Theory-driven approaches and empirical advances

A protocol for Pseudo-Coordinations and Multiple Agreement Constructions in Italo-Romance

Giuliana Giusti and Anna Cardinaletti
Ca' Foscari University of Venice

Italo-Romance varieties present at least three types of constructions that cluster together two verbs displaying double tense and double subject agreement and are taken as Pseudo-Coordinations (PseCos) or Multiple Agreement Constructions (MACs). In this paper, we follow Cardinaletti and Giusti's (1998, 2001, 2003, 2020) hypotheses and claim that unification between the PseCos with *a* and the MACs with *mu/mi/ma* or *ku* in Southern Italian dialects is not viable. We adopt a diagnostic tool, which we call a protocol, that clusters the predictions of theory-driven analyses and apply it to the 'take and' construction, which is widespread across dialects and productive in Italian. In doing so, we discuss unobserved facts arising in the well-studied dialectal structures and make fine-grained observations about the less studied 'take and' PseCo in Italian.

Keywords: southern Italian dialects, pseudo-coordination, functional verbs, lack of infinitive, clitic climbing, negation raising, 'take and' construction'

Introduction

Pseudo-Coordination (PseCo) and Multiple Agreement Construction (MAC) are often studied together with other constructions such as Serial Verb Constructions (Aikhenvald and Dixon 2006), Pseudo-Subordinations (Yuasa and Saddock 2002), and Converbs (Haspelmath and König 1995). What these constructs have in common is the coexistence of two (or more) verbs unexpectedly sharing (parts of) their verbal inflection because they form a single (though complex) event (Aikhenvald 2011) or displaying the clausal Tense and Agreement inflection on the unexpected Verb (as is the case of Pseudo-Subordination and Converbs, cf. Ross, this volume). Furthermore, if there is a connector between the two verbs, as in the case

of Pseudo-Coordinations, which has the form or can be related to a coordinating conjunction, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties show that the two verbs are not truly coordinated.

The fact that in unrelated languages, we find the same unexpected multiple agreement on two verbs in the same sentence, without them being genuinely (semantically and syntactically) coordinated calls for an explanation from both a typological and formal perspective. From a typological perspective, the comparison with unrelated languages has mostly focussed on the categorization of these phenomena and the observation of different degrees of productivity of such constructions across languages. From a formal perspective, the main issue concerns the universal property that exceptionally clusters together two or more inflected verbs, the parameter(s) that constrain(s) such clustering in different languages, and the interaction of this (parametrized) property with other (parametrized) properties of the languages.

It is clear that the typological and the formal approaches would greatly benefit from one another if the advances they make were shared, but this is rarely the case, due to the lack of a common way of treating and reporting the data. A formal approach can be especially opaque to those who are not familiar with the particular theoretical framework(s), which develop rapidly and focus on achieving explanatory adequacy rather than providing a systematic description of the phenomena. Formal approaches, however, are designed to make predictions that must be tested through controlled diagnostics. In this respect, they can provide an invaluable tool for empirical systematization which is crucial for every type of theoretical approach.

In this paper, we start from Cardinaletti and Giusti's (2020) hypothesis of two different structures that give rise to PseCos and MACs in southern Italian dialects and create a diagnostic tool that allows us to compare these two constructions with a third, more widely attested PseCo, which is productive in standard and colloquial Italian and very common across Romance languages, namely the 'take and' construction (Masini, Mattiola and Vecchi 2019). The diagnostics will support our hypothesis that the 'take and' construction is a third type, which must receive a different theoretical analysis. We will see that the comparison of closely related languages will help us disentangle PseCos and MACs coexisting in neighbouring varieties and even in one and the same variety, thereby providing new empirical data for another debated issue in relation to the dimensions of variation and optionality in cognate varieties (Adger 2006).

1.1 The empirical domain

Let us first define the three constructions for which our diagnostic tool is designed, which we call *e*PseCo, *a*PseCo, and *mu*MAC.

Only the *e*PseCo type, shown in (1), is an authentic PseCo in the sense that the two verbs are connected by the canonical coordinator 'and', even if the construction entirely lacks the properties of a coordination. The sentences are felicitous only if the event is sudden and/or unexpected (as suggested by the translation). We provide an example in standard Italian (where the coordinator is *e*) and one in the Sicilian dialect of Marsala (where the coordinator is *i*):[1]

(1) a. Ora prendo e parto.   (standard Italian)
     b. Aora pigghio i parto.   (Marsala)
        now take.PRES.1SG and leave.PRES.1SG
        '(You know what?) I'll leave now.'

In the *a*PseCo type, shown in (2), the interpretation is equivalent to a control infinitival, with the additional implicature that the event expressed by V2 is true (for discussion, see Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001; Todaro and Del Prete 2019; Del Prete and Todaro 2020). Here we give examples of two Sicilian dialects that display different restrictions on the persons and tenses allowed in this construction:

(2) a. Vaj'   a pigghiu   u   pani.
        go.PRES.1SG *a* fetch.PRES.1SG the bread
        'I go and buy the bread.'   (Marsala, Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001)
     b. Vinn'   a ffici   a   spisa.
        come.PAST.1SG *a* do.PAST.1SG the shopping
        'I came to do the shopping.'   (Mazzarino, Caltanissetta, Di Caro 2019a)

Traditionally, the connector *a* in (2) is analysed as derived from the Latin conjunction AC 'and' (cf. Rohlfs 1969: par.761). In this perspective, it is a PseCo with a dedicated connector. However, the homophony of *a* with the infinitival connector in (3) and the dative preposition in (4) (both derived from Latin AD) and the opacity of its origin as a coordinator are considered by Manzini and Savoia (2005) and Manzini and Lorusso (this volume) as counterevidence for its pseudo-coordinative nature:

(3) a. Vado   a prendere il pane.   (Italian)
     b. Vaju   a pigghjari u pani.
        go.PRES.1SG *a* take.INF the bread
        'I am going to buy bread.'   (Marsala, Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001)

---

1. Note that *i* in Marsalese is equivalent to 'and' and should not be confused with *i*, the reduction of *mi* that introduces the MAC in some southern Calabrian dialects.

(4) a. Do   un libro a mia sorella.   (Italian)
    b. Dugno   un libbru a me   soro.   (Marsala)
       give.PRES.1SG a book to my sister
       'I give a book to my sister.'

On this view, the construction in (2) would be a multiple agreement construction (MAC), parallel to the *mu*MAC type in (5). In (5a), the connector is (*m*)*u*, (the variants (*m*)*i* and (unreduced) *ma* are also found across Calabrian and north-eastern Sicilian varieties, cf. De Angelis 2013). It is historically related to the Latin subordinator MODO (which can be glossed in very different ways, a.o. 'as', 'since', 'given that'). Since it is common in southern Italian dialects that aspectual verbs lack embedded infinitival clauses, it is often related to the substitution of infinitive clauses with the embedded subjunctive subordinates, even if in these dialects the subjunctive has now disappeared and is replaced by the indicative. In (5b), we observe the subordinator *ku*, derived from Latin QUOD, which can also appear in monoeventive constructions substituting the infinitive in Salentino dialects. For recent discussion of the origin of the connectors, see De Angelis (2013, 2016, ~~201 7~~); Ledgeway (2016b); Groothuis (2019) a.o.

(5) a. vinni   mu ti   viju.
       come.PRF.1SG *mu* CL.ACC.2SG see.PRES.1SG
       'I came to see you'   (southern Calabria, Rohlfs 1969: 103)
    b. vɛnɛ   ku llu   viðɛ.
       come.PRES.3SG *ku* CL.ACC.M.SG see.PRES.3SG
       'He is coming to see it'.   (Nociglia, Manzini and Savoia 2005: 694)

Manzini and Savoia (2005) further unify the cases in (2) and (5) with Serial Verb Constructions (SVCs) observing that in some varieties, in some cases, the connectors in (2) and (5) can be missing, as shown in (6) with respect to *a* and in (7) with respect to (*m*)*u*. In (6), we observe that the connector may or must be missing, as is the case in SVCs:[2]

(6) a. vɔ   'maɲdʒə
       go.PRES.1SG eat.PRES.1SG
       'I'm going to eat.'   (Martina Franca, Manzini and Savoia 2005: 690)

---

2. Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001) argue against considering the PseCo in (2) as a SVC on the grounds that the connector is mandatory in many cases and that the two verbs do not share the same argument structure. In recent years, however, the definition of SVCs has been loosened to include desemanticized connectors and combinations of Vs with different argument structures. This has led some linguists (e.g. Manzini and Savoia 2005; Cruschina 2013; Todaro and Del Prete 2019) to claim that these constructions are verb serializations in non-serializing languages in the sense of Déchaine (1993); cf. Di Caro (2019a) for an overview and a thorough discussion of this debate.

b. vɔnə   (a) m'maɲdʒənə
    go.PRES.3PL (a) eat.PRES.3PL
    'They are going to eat.'   (Martina Franca, Manzini and Savoia 2005: 690)

(7) a. veni   mangia   (Squillace, Chillà 2011: 118)
         come.IMP.2SG eat.imp.IMP.2SG
     b. veni   u mangi
         come.IMP.2SG *u* eat.PRES.2SG
         'Come to eat.'

