

A Protocol for the Inflected Construction in Sicilian Dialects

Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro, Giuliana Giusti
(Università Ca' Foscari Venezia, Italia)

Abstract Most Sicilian dialects display a monoclausal construction with a functional verb (usually of motion), followed by the linking element *a* and a lexical verb called Inflected Construction by Cardinaletti, Giusti (2001, 2003). This construction shows a high degree of cross-linguistic variation. The aim of the paper is to propose the protocols in the sense of Giusti, Zegrean (2015) to conduct fieldwork in this area. Protocol Linguistics is a metamodel of linguistic research that can be shared by linguists of different theoretical persuasion, can be accessible to non-linguists, and is meant to interface with a number of disciplines and environments such as social sciences and political planning, neuro-psychology and language rehabilitation, pedagogy and language education. The protocols consist of simple table-charts with the horizontal axis listing the empirical environments to be searched, e.g. the languages to be compared, and the vertical axis listing (clusters of) properties, named features, to be valued as +/- according to whether they are present or absent in each environment. The features relevant to the investigation on the Inflected Construction rely on preliminary work by Di Caro (2015), which highlights a finer grained variation than the one presented in previous literature (a.o. Cardinaletti, Giusti 2001, 2003, and Cruschina 2013). In the spirit of the principles-and-parameters approach, the protocols for the Inflected Construction are clustered around two main dimensions, each involving clusters of properties: (i) the lexical restrictions on the functional and/or the lexical verb; (ii) the person, tense and mood restrictions of the verbal paradigm.

Summary 1 Introduction. – 1.1 A Serial Verb Construction in Southern Italo-Romance. – 1.2 Aims and Goals of the Paper. – 1.3 Structure of the Paper. – 2 Protocol Linguistics (PL). – 2.1 Cultural Identity and Italian Dialects. – 2.2 What Is a Protocol? – 3 Lexical Restrictions. – 3.1 Restrictions on V1. – 3.2 Restrictions on V2. – 4 Verbal Inflection. – 4.1 Inflectional Paradigm. – 4.2 Uninflected Forms. – 4.3 Reduced Forms. – 5 Conclusions.

Keywords Sicilian dialects. Inflected construction. Protocol linguistics. Functional verbs.

1 Introduction

1.1 A Serial Verb Construction in Southern Italo-Romance

Sicilian dialects¹ display a particular construction with verbs of motion combining with a lexical verb inflected for finite tense and subject agreement,

¹ We thank Anna Thornton, Probal Dasgupta and two anonymous reviewers for supportive comments and constructive criticism. The usual disclaimers apply. This paper has been writ-

similar to what is generally known as 'Serial Verb Construction' in other language families (cf. Joseph, Zwicky 1990; Aikhenvald, Dixon 2006), in which the two verbs (V1 and V2) share the same inflection for Tense and person.² The examples in (1) are from the dialect spoken in Delia (Caltanissetta):

- (1) a. Vaju a ffazzu la spisa. (Del.)
 go.1SG a do.1SG the shopping
 'I go and do the shopping'
- b. La sira mi veni a ccunta du cosi.
 the evening to-meCL come.3SG a tell.3SG two things
 'He comes to tell me some stories at night'

This construction competes with the infinitival construction, which is the only option in standard Italian, as in (2b), and in most varieties of Italo-Romance:

- (2) a. La sira mi veni a ccuntari du cosi. (Del.)
 the evening to-meCL come.3SG to tell.INF two things
- b. La sera mi viene a raccontare /*racconta delle storie.
 the evening to-meCL come.3SG to tell.INF tell.3SG some stories
 'He comes to tell me some stories at night'

Cardinaletti, Giusti (2001, 2003) call it 'Inflected Construction' (henceforth, IC)³ and compare it with the *go (and) V* construction in English, (3a) (Carden, Pesetsky 1977; Jaeggli, Hyams 1993), and the *går och V* construction in Swedish, (4a) (Wiklund 1996), which also compete with the infinitival construction (cf. (3b) and (4b)):

ten four hands, but for the sake of the Italian Law, Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro is responsible for sections 3 and 4; Giuliana Giusti for sections 1, 2 and 5.

