Anna Cardinaletti and Giuliana Giusti
Multiple agreement in Southern Italian dialects

1 Introduction

In Southern Italian varieties of Sicily, Calabria and Apulia, motion verbs enter multiple agreement constructions like the ones listed in (1), in which V1 and V2 are inflected for the same Person and Tense features[1]:

(1) a. vɔ ˈmaɲdʒə   (Martina Franca, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 690)
         go.1p.sg eat.1p.sg
     b. va[japp]igghio u pani   (Marsala, Sicily, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2003: 32)
         go.1p.sg *a* fetch.1p.sg the bread
     c. vinni mu ti viju   (Southern Calabria, Rohlfs 1969: 103)
         come.past.1p.sg *mu* you.cl eat.1p.sg
     d. vau ku mˈmaɲdʒu   (Mesagne, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 692)
         go.1p.sg *ku* eat.1p.sg

As noted since Rohlfs (1969: §761, §788, §789), the three connecting elements in (1b–d) have a different diatopic distribution. *A* is attested in Sicily and Apulia,[2] *mu* and its variants *mi, ma, u* and *i* are restricted to north-eastern Sicily and Calabria,[3] while *ku* is restricted to Apulia.

---

1 We report the data as they are found in the literature. The transcription of the examples will therefore not be consistent throughout the paper.
2 Rohlfs (1969: §761) reports that the inflected construction has a wider distribution across the dialects of Italy, especially in the imperative. This is outside the scope of this paper.
3 The following examples illustrate some variants of the linker *mu*:
(i) a. vaju i pigghiu u pani   (Roghudi, Calabria, Maesano 2016)
         go.1p.sg *i* fetch.1p.sg the bread

Anna Cardinaletti and Giuliana Giusti, Ca' Foscari University of Venice

In their broad account of Italian dialects, Manzini & Savoia (2005) discuss all constructions in (1) and treat (1a–b) as "aspectual constructions with finite verbs" (see Volume 1: 688–701) and (1c–d) as "subjunctive in place of infinitives" (see Volume 1: 650–673). Other authors have limited their attention to one of the constructions. Cases like (1b) are analysed by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003) for Sicilian and Ledgeway (2016) for Apulia; cases like (1c) are analysed by Chillà (2011) for Calabrian; cases like (1d) are analysed by Calabrese (1993) for Salentino. Cases like (1a) are mentioned in all works.

In all of these works, two generalizations emerge. First, it is often the case that more than one construction in (1) can coexist in one and the same variety (often together with the infinitive on V2). For instance, Cardinaletti & Giusti (2003: 374) note that the Sicilian dialect of Milazzo displays both *a* and *mi*; Manzini & Savoia (2005: 691–2) provide examples from the Apulian dialect of Mesagne where both *a* and *ku* are possible. Second, the constructions in (1) have a different degree of restructuring: when tested against the properties in (2), (1a–b) display monoclausal behaviour, while (1c–d) have a biclausal structure:

(2) a. Restricted class of V1
    b. Restrictions on Person and Tense
    c. Possible reduced morphology on V1 or on V2
    d. Presence / absence of arguments of V1
    e. Anaphoric vs. disjoint reference of the subject of V2
    f. Presence / absence of clitic climbing onto V1

The aim of this paper is to apply the diagnostics in (2) in order to distinguish systematically among the constructions in (1) from a structural point of view, as outlined in (3). As in Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 374), we call (3a) the "Inflected construction" to capture the fact that V1 is parasitically inflected on the features of V2 (which we express by suggesting that V1 is merged in *t*, a head immediately higher than T), and (3b) the "Finite construction" to capture the fact that V1 selects a reduced subordinate clause (FinP) with an independent TP (parallel to the type of subordinate clause found in Balkan

---

b. vaju u cattu u pani   (Siderno, Calabria, Maesano 2016)
    go.1p.sg *u* fetch.1p.sg the bread
c. vaju mi pigghiu u pani   (Milazzo, Sicily, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 374)
    go.1p.sg *mi* fetch.1p.sg the bread

languages which replaces infinitival constructions, cf. Calabrese 1993). Multiple agreement thus arises in different ways in the two constructions[4]:

(3) a. $[_{tP}$ V1 [a $[_{TP}$ V2 $[_{VP}$ ~~V2~~   (Inflected construction)

   b. $[_{TP}$ V1 $[_{VP}$ ~~V1~~ $[_{FinP}$ mu / ku $[_{TP}$ V2 $[_{VP}$ ~~V2~~   (Finite construction)

Our second aim is to provide a more general picture of their diatopic distribution and observe how the structures in (3) can be entered by other verbal elements such as aspectuals and modals.

   The connecting element in (1b) triggers Raddoppiamento sintattico (RS) on V2. This has also been discussed for the Apulian dialects by Ledgeway (2016), as in (4a). When the connecting element is absent, its presence can be detected by the presence of RS, as in (4b):

(4) a. vok a ffattsə   (Putignano, Apulia, Ledgeway 2016)
      go.1p.sg *a* do.1p.sg

   b. lu va ffazzu   (Mesagne, Apulia, Ledgeway 2016)
      it.cl go do.1p.sg

In (1a), no RS on V2 is found. Thus, the connecting element is truly missing. The presence of *a* can be optional, as is the case of Enna. *A* in (5a) triggers RS; in (5b) *a* is absent, and no RS is found[5]:

(5) a. vaju / vignu a ppigliu u pani.   (Enna, Sicily, Di Caro 2015: 84)
      go.1p.sg / come.1p.sg *a* fetch.1p.sg the bread

   b. vaju / vignu pigliu u pani   (Enna, Sicily, Di Caro 2015: 84)
      go.1p.sg / come.1p.sg fetch.1p.sg the bread

Absence of the connecting element as in (1a) will be shown to arise in either construction in (3).

---

4 As discussed in detail by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003) and Ledgeway (2016), the Inflected construction is not a coordination structure although the connecting element *a* is diachronically related to the Latin conjunction AC. Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 374, 409, fn. 3) also exclude that the Inflected construction is a serial verb construction because of the lack of object sharing between V1 and V2 and the presence of the connecting element *a*. Manzini and Savoia (2005: 701) envisage the possibility that the Inflected construction be a serial verb construction (also see Cruschina 2013).

5 In the dialect of Marsala, lack of *a* without RS is only found in the imperative form (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 412, fn. 19).

2 Lexical and morphological restrictions

2.1 Restrictions on V1

Being merged in one and the same clause as the lexical verb V2, V1 in the Inflected construction qualifies as a functional verb. Its functional status correlates with a restriction on the type of verbs that can appear as V1. In western Sicily, the Inflected construction is possible with the most basic andative verbs (6a). In central Sicily, the Inflected construction also allows for two aspectual verbs, (6b). The most restricted distribution is found in Apulia where the Inflected construction is limited to *go, stand* and *want* (6c)[6]:

(6) a. Marsala (Western Sicily) (Cardinaletti & Giusti 1998, 2001, 2003):
         motion verbs: go, come, send, come by.
     b. Delia (Central Sicily) (Di Caro 2015):
         motion verbs: go, come, send, come by, come back;
         aspectual verbs: come back (= do again), start.
     c. Apulia (Manzini & Savoia 2005: 689; Ledgeway 2016):
         motion verbs: go (rarely come).
         aspectual verbs: go, stand.
         modal verbs: want.

The Finite construction is much more productive in that many more verbs can appear as V1, as already noted by Calabrese (1993) for Salentino and Manzini & Savoia (2005) for Calabrian. In the detailed overview of three geographically adjacent Southern Calabrian dialects (in the province of Reggio Calabria), Maesano (2016) reports that the Finite construction can be selected by most motion verbs and, in addition, by most aspectual and modal verbs (7a). For the Finite construction with *ku* in the Apulian dialects, Manzini & Savoia (2005) provide examples with verbs of the three classes listed in (7b):

(7) a. Galati/Roghudi (Southern Calabria) (Maesano 2016):
         motion verbs: go, come, send, come by, come back, go out, go down, go up, run, come in, jump, arrive, stretch out, hurry up;
         aspectual verbs: start, begin, finish, try, keep;
         modal verbs: want, can, must.

---

6 Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001: 372) define motion verbs occurring in the Inflected construction as "semi-lexical", namely "lexical categories merged as functional heads". This is to capture the fact that they preserve the andative meaning while losing the goal argument (*ibid.*: 392f).

b. Alliste, Carmiano, Copertino, Mesagne, Nociglia, Torre Santa Susanna
(Apulia) (Manzini & Savoia 2005: 653–656, 692–695):
motion verbs: go, come, sit;
aspectual verbs: begin, stay, try;
modal verbs: want, must.

As already noted by Calabrese (1993) for Salentino (8), the Finite construction is also possible as the complement of lexical verbs and alternates with the full finite clause introduced by *ka* 'that'. The same is true for Calabrian dialects (9) with *mi*:[7]

(8) a. speru lu Karlu ku bbene kray   (Salentino, Apulia, Calabrese 1993: 46)
         hope.1p.sg the Karlu *ku* come.3p.sg tomorrow
     b. speru ka lu Karlu ene kray   (Salentino, Apulia, Calabrese 1993: 46)
         hope.1p.sg *ka* the Karlu come.3p.sg tomorrow

(9) a. pensu mi partu dumani.   (Roghudi, Calabria, D. Maesano, p.c.)
         think.1p.sg *mi* leave.1p.sg tomorrow
     b. pensu ca partu dumani.   (Roghudi, Calabria, D. Maesano, p.c.)
         think.1p.sg *ca* leave.1p.sg tomorrow

The restrictions seen in (6), which are typical of functional verbs, support the peculiar monoclausal analysis proposed in (3a). In each variety, only a few verbs are lexically marked for the possibility of being merged as the head of *t*P, a functional projection higher than TP whose head copies the featural specification of T, which we take to be a bundle of features including subject Agreement (Agr).[8] The full productivity of the Finite construction in (7)–(9) supports the biclausal analysis proposed in (3b).

---

7 The finite construction is also found in other environments, such as adverbial and relative clauses, which will not be discussed here (also see Chillà 2011).

8 Ledgeway (2016) criticizes Cardinaletti & Giusti (2003) by saying that their hypothesis of a low AgrP is in conflict with hypotheses on the location of AgrP in current syntactic theory (Cinque 1999). In that paper on page 36, we show that the lexical verb V2 raises to its usual surface position preceding floating quantifiers and adverbs (Agr/T, which in Sicilian is as high as in Italian) and suggest that the motion verb is first-merged immediately higher than that position. No low AgrP is suggested in Cardinaletti & Giusti (2003) (or here). On the contrary, a high merger of V1 parasitically copying the Agr/T features of V2 is proposed by us. Ledgeway's criticism actually applies to his own proposal which will be provided in (28b) below, where V2 carrying [+Agr] remains inside VP and the Agr position in the clause is filled by V1 which actually carries a [-Agr] feature.

Strong support for this analysis comes from the observation that the Finite construction refers to two different events, while the Inflected construction has single event interpretation. By stating (10a) with the Inflected construction, the speaker not only claims that she goes to buy chicory but, crucially, that she actually buys it every day. For this reason, the continuation which implies that the event of buying has not taken place is ungrammatical. This is not the case in the infinitival construction in Marsalese (10b) and in the Finite construction in Leccese (10c), where the two verbs have separate Tenses (also cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 386–8)[9]:

(10) a. Vaju a accattu a cicoria gnignornu (*ma unn'a trovu mai).
         (Marsala, Sicily)
         go.1p.sg *a* buy.1p.sg the chicory every day (but not it.cl find.1p.sg never)
     b. Vaju a accattari a cicoria gnignornu (ma unn'a trovu mai).
         (Marsala, Sicily)
         go.1p.sg to buy.inf the chicory every day (but not it.cl find.1p.sg never)
         'I go to buy chicory every day, but I can never find any.'
     c. Au cu cattu le cecore ogne giurnu (ma nu le trou mai).
         (Lecce, Apulia, D. Cesiri p.c.)
         go.1p.sg *ku* buy.1p.sg the chicories every day (but not them.cl find.1p.sg never)

2.2 Restrictions on person and tense

The Inflected construction displays Person and Tense restrictions which are not found in the Finite construction.

Cardinaletti & Giusti (1998, 2001, 2003) note for the dialect of Marsala that the Inflected construction is possible in the three persons singular (11a,b,c) and in the 3rd person plural of the present indicative (11f) and the 2nd person singular of the imperative (11g). The 1st and 2nd person plural of the indicative (11d, e) and the 2nd person plural of the imperative (11h) are ungrammatical[10]:

---

9 Manzini & Savoia (2005: 698) observe that the events of the two verbs of the Inflected construction share the same time reference; they however assume a biclausal analysis of the Inflected construction, different from our hypothesis in (3a).

10 In the dialect of Marsala, as in most other Sicilian dialects, the Inflected construction coexists with the infinitival construction also found in Italian. The persons which are ungrammatical in the Inflected construction can only express the andative meaning with the infinitive on V2, while the other persons display both the Inflected and the infinitival construction.

(11) a. vaju / vegnu / passu / mannu a pigghiu u pani
    b. vai / veni / passi / manni a pigghi u pani
    c. va / vene / passa / manna a pigghia u pani
    d. *imu / *vinimu / *passamu / *mannamu a pigghiamu u pani
    e. *iti / *viniti / *passati / *mannati a pigghati u pani
    f. vannu / vennu / passanu / mannanu a pigghianu u pani
    g. va pigghia u pani
    h. *iti pigghiati u pani
       go / come / come by / send *a* fetch the bread

There are more liberal Sicilian dialects which display the Inflected construction with other persons and tenses. For the dialect of Modica (Sicily), Manzini & Savoia (2015) provide the full pattern in the present and imperfect indicative, and Cruschina (2013: 274, fn. 9) reports to have personally checked that "the paradigm is actually complete". However, he does not provide examples, neither does he specify whether the alleged complete paradigm refers to all moods (including subjunctive / conditional, infinitival and gerund) and all tenses (including compound tenses). If the dialect of Modica presents the same situation as Di Caro (2015) reports for the dialect of Aci, another eastern Sicilian variety, Cruschina's complete pattern should be intended as being limited to simple finite tenses.[11]

The general picture obtained from these works is that the Inflected construction manifests a mechanism of Person and Tense feature sharing between V1 and V2 which display different morphological patterns in different dialects.

Cruschina (2013: 273) claims that "no morphosyntactic restrictions or semantic principles can be considered responsible for the irregular distribution" of the Inflected construction and reduces the defective paradigm of the Marsalese Inflected construction to a manifestation of Maiden's (2004) N-pattern, which is typical of the morphological organization of verbal paradigms in Romance languages (also see Dressler & Thornton 1991, Thornton 2007). This account is not incompatible with the hypothesis put forth by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 407–409 and 2003: 44) that the less marked forms of the verbal paradigm enter the Inflected construction in Marsalese: 1st, 2nd, 3rd person singular and 3rd person plural of the present indicative plus 2nd person singular of the imperative. In fact, the N-pattern sorts out

---

11 An Inflected construction with a non-finite V1 is logically possible even if it cannot be detected in Marsalese (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2003: 48, fn. 19). For Apulian dialects, Ledgeway (2016) provides examples with reduced infinitive *sci'* instead of *scire* and reduced past participle *sciu'* instead of *sciuta*, which can only occur when a V2 is also present; thereby, providing a case for the Inflected construction in the infinitive and participle moods.

morphologically less marked forms built on the bare stem of the verb from more marked forms built on the theme and in more complex ways (cf. Thornton 2007).[12]

Many questions arise in Cruschina's purely morphological account. First, since many verbs in Marsalese display the N-pattern, why don't other verbs (e.g. 'go out' or 'stay' and 'sit') enter the Inflected construction as V1? (Note that this is indeed possible in other varieties, see (6) above). Second, why do regular verbs such as *passari* 'come by' and *mannari* 'send' only enter the Inflected construction in the same persons and moods as the verbs which have the morphological N-pattern and not in the whole paradigm (see (11) above)? Third, what is the parameter that allows the complete paradigm in dialects like Modicano (and thus also the persons and tenses outside the N-pattern) but still limits the Inflected construction to very few selected V1s? We believe that a syntactic account is still needed and should complement a morphological account, as also suggested by Corbett (2015: 179–180), who brings the Inflected construction as an example of externally relevant morphological irregularity in a paradigm.

Other issues are raised by the application of morphomic patterns to the Inflected construction across dialects. In the Sicilian dialects of Marsala (12a) and Delia (12b), *viniri* 'come' displays an L-pattern in Maiden's (2005) terms (only 1st person indicative and all persons in the present subjunctive).[13] Yet, the person split in the Inflected construction with this verb singles out the same persons and moods as in the N-pattern in both Marsalese (cf. (11)) and Deliano (Di Caro 2015):

---

12 "Morphomic paradigms" are classified by Maiden (2004) with the letters of the alphabet that most resemble the shape resulting by highlighting cells of the paradigm realized by a certain allomorph. The 1st, 2nd, 3rd person singular and 3rd person plural of the present indicative plus 2nd person singular of the imperative form an N:

indicative						imperative	
1st sg	2nd sg	3rd sg	1st pl	2nd pl	3rd pl	2nd sg	2nd pl
vaju	vai	va	imu	iti	vannu	va	iti

For the graphic representation of other patterns, see fn. 14 and fn. 15.

13 The L-pattern is exemplified by Portuguese *poder* 'be able' (Maiden 2004: 149):

	1st sg	2nd sg	3rd sg	1st pl	2nd pl	3rd pl
Indicative	posso	podes	pode	podemos	podeis	podem
Subjunctive	possa	possas	possa	possamos	possais	possam

Note that present subjunctive is independently absent in the dialects of Marsala (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001: 410, fn. 9), and Delia (Di Caro 2015). Thus, in these dialects, the L-pattern only includes the 1st singular person of the present indicative.

(12) a. <u>vegnu</u>, veni, veni, vinimu, viniti, vennu
    b. <u>vjignu</u>, vjini, veni, vinjimmu, viniti, vjinnu
      come.1p.sg, come.2p.sg, come3p.sg, come.1p.pl, come.2p.pl, come.3p.pl

Furthermore, the aspectual verbs *turnari* 'do again' and *accuminciari* 'begin' in Deliano display different morphomic patterns from one another, yet they enter the Inflected construction only in the 1st person singular and 3rd person plural indicative. These two persons remind us of Maiden's (2005) U-pattern, if we consider that present subjunctive is independently absent in this dialect (see fn. 11)[14]:

(13) a. tuirnu / accuminciu a ddicu
    b. *tuirni / *accuminci a ddici
    c. *torna / *accumincia a ddici
    d. *turnammu / *accuminciammu a ddiciimmu
    e. *turnati / *accuminciati a ddiciti
    f. tornanu / accumincianu a ddicinu
      return / start *a* say

Lack of straight correspondence between the morphomic patterns of the paradigms and the person restrictions in the Inflected construction shows that the former cannot be the only and direct trigger of the latter.

In all the cases discussed above, the verb relevant for morphomic considerations is V1. The dialect of Delia lets us uncover another morphological restriction on the Inflected construction which is unexpected in Cruschina's morphomic account. In Delia, the Inflected construction is also possible in the simple past. However, it undergoes different restrictions from those observed for the present indicative. It is limited to 'go' and 'come' as V1 and is possible in the 1st and 3rd persons singular and plural. This person split is not discussed in Maiden's (2005) overview of morphomic patterns in Romance. Following Di Caro and Giusti (2016), we call it the W-pattern:

---

14 The U-pattern is exemplified by Old Tuscan *potere* 'be able' and other Central Italian varieties (Maiden 2004: 149):

	1st sg	2nd sg	3rd sg	1st pl	2nd pl	3rd pl
Indicative	posso	puoi	può	potemo	potete	possono
Subjunctive	possa	possa	possa	possiamo	possiate	possano

(14) a. jivu / vinni a bbitti
    b. *jisti / *vinìsti a bbidìsti
    c. ji / vinni a bbitti
    d. jammu / vìnnimu a bbìttimu
    e. *jìstivu / *vinìstivu a bbidìstivu
    f. jiru / vìnniru a bbìttiru
       go / come *a* see

Di Caro (2015) also observes that the Inflected construction in the past is only possible in Deliano when both V1 and V2 are "rhyzotonic", namely when the main stress falls on the root. Thus, the morpho-phonological properties of V2 are also relevant:

(15) a. *jivu a mmangiàvu
    b. *jisti a mmangiàsti
    c. *ji a mmangià
    d. *jammu a mmangiàmmu
    e. *jìstivu a mmangiàstivu
    f. *jiru a mmangiàru
       go *a* eat.

Note that the stress on the root also characterizes the relevant forms in the N-pattern. Building on this as well as other properties, Thornton (2007) suggests that the N-pattern should be extended to regular verbs, where the three persons of the singular and the 3rd person plural have a stressed verbal root, while the 1st and 2nd person plural are "arhyzotonic", namely they have an unstressed root. In this hypothesis, any verb can in principle enter the Inflected construction in those varieties that display it. Since this is trivially not the case, further specifications in the lexicon of each variety must be assumed as regards which forms of V1 have the capacity to check their features parasitically on the Tense+Agr features of V2.

In conclusion, the Sicilian facts discussed in this section argue against Cruschina's (2013: 273) assumption that "no morphosyntactic restrictions or semantic principles can be considered responsible for the irregular distribution" of the Inflected construction and suggest that an intricate interaction between syntax and morpho-phonology is at stake.

Whatever the correct syntactic analysis of the peculiar restrictions on V1 (and V2, see (15) in Deliano) in the Inflected construction should be, it is crucial to note that no such restrictions have been pointed out for the Finite Construction in Calabrian and and Apulian dialects (Calabrese 1993, Manzini & Savoia 2005,

Ledgeway 2016, Maesano 2016). This is expected in the biclausal analysis of the Finite construction, in which the superordinate and the subordinate clauses have independent Tenses (see (3b) and (18) below). When the two verbs share the same Agreement features, this is because the subject of V2 is anaphoric to the subject of V1. But the two subjects may also be different, as in (8) above, in which case V1 and V2 expectedly display different person agreement morphology. At this point, it should be clear that in the Finite construction, multiple agreement is only apparent. This is further supported by cases like (16), where the superordinate clause contains an infinitival V1 which displays no agreement at all, while V2 is a subjunctive-like form, namely *u* + indicative:

(16) pozzu iri u'ccattu u pani   (Siderno, Calabria, Maesano 2016)
        can.1p.sg go *u* buy.1p.sg the bread

2.3 Invariant or reduced forms of V1 or V2

V1 and V2 do not always display full inflection for Tense and Agreement. In some dialects, it is possible / obligatory to find reduced inflection on either verb. The Inflected construction allows for a reduced or invariant form of V1 and has full Tense+Agr realization on V2 (17), while the Finite construction allows for a reduced T (but full Agr) on V2 and has full Tense+Agr realization on V1 (18):

(17) a.   (Tu) vai/va a pigghi u pani.   (Marsala, Sicily, Cardinaletti & Giusti
                                                                2001: 383)

              (you) go.2p.sg/go *a* fetch.2p.sg
              the bread
       b.   lu sta fˈfattsu / fˈfatʃi / etc.   (Mesagne, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia
                                                                2005: 691)

              it.cl stay do.1p.sg / do.2p.sg / etc.
       c.   ti sta rispunˈnia   (Copertino, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia
                                                                2005: 693)

              you.cl stay answer.past.1p.sg

(18) a.   uˈlia ku ˈ maɲtʃu   (Alliste, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia
                                                                2005: 695)

              want.past.1p.sg *ku* eat.1p.sg
       b.   potiva i pigghiu u pani   (Galati, Calabria, Maesano 2016)
              can.past.1p.sg *i* fetch.1p.sg the bread

The patterns in (17) are expected under Cardinaletti & Giusti's (2001, 2003) hypothesis that in the Inflected construction, Agreement and Tense features are checked parasitically by V1 sitting in *t* onto V2 sitting in T, as in (3a) above. If V1 does not have autonomous Tense and Agreement features, it is not implausible that V1 has a more reduced feature realization than V2.

Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001, 2003) report that the only reduced V1 in Marsalese is *va* 'go'. More accurate field work, however, reveals that *viniri* 'come', *passari* 'come by', and *mannari* 'send' also display reduced forms, as represented in the following paradigms which distinguish between elided and invariant forms. Note that in some persons, the two forms cannot be distinguished phonologically, but we have inserted them for completeness. Note also that the invariant forms are not possible in the 1st and 2nd person plural, which never allow the Inflected construction in this dialect, see (11d,e) above:

(19) a. vegn(u) /*ven a pigghiu u pani
    b. ven(i) / ven a pigghi u pani
    c. ven(a) / ven a pigghia u pani
    d. *imu / *ven a pigghiamu u pani
    e. *iti / *ven a pigghia u pani
    f. venn(u) /ven a pigghianu u pani

(20) a. pass(u) / pass a pigghiu u pani
    b. pass(i) / pass a pigghi u pani
    c. pass(a) / pass a pigghia u pani
    d. *passam(u) / *pass a pigghiamu u pani
    e. *passat(i) / *pass a pigghiati u pani
    f. passan(u) /pass a pigghianu u pani

In both paradigms, it is clear that phonological elision of the ending vowel of V1 triggered by adjacency with the vocalic connecting element *a* is always possible. In the 2nd and 3rd person singular forms of *viniri* in (19b,c) and in the three persons singular of *passari* in (20a,b,c), the elided forms are homophonous to the bare stem, *ven-* and *pass-*, respectively. However, the 1st person singular of *viniri* (19a) shows that only the elided form is possible and not the bare stem. Differently from this, the 3rd person plural forms display both possibilities (19f) and (20f). These data clearly show that phonological reduction should be kept distinct from invariant forms, and that both may be possible in the same persons of the verbal paradigm in one and the same variety. Thus, invariant forms cannot be taken as the final step of grammaticalization due to "inflectional attrition" (Ledgeway 2016) or "phonological erosion" (Cruschina 2013).

The impossibility of the invariant form in (19a) also shows that the availability of invariant / uninflected forms in the dialect is independent of their use in the Inflected construction. This is further confirmed by empirical evidence going in both directions. On the one hand, the dialect of Marsala displays uninflected forms for the present perfect auxiliary *ha* 'have' and the progressive auxiliary *sta* 'stay' (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 384–5); however, *sta* does not enter the Inflected construction. On the other hand, the dialect of Delia displays an invariant form only for the progressive auxiliary *sta* 'stay' and not for *va* 'go' in the Inflected construction (Di Caro 2015). This means that the overt realization of parasitic agreement is mandatory in some dialects (e.g. Delia), optional in others (e.g. Marsala), and impossible in those dialects in which the Inflected construction is only found with the invariant form of 'go' and 'stay' (e.g. Mesagne (17b), cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005: 691–2).

The Finite construction presents a very different picture. As shown in (18), not only is the reduced form on V2 and not on V1, but it is also of a different nature in that it only regards Tense features while Person features are fully realized. The patterns in (18), where V1 is past indicative and V2 is present indicative, are expected if the V2 clause contains a Tense anaphoric to the Tense on V1, as is the case of subjunctives (cf. Calabrese 1993: 46–48 and Manzini & Savoia 2005: 652), and if this anaphoric tense is formed analytically with the morpheme *ku/mu* preceding the forms of the indicative, as suggested by Manzini & Savoia (2005).

Note finally that the patterns in (18) can also be found in the absence of *ku*. Example (18), repeated in (21a), forms a minimal pair with (21b):

(21) a.　uˈlia kuˈ maɲtʃu　　　　　(Alliste, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 695)
　　　　 want.past.1p.sg *ku* eat.1p.sg
　　 b.　uˈlia ˈmaɲtʃu　　　　　　(Alliste, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 695)
　　　　 want.past.1p.sg eat.1p.sg

The optional realization of *ku* in (21) reminds us of the optional realization of the complementizer in Italian when the subordinate clause contains a subjunctive (or conditional or future indicative) verb (22) (Poletto 2001, Cardinaletti 2004: 129–131, Giorgi & Pianesi 2004):

(22)　Credo (che) lo incontri domani.
　　　 think.1p.sg (that) him.cl meet.3p.sg tomorrow

This analysis will be supported by clitic placement discussed in section 3.3.2 below.

3 Syntactic properties

So far, we have illustrated the different morphological properties which characterize V1 in the Inflected construction: we have seen that in some dialects, V1 respects morphomic patterns and that in other dialects, different patterns are found in this construction. We have also seen that V1 may appear in reduced and invariant forms. In what follows, we show that independently of the morphology of V1, the Inflected construction is a unitary syntactic phenomenon that reacts consistently to syntactic diagnostics to detect monoclausal structures (2d–f) and it is different from the Finite construction.

3.1 Presence / absence of arguments of V1

If the Inflected construction is monoclausal with a single VP and a single TP, unlike the Finite construction which has two independent VPs and two independent TPs (see (3)), we expect that V1 behaves like an auxiliary and cannot project its argument structure. This is in fact the case. The Inflected construction does not allow for arguments of V1 (such as locative arguments in (23) and clitic clusters selected by the lexical motion verb 'go' in (24)), while they are possible in the Finite construction (25)–(26)[15]:

(23) a. Va (*agghiri a casa) a mangia.   (Marsala, Sicily, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 377)
        go.3p.sg (towards to home) *a* eat.3p.sg
    b. Va (*alla scola) ffatìa.   (Lecce, Apulia, Ledgeway 2016)
        go.3p.sg (to-the school) work.3p.sg

(24) a. (*Minni) vaju a mangiu.   (Marsala, Sicily, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 377)
        (me.cl-from-it.cl) go.1p.sg *a* eat.1p.sg
    b. (*Se nde) va ccanta.   (Lecce, Apulia, Ledgeway 2016)
        (self.cl-from-it.cl) go.3p.sg sing.1p.sg

---

15 Daniela Cesiri (p.c.) points out that the form *va* in (23b) and (25b) is not used in the town of Lecce, which displays *ae*, as in (i), but it is used in other Salentino varieties:
(i) a.   Ae (*alla scola) ffatìa.   (Lecce, Apulia)
     b.   Ae alla scola cu ffatìa.   (Lecce, Apulia)
          go.3p.sg to-the school *ku* work.3p.sg

(25) a. Va a scola i/mi lavora.   (Galati/Roghudi, Calabria, D. Maesano, p.c.)
     go.3p.sg to school *i/mi* work.3p.sg
  b. Va alla scola cu ffatìa.   (Lecce, Apulia, Ledgeway 2016)
     go.3p.sg to-the school *ku* work.3p.sg

(26) a. Sinni va a scola i/mi lavora.   (Galati/Roghudi, Calabria, D. Maesano, p.c.)
     self.cl-from-it.cl go.3p.sg to school work.1p.sg
  b. Se nde va cu ffatìa.   (Salentino, Apulia, D. Cesiri, p.c.)
     self.cl-from-it.cl go.3p.sg *cu* work.1p.sg

It is incorrect to assume a biclausal structure in all cases in which V1 is fully inflected. We thus disagree with Ledgeway's (2016) analysis of Apulian dialects. He claims that in the northern dialects, the inflected V1 (*stoc* in (27a)) selects a CP, as shown in the structural representation in (28a), while in Salentino, the invariant V1 (*sta* in (27b)) gives rise to a monoclausal structure as in (28b):

(27) a. stoc' a ffazzu   (Northern Apulian, Ledgeway 2016)
     stay.1p.sg *a* do.1p.sg
  b. sta ffazzu   (Salentino, Ledgeway 2016)
     stay do.1p.sg

(28) a. [$_{IP}$ AgrP$_i$ STAND/GO$_{[+Agr_i]}$] [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ ~~STAND/GO~~ [$_{CP}$ *a* [$_{IP}$ AgrP$_j$ V$_{[+Agr_j]}$]]]]]
  b. [$_{IP}$ AgrP$_i$ STAND/GO$_{[-Agr]}$ [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ V$_{[+Agr_i]}$]]]

If the correct analysis of (27a) were (28a), we would expect V1 *stoc* to behave as a lexical verb and therefore occur with its arguments on a par with (25)–(26), something which Ledgeway does not illustrate and to our knowledge is unattested. We analyze both (27a) and (27b) as instances of the Inflected construction, with a monoclausal structural analysis as in (3a) above. This analysis is supported by the clitic placement facts discussed in Section 3.3.1 below.

3.2 Anaphoric vs. disjoint reference of the subject of V2

As already observed in (8), the *ku* construction has an independent subject position, which can but does not have to be anaphoric to the subject of the main predicate:

(29) a. oyyu ku mme ne bbau   (Salentino, Apulia, Calabrese 1993: 44)
         want.1p.sg *ku* me.cl from-it.cl go.1p.sg
     b. oyyu ku bbene krai   (Salentino, Apulia, Calabrese 1993: 34)
         want.1p.sg *ku* come.3p.sg

Different subjects and hence different agreement morphology on V1 and V2 are never possible in the Inflected construction, even in the case of 'send' as V1, whose causative meaning implies that the causer is necessarily different from the external argument of V2:

(30) a. mannu a pigghiu u pani   (Marsala, Sicily, Di Caro & Giusti 2016)
         send.1p.sg *a* fetch.1p.sg the bread
     b. *mannu a pigghia u pani
         send.1p.sg *a* fetch.3p.sg the bread

The grammaticality is reversed in the Finite construction in (31). Coreference of the two subjects is impossible due to the meaning of 'send' (31a); V1 and V2 necessarily display different subjects and hence different agreement morphology in (31b)[16]:

(31) a. *mandu cu pigghiu lu pane   (Lecce, Apulia, D. Cesiri, p.c.)
         send.1p.sg *ku* fetch.1p.sg the bread
     b. mandu figghiama cu pigghia lu pane   (Lecce, Apulia, D. Cesiri, p.c.)
         send.1p.sg daughter-my *ku* fetch.3p.sg the bread

Cliticization in (32) shows that *figghiama* 'my daughter' in (31b) is the accusative object of V1, confirming that V1 in the Finite construction has full argument structure (see section 3.1)[17]:

(32) la mandu cu pigghia lu pane   (Lecce, Apulia, D. Cesiri p.c.)
     her.cl send.1p.sg *ku* fetch.3p.sg the bread

---

16 If the external argument of V2 is not expressed, the infinitival construction should be used:
(i)   Mandu pigghiare lu pane   (Lecce, Apulia, D. Cesiri, p.c.)
       send.1p.sg fetch.inf the bread

17 In (32), *cu* may be missing, as already noted for the complement of 'want' in (21) above:
(i)   La mandu pigghia lu pane.   (Lecce, Apulia, D. Cesiri p.c.)
       her.cl send.1p.sg fetch.3p.sg the bread

Note that (32) with 'send' crucially differs from (33) with 'want'. In (33), the strong pronoun *iḍḍa* 'she' is the subject of V2 and not the object of V1, hence it cannot be cliticized (33b):

(33) a. oyyu iḍḍa ku bbene krai   (Salentino, Apulia, Calabrese 1993: 36)
       want.1p.sg she *ku* come.3p.sg tomorrow
     b. *la oyyu ku bbene krai   (Salentino, Apulia, Calabrese 1993: 36)
       her.cl want.1p.sg *ku* fetch.3p.sg the bread

Note that the position of the subject of V2 in (33) is above *ku* (34a). This makes the Finite construction different from the embedded clause introduced the complementizer *ka*, which occurs above the subject position (see (8) above). The same holds of Calabrian (*m*)*u* in (34b):

(34) a. oju {lu Maryu} ku {*lu Maryu} bbene   (Salentino, Apulia, Calabrese
                                            1993: 34)
       want.1p.sg {the Maryu} *ku* {the Maryu} come.3p.sg tomorrow
     b. vogghiu {Giuvanni} u {*Giuvanni} parta   (Calabrian, Chillà 2011: 25)
       want.1p.sg {Giuvanni} *u* {Giuvanni} come.3p.sg tomorrow

Following Calabrese (1993: 36), we take the subject to be in the usual preverbal subject position, where it receives nominative case (see the ungrammaticality of (33b)). The connecting element *ku* / *mu* thus occurs in a position of the IP field, which Roberts & Roussou (2003) takes to be MoodP, the same position as infinitival *to* in English and subjunctive *na* in Greek.

3.3 The position of object clitic pronouns

Since clitic pronouns target the first T-layer above them, they provide a good diagnostics of the presence or absence of an independent T. The diagnostics works only in one direction: if we find clitic climbing onto V1, we can be sure that there is no intervening T in the path, as in Italian (35a). If we do not find climbing however, we have no direct indication that there is a lower independent T, as the pronoun may cliticize on the lower verb V2 even in monoclausal constructions, as is the case of infinitival constructions in Italian according to Cinque (2006); see (35b):

(35) a. [TP lo vado [subito [andP V [a [VP prendere
          it.cl go.1p.sg immediately to fetch.inf
     b. [TP vado [subito [andP V [a [VP prenderlo
          go.1p.sg immediately to fetch.inf it.cl

3.3.1 Cliticization on V1

Clitic placement onto V1 only occurs in the Inflected construction with or
without the overt connecting element *a*, as in (36a)–(37a) and (36b)–(37b),
respectively:

(36) a. u vaju a pigghiu   (Marsala, Sicily, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 388)
          it.cl go.1p.sg *a* fetch.1p.sg
     b. u ˈvəju ˈcəmu   (Umbriatico, Calabria, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 695)
          it.cl go.1p.sg call.1p.sg

(37) a. lu ˈvɔɟɟ a vˈveku   (Monteparano, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 692)
          it.cl want.1p.sg *a* see.1p.sg
     b. nɔl lu ˈvɔɟɟu ˈfattsu cˈcui   (Torre S. Susanna, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia
                                              2005: 693)
          not it.cl want.1p.sg do.1p.sg any-more

Clitic climbing is possible with both agreeing (36)–(38) and invariant V1 (39)–(40):

(38) a. u vok a fˈfattsu   (Putignano, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 689)
          it.cl go.1p.sg *a* do.1p.sg
     b. u stok a fˈfattsə
          it.cl stay.1p.sg *a* do.1p.sg

(39) u va pigghiu   (Marsala, Sicily)
     it.cl go.1p.sg *a* do.1p.sg

(40) a. lu va ffattsu   (Mesagne, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 691)
          it.cl go.1p.sg do.1p.sg
     b. lu sta ffattsu   (Mesagne, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 691)
          it.cl stay.1p.sg do.1p.sg

The parallel behavior of agreeing and invariant forms confirms that the two cases must be unified under the same syntactic analysis and is further evidence against Ledgeway's biclausal analysis of sentences like (27a) with agreeing forms of V1, as depicted in (28a) above.

3.3.2 Cliticization on V2

In the Finite construction (41), the pronoun follows the connecting element and procliticizes onto V2:

(41) a. vegnu i vi sconzu   (Galati, Calabria, Maesano 2016)
          come.1p.sg *i* you.cl disturb.1p.sg
     b. viˈnia ku llu fattsu   (Mesagne, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 692)
          come.past.1p.sg *ku* you.cl do.1p.sg

(42) a. ˈstannu ku sse sˈkarfane ˈl akkwa   (Nociglia, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia
                                                   2005: 694)
          stay.3p.pl *ku* refl.cl warm.3p.sg the water
     b. ˈvɛnɛ ku llu ˈviðe   (Nociglia, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 694)
          come.3p.sg *ku* him.cl see.3p.sg

Apulian dialects provide cases where the connecting element is absent and the clitic pronoun is on V2:

(43) uˈlia llu ˈfattsu   (Carmiano, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 693)
     volevo lo faccio

This is clearly an instance of the Finite construction because V1 is fully inflected for Agreement and (past) Tense, while V2 appears in the present form, following the pattern seen above in section 2.2. We therefore hypothesize that (43) is a Finite construction without an overt connecting element parallel to what we have independently observed in (21) above for the Apulian dialect of Alliste.

In other cases, however, cliticization on V2 occurs with an invariant V1, which characterizes the Inflected construction and differentiates it from the Finite construction (see section 2.3). Our hypothesis forces us to take the cases in (44) as instances of the Inflected construction:

(44) a. ʃta llu caˈmati   (Melissano, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 695)
     b. ˈva lli ˈkuntu ˈjɔu   (Maglie, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 694)

Thus, clitic climbing is not an obligatory feature of the Inflected construction but depends on the properties of the language. As seen above in section 3.3.1, clitic climbing is obligatory in Marsalese, but both options are possible in Apulian dialects where microvariation is indeed observed. In particular, while the Salentino dialects south of Lecce (Maglie, Nociglia, Alliste, Melissano) quite robustly show procliticization on V2 (Manzini & Savoia 2005: 694–5), as in (44), the main town Lecce requires climbing to V1 (Daniela Cesiri, p.c.).

This is not unwelcome as it may appear at first sight because optionality of clitic climbing is found in monoclausal constructions in many Romance varieties including Italian as in (44) (cf. Cardinaletti & Shlonsky 2004):

(45) a. lo ha dovuto andare a prendere
       it.cl has had.to go to fetch
   b. ha dovuto andarlo a prendere
       has had.to go it.cl to fetch
   c. ha dovuto andare a prenderlo
       has had.to go to fetch it.cl

In the dialect of Brindisi (Apulia), the modal verb 'want' with the connecting element *a* displays such an optionality. Note that *a* is present in both cases, suggesting that both cases are instances of the Inflected construction:

(46) a. lu vɔl(i) a mˈmaɲdʒa.   (Brindisi, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 693)
       it.cl want.3p.sg *a* do.3p.sg
   b. vɔl(i) a ssi lu ˈmaɲdʒa   (Brindisi, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 693)

Other cases of procliticization on V2, where *a* is missing and V1 and V2 share identical Agreement and Tense morphology, could in principle be ambiguous in those varieties that have both the Inflected and the Finite constructions:

(47) a. ˈsta tʃi sˈkarfa ˈl akkwa   (Nociglia, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 694)
       stay.3p.sg. there.cl refl.cl warm.3p.sg the water
   b. ˈvɛnɛ llu ˈviðe   (Nociglia, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 694)
       come.3p.sg him.cl see.3p.sg
   c. vuˈlimu lu viˈtimu   (Mesagne, Apulia, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 691)
       want.1p.pl it.cl see.1p.pl

Note finally that the causative verb 'send', which unambiguously enters the Inflected construction in Marsala and unambiguously enters the Finite construction in Calabrian and Apulian, behaves consistently with respect to the

diagnostics of clitic climbing. In Marsalese, the object of V2 must procliticize on V1 (48a), while in Calabrian, the object of V2 remains on V2 (48b) (and the obligatory object of V1 procliticizes on V1, see (32) above):

(48) a. u̲ mannu a pigghiu   (Marsala, Sicily, Di Caro & Giusti 2016)
       it.cl send.1p.sg *a* fetch.1p.sg
     b. a mandu m'u̲ pigghia   (Galati/Roghudi, Calabria, D. Maesano p.c.)
       her.cl send.1p.sg *mi* it.cl fetch.3p.sg

4 Conclusions

The data discussed in this paper clearly show that in Southern Italian dialects, there are two different multiple agreement constructions, which Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) call the Inflected construction and the Finite construction, respectively.

The Inflected construction is a monoclausal / monoeventive structure where V2 carries the fully fledged bundle of Tense and Agreement features and V1 is parasitic on V2. This accounts for the occurrence of a connecting element (*a* < AC) which points to a conjunction of events, a restricted number of verbs which can occur as V1, full Tense+Agr realization on V2, the possibility of reduced and invariant forms as V1, lack of arguments of V1, and clitic climbing onto V1.

The Finite construction is a biclausal / bieventive structure where V1 carries the fully fledged bundle of Tense and Agreement features and allows for a reduced T on V2. This construction is similar to an independent infinitive in Italian or subjunctive in Balkan languages. V1 selects for a clause introduced by a complementizer typical of reduced CPs (FinP in Rizzi's 1997 terms), shows full Tense+Agr realization and cannot be reduced, has arguments, and does not allow for clitic climbing.

Nothing prevents that the two constructions co-occur in one and the same sentence. The Inflected construction can indeed occur in the embedded clause of a Finite construction, as in (49):

(49) E ssu' sciuti cu bba ffatìanu.   (Matino, Apulia, Ledgeway 2016)
     and are.3p.pl gone.ms.pl *cu* go worked.3p.pl

In (49), the fully inflected lexical verb 'go' (in the present perfect with agreeing past participle *sciuti*) selects for the Finite construction introduced by *cu*, which

contains an instance of the Inflected construction with invariant 'go' (*bba*) as V1 and the fully agreeing lexical 'work' (*ffatìanu*) as V2.[18]

In conclusion, we hope to have somehow clarified the complex set of multiple agreement data found in Southern Italian dialects. Much remains to be explained, among which the microvariation observed in the intricate interplay of syntactic and morpho-phonological properties which allows a specific verbal form to enter the Inflected construction.

References

Calabrese, Andrea. 1993. The sentential complementation of Salentino: A study of a language without infinitival clauses. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, 28–98. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Cardinaletti Anna. 2004. Toward a cartography of subject positions. In L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP, The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*. New York: Oxford University Press, 115–165.

Cardinaletti, Anna and Giuliana Giusti. 1998. Motion verbs as functional heads. *GenGenP* 6.1: 50–60.

Cardinaletti Anna and Giuliana Giusti. 2001. 'Semi-Lexical' Motion Verbs in Romance and Germanic. In N. Corver and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Semi-lexical categories. On the function of content words and content of function words*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 371–414.

Cardinaletti, Anna and Giuliana Giusti. 2003. Motion verbs as functional heads. In Christina Tortora (ed.), *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cardinaletti Anna and Ur Shlonsky. 2004. Clitic positions and restructuring in Italian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35.4: 519–557.

Chillà, Leonida. 2011. *Variazioni sintattiche in alcune varietà meridionali estreme: le strutture a controllo e la selezione dell'ausiliare*. PhD dissertation. University of Florence.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2006. *Restructuring and Functional Heads, The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 4*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Corbett Greville G. 2015. Morphosyntactic complexity: A typology of lexical splits. *Language* 91: 145–193.

Cruschina, Silvio. 2013. Beyond the Stem and Inflectional Morphology: an Irregular Pattern at the Level of Periphrasis. In Cruschina, Silvio, Martin Maiden, and John Charles Smith

---

18 This analysis is different from Ledgeway's account of (49): he takes the double occurrence of 'go' to show that the first instance *sciùti* has dethematicized and can therefore enter a sentence with the lexical version of 'go' without any "pleonastic repetition". In support to our analysis in (49), contrast the full forms of the past participle to the reduced forms found in the Inflected construction (see fn. 10).

(eds.) *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology*, 262–283. New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Di Caro Vincenzo N. 2015. *Syntactic constructions with motion verbs in some Sicilian dialects: a comparative analysis*, Ma Thesis, Ca' Foscari University of Venice.

Di Caro Vincenzo N. and Giuliana Giusti. 2016. Dimensions of variation: the Inflected construction in the dialect of Delia. Paper delivered at the 42nd IGG, February 2016, Lecce; at the 46th LSRL, May 2016, Stony Brook, NY.

Dressler Wolfgang U. and Anna Thornton. 1991. Doppie basi e binarismo nella morfologia italiana. *Rivista di Linguistica* 3: 3–22.

Giorgi Alessandra and Fabio Pianesi. 2004. Complementizer Deletion in Italian. In L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP, The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*, New York: Oxford University Press, 190–210.

Ledgeway Adam. 2016. From Coordination to Subordination: The Grammaticalisation of Progressive and Andative Aspect in the dialects of Salento. In A. Cardoso et al. (eds), *Coordination and Subordination. Form and Meaning*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Maesano, Deborah. 2016. *Inflected Construction in Southern Calabrian Dialects*, BA Thesis, Ca' Foscari University of Venice.

Maiden Martin. 2004. When lexemes become allomorphs. On the genesis of suppletion. *Folia Linguistica* 38: 227–256.

Maiden Martin. 2005. Morphological autonomy and diachrony, in G. Booij and J. Van Marle (eds), *Yearbook of Morphology 2004*, 137–175.

Manzini, M. Rita and Leonardo Maria Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa.* Alessandria.

Poletto Cecilia. 2001. Complementizer Deletion: Edizioni dall'Orso and Verb Movement in Standard Italian, in G. Cinque and G. Salvi, eds., *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 265–286.

Rizzi Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery, in L. Haegeman (ed), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281–337.

Roberts Ian and Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic change. A minimalist approach to grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rohlfs Gerhard. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, vol. 3: *Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Torino: Einaudi.

Thornton Anna. 2007. Is there a partition in the present indicative of Italian regular verbs?, *Annali Online di Ferrara – Lettere* 2, 43–61.