Unification or differentiation approaches may depend on the theoretical persuasion of the researchers more than actual empirical evidence. For example, Manzini and Savoia (2005) and Manzini and Lorusso (this volume) unify all verbal periphrases under a biclausal analysis, not just (2) and (5), but even auxiliaries combined with past participles or gerundive verbs. In their perspective, the biclausal vs. mono-clausal debate loses the significance and prediction power that it has in the re-structuring proposal stemming from Rizzi (1982) and developed by Cinque (2001), which correlates monoclausal structure to monoeventive interpretation, clitic climbing, and mandatory anaphoric subjects, and biclausal structure to bieventive interpretation, no clitic climbing, and the possibility that the subject of V2 be non-anaphoric to the subject of V1. The theoretical issues raised by Manzini and Lorusso's unification analysis regard the notion of phase (which must be assumed to be defective in order to capture monoclausality effects in biclausal structures) and the notion of optionality (which is problematic for Economy principles).[3]

    However, the unification hypothesis cannot explain why the *a*PseCo in (2) is absent in standard and informal Italian, especially in view of the fact that *e*PseCos are widespread and productive in both the standard and the local varieties.[4] If the connector *a* in the *a*PseCo is the same as the infinitival complementizer *a*, it is not clear why the *a*PseCo is totally absent in Italian, even in the regional varieties of Italian that are in contact with the dialects where the *a*PseCo is productively

---

3. Since any operation, such as Insertion, Merge, Move (or re-merge), is costly (cf. Chomsky 1995, 2001), the expectation is that optionality only involves equally costly derivations or outputs with different interpretations (Biberauer and Richards 2006; Miyagawa 2011). This is not the case with clitic climbing and insertion of the connector. Given that our aim here is not purely theoretical, but mainly addressed towards highlighting the benefits that theoretical hypotheses can have on em-pirical advances, we do not pursue this issue here. Note however that the three structures proposed in (8) are not in contrast with most assumptions and proposals stated in Manzini and Lorusso's (this volume) unifying hypothesis, which implies a reduced status of the phase projected by V2.

4. The only exception is the fixed expression *Vattelapesca* (lit. go.IMP.2SG CL.ACC.M.SG *a* fish. IMP.2SG 'Go fish it!', intended meaning 'Goodness knows!'), which confirms that in principle the structure is not incompatible with the Italian syntax.

present. This can be easily explained in our differentiation approach, which proposes that the connector *a* (whatever its etymology turns out to be) is simply not present in Italian.

Our aim here is to pin down the predictions of Cardinaletti and Giusti's (2001, 2003, 2020) structural analyses of (2) as monoclausal and (5) as biclausal and extend the comparison to the speaker-oriented 'take and' construction in (1), adopting a recent proposal by Soto Gómez (2020) for Spanish. These three structural analyses will be briefly presented in 1.2. The predictions of the three analyses will be shown to build a diagnostic tool that can be used beyond the theoretical framework from which it originates. We call the diagnostic tool a 'protocol' for the reasons outlined in 1.3. The protocol highlights two clusters of properties, predicted by two different points of diversification as proposed in the formal analyses: the functional status of V1 in (1) and (2) vs. the lexical status of V1 in (3), to be discussed in Section 2, and the different realization of Tense, to be discussed in Section 3. Section 4 draws the conclusions.

1.2   The formal analyses

For the 'take and' Construction in (1), which we label *e*PseCo, we adopt Soto Gómez's (2020) analysis for the Spanish speaker-oriented *y*PseCo given in (8a), where V1 is a functional verb that first merges in a high clausal functional head (Foc) projected by the pseudo-coordinator *e* in CP, while the rest of the clause is canonical, i.e., a full TP where the lexical verb V2 remerges, as is typical in Romance languages and in particular in Italo-Romance.[5] In (8b), we give the structure of Cardinaletti and Giusti's (2020) Inflected Construction, which we label here *a*PseCo, where V1 is a functional verb that first-merges as the head of *t*P, a copy of the lower TP. In (8c), we give the structure of Cardinaletti and Giusti's (2020) Finite Construction, where V1 projects an independent vP and takes a FinP as its complement. FinP is a reduced clausal projection, with the same properties as the non-finite Fin that is found in control and raising infinitives (cf. Rizzi 1997):

(8) a. $[_{\text{FocP}}$ V1 $[_{\text{CP}}$ *e* $[_{\text{TP}}$ V2 $[_{\text{vP}}$ V2 …   (*e*PseCo, (1) 'Take and' Construction)
     b. $[_{t\text{P}}$ V1 $[_{t\text{P}}$ (*a*) $[_{\text{TP}}$ V2 $[_{\text{vP}}$ V2 …   (*a*PseCo, (2), Inflected Construction)
     c. $[_{\text{TP}}$ V1 $[_{\text{vP}}$ V1 $[_{\text{FinP}}$ (*mu/ku*)   (*mu*MAC, (5), Finite Construction)
        $[_{\text{TP}}$ V2 $[_{\text{vP}}$ V2 …

The three proposals in (8) make a number of predictions with respect to many properties that have been noted for PseCos and MACs in Romance languages and are the topic of the first part of this volume (cf. the contributions by Manzini and Lorusso, Di Caro, Cruschina, and Bleotu).

First of all, in no case is the connector a true coordinator. For this reason, the usual arguments against coordination hold of all three constructions and will not be reviewed here, where we claim that these are not sufficient arguments for unification. Another recurrent property is the special aspectual or pragmatic interpretation that may or must be associated with the construction. This is the case with the surprise interpretation of the *e*PseCo, which may be present in the Sicilian *a*PseCo (Cruschina, this volume) or its equivalents (cf. Blensenius and Andersson Lilja, this volume, for Scandinavian; Skodova, this volume, for Czech) but is not present in the *mu*MAC. A third recurrent property is the variability of insertion of the connector in the *a*PseCo and the *mu*MAC. The connector may be optional, obligatory, or obligatorily absent. Pragmatic values and the variability of the connector give rise to variation across neighbouring dialects and across specific combinations of mood, tense, and person features. They need a more fine-grained analysis than that proposed in this contribution but the approach adopted here is adequate to capture them (cf. Di Caro 2019b).

The functional status of V1 in the *e*PseCo (8a) and *a*PseCo (8b) predicts that in these constructions, V1 belongs to a closed class and projects no argument structure (like auxiliaries). Conversely, the lexical nature of both V1 and V2 in the *mu*MAC accounts for the independent projection of the argument structure of V1 and the possibility of disjoint reference of the two subjects (for the special case of the causative verb of motion SEND in *a*PseCo, see Section 2.3 below).

The different nature of the projection under V1 causes the major difference across the three constructions. The CP-layer in the *e*PseCo allows it the largest freedom with respect to Tense and Aspect in the construction: what is crucial is that the two verbs have the same features, such that they can even display compound tenses. In the *mu*MAC, V1 selects a deficient clause (FinP-TP-V2), which has anaphoric Tense and may but need not have an anaphoric subject. The deficient nature of the FinP derives the reduced morphology on V2, which is not found in the two PseCos. The 'fake' nature of the Tense and Aspect features in *t* (in the *a*PseCo) predicts that in some varieties, the *a*PseCo only displays some cells of the paradigm of V1, including the appearance of reduced forms, in those languages that have reduced forms on auxiliaries. We know that this is not the case for the functional V1 in Foc in the *e*PseCo. The *t*/TP-layer in the *a*PseCo also predicts a close relation between V1 and V2. It predicts clitic and negation climbing onto V1 and the adjacency requirement between V1 and V2, which can only be separated by the connector. This is not the case in the other two constructions, but for opposite reasons. In the *e*PseCo, the fake inflection on V1 is not a projection of T but of Fin. Clustering of

negation and the clitics must therefore target the only T which is present. In the *mu*MAC, there are two independent Ts, and negation and clitics cannot climb from the subordinate clause to the superordinate clause.

In the next subsection, we organize these properties in a 'protocol' in the sense of Giusti (2011). In the rest of the paper, we apply the protocol to the Italo-Romance domain.

1.3   A protocol for PseCos and MACs in Italo-Romance

As observed by Giusti (2011), achievements in Linguistics are often ignored by contiguous fields that have a major social impact, such as foreign language teaching program design, revitalization programmes, clinical linguistic rehabilitation, language policies, and ~~revitalization of~~ heritage languages. Updated knowledge about language in its social and biological aspects could help build more effective actions in all these aspects that involve the inclusion of disadvantaged groups and the well-being of individuals.

Even inside the vast field of Linguistics, scholars of different theoretical persuasions tend to ignore each other's advances due to a generalized incommunicability, caused by the highly abstract theoretical assumptions and specialized terminological tools, which often aim at highlighting the divergences across frameworks or across individual researchers instead of building on common advances. This is particularly unfortunate given that different subfields (syntax, semantics, morphology, phonology, discourse, etc.) and approaches (historical, typological, functional, generative, constructional, just to name the ones represented in this volume) raise different research questions, whose answers complement one another and if presented together would bring about a better understanding of linguistic facts, such as the PseCo-MAC phenomenon.

To overcome this stalemate, in a number of papers Giusti proposes an inclusive and at the same time rigorous methodology that allows the formulation of research questions, the design of experiments, and the presentation of the results in a format accessible to linguists of different persuasions as well as non-linguists who work with language in different fields of the social sciences.[6] The proposed approach has the aim to avoid unnecessary technicalities (such as the ones presented in structures (8a–c) above) without renouncing to depth of insight. It is crucially not

---

6.   The protocol methodology has been applied by Giusti and Zegrean (2015) in building language awareness about heritage Istro-Romanian, a Romance language in contact with Croatian; by Di Caro and Giusti (2015) and Di Caro (2019a) in Pseudo-Coordinations in Sicilian dialects; by Giusti (2021a) in relation to indefinite determiners in Italo-Romance, and by Giusti (2021b) in relation to partitivity in Italian.

a new theory, in addition to the ones already available; nor is it an a-theoretical or anti-theoretical approach. It is called the 'protocol' approach because in science, a protocol is an established procedure, which applies in the same way with the same tools in different but comparable situations. It is intended to ensure comparability in the collection, organization, and presentation of data avoiding disturbances.

General linguistics is used to organizing linguistic results in tables that display [±] values for the crossing point of two different indicators. Such a shared procedure is an accessible but still rigorous procedure. In streamlining the search for parameters or implicational universals of language, the features of the protocol can be organized in clusters of properties that contribute to characterize a given construction and distinguish it from the other.

An example of how the rather complex and theory-internal reasoning conducted in the two previous sections can be presented in a more accessible protocol is the list of properties given in (9), where the [+] and [−] values report what is predicted by the theoretical hypotheses in (8) above. The features have been checked in the literature and in fact have suggested the analyses for the *a*PseCo and the *mu*MAC. What is indicated as [?] has not yet been checked for the less studied *e*PseCo. The discussion of the *e*PseCo will be the original empirical contribution of this chapter, which ultimately shows how the predictions made by theoretical hypotheses raise empirical questions which then produce improved analyses.

In (9a–d), we find the predictions of the hypothesis that V1 is a functional verb in (8a–b) but not in (8c). This cluster of properties could suggest unification of *e*PseCo and *a*PseCo, distinguishing them from the *mu*MAC in which V1 is lexical. The (+) value in parentheses indicates that variation is expected in the presence of this feature. In (9e–h), we list the predictions that the different realization of Tense brings with it. In (8a–b), there is a single T feature, but in (8b), T reprojects in *t*, where the functional V1 first merges. This results in concord of tenses: *t* is a (full or partial) copy of the values of the features in T. In (8c), there are two Ts, one associated to the main verb V1 and one in the subordinate clause. The *a*PseCo is characterized by restrictions on its paradigm, in principle we may expect the same restrictions on the *e*PseCo. We insert a [?] but we already know that this is not the case. The *mu*MAC has no restrictions because V1 is in the T of the main clause. T is also the locus of the clitic cluster and clausal negation. We expect that in the *a*PseCo, clitics and negation attach to the highest projection of T, namely *t*. In the *e*PseCo, the main and only T is associated with V2. In the *mu*MAC we expect clitics and negation to be on either verbs, so not necessarily on V1:

(9)

PseCos and MACs in Italo-Romance (predictions)	*a*PseCo	*e*PseCo	*mu*MAC
Functional vs. lexical V1			
a. restricted class of V1	+	+	−
b. absence of argument structure of V1	+	+	−
c. mandatory coreference between the subject of V2 and V1	+	+	−
d. reduced morphology on V1	(+)	(+)	−
The realization of Tense			
e. restrictions in the paradigm (person and Tense)	+	?	−
f. mandatory clitic climbing onto V1	+	−	−
g. clausal negation on V1	+	−	−

There are other predictions, such as the consequences of the monoclausal vs. bi-clausal analysis, or the pragmatic values that such constructions may have (cf. Cruschina, this volume) but the limits of this chapter do not allow us to take them in due consideration.

The protocol in (9) must therefore be viewed as a partial attempt to treat a rather intricate empirical domain within the protocol approach. The rest of the chapter is organized in two sections dedicated to applying the protocol in (9) to the comparative analysis of the three constructions. We will observe how the systematic nature of the protocol raises specific empirical questions which bring about a more complete understanding of the languages under scrutiny.

2.   The functional vs. lexical status of V1

In this section, we review the properties listed in (9a–d) above.

2.1   V1 belongs to a restricted class

One of the main supporting pieces of evidence for the claim that the *a*PseCo and the *mu*MAC are two different structures is the very different ratio of productivity with respect to the class of V1. The *a*PseCo is usually limited to one or few basic motion verbs: e.g. GO, COME, COME BY, SEND in Marsalese (10a), as originally described by Cardinaletti and Giusti (1998, 2001, 2003). Other dialects may have a few more aspectual verbs, as is the case of Delia (10b), which also has START and other mo-tion or stative verbs with grammaticalized aspectual interpretation, such as COME BACK (with iterative meaning), ARRIVE (with resultative meaning), REMAIN (with

durative meaning), cf. Di Caro (2019a) for a protocol approach to Sicilian dialects.[7] In Apulian varieties, the *a*PseCo is found with STAY (expressing progressive aspect) and WANT (Ledgeway 2016a).[8]

This is not the case for the *mu*MAC, which allows all sorts of motion verbs including less basic ones such as COME IN, JUMP, STRETCH OUT, HURRY UP (11a), modals such as CAN, WANT, MUST (11b), aspectual verbs such as START, STOP, KEEP (11c), and even control verbs, such as THINK (11d) (Rohlfs 1969: 106, Manzini and Savoia 2005; Chillà 2011; Cardinaletti and Giusti 2020):

(10) a. Passa   a pigghia   u   pani.
        come-by.PRES.3SG *a* fetch.PRES.3SG the bread
        'She comes to get the bread.'   (Marsala, Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001)

    b. Tuirnu   a pigliu   lu   pani.
        come-back.PRES.3SG *a* fetch.PRES.1SG the bread
        'I'll go and get the bread again'   (Delia, Di Caro and Giusti 2015)

(11) a. 'llongammu   mi vidimu   a   me   zia
        stretch-out.PAST.1PL mi see.PAST.1PL DOM. My aunt.
        'We went to visit my aunt.'   (Roghudi, Maesano 2016)

    b. Pozzu   / Vogghiu   / 'Ndaju   mi 'ccattu
        can.PRES.1SG / want.PRES.1SG / must.PRES.1SG *mi* buy.PRES.1SG
        lu   pani.
        the bread.
        'I can/ want/ must buy the bread.'

    c. 'Ncuminciu   / Finisciu   / Continuu   mi mangiu.
        Start.PRES.1SG / finish.PRES.1SG / keep.PRES.1SG *mi* eat.PRES.1SG
        'I start / stop / keep eating.'

    d. Pensu   mi partu   dumani.
        think.PRES.1SG *mi* leave.PRES.1SG tomorrow
        'I'm thinking of leaving tomorrow.'
                                (Roghudi, Cardinaletti and Giusti 2020)

The *e*PseCo is limited to TAKE (UP), expressed via two verbs in Italian: *prendere* (*su*) and *pigliare* according to regional varieties (Rohlfs 1969; Masini, Mattiola and Vecchi 2019). This distinguishes Italian from Spanish, which displays a few more

---

7. Di Caro and Giusti (2015, 2018) apply the protocol approach to the systematic investigation of the possible V1 in Sicilian dialects, which also show different restriction patterns as regards tense and person combinations. We can only briefly hint at those here, as we will do in the next sections.

8. Presenting the data would take too much space. We refer the readers to the quoted literature and to Manzini and Savoia (2005: 688–701) for a wealth of data.

verbs notably including GO (cf. Coseriu (1977 [1966], quoted by Masini, Mattiola and Vecchi for his seminal work and, more recently, Bravo 2020 and Soto Gómez 2020). Cases such as (12a)–(13a) taken from the internet by Soto Gómez (2020: 36–37) are not grammatical in Italian (12b)–(13b):

(12) a.   … y entonces   voy   y   pienso,
      b. *… e poi   vado   e   penso,
           and then   go.PRES.1SG and think.PRES.1SG
           éstas son españolas seguro …
           queste sono spagnole di sicuro
           these.F.PL are Spanish certainly
           '… and then I go and think, these girls are certainly Spanish…'

(13) a.   Y no,   no fui   y   le   dije: " …"
      b. *E no,   non sono andata e   le   ho detto. "…."
           and no, NEG go.PAST.1SG and CL.DAT say.PAST.1SG "…"
           'And no, I didn't go and tell her "…."'

The ungrammaticality of (12b)–(13b) suggests that the ePseCo in Italian is not possible with GO. We will observe later that some Italian dialects do have GO in this function as well, creating interesting pairs for comparison with the other two constructions.

2.2   Absence of argument structure of V1

Motion verbs in the aPseCo cannot project their goal arguments in Sicilian dialects. Otherwise, V2 must occur in the infinitive. In Marsalese, lexical GO has a clitic cluster formed by a reflexive si and elative ni. This cluster is mandatory in order to express the goal argument. In (14a), the presence of the cluster would be sufficient to qualify V1 as lexical (and block the aPseCo), something which is possible in (14b) with the infinitive, which is fully productive in Marsalese, as it is in Italian. In (14c), we observe the case of the muMAC, which is possible with or without the goal complement of GO (examples are taken from Cardinaletti and Giusti 2020):

(14) a. *Si-nni   va   (na   scola) a travagghia.
           CL.REFL-CL.ELA   go.PRES.3SG (to-the school) a work.PRES.3SG
                                                                              (Marsala)
      b.   Si-nni   va   (na   scola) a travagghiari.   (Marsala)
           CL.REFL-CL.ELA   go.PRES.3SG to-the   school a work.INF
      c. (Si-nni)   va   (a   scola) mi lavora.
           CL.REFL-CL.ELA   go.PRES.3SG (to-the school) mi work.PRES.3SG
                                                                              (Roghudi)

In the *e*PseCo, TAKE cannot have a direct object (15a), unlike the case of lexical TAKE with which the direct object is obligatory (15b).[9] The coordination in (15c) is a real coordination, as confirmed by the fact that the surprise interpretation is not required:

(15) a. Ha preso ed è partita.
          has taken and is left
          'She suddenly left.'
      b. *Gianna ha preso.
          Gianna has taken
      c. Ha preso la macchina ed è partita.
          has taken the car   and is left
          'She took her car and left.'

Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001) observed that the motion verb in Marsalese *a*PseCo does not add an agentive role to the construction (unlike what was noted by for American English by Shopen (1971) and Jaeggli and Hyams (1993)). Thus the subject of an *a*PseCo has the role assigned by V2, which can be agentive or non-agentive and must be compatible with the andative aspect. In (16), we observe a motion event with an inanimate subject (16a) and a weather verb (16b), selecting a quasi-argument (Chomsky 1981):

(16) a. U   fetu   di frittu ne   vene   a 'ngueta
          The bad-smell of fried CL.ACC.1pl come.PRES.3SG *a* disturb.PRES.3SG
          assupra
          up-here
          'The bad smell of fried food comes up and disturbs us.'
      b. Dumani va   a chiove.
          tomorrow go.PRES.3SG *a* rain.PRES.3SG
          'Tomorrow it will rain.'

---

9. *Prendere* appears in many fixed expressions usually grammaticalizing the concrete notion of 'seizing' (*prendere una lepre* 'seize a wild rabbit') or abstract notion of 'assuming' (*prendere posizione* 'take stand'), which select an internal object. There is also an intransitive use (pointed out by Adam Ledgeway, p.c.), which is synonymous to *attecchire* ('take root'), and an optionally intransitive use (pointed out by Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro, p.c.), which is synonymous to *prendere la linea* ('connect to the phone line') and selects an electronic device as its subject (*Il telefono qui non prende* 'my mobile does not connect to the line here'). The ungrammaticality of (15b) is therefore due to the incompatibility of the [+animate] subject *Gianna*, which is not only possible but preferable in the *e*PseCo, as shown immediately below. Thus the intransitive use of lexical *prendere* is not related to its insertion in the *e*PseCo.

The *mu*MAC is a construction that substitutes embedded infinitives in southern Italian varieties which display a reduced use of the infinitive or do not have the infinitive at all with the verbs that select a *mu*MAC. It can therefore substitute the Italian 'control' and 'raising' constructions. In control constructions, V1 assigns a role to its external argument independently of the role assigned by V2 to its subject. In raising constructions, V1 assigns no role to the subject and the external argument of V2 is raised to the Subject position of the higher clause. In the dialect of Roghudi, andative GO behaves as a control verb: it is compatible with inanimate subjects (17a) but incompatible with the expletive subject of weather verbs (17b). Conversely, inceptive START behaves like a raising verb: it can occur with any subject role, including the expletive subject of a weather verb (17c). This piece of evidence is one of those empirical questions raised by the systematic character of the protocol methodology, which had gone unnoticed in the theoretical literature:

(17) a. La puzza   veni   mi 'ndi   sconza fin' a ssupra.
         the bad-smell come.PRES.3SG *mi* CL.ACC.1PL disturb up to upstairs
         'The bad smell of fried food, comes upstairs and disturbs us.'
                                                     (Roghudi, Maesano p.c.)

     b. *Oj   va   mi chjovi
         today go.PRES.3SG *mi* rain.PRES.3SG

     c. Ora 'ncigna   mi chjovi
         now start.PRES.3SG *mi* rain.PRES.3SG

The *e*PseCo gives slightly marginal results with inanimate subjects and weather verbs, according to our judgement in (18). Interestingly, only unergative and not unaccusative *piovere* can appear in this case (18b), even if unaccusative verbs are possible as V2 as in (18a) and in the cases already observed above (for the difference between unergative and unaccusative *piovere*, cf. Benincà and Cinque 1992):

(18) a. ˀLa pietra ha preso ed è rotolata giù.
         the stone has taken and has started to roll down
         'The stone unexpectedly rolled down.'

     b. ˀAlle cinque, ha preso ed ha /??è piovuto.
         At-the five has taken and has rained
         'At five, it unexpectedly rained.'

The degraded acceptability of (18b) with auxiliary *be* could be explained by a register clash, since the *e*PseCo belongs to the colloquial register, considering the fact that *piovere* is unergative in the colloquial variety (at least to our native speaker judgement). Note that inceptive aspect on V2 favours the acceptability of inanimate subjects and quasi-arguments: cf. *Alle cinque, ha preso e ha cominciato / si è messo a piovere* 'At five, it unexpectedly started to rain'.

The structure in (8a) with V1 filling the head of a Foc implies no selection of V1 with respect to the subject role. However, a deeper understanding of the mirative implication in this construction may correlate with different types of events and consequently different subject roles. We leave this issue open for the time being.

2.3   Coreference of Subj1 and Subj2

In order to check whether in the *a*PseCo the subject of V2 is mandatorily coreferential to the subject of V1, we consider the causative verb of motion SEND, which requires disjoint reference between the external argument of V1 (the sender) and the external argument of V2 (the person sent to do something) when it is used as a lexical verb taking an infinitival and a theme, as in *I_i sent Mary$_j$ to the market place* PRO$_{j/*i}$ *to buy bread*.

As already noted in previous work (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2020), and shown here in (19) the subject of SEND used as functional V1 in the *a*PseCo is the sender. The person sent to participate in the subevent expressed by V2 cannot be overt (19b–c). The complex event is an event of fetching bread at the market place (also cf. Todaro and Del Prete 2019 and Del Prete and Todaro 2020): the sentence is true only if the fetching subevent has reached completion, as indicated by the ungrammaticality of the continuation in parentheses in (19a). The *a*PseCo in (19a–c) is thus very different from the infinitival construction in (19d), where the theme is a clitic on the main verb and controls the subject of the infinitival:

(19) a.   Mannu   a pigghiu   u pani no   mercato. (*Ma un
          send.PRES.1SG *a* fetch.PRES.1SG the bread at-the market but NEG
          si-nni   trova.)
          CL.REFL-CL.PRT find.PRES.3SG
          'I send somebody to buy bread at the market place. (But bread cannot to
          be found).'
     b.   *A   mannu   a pigghiu   u   pani
          CL.ACC.F.SG send.PRES.1SG *a* fetch.pres.PRES.1SG the bread
          no   mercato.
          at-the market
     c.   *A   mannu   a pigghia   u pani no   mercato.
          CL.ACC.F.SG send.PRES.1SG *a* fetch.PRES.3SG the bread at-the market
     d.   A   mannu   a pigghiari u pani no   mercato.
          CL.ACC.F.SG send.PRES.1SG *a* fetch.INF the bread at-the market
          'I send her to buy bread at the market place.'

This feature is crucially different in the *mu*MAC, which allows disjoint reference between the two subjects:

(20) a. Mannu   figghia-ma cu pigghia   lu pane.
          send.PRES.1SG daughter-my *cu* fetch.PRES.3SG the bread
          'I'll send my daughter to fetch the bread.'

                                        (Lecce, Cardinaletti and Giusti 2020)

      b. Mandaria   a   figghi-ma   u pigghia   lu pane
          send.COND.1SG DOM daughter-my *u* fetch.PRES.3SG the bread
          'I would send my daughter to fetch the bread.'   (Siderno, Maesano 2016)

The structure in (8a) does not have two subject positions for V1 and V2 in *e*PseCo. Technically, we cannot even talk of coreferentiality. This is fully confirmed by the data. There is always a single subject in *e*PseCo, as shown by the ungrammaticality of the second sentence in the two Examples (21):

(21) a. Maria era furiosa con me. *Ha preso e ho ricevuto un pugno sul naso.
          Maria was furious with me. [she] took and [I] got a punch on my nose
      b. Maria era furiosa con me. *Ho preso e mi ha dato un pugno sul naso.
          Maria was furious with me. [I] took and [she] gave me a punch on my nose

2.4   Morphological reductions of V1

The paradigm of V1 is different across Sicilian dialects. Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001: 384) show that in Marsalese, reduced forms are marked for person and tense features and cannot appear in those combinations in which a parallel auxiliary would be ungrammatical. The progressive auxiliary *sta*, which does not appear in a PseCo construction, but cooccurs with a gerundive, shows that the base of the verb, which is identical to the PRES.3SG (22a), can also stand for PRES.1–2SG and PRES.3PL (22b–d) but not for PRES.1–2PL (22e–f) or any person of the imperfect (22g):

(22) a. Sta   ennu a casa.
          stay.PRES.3SG going to home
      b. =Staju   ennu a casa.
          stay.PRES.1SG going to home
      c. =Stai   ennu a casa.
          stay.PRES.2SG going to home
      d. =Stannu   ennu a casa.
          stay.PRES.3PL going to home
      e. ≠ Stamu   ennu a casa.
          stay.PRES.1PL going to home
      f. ≠ Stati   ennu a casa.
          stay.PRES.2PL going to home
      g. ≠ Stava   ennu a casa.
          stay.IPF.3SG   going to home

This is also the case of reduced *va* in (23), corresponding to PRES.3SG (23c), which can combine with a V2 inflected for PRES.1–2SG (23a–b) and PRES.3PL (23f) but not PRES.1–2PL (23d–e) and with the imperfect tense even in the 3SG (23g):

(23) a. Va a accattu   u   pani.
          go *a* buy.PRES.1SG the bread
      b. Va a accatti   u   pani.
          go *a* buy.PRES.2SG the bread
      c. Va a accatta   u   pani.
          go *a* buy.PRES.3SG the bread
      d. *Va a accattamu   u   pani.
          go *a* buy.PRES.1PL the bread
      e. *Va a accattati   u   pani.
          go a buy.pres.2pl   the bread
      f. Va a accattanu   u   pani.
          go *a* buy.PRES.3PL the bread
      g. *Va a accattava   u   pani.
          go *a* buy.IPF.3SG   the bread

Di Caro (2019a) reports what he calls Type 3 PseCo in the Eastern Sicilian dialects: V1 is reduced to a prefixal morphology incorporating the connector (*o-, uo-*),[10] which is found with every non-periphrastic verb forms. In this respect, the only difference with the Spanish *y*PseCo is the reported impossibility of verbal periphrases in V2:

(24) a. Uoppigghiati   u   pani.
          go.*a*.fetch.PRES.2PL the bread
          'You usually go and buy bread.'
      b. Uoppigghiassi   u   pani.
          go.*a*.fetch.SUBJ.PERF.1SG the bread
          'I would go buy bread.'

For the sake of the protocol, we limit our comparison here to the more canonical *a*PseCo (Type 1, in Di Caro's terms), which is therefore different from the Italian *e*PseCo, which allows full person and tense realization on both V1 and V2, as shown in (25) with compound present perfect and past perfect, respectively:

---

10. The formation of *uo/o* as the combination of uninflected *va* and the connector *a* is argued for by Di Caro (2019a; b) on the basis of the phonological doubling it triggers, as displayed by the examples.

(25) a. Eravamo   stanche. Abbiamo   preso e   ci   siamo
be.ɪᴘꜰ.1ᴘʟ tired   have.ᴘʀᴇs.1ᴘʟ taken and ᴄʟ.1ᴘʟ be.ᴘʀᴇs.1ᴘʟ
sedute sulle   poltrone.
sat   on.the sofas
'We were tired. We took and sat down on the sofas.'

   b. La mamma era   arrabbiata, perché avevate   preso e   vi
the mother was   angry   because have.ᴘʀᴇs.2ᴘʟ taken and ᴄʟ.2ᴘʟ
eravate   messi a piangere.
be.ɪᴘꜰ.2ᴘʟ set   to crying
'Mom was angry because you had unexpectedly burst into tears.'

In Italian, it is not possible to have a reduced inflection on V1. This is however subject to parametrization, since according to Soto Gómez (2020), reduced inflection of V1 is possible in Spanish speaker-oriented *y*PseCo (although not possible in inceptive *y*PseCo). In (26a), the V1 *coge* is the unmarked form of the indicative ᴘʀᴇs.3sɢ, while person (3ᴘʟ), tense (imperfect), and aspectuality (progressive) of the event is morphologically expressed on V2, which has even a compound tense. The parallel Italian Example (26b) is ungrammatical:

(26) a. Y   a   Telmo me   lo   encuentro   en una
and ᴅᴏᴍ Telmo ᴄʟ.ʀᴇꜰʟ.1s ᴄʟ.ᴀᴄᴄ.3s.ᴍ encounter ᴘʀᴇs.1sɢ in a
sala   de ordenadores… y   coge   y   estaban jugando
room of computers…   and take.ᴘʀᴇs.3sɢ and be.ɪᴘꜰ.1ᴘʟ playing
a   un juego de futbol
to a   game of football
'I found Telmo in a computer room and, hilariously, they were playing a football videogame.'

   b. *… e prende   e   stavano   giocando a un gioco di calcio
and take.ᴘʀᴇs.3sɢ and be.ɪᴘꜰ.1ᴘʟ playing   to a   game of football

Soto Gómez's (2020) analysis predicts the possibility of reduced morphology in V1, which otherwise copies the T-features transmitted to Foc through C. This was the prediction formulated in (9d). The prediction was not confirmed by the Italian data. In Italian, we set the parameter to mandatory realizations of the copied features. In this respect, the Spanish *y*PseCo is more similar to the southern Italian *a*PseCo, which has extensively been shown to have reduced morphology (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001; Cruschina 2013; Di Caro and Giusti 2015, 2018, Ledgeway 2016, 2021, a.o.).

3.   Concord of tenses

We have just observed that the reduced morphology on V1 found in southern Italian dialects is due to concord of tenses in *t*-T, as in (8b), a property which distinguishes the *a*PseCo from both the *e*PseCo and the *mu*MAC. In this section, we present the properties listed in (9e–g) which are predicted by this formal analysis.

3.1   Restriction of Mood, Person, and Tenses

Cardinaletti and Giusti (1998, 2001, 2003) point out that only some parts of the paradigm can appear in the Marsalese *a*PseCo. They analyse it as the result of the semi-lexical nature of V1. Cardinaletti and Giusti (2020) formalize this as a reprojection of T, which we call (little) *t*, a copy of the Mood, Person and Tense features of T. Thus in the part of the lexicon in which the present indicative paradigm of GO is stored, the roots with *va-* are marked with a *t*-feature while the roots with *i-* can only merge with T:

(27)   a.   Vaju   a accattu   u   pani.
               Go.PRES.1SG *a* buy.PRES.1SG the bread
         b.   Vaj   a accatti   u   pani.
               Go.PRES.2SG *a* buy.PRES.2SG the bread
         c.   Va   a accatta   u   pani.
               Go.PRES.3SG *a* buy.PRES.3SG the bread
         d.   *Imu   a accattamu   u   pani.
               Go.PRES.1PL *a* buy.PRES.1PL the bread
         e.   *Iti   a accattati   u   pani.
               Go.PRES.2PL *a* buy.PRES.2PL the bread
         f.   Vannu   a accattanu   u   pani.
               Go.PRES.3PL *a* buy.PRES.3PL the bread
         g.   *Iva   a accattava   u   pani.
               Go.IPF.3SG *a* buy.IPF.3SG the bread

The information on which items are stored in the lexicon of a language as functional (and, in this case, as being able to first merge in *t*) is a matter of low level parametrization, which could even involve individual speaker's grammars. Considerable variation is therefore expected across varieties, as witnessed by Cruschina (2013) and Di Caro (2019a; b), also see Andriani (2017) for the dialect of Bari. In our protocol here, we are just interested in whether there may be restrictions. Lack of restrictions in some variety (e.g. Modica and Mesagne, cf. Manzini and Savoia 2005, Manzini and Lorusso, this volume) is not a counterargument for the proposal. One can just

assume that in given varieties, all entries of the relevant subclass of motion verbs are specified as functional.

The restriction to non-periphrastic tenses is however widely generalized. This makes the *a*PseCo very different from the *e*PseCo, which is very productive in the present perfect, as exemplified above in (15a). The auxiliary may be repeated or not. In either case, the construction has the typical surprise interpretation:

(28)   a.   Ho   preso e   ho   comprato il   pane.
            Have.PRES.1SG taken and have.PRES.1SG bought   the bread
       b.   Ho   preso e   comprato il   pane.
            Have.PRES.1SG taken and bought   the bread
            'I unexpectedly / suddenly bought bread.'

(29)   a.   ?Stavo   prendendo e   stavo   andando a casa quando
            Stay.IPF.1SG taking   and stay.IPF.1SG going   home, when
            sei   arrivata tu.
            you arrived.
       b.   Stavo   prendendo e   andando a casa quando sei   arrivata tu.
            Stay.IPF.1SG taking   and going   home, when   you arrived.
            'I was suddenly about to go home when you showed up.'

The *mu*MAC has independent tenses. Any Tense can appear on V1, while V2 always has present indicative, which is semantically anaphoric to T1. Observe (30a–b), in which V1 has a compound tense (past perfect and present progressive, respectively) and the event of V2 is interpreted as immediately subsequent to it but is formally a present indicative:

(30)   a.   Era   jutu mi pigghiu   lu pani. (Roghudi, Maesano 2016)
            be.IPF.1SG gone *mi* fetch.PRES.1SG the bread
            'I had gone to take the bread.'
       b.   Staju   jendu mi pigghiu   lu pani.
            stay.PRES.1SG going *mi* fetch.PRES.1SG the bread
            'I am going to fetch the bread.'   (Roghudi, Maesano 2016)

Thus, tense restrictions would unify *e*PseCos with *mu*MACs and not with *a*PseCos, as reported in (9e).

3.2   Clitic climbing

It is well known that clitics target a functional head in the clause in which they are first merged. They do not undergo iterated movement from one clause to the next. Having two Ts, as in the *mu*MAC, predicts that the clitics associated with V2 cannot cliticize onto V1 and that V1 may only host the clitics associated with it.

Conversely, the reprojection of *t*-T, as in the *a*PseCo, predicts that the clitics target *t*. Finally, if the main T does not reproject and V1 is in a higher head (C), as in the *e*PseCo, the prediction is that the clitic appears in the one and only T projected in the construction, namely the one associated with V2. No optionality is expected in the position of the clitic in the three constructions, as confirmed by the examples in (31)–(33), unlike what we find with restructured infinitives, where the clitic can pro-cliticize on the auxiliary of V1 or be enclitic on the infinitival V2 (34):

(31) a. Ci   u   vaju   a dicu.   (*a*PseCo, Marsala)
         CL.LOC CL.ACC.M.SG go.PRES.1SG *a* tell.PRES.1SG
      b. *Vaju   a ci   u   dicu.
          go.PRES.1SG *a* CL.LOC CL.ACC.M.sg tell.PRES.1SG
          'I'll go and tell him that'

(32) a. *Glie-l'   ho   preso e ho   detto.
          CL.LOC-CL.ACC.M.SG have.PRES.1SG taken and have.PRES.1SG told
                                                                 (*e*PseCo, St. Ital.)
      b. Ho   preso e glie-l'   ho   detto.
          have.1P.SG taken and CL.LOC-CL.ACC.M.SG have.1P.SG told
          'I took and told him that'

(33) a. *Nci   lu   vaju   mi dicu.   (*mu*MAC, Roghudi)
          CL.LOC CL.ACC.M.SG go.PRES.1SG *mi* tell.PRES.1SG
      b. Vaju   mi nci   lu   dicu.
          go.PRES.1SG *mi* CL.LOC CL.ACC.M.SG tell.PRES.1SG
          'I'll go and tell him that'

(34) a. Ci   u   sta   ennu a diri.
         CL.LOC CL.ACC.M.SG stay.PRES.1SG going to tell.INF
                                            (infinitival construction, Marsala)
      b. Staju   ennu a diri-   ci-   llu.
          stay.PRES.1SG going to tell.INF- CL.LOC- CL.ACC.M.SG
          'I'm about to go and tell him that'

Manzini and Lorusso (this volume) observe that the position of clitics is variable in those dialects and constructions that display no (overt) connector, while it is on V1 in *a*-constructions (with a single exception).[11] They do not discuss the position of

---

11. Brindisi is not far from Mesagne, the dialect in which both the *a*PseCo and the *mu*MAC (with *ku*) occur and both can have a silent connector, as shown by the fact that only in the absence of the connector, the clitic can either be on V1 or on V2. A finer account of the dialect of Brindisi could consider the possibility that *a* in that dialect (or in the grammar of the informant who provided the judgement) is gaining the function of connecting the *mu*MAC. Ledgeway (2012: 476, n.5) and Ledgeway (2016a, footnote 6) show that in the city of Brindisi, the distribution of *a* vs. *ku* is determined by subject coreference vs. disjoint reference.

the clitic in the case of *mu/ku*-constructions but a scrutiny of Manzini and Savoia's (2005) data shows that the presence of *mu/ku* forces the clitic to stay on V2. This state of affairs is predicted by (8b–c) above, which claim that in both cases, the connector can be silent. Since many Apulian dialects have both *a*PseCos and a *mu*MAC (with *ku*), the variability of the position of the clitic can be attributed to the structural ambiguity of the V1-V2 order, as already suggested by Cardinaletti and Giusti (2020).[12]

If the clitic targets T, the analysis of the *e*PseCo in (8a) correctly predicts that in *e*PseCo the clitic is never on V1 because V1 is in Foc, a high clausal projection, even higher than C, which is in turn higher than T onto which the clitic attaches. This is the case of Italian *e*PseCo with TAKE in (32), and it is found in Marsalese (35), which can also have both TAKE and GO as V1 in the *e*PseCo. Note the minimal pair created by the *e*PseCo with GO in (35b) and the *a*PseCo with GO in (31b) above:

(35) a. Pigghiai   i   ci   u   dissi.
         take.PRF.1SG and   CL.LOC CL.ACC.M.SG say.PRF.1SG
         'I took and told him that.'
     b. Vaju   i   ci   u   dico!
         go.PRES.1SG and   CL.LOC CL.ACC.M.SG tell.PRES.1SG
         'I'll go and tell him!'

Clitic placement would therefore unify *e*PseCos with *mu*MAC and distinguish them from the *a*PseCo. But the formal analysis highlights that this cannot be taken as evidence for unification.

3.3   Negation

Clausal negation in Italo-Romance is a clitic that targets Tense and is part of the clitic cluster if clitic pronouns are also present in the clause. We therefore expect to find negation in all the positions where we find the clitics. To negate the complex event created by a motion verb, in both *a*PseCos and *mu*MACs negation is on V1. The two structures in (8b–c) however predict that when it is semantically possible, as with the aspectual verb START, only the *mu*MAC allows negation to occur on V2 leaving V1 outside the scope of negation. This is in fact the case. Contrast the

---

12. Adam Ledgeway (p.c.) points out that in some occurrences of the *mu/mi/ma* and *ku*-constructions, clitic pronouns can appear twice, on both V1 and V2 (see Squillaci 2016:110 for Calabrian dialects). A closer scrutiny of the double realization of the clitic is needed to fully understand the phenomenon, to check whether it is a sign of grammaticalization from the *mu*MAC to the *a*PseCo structure.

*mu*MAC of the dialect of Roghudi in (36) with the *a*PseCo of the dialect of Delia in (37). In Deliano, low scope negation is possible only with the infinitive:[13]

(36) a. Non 'ncignau   mi lavura.   (Roghudi, Maesano p.c.)
     NEG   start.PRF.3SG *mi* work.PRF.3SG
     'She didn't start to work.'

    b. 'Ncignau   non mi lavura.
     start.PRF.3SG NEG *mi* work.PRF.3SG
     'She started not to work.'

(37) a. Nun accuminciavu a bbippi   (Delia, Di Caro p.c.)
     neg   start.PRF.1SG *a* drink.PRF.1SG
     'I didn't start to drink.'

    b. *Accuminciavu a nun vippi
     start.PRF.1SG *a* NEG drink.PRF.1SG

    c. Accuminciavu a nun viviri.
     start.PRF.1SG *a* drink.INF
     'I started not to drink.'

In the *e*PseCo, where V1 is not part of the extended projection of T, despite the full form of its tense morphology, semantic negation cannot target V1. The negation found on V1 in the *e*PseCo (38a) is an expletive negation which reinforces the mirativity interpretation of the construction and does not negate the event. In order to negate the event, negation must be on V2 (38b):

(38) Eravamo tutti lì   per festeggiar=lo, …
     be.IPF.1PL all   there for celebrate.INF-CL.ACC.M.SG

    a. … e lui non ha   preso e   se   n'   è andato via?
     and he NEG has PRES.3SG taken and CL.REFL CL.ELA is gone away
     'We were all there to celebrate him, and – you know what? – he took and went away!'

    b. … e lui ha   preso e   non s'   è   presentato!
     and he have.PRES.3SG taken and NEG CL.REFL be.PRES.3SG presented
     'We were all there to celebrate him, and he didn't show up!'

This effect is predicted by structure (8a) above and obviously makes the *e*PseCo different from the other two constructions.

---

13. Note that in (36b), the negation precedes *mi*, while pronominal clitics follow it as in (33b). Although negation and pronominal clitics are both related to V2, a finer analysis of their placement is needed to account for the different distribution with respect to *mi*, which would impact on the structural hypothesis provided in (8c) above. That hypothesis predicts that negation clusters with the clitics and follows the connector *mi*, as is indeed found in the dialect of Messina, see De Angelis (2017: 147). Whatever the exact position of *mi* in Fin or lower clausal heads, our point remains that MACs are biclausal in a sense in which PseCos are not.

4.   Conclusions

The general aim of this paper was to show how a formal theory can be put at the service to design a diagnostic tool for language description, which we have called a protocol. In 1.2, we sketched three formal analyses of two different Pseudo-Coordinations and one Multiple Agreement Construction and argued against a unification account. The protocol presented in 1.3 was built on the predictions of two formal aspects of the three analyses (functional vs. lexical status of V1 and the realization of T). In the rest of the paper, we presented the relevant data, introducing some new data especially regarding the less-studied ePseCo. We have shown that a subset of properties would unify the ePseCo with the aPseCo and another subset would unify it with the muMAC. This shows that from a comparative perspective, limiting the consideration to just some properties is fallacious.

We can now pinpoint in (39) the results of the protocol on the ePseCo, which are slightly different from the first predictions in (9). First of all, there is a different degree of restriction on the number of items that appear as V1, according to the degree of their functional status. In the aPseCo, V1 is functional (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001), the number of items that can appear in this function is certainly small, but it is subject to variation (and even subject to extension, according to Di Caro's 2019b sociolinguistic inquiry). The V1 in the ePseCo is much more functional (the lexical meaning of 'take' or 'go' is completely lost in the ePseCo, while the andative meaning of 'go', 'come', etc. is preserved in the aPseCo), it merges much higher in the clausal hierarchy and the class of items that can have this property is very restricted. We symbolize this with a [++] value in (39a). Another small change to be made to the protocol is to note the irrelevance of the notion of coreference between subjects in case of the ePseCo (39c), where technically there is no subject of V1. This is reported as a [0] value. A third correction regards the lack of reduced morphology on V1 in Italian ePseCo, which is in principle possible but not mandatory, for a functional verb, as is the case of V1 in the aPseCo. A straight [−] value in (39d) thus substitutes the [(+)] of the predictions in (9d) and introduces a difference between aPseCo and ePseCo. The only property that is left in common between the two is lack of argument structure (39b).

The second set of properties concerns the realization of Tense in the three structures. In the ePseCo, there is a single T head, much lower than the first merge position of V1; the aPseCo displays concord of tenses, that is a reprojection of the features of T in t where V1 first merges; in the muMAC, there are two T projections, where the lower one can be anaphoric or bound to the higher one, as with infinitives. We have observed that these different realizations of Tense give different results in the morphological restrictions on the paradigm of V1, clitic climbing, and the position of clausal negation. The results laid out in (39e–g) confirm the

predictions spelled out in (9e–g). The discussion of the different possible scope of negation allowed us to add the complementary property of having negation only on V2, now inserted as (39h). This feature clearly distinguishes the *e*PseCo from the other two constructions.

(39)

PseCos and MACs in Italo-Romance (results)	*a*PseCo	*e*PseCo	*mu*MAC
Functional vs. lexical V1			
a. restricted class of V1	+	++	–
b. absence of argument structure of V1	+	+	–
c. mandatory coreference between the subjects	+	0	–
d. reduced morphology on V1	(+)	–	–
The realization of Tense			
e. restrictions in the paradigm (person and Tense)	+	–	–
f. mandatory clitic climbing onto V1	+	–	–
g. mandatory clausal negation on V1	+	–	–
h. mandatory clausal negation on V2	–	+	–

We conclude that a unification of the three constructions is not appropriate. Even in the similarities between the *a*PseCo and the *e*PseCo due to the functional status of V1, we observe substantial differences due to the different merging point and the different degree of functional status. The apparent similarities between the *e*PseCo and the *mu*MAC could also be erroneously interpreted as evidence in favour of unification. The addition of property (39h) however clears up a crucial difference, which is the only one to distinguish the *e*PseCo from the other two.

A general highlight of the paper is that labels such as PseCo or MAC or Serial Verbs, on which much discussion focuses in the typological and generative literature, may be illusory (cf. Ross, this volume). The differences and similarities across the three constructions are, to a large extent, irrelevant to their labelling. Only the *e*PseCo is a synchronic pseudo-coordination, due to the homophony of the connector with the coordinating conjunction, but this homophony cannot be considered as the trigger for any property. We decided to use the term PseCo for monoclausal constructions and MAC for the biclausal construction but, again, this is an arbitrary descriptive decision. What the theoretical position allows us to do is to conceive these cases as a continuum of the restructuring process which is captured in the minimalist framework as a complex process of feature sharing instantiated by Merge.

In this paper, we started from a theoretical stance, which made empirical predictions, and organized these predictions into a diagnostic tool which has allowed

us to make empirical advances. The results were presented in the protocol fashion, which is accessible to all linguists, unlike the complex theory-internal issues that are intrinsic to the formal hypotheses we have adopted. The empirical advances however would have not been possible if the theoretical proposals had not existed. We therefore hope to have shown how theory-driven approaches can be made useful to empirical advances as much as empirical advances are crucial for theoretical reflection and how these advances can be shared with the larger community of linguists without giving up a sound and rigorous methodology.

Acknowledgements

Funding

References

Adger, David. 2006. Combinatorial variability. *Journal of Linguistics*, 42: 503–530.
    https://doi.org/10.1017/S002222670600418X
Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2011. Multi-verb constructions: setting the scene. In *Multi-verb construction: A view from the Americas (Brill Studies in the Indigenous Languages of the Americas)*, Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and Pieter Muysken (eds.), 10–27. Amsterdam: Brill.
    https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004194526.i-313
Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and Robert M. W. Dixon. 2006. Serial Verb Constructions in typological perspective. In *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and Robert M. W. Dixon (eds), 1–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Andriani, Luigi. 2017. The syntax of the dialect of Bari. PhD Dissertation, University of Cambridge.
Benincà, Paola & Cinque, Guglielmo. 1992. Sur l'ambiguïté structurale des verbes météorologiques en italien. In *De la musique à la linguistique: Hommages à Nicolas Ruwet*, Liliane Tasmowski and Anne Zribi-Hertz (eds.), 155–162. Ghent: Communication and Cognition: Ghent.

Biberauer, Theresa & Richards, Mark. 2006. True optionality. When the grammar doesn't mind. In *Minimalist Essays* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 91] Cedric Boeckx (ed.), 35–67. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.91.08bib

Bravo, Ana. 2020. On Pseudocoordination in Spanish. *Borealis – An international Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 9(1): 125–180. https://doi.org/10.7557/1.9.1.5365

Cardinaletti, Anna & Giusti, Giuliana. 1998. Motion verbs as functional heads. *GenGenP* 6: 50–60.

Cardinaletti, Anna & Giusti, Giuliana. 2001. 'Semi-Lexical' Motion Verbs in Romance and Germanic. In *Semi-lexical categories. On the function of content words and content of function words* [Studies in Generative Grammar 39], Norbert Corver & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), 371–414. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110874006.371

Cardinaletti, Anna & Giusti, Giuliana. 2003. Motion verbs as functional heads. In *The Syntax of Italian Dialects* [Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax] Christina Tortora (ed.), 31–49. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cardinaletti, Anna & Giusti, Giuliana. 2020. Multiple agreement in southern Italian dialects. In *Linguistic variation: structure and interpretation* [Studies in Generative Grammar132] Ludovico Franco & Paolo Lorusso (eds.), 125–148. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

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

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, Michel Kenstowicz (ed.), 1–52. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2001. "Restructuring" and the order of aspectual and root modal heads. In *Current Studies in Italian Syntax*, Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), 137–155. Amsterdam: Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1163/9780585473949_009

Coseriu, Eugenio. 1977 [1966]. "Tomo y me voy": Un problema de sintaxis comparada europea. In Coseriu, Eugenio, Estudios de linguistica romanica, 79–151. Madrid: Editorial Gredos [Orig. publ.: 1966. "Tomo y me voy". Ein Problem vergleichender europaischer Syntax. *Vox romanica* 25: 13–55].

Cruschina, Silvio. 2013. Beyond the stem and inflectional morphology: an irregular pattern at the level of periphrasis. In *The boundaries of pure morphology. Diachronic and synchronic perspective*, Silvio Cruschina, Martin Maiden & J. Charles Smith (eds.), 262–283, Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199678860.003.0014

De Angelis, Alessandro. 2013. Strategie di complementazione frasale. Messina: SGB Edizioni.

De Angelis, Alessandro. 2016. Origini formali e funzionali della particella (m)i, (m)u, ma nell'area messinese e calabrese centro-meridionale. In *Dialetti: per parlare e parlarne. Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Dialettologia. Progetto A.L.Ba. (Potenza, Castelmezzano, Lagopesole, 6–8 novembre 2014)*, Patrizia Del Puente (ed.), 75–95. Venosa (Pz): Osanna Edizioni.

De Angelis, Alessandro. 2017. Between Greek and Romance: Competing Complementation Systems in Southern Italy. In *Language and Identity in Multilingual Mediterranean Settings*, Piera Molinelli (ed.), 135–155. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110554274-008

Déchaine, Rose-Marie. 1993. Serial verb constructions. *Syntax. Vol 1*. Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann (eds.), 799–825. Berlin: de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110095869.1.12.799

Del Prete, Fabio & Giuseppina Todaro. 2020. Building complex events. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 38(1): 1–41. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-018-09439-2

Di Caro, Vincenzo N. 2019a. Multiple Agreement Constructions in southern Italo-Romance. The syntax of Sicilian Pseudocoordination. PhD Dissertation. Ca' Foscari University of Venice.

Di Caro, Vincenzo N. 2019b. The inflected construction in the dialects of Sicily: parameters of microvariation. In *Italian dialectology at the interfaces* [Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics Today 251], Silvio Cruschina, Adam Ledgeway & Eva-Maria Remberger (eds.), 63–78. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.251.03dic

Di Caro, Vincenzo N. & Giuliana Giusti. 2015. A Protocol for the Inflected Construction in Sicilian Dialects. *Annali di Ca' Foscari. Serie Occidentale* 49: 293–322.

Di Caro, Vincenzo N. & Giuliana Giusti. 2018. Dimensions of variation: the inflected construction in the dialect of Delia (Caltanissetta). In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 14: Selected papers from the 46th LISRL, Stony Brook, NY*, Lori Repetti & Francisco Ordóñez (eds.) 54–68. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/rllt.14.04car

Giusti, Giuliana. 2011. Structural protocols for linguistic awareness enhancing language identity. Research project at CRASSH. University of Cambridge, October-December 2011. http://www.crassh.cam.ac.uk/people/profile/giuliana-giusti

Giusti, Giuliana. 2021a. A protocol for indefinite determiners in Italo-Romance. In *Disentangling Bare Nouns and Nominals Introduced by a Partitive Article* [Syntax & Semantics 43] Tabea Ihsane (ed.), 262–300. Amsterdam: Brill.

Giusti, Giuliana. 2021b. Partitivity in Italian: A protocol approach to a multifaceted phenomenon. In *Partitive Determiners. Partitive Pronouns and Partitive Casem* Petra Sleeman & Giuliana Giusti (eds.) Linguistische Arbeiten. Berlin: de Gruyter (in print).

Giusti, Giuliana & Iulia Zegrean. 2015. Syntactic Protocols to enhance inclusive cultural identity. A Case study on Istro-Romanian clausal structure. *Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali* 1: 117–138.

Groothuis, Kim A. 2019. Reflexes of Finiteness in Romance. University of Cambridge: doctoral thesis.

Haspelmath, Martin & Ekkehart König. 1995. *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective. Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Forms – Adverbial Participles, Gerunds*. [Empirical Approaches to Language Typology]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110884463

Jaeggli, Osvaldo A. & Nina M. Hyams. 1993. On the independence and interdependence of syntactic and morphological properties: English aspectual *come* and *go*. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11: 313–346. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992916

Ledgeway, Adam. 2012 [2013]. Contatto e mutamento: Complementazione e complementatori nei dialetti del Salento. In *Lingue e grammatiche. Contatti, divergenze, confronti*, Marina Benedetti (ed.), special issue of *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 41(3): 459–480.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2016a. 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.), 157–185. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholar Publishers.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2016b. Clausal complementation. In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden (eds.), 1013–1028. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0063

Ledgeway, Adam. 2021. *Coming* and *going* in Calabrian: The syntax of pseudo-coordination. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* LXVI(1), 3–35.

Maesano, Deborah. 2016. The inflected constructions in Southern Calabrian dialects. BA Thesis, Ca' Foscari University of Venice.

Manzini, M. Rita & Leonardo Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci: morfosintassi. Vol 1.* Alessandria: Edizioni dall'Orso.

Masini, Francesca, Simone Mattiola, Greta Vecchi. 2019. La costruzione "prendere e V" nell'italiano contemporaneo. In *Le tendenze dell'italiano contemporaneo rivisitate. Atti del LII Congresso Internazionale di Studi della Società di Linguistica Italiana (Berna, 6–8 settembre 2018)* Bruno Moretti, Aline Kunz, Silvia Natale, Etna Krakenberger (eds.), 115–137. Roma: Bulzoni.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2011. Optionality. In *The Oxford handbook of linguistic minimalism* Cedric Boeckx (ed.), 354–376. Oxford: OUP.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110883718

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. On the fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*. Liliane Haegeman (ed.), 147–161. Dordrecht: Kluwer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7

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

Shopen, Timothy. 1971. Caught in the act. *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 254–263.

Soto Gómez, Juan Francisco. 2020. Pseudocoordination in Spanish. A two construction analysis. MA thesis, Ca' Foscari University of Venice. http://dspace.unive.it/handle/10579/18854

Squillaci, M. Olimpia. ~~2017~~. When Greek Meets Romance: A Morphosyntactic Investigation of Language Contact in Aspromonte. University of Cambridge: doctoral thesis.

Todaro, Giuseppina & Fabio Del Prete. 2019. The morpho-syntax-semantics interface and the Sicilian *Doubly Inflected Construction*. In *Italian dialectology at the interfaces* [Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics Today 251], Silvio Cruschina, Adam Ledgeway & Eva-Maria Remberger (eds.), 131–154. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.251.07tod

Yuasa, Etsuyo & Saddock, Jerry M. 2002. Pseudo-subordination: a mismatch between syntax and semantics, *Journal of Linguistics* 38(1): 87–111. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226701001256

Author queries

Please provide a citation for the reference "CIT0212 (Squillaci, M. Olimpia. (2017))" since citation is missing in the article.