2 Sornicola (1976) attributes the first study of this construction across Italian varieties to Ascoli (1896), also cf. Ledgeway (1997) on Neapolitan. These studies show that the constructions are restricted to andative verbs in the imperative mood. This may not be a unique property of (Italo-) Romance languages, as Probal Dasgupta (p.c.) observes that *mutatis mutandis* this is also the case in Bangla. In this paper, we concentrate on Sicilian varieties in which the construction is much more productive.

3 There is no consensus on the terminology and on the analysis of this (family of) constructions. Ledgeway (1997, 2015) considers it as part of a family of coordinative constructions grammaticalized into subordination, Manzini, Savoia (2005) treat them in a generalized way, Cruschina (2013) calls it Doubly Inflected Construction. We follow here Cardinaletti, Giusti's terminology, which allows us to keep it distinct from non-restructured constructions, which are not widespread in Sicily.

- (3) a. I go (and) do the shopping.
 b. I go to do the shopping.
- (4) a. Jag går och hämtar brödet.
 I go.1SG and fetch.1SG bread-theCL
 'I go and fetch the bread'
- b. Jag går och hämtar brödet.
 I go.1SG for to fetch.INF bread-theCL
 'I go to fetch the bread'

Cardinaletti, Giusti (henceforth C&G) characterize the IC as displaying three general properties: it is monoclausal, it cooccurs with a restricted number of verbs, it displays a defective paradigm.

In Marsalese, it is only possible with three motion verbs: *iri* 'go', *vè niri* 'come', *passari* 'come by', and the causative motion verb *mannari* 'send', and it only occurs in four persons of the indicative present (5) and in the singular person of the imperative (6):

- (5) a. Vajo / Vai / Va / Vanno a pigghio / pigghi / piggia / pigghiano
 go.1SG / 2SG / 3SG / 3PL a fetch.1SG / 2SG / 3SG / 3PL
 u pani. (Mar.)
 the bread
 'I/you/he/they go(es) to fetch the bread'
- b. *Emo / *Ite a pigghiamo / pigghiate u pani.
 go.1PL / 2PL a fetch.1PL / 2PL the bread
 'We/you go and fetch the bread'
- (6) a. Va pigghia u pani!
 go.IMP.2SG fetch.IMP.2SG the bread
- b. *Ite pigghiate u pani!
 go.IMP.2PL fetch.IMP.2PL the bread
 'Go and fetch the bread!'

C&G also note that in the indicative present, the V2 displays consonant gemination (7a) triggered by the linking element *a*,⁴ which is mandatory;

4 This is an instance of 'raddoppiamento fonosintattico', a sandhi phenomenon that is sensitive to lexical properties as well as phonosyntactic contexts. It is found in Tuscan and most central and southern Italian dialects and is triggered by an unassociated Coda of a strong syllable, cf. Chierchia (1986). With the preposition *a*, which does not present a strong

while in the imperative (7b), gemination is not present, suggesting that the linking element *a* is absent at all levels of representation and not simply fused to the *-a* ending of V1:

- (7) a. Va a[pp]igghia u pani. (Mar.)
 go.3SG a fetch.3SG the bread
 'He goes to fetch the bread'
- b. Va [p]igghia u pani!
 go.IMP.2SG fetch.IMP.2SG the bread
 'Go and fetch the bread!'

They propose that the linking element and the motion verb merge immediately higher than the lexical verb in the same functional head in which the lexical verb checks Tense and Agr features. In other words, T would host the complex head [_T V1 *a* V2]. They account for the missing persons and tenses proposing that the possibility of being part of a complex T is specified in the lexicon for some forms of the paradigm of a restricted class of V1. Lack of the linking element in the imperative is reduced by C&G to the higher checking position of the imperative Mood.⁵

Manzini, Savoia (2005, pp. 688-701) treat the IC together with other aspectual constructions which display finite inflection for both V1 and V2 in dialects of Sicily, Calabria and Salento. They report that in the dialect of Modica (Ragusa), the IC is found with all persons, not only in the present but also in the imperfect and preterite. In (8) we give the 1st person plural in the present (8a) and imperfect (8b):

- (8) a. Jemu a mmanciamu. (Mod.)
 go.1PL a eat.1PL
 'We go to eat'
- b. u jeumu a ffascieumu
 itCL go.IMPERF.1PL a do.IMPERF.1PL
 'We used to go and do it'

syllable structure, the unassociated consonantal Coda must be assumed as part of the lexical specification. This is diachronically motivated assuming that the final consonant of Latin *ad* has developed into an unassociated consonantal Coda. The same kind of metrical analysis can be extended to the connecting element *a*, which is diachronically related to the Latin coordination *ac* by Rohlf's (1969, § 761), while Manzini, Savoia (2005) claim that it is a preposition. Nothing in this paper hinges on the difference between the two analyses.

⁵ This proposal is not directly relevant to our discussion, we therefore refer the interested reader to Cardinaletti, Giusti (2001, pp. 398-402) for the justification of their analysis.

C&G (2001) report that the dialect of Milazzo (Messina) has an option for the three constructions with the motion verb 'go' (we omit the data here for reasons of brevity). In this perspective, it would be interesting to know whether in each variety which presents more than one construction, the option is free (as it seems to be the case in Marsalese) or if the choice has semantic or pragmatic consequences, as appears to be the case in the more general, pan-Italian perspective adopted by Sornicola (1976).

All these questions and many more can only be correctly spelled out and, at a later stage, receive an answer, if we get hold of more solid comparable data.

1.2 Aims and Goals of the Paper

The main aim of this paper is to establish a list of adequate empirical questions arising in the study of the IC to be answered in future fieldwork. It is therefore intended to be the first milestone of a larger project. We set the questions in a pre-theoretical way, as done by Giusti, Zegrean's (2015) study on Istro-Romanian in a framework that is aimed to be at the same time descriptively adequate and easily accessible to a large public. They call this framework Protocol Linguistics (henceforth PL), as originally suggested by Giusti's (2011) research project.

PL is conceived as a flexible tool for language documentation as well as for any other action in which language is involved, including but not limited to language education, rehabilitation, enhancement of language awareness, language standardization and planning. It is characterized by an aim to simplicity as regards technical tools and to ecumenicity as regards theoretical persuasion.

The first general goal in our agenda is to obtain and disseminate knowledge on a construction that can be considered one of the most characteristic and less studied of the Sicilian varieties. In fact, the IC is present in most, maybe all the varieties of the island (cf. Cruschina 2013), and only sporadically present in other Southern Italian varieties, which also display the finite construction with a variety of V1, which is not limited to verbs of motion. It is certainly poorly studied from the point of view of dialectal syntax. Rohlfs (1969) deals with it in § 761 and with the finite construction in § 717. AIS displays a single chart in which the IC can be detected: 822 'vo a comprare' ('I go and buy'), where the coexistence with the infinitival form is only recorded for Palermo (803), while the infinitival construction looks mistakenly pervasive in the island. The other two maps with the verb 'go' are in the imperative 1st person plural 1534 'andiamo a scegliere' ('let's go and choose') and in the infinitive 636 'andare a cercare' ('to go and find'). No other motion verb combining with a verbal predicate is present. Sornicola (1976) presents the historical linguistic discussion that

treats the IC and the finite construction as a single phenomenon (parataxis) opposed to the infinitival construction (hypotaxis) and disregards the syntactic variation to be discussed in this paper.

Our second goal is to improve the PL approach, at its very initial stages, applying it to fieldwork design. We want to reflect on what is the most adequate way of formulating the features to be compared, in order to be successful in our effort towards theoretical ecumenicism.

We mostly restrict our study to Sicilian dialects, for two reasons. One is the obvious need to respect space limits. The other, more important, is suggested by the protocol methodology which allows to compare given features in a 'telescopic' way, going from finer-grained variation to a wider perspective and backwards. We believe that the variation found in Sicily is complex enough for a starting point. But the Italo-Romance and the Italo-Balkan perspective is always taken as our closer background, never forgetting a more general view that include at least (Indo-)European languages.

1.3 Structure of the Paper

Section 2 is devoted to present PL as proposed by Giusti, Zegrean (2015) and to develop its potentialities in planning fieldwork. The rest of the paper is devoted to set out the protocols according to the two dimensions highlighted above; namely, the lexical restrictions on V1 and V2, which is dealt with in section 3; and the restrictions on the cells of the paradigm that can enter the IC, which is dealt with in section 4. Section 5 draws the conclusions and suggests possible developments.

2 Protocol Linguistics (PL)

PL is a metamodel of linguistic research that can be shared by linguists of different empirical specