trentacosti and her family (for Marinese).

² The examples in (1a) and (2a) are from Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 373).

³ The Infinitival Construction, which is the only possible construction in Italian, is generally possible in the Sicilian dialects and is used to fill the ungrammatical slots of the IC paradigms. Note, however, that the imperative 2SG is the slot where the IC is preferred most of the times.

come.1SG *a* do.1SG the shopping

‘I come and do the shopping.’

(2) a. Vaju a ppigghjari u pani.

go.1SG to fetch.INF the bread

‘I go to fetch the bread.’

b. Vegnu a ffari a spisa.

come.1SG to do.INF the shopping

‘I come to do the shopping.’

Only recently, however, have detailed syntactic accounts of the phenomenon emerged (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003; Manzini & Savoia 2005)⁴, with some attempts at accounting for the defectiveness of the paradigms that resort to non-syntactic explanations (cf. Cruschina 2013 for a morphomic account).⁵ Cardinaletti & Giusti’s work, which focuses on the variety spoken in Marsala (in the province of Trapani) in comparison with similar constructions in Germanic (i.e. Swedish and American English),⁶ is taken as a point of reference in the present paper and for this reason the term Inflected Construction, or IC, to refer to this Pseudo-Coordination is used here.⁷

⁴ See also Ledgeway (2015), who describes the IC found in some dialects of Apulia with GO, STAND, and WANT as V1s.

⁵ Cf. Del Prete & Todaro (this volume) for a semantic analysis of the IC, especially with *mannari* ‘send’ as V1. Their work also contains an interesting account of the IC as a possible instance of a Serial Verb Construction. See also Accattoli & Todaro (2017) who treat the IC with invariable GO as a case of morphologization.

⁶ See Wiklund (1996, 2007) for Swedish Pseudo-Coordination and Shopen (1971), Carden & Pesetsky (1977) for the Pseudo-Coordination in American English.

More recently, Di Caro (2015) has highlighted the high degree of micro-variation the IC displays by providing data from many Sicilian varieties, covering different areas. Those data, which reported a wider set of possible V1s and described different patterns subject to lexical restrictions on V2, were later treated in a more organic way in Di Caro & Giusti (2015) and prompted a more fine grained syntactic analysis by Cardinaletti & Giusti (*to appear*), which clearly keeps the IC apart from another construction featuring two finite verbs, namely the Finite Construction (such as Milazzese *Vaju mi pigghju u pani* ‘I go to fetch the bread’, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 373-374; see also Rohlf’s 1969: §717; Calabrese 1993), more widespread in the dialects of southern Italy.

The present paper offers a way to handle important aspects that make the IC so rich in variation⁸ and is organized as follows: Section 2 summarizes Cardinaletti & Giusti’s (2001, 2003) account for what in this paper will be called the Type 1 IC found in Marsalese; Section 3 deals with a special case of lexical restriction on V2 in Palermitano; Section 4 introduces the IC Type 2; Section 5 introduces the IC Type 3; in Section 6 some other configurations of IC are considered; Section 7 draws the conclusions.

⁷ The use of the term Pseudo-Coordination comes from the fact that the connecting element *a* in the IC is diachronically a coordinator but the resulting construction does not instantiate any real coordination (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003 and Wiklund 2007 for extensive argumentation against the coordination reading of the two verbs within the IC).

⁸ Please note that the types this paper proposes focus mainly on the mood, tense and person restrictions, since some of the other features, such as the lexical restrictions on V1 and on V2, the possible presence of invariable V1s, and the optionality of the connecting element *a* seem to be orthogonal.

2. Type 1: the IC in Marsalese

The IC in Marsalese is only possible in the indicative present, where it is limited to 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and 3PL, and in the imperative 2SG. No other moods or tenses are accepted. The available V1s are only four and are taken from a restricted class of motion verbs: *jiri* ‘go’, *vèniri* ‘come’, *passari* ‘come by’ and the motion causative verb *mannari* ‘send’ (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003).

Cruschina (2013) suggests that we refer to morphomes (first described in Aronoff 1994) to account for the defectiveness of the IC paradigms in Marsalese and call this particular combination of grammatical cells in the indicative present and imperative the N-Pattern, following Maiden (2004) (see also Dressler & Thornton 1991, Thornton 2007).⁹ Besides the patterns used in the morphomic system, I will propose a more straightforward way to represent the different paradigms the various instances of IC display by using “0” and “1” for, respectively, ungrammatical and grammatical slots of the paradigm, separating the singular and the plural persons with a hyphen, so that, for example, the pattern for the indicative present in Marsalese is 111-001 (1SG, 2SG, 3SG, *1PL, *2PL, 3PL) and the pattern for the imperative is 1-0 (2SG, *2PL). In this way, we can describe the pattern of a specific paradigm (for example, the indicative present) without implying any correlated paradigm elsewhere (as the concepts of N-pattern or L-pattern do).

In order to account for the restrictions found in Marsalese, Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 397-407) describe the V1 as a lexical verb that is merged as a functional head and thus loses (part of) its argument structure (for this reason, they call it a “semi-lexical verb”). V1 is merged at the point where the language realizes the inflected V2, which is subject to parametric variation: in dialects like Marsalese it is merged in T. The two verbs in the IC are therefore restructured in a monoclausal structure subject to the Single Event Interpretation (cf. Shopen 1971), and Clitic Climbing to V1 is obligatory (whereas it is optional in the Italian Infinitival Construction). It is the lexicon that crucially specifies

⁹ We will see in Section 4 that some patterns in the IC emerging both from the same context (i.e. indicative present and imperative) and in other moods and tenses (i.e. indicative imperfect, preterite and subjunctive) are not predicted by any morphomic account (cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2015, *to appear*).

which forms of a given verb, usually the less marked form, can fill the V1 position. Di Caro & Giusti (*to appear*) propose to refer to this parameter, that should also be applied to V2, as a “nano-parameter”, in the sense of Biberauer & Roberts (2012:268).

The tables in (3) and (**Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.**) summarize the N-Pattern (i.e., 111-001 for the indicative present and 1-0 for the imperative) in Marsalese with all the four possible V1s and the transitive V2 ‘fetch’:

(3)	V1 GO	V1 COME	V1 COME BY	V1 SEND	V2 FETCH
1SG.	vaju	vegnu	passu	mannu	a ppigghju
2SG.	vai	veni	passi	manni	a ppigghji
3SG.	va	vene	passa	manna	a ppigghja
1PL.	*emu	*vinemu	*passamu	*mannamu	a ppigghjamu
2PL.	*iti	*viniti	*passati	*mannati	a ppigghjati
3PL.	vannu	vennu	pàssanu	mànnanu	a ppigghjanu

(4)	V1 ‘go’	V1 ‘come’	V1 ‘come by’	V1 ‘send’	V2 ‘fetch’
2SG.	va	veni	passa	manna	(a) pigghia!
2PL.	*iti	*viniti	*passati	*mannati	a ppigghjati!

All the other dialects that display the same IC found in Marsalese in terms of mood, tense and person restrictions will be referred to as Type 1. The IC in Marsalese also displays another interesting phenomenon: the possibility for the V1 GO to occur in the invariable form *va* for all the grammatical persons:¹⁰

(5) a. Vappigghju u pani. (Marsala)

va+a+fetch.1SG the bread

‘I go and fetch the bread.’

b. Vappigghji u pani.

va+a+fetch.2SG the bread

‘You go and fetch the bread.’

c. Vappigghja u pani.

va+a+fetch.3SG the bread

‘He goes to fetch the bread.’

d. Vappigghjanu u pani.

va+a+fetch.3PL the bread

‘They go and fetch the bread.’

¹⁰ Note that the pseudo-coordinator *a*, which is diachronically derived from Latin AC (cf. Rohlfs 1969 §761) is covert but still triggers the obligatory syntactic doubling on the starting consonant of V2 known as Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico.

I will not take into consideration this feature to decide whether a dialect belongs to Type 1 or not, but it will turn out to be an important feature of Type 3 IC. Next Section will present a dialect featuring Type 1 IC that displays a peculiar case of lexical restriction on V2.

3. Restrictions on V2 in the dialect spoken in Palermo

The IC found in Palermo shares with Marsalese most of its features and restrictions. Thus, it is only possible in some persons of the indicative present and in the 2SG of the imperative with GO, COME, COME BY and SEND as V1s. It also shares with Marsalese the optional invariable V1 *va* ‘go’, as shown in (6b):

- (6) a. Vaju a mmanciu a pasta. (Palermo)
 go.1SG a eat.1SG the pasta
- b. Vammanciu a pasta.
 va+a+eat.1SG the pasta
 ‘I go and eat pasta.’

According to the grouping system I am suggesting in this paper, this IC should be considered as a Type 1. However, with intransitive V2s it is limited to the indicative present 1SG (cf. Sorrisi 2010) and only with invariable GO as V1 (cf. (7a’)). This IC is structurally similar to the one of the imperative 2SG (Sorrisi 2010: 117-118), as shown in (7b):

- (7) a. *Vaju a ttravagghju.
 go.1SG a work.1SG

a'. Vatravagghju.

va+work.1SG

'I go to work.'

b. Va travagghja!

go.IMPR.2SG work.IMPR.2SG

'go to work!'

Such a restriction with intransitive V2s, which seems to be very specific to the area of Palermo, is a first instance of the interaction of the V2 in allowing for the IC to occur.¹¹ The next Section will deal with a case of more selective restrictions on V2 in some dialects of central Sicily.

4. Type 2: the indicative preterite IC in Deliano

The mood, tense and person restrictions accounted for by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003) for Marsalese are quite common in Sicily. However, some varieties, especially in central Sicily, display less restrictive versions in which the IC can also occur in the indicative imperfect and preterite, and even in the subjunctive (cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005, Cruschina 2013, Di Caro 2015, Di Caro & Giusti 2015). The data collected so far in recent fieldwork suggest that if a dialect displays the IC in the indicative imperfect, preterite, or in the subjunctive, then it will display it in the indicative present and in the

¹¹ Sorrisi (2010: 112-113) shows that the intransitive V2 *ruòrmiri* 'sleep' displays the same restrictions as *travagghjari* 'work' in (7). I have personally checked with other native speakers the peculiar behaviour of intransitive V2s. My informants have confirmed this distribution.

imperative too, according to the restrictions described for Type 1.¹² I will refer to such cases as Type 2.

The IC found in Delia (Caltanissetta) is a very interesting case of Type 2 IC that displays for the indicative preterite what in morphomic terms could be called the W-Pattern.¹³ This preterite IC, which excludes the 2SG and the 2PL persons (i.e., 101-101) features the same V1s of Type 1 (cf. (8a, b)) but can also occur with the restructuring verb *accuminciari* ‘start’ (as in (8c)) and, in a specific combination with *dari* ‘give’ as V2, also with *arristari* ‘remain’ (cf. Di Caro & Giusti *to appear*):

(8) a. Arsira jivu a ffici la spisa. (Delia)

last night go.PST.1SG a do. PST.1SG the shopping

‘I went to do the shopping last night.’

b. La vinni a scrissi la littra?

itCL come.PST.3SG a write.PST.3SG the letter

‘Did he/she come to write the letter?’

c. Allora, cci accuminciaru a ddissiru paroli.

then to-himCL start.PST.3PL a say.PST.3PL words

‘Then, they started insulting him.’

More interestingly, in Deliano this IC is only possible with a restricted class of V2s that display rhizotonic (i.e. root-stressed) and arhizotonic forms in their paradigm. In the

¹² Nevertheless, in the light of Cardinaletti & Giusti’s (2001, 2003) claim that it is the lexicon that specifies which forms of a given verb can enter the IC, a dialect displaying the IC only in moods and tenses other than the ones found in Marsalese could, in theory, be possible.

¹³ I refer the interested reader to Di Caro & Giusti (*to appear*), who provide a very detailed syntactic account of this particular instance of IC in Deliano.

preterite, it is possible only with the rhizotonic forms (cf. Di Caro 2015, Di Caro & Giusti 2015, to *appear*). The table in (9) summarizes the W-Pattern (101-101) for Deliano with GO, COME and START as V1 (but note that COME BY and SEND are also available) and DO and SAY as V2:

(9)	V1 GO	V1 COME	V1 START	V2 DO	V2 SAY
1SG.	jìvu	vinni	accuminciavu	a ffici	a ddissi
2SG.	*jìsti	*vinisti	*accuminciasti	a ffacisti	a ddicisti
3SG.	ji	vinni	accumincià	a ffici	a ddissi
1PL.	jammu	vìnnimu	accuminciammu	a fficimu	a ddìssimu
2PL.	*jìstivu	*vinìstivu	*accuminciàstivu	a ffacìstivu	a ddicìstivu
3PL.	jiru	vìnniru	accuminciaru	a fficiru	a ddìssiru

We have seen in Section 3 that in some cases V2 can play a role in deciding whether a cell of the paradigm is available or not. If in Palermitano, according to Sorrisi (2010: 111-13), intransitive V2s limit the IC to the indicative present 1SG and the imperative 2SG, and to the invariable GO as V1, in Deliano it is an even more restricted class of V2s, namely the verbs diachronically derived from Latin third conjugation (cf. Di Caro 2015: 50; see also the up-to-date set of available V2s in Di Caro & Giusti to *appear*), that trigger the IC in the preterite.

Note that, while in Palermitano the lexical specification of V2 interacts with the one of the preceding verb, so that it is still the less marked form of GO as V1 to allow for the IC to occur, in the Deliano preterite IC the lexical specification of V1 is bypassed by the one of V2. As a consequence, the resulting paradigm (101-101) is decided by the markedness of V2 (2SG and 2PL are prosodically more marked) whereas the V1 GO displays the more marked allomorph (*ji-* / *ja-*).

However, along with the particular configuration instantiated by Deliano and some other dialects of central Sicily (such as the ones spoken in Campobello di Licata and Camastra, in the province of Agrigento), a more liberal configuration can be found in dialects such as Leonfortese (Giusi Todaro, p.c.), in the province of Enna, where the IC in the preterite displays the W-Pattern but V2 is not restricted to the rhizotonic forms, so that both (10a) with DO as V2 and (10b) with SING as V2, the latter displaying an arhizotonic form, are grammatical:

(10) a. Ivi a ffici a spisa. (Leonforte)

go.PST.1SG a do.PST.1SG the shopping

‘I went to do the shopping.’

b. Ivi a ccantaju.

go.PST.1SG a sing.PST.1SG

‘I went to sing.’

It is not clear whether the IC did already display the restrictions found in Type 1 in its early versions or it was more liberal and has progressively lost some of the available cells of its paradigms for different reasons. Diachronically, however, data from Wilson (1999, cited in Cruschina 2013: 273) show some instances from the collection of Sicilian tales and short stories by the Sicilian folklorist Giuseppe Pitrè, in which the IC can occur in the indicative preterite also with V2s such as *lassari* ‘deliver’, which features only arhizotonic forms (cf. the example from Leonfortese in (10b)):

(11) Lu iju a lassau a lu funnacu. (Pitrè III, 340)

itSG go.PST.3SG a deliver.PST.3SG to the storehouse

‘I went to deliver it to the storehouse.’

This seems to indicate that the IC originally displayed less restrictions as regards both the lexical specification of V1 and V2 and the mood, tense and person features.

The following section will deal with a different type of IC, which on the one hand displays a wider range of mood, tense and person configurations, but on the other hand seems to be productive only with GO as V1.

5. Type 3: the IC in the dialects of eastern Sicily

Many Sicilian dialects, regardless of their belonging to Type 1 or Type 2, display the optional invariable GO as V1.¹⁴ Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 400) claim that the checking of the mood, tense and person features precedes the merging of the V1, which is merged in such a high head that cannot interact with the thematic structure of V2 and, thus, cannot check its features by moving to a designated functional head. Instead, V1 copies its features from the inflected V2 in a parasitic way. In the case of invariable V1, Cardinaletti & Giusti conclude that either no feature copying takes place or copying has an optional morphological manifestation.¹⁵

Some dialects of the eastern coast of Sicily, such as the ones spoken in Catania and Acireale, feature an IC in which V1 displays a high degree of grammaticalization. In

¹⁴ Note that the invariable form of GO is only possible within the IC. When GO is used as a lexical verb or within the Infinitival Construction, it never occurs in its invariable form. I thank an anonymous reviewer for suggesting me to point this out.

¹⁵ Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 402) relate the presence of the IC to the possibility for a variety to display invariable V1s and provide the cases of Italian and the dialect spoken in the town of Bovalino Marina (in the province of Reggio Calabria) which lack both invariable forms and the IC. Although micro-variation is very high among the dialects taken into account, as a matter of fact all of them display the optional invariable V1 GO for, at least, the 1SG of the indicative present.

these varieties, which feature a full-fledged paradigm (i.e. 111-111), the only available V1 is the invariable GO. V1 GO can occur as *va-*, *vo-*, *uo-* and, as a sign of the phonetic erosion typical of further grammaticalization process, even as *o-* (cf. Di Caro 2015: 62-8, Di Caro & Giusti 2015: 415-18).¹⁶ The tables in (12)-(16) show the full-fledged paradigm of Type 3 in the dialect of Catania with the invariable V1 *uo-* (in this dialect it can also occur as *o-*) in the indicative present, imperfect, preterite, together with the subjunctive – also functioning as conditional – and the imperative (since there are no ungrammatical cells in the Type 3 IC, I will not rely on the distinction between grey and white cells):

(12)	<i>uo+a+V2 Ind. Present FETCH</i>	
1SG.	Uoppigghju u pani.	‘I go and fetch the bread.’
2SG.	Uoppigghji u pani.	‘You go and fetch the bread.’
3SG.	Uoppigghja u pani.	‘(S)he goes to fetch the bread.’
1PL.	Uoppigghjamu u pani.	‘We go and fetch the bread.’
2PL.	Uoppigghjati u pani.	‘You go and fetch the bread.’
3PL.	Uoppigghjunu u pani.	‘They go and fetch the bread.’

(13)	<i>uo+(a)+V2 Imperative FETCH¹⁷</i>	
2SG.	Uopigghja u pani!	‘Go and fetch the bread!’
2PL.	Uoppigghjati u pani!	‘Go and fetch the bread!’

(14)	<i>uo+a+V2 Ind. Imp. FETCH</i>	
------	--------------------------------	--

¹⁶ On the origin of *uo-* and *o-* as deriving from *va-* see also Leone 1973 and Ledgeway 1997.

¹⁷ Note that in the imperative 2SG the connecting element *a* is usually missing, hence the lack of Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico on *pigghja*.

1SG.	Uoppigghjava u pani.	‘I used to go and fetch the bread.’
2SG.	Uoppigghjavi u pani.	‘You used to go and fetch the bread.’
3SG.	Uoppigghjava u pani.	‘(S)he used to go and fetch the bread.’
1PL.	Uoppigghjàumu u pani.	‘We used to go and fetch the bread.’
2PL.	Uoppigghjàuvu u pani.	‘You used to go and fetch the bread.’
3PL.	Uoppigghjàunu u pani.	‘They used to go and fetch the bread.’

(15)	<i>uo+a+V2 Ind. Preterite</i> FETCH	
1SG.	Uoppigghjai u pani.	‘I went to fetch the bread.’
2SG.	Uoppigghjasti u pani.	‘You went to fetch the bread.’
3SG.	Uoppigghjau u pani.	‘(S)he went to fetch the bread.’
1PL.	Uoppigghjammu u pani.	‘We went to fetch the bread.’
2PL.	Uoppigghjàsturu u pani.	‘You went to fetch the bread.’
3PL.	Uoppigghjaru u pani.	‘They went to fetch the bread.’

(16)	<i>uo+a+V2 Subj.</i> FETCH	
1SG.	Uoppigghjassi u pani.	‘I would go to fetch the bread.’
2SG.	Uoppigghjassi u pani.	‘You would go to fetch the bread.’
3SG.	Uoppigghjassi u pani.	‘(S)he would go to fetch the bread.’
1PL.	Uoppigghjàssimu u pani.	‘We would go to fetch the bread.’
2PL.	Uoppigghjàssivu u pani.	‘You would go to fetch the bread.’
3PL.	Uoppigghjàssiru u pani.	‘They would go to fetch the bread.’

Most of the centres of the areas in which the Type 3 IC occurs (mainly the coastal ones around Catania and Ragusa) are well connected to one another. As a consequence,

speakers can generally use, or at least recognize, more than one invariable GO for their IC. This can account for the variety of forms found there and, above all, for the difficulty to attribute one form to one specific variety. I will provide two examples. First, in Mazzarellese it is possible to find another invariable GO, namely *adda-*, together with the most common *vo-* (*addappigghju u pani* being synonymous to *voppigghju u pani* ‘I go and fetch the bread’).¹⁸ Despite being less common, *adda-* displays the same full-fledged paradigm and the same distribution of *vo-*, but most speakers, although understanding it, would rather attribute this form to Ragusano, the dialect spoken in the city of Ragusa, of which Marina di Ragusa is a frazione. Second, in the dialect of Ispica (Ragusa), the Type 3 IC in the imperative can display both the invariable V1s *vo-* and *o-*. According to some speakers, these V1s are used for different purposes: *o-* is preferred when giving orders, whereas *vo-* is used for invitations. This latter fact is further evidence that the V1 in Type 3 has undergone a process of grammaticalization in two steps, i.e. a semantic shift and phonetic erosion (cf. Bybee 2003, 2007), a phenomenon which is not new when the most basics motion verbs GO and COME are involved, especially because of their high frequency of use.

When V1 has undergone grammaticalization, it can retain its lexical meaning while becoming a progressive marker, as in (17a), or it can lose its motion semantics and become an emphatic marker involving emotional participation of the speaker in order to

¹⁸ I propose this ethnonym for the first time, since there seems to be none for the dialect spoken in Marina di Ragusa. Mazzarellese is named after the toponym *Mazzarelli*, italianized version of the local *Mazzareddri*, original name of Marina di Ragusa.

convey a sense of surprise or of a sudden action, as in (17b) (see also Cruschina 2013: 278-281, for the ‘surprise effect’ in the Type 1 IC):¹⁹

(17) a. Ora ottravagghju e poi u chjamu. (Acireale)

now *o*-work.1SG and then himCL call.1SG

‘I’m going to work now. I’ll call him later.’

b. Ci oddesi un pgnu...

to-himCL *o*-give.PST.1SG a punch

‘I suddenly punched him ...’

In the next session, other configurations of ICs featuring characteristics of more than one of the types proposed in the present paper will be presented.

¹⁹ Interestingly, we can find similar emphatic effects in the Pseudo-Coordination displayed by Germanic languages (see, for example, the ‘surprise effect’ in Swedish in Wiklund 2008 and Josefsson 2014).

6. Other configurations of Inflected Construction

As already stated above, the IC of the Sicilian dialects can occur in a number of configurations. Some of them share features of more than one type and could provide us with some hints on what the original IC could have looked like (if we presume a common origin for all the instances of IC in Sicily, something which is still to be ascertained). In very few varieties does the IC occur without the mood/tense/person restrictions described by Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003 or the ones found in Type 2 and 3.²⁰ Let us consider some examples.

Manzini & Savoia (2005: 696) report for the dialect spoken in Modica (Ragusa) an IC displaying full-fledged paradigms in the indicative present, imperfect and preterite but with both V1 and V2 fully inflected ('V1 a V2'). The examples in (18) show the indicative imperfect:

(18)	V1 Ind. Impf. GO + V2 I. Impf. DO	
1SG.	U ìa a ffascìa.	'I used to go and do it.'
2SG.	U jèutu a ffascièutu.	'You used to go and do it.'
3SG.	U ìa a ffascìa.	'(S)he used to go and do it.'
1PL.	U jèumu a ffascièumu.	'We used to go and do it.'
2PL.	U jèubbu a fascièubbu.	'You used to go and do it.'
3PL.	U jèunnu a fascièunnu.	'They used to go and do it.'

Furthermore, the Calabrian dialect of Rossano, in the province of Cosenza, displays an IC that, similarly to Modicano, features a full-fledged paradigm but in the asyndetic 'V1 V2'

²⁰ Note, however, that according to the data collected so far, the IC occurs only in simple tenses, regardless of the type it belongs.

configuration (Elvira Graziano, p.c.). This IC is possible in the indicative present and imperfect (the preterite is not used in Rossanese), in the imperative and further extends to subjunctive, like the Type 3 IC. In Rossanese, however, *COME* can also feature as V1. For reasons of space I will only show the 1SG (2SG and 2PL for the imperative) with *GO* as V1:

(19) a. *Vaju* *piju* *u* *panə*. (Rossano)

go.1SG *fetch*.1SG *the* *bread*

‘I go and fetch the bread.’

b. *Jia* *pijaja* *u* *panə*.

go.IMPRF.1SG *fetch*.IMPRF.1SG *the* *bread*

‘I used to go and fetch the bread.’

c. *Va* *pija* *u* *panə!*

go.IMP.2SG *fetch*.IMP.2SG *the* *bread*

‘Go and fetch the bread!’

c’. *Jitə* *pijatə* *u* *panə!*

go.IMP.2PL *fetch*.IMP.2PL *the* *bread*

‘Go and fetch the bread!’

d. *Jissa* *pijassa* *u* *panə*.

go.SUB.1SG *fetch*.SUB.1SG *the* *bread*

‘I would go and fetch the bread.’

Another, perhaps more interesting, case is the one found in Mazzarino (Caltanissetta). The IC in Mazzarinese behaves in different ways according to the V1 selected and to its form. Extended V1 *GO* follows the Type 1 IC, whereas invariable V1 *GO* (*va*-) instantiates

a Type 3 IC. But this dialect also features an invariable COME as V1 in the preterite (i.e. *vinn-*) that displays the W-Pattern as in the Type 2 IC.

The phenomenon under consideration is multifaceted, as these latter examples show, and further research is needed to establish the extent of the micro-variation this construction displays.

7. Conclusions

The IC of the Sicilian dialects is a syntactic structure occurring in many different configurations according to a number of features, such as the available persons, tenses and moods of the paradigm, the characteristics of the verbs involved as V1s and V2s in terms of meaning and morphological markedness, and the degree of grammaticalization of the first verb.

In this paper I have outlined the parameters of micro-variation of the IC in the light of the data already present in literature (mainly Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003; Di Caro & Giusti 2015, *to appear*), together with some new data collected in recent fieldwork. I have taken into account three different parameters concerning, respectively, the lexical restriction of the IC to some V2s, the range of restrictions (from the very limited configuration of Marsalese as described by Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003, to the more liberal, full-fledged paradigms of the dialects of eastern Sicily), and, finally, the prefixation of the invariable V1 GO (or of other possible V1s) in a highly grammaticalized construction.

Throughout the paper I have outlined three different types of IC:

i) Type 1 (see Section 2) basically coincides with the IC of Marsalese, featuring GO, COME, COME BY and SEND as available V1s, 1SG, 2SG, 3SG, 3PL of the indicative present

and 2SG of the imperative as available cells of the paradigm, and an optional invariable form of GO as V1;

ii) Dialects such as Deliano, Camastrese and Campobellese (central Sicily) belong to Type 2 (see Section 4) and feature the same characteristics of Type 1 but with the addition of a special paradigm for the indicative preterite (1sg, 3sg, 1pl, 3pl) and invariable forms of GO as V1 generally limited to singular persons;

iii) Some dialects of Eastern Sicily, such as Catanese, Acese and Mazzarellese, belong to Type 3 (see Section 5) and feature GO as 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 2SG, 2PL of the imperative.

Proposing three different types of IC does not imply that other types cannot be found. Actually, as data from further dialects are collected, new configurations emerge, but basically displaying the same features of the types suggested in this paper, and sometimes showing characteristics of more than one type.

References

- Accattoli, Matilde & Todaro, Giuseppina. 2017. Verbes de mouvement et grammaticalisation: le cas du sicilien vaffazzu. In *Normes et grammaticalisation: le cas des langues romanes*, Malinka Velinova (ed.), Sofia: CU “Romanistika”.
- Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by Itself*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Ascoli, Graziadio Isaia. 1896. Un problema di sintassi comparata dialettale. *Archivio glottologico italiano* 14: 453-468.
- Ascoli, Graziadio Isaia. 1901. Appendice all’articolo Un problema di sintassi comparata dialettale. *Archivio glottologico italiano* 15: 221-225.

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, Robert M. W. (eds). 2006. *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Roberts, Ian. 2012. Towards a Parameter Hierarchy for Auxiliaries: Diachronic Considerations. Paper presented at DGfS. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Bybee, Joan. 2003. Mechanisms of Change in Grammaticalization: The Role of Frequency. In *Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, Richard Janda & Brian Joseph (eds), 602-23. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bybee, Joan. 2007. *Frequency of Use and the Organization of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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 & 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. *to appear*. Multiple Agreement in Southern Italian Dialects. In *Linguistic Variations: Structure and Interpretation - Studies in Honor of M. Rita Manzini*, SGG, Ludovico Franco & Paolo Lorusso (eds). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2013. Beyond the Stem and Inflectional Morphology: an Irregular Pattern at the Level of Periphrasis. In *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology*, Silvio

- Cruschina, Martin Maiden & John Charles Smith (eds), 262-283. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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 & 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. *to appear*. Dimensions of variation: the Inflected Construction in the dialect of Delia (Caltanissetta). Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 13: Selected papers from the 46th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), New York, USA. John Hopkins.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Thornton, Anna. 1991. Doppie basi e binarismo nella morfologia italiana. *Rivista di Linguistica* 3 (1): 3-22.
- Josefsson, Gunlög. 2014. Pseudo-coordination in Swedish with gå 'go' and the 'surprise effect'. Lund University.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 1997. Asyndetic Complementation in Neapolitan Dialect. *The Italianist* 17: 231-273.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2016. From coordination to subordination: The grammaticalization of progressive and andative aspect in the dialects of Salento. In *Coordination and Subordination. Form and Meaning. Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*. Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira & Clara Pinto (eds), 157–184. Newcastle: Cambridge Publishing Scholars.
- 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.

- Maiden, Martin. 2004. When lexemes become allomorphs – on the genesis of suppletion. *Folia Linguistica* 38: 227-56.
- Manzini, M. Rita & Savoia, Leonardo M. 2005. *I dialetti Italiani e Romanci: Morfosintassi Generativa*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- Pitrè, Giuseppe. 1993 [1875]. *Fiabe, novelle e racconti popolari siciliani*, Vol. I-IV. Catania: Clio.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti, vol. 3: Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Shopen, Timothy. 1971. Caught in the Act. *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*: 254-263.
- 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.
- Sorrisi, Fabrizio. 2010. Le costruzioni flesse con va + verbo lessicale in palermitano. In *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt, 11. Studi sui dialetti della Sicilia*, Jacopo Garzonio (ed.), 111-120, Padova: Unipress.
- 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.
- Wilson, Imogen. 1999. Paratactic complementation in Sicilian. Unpublished M.Phil. dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- 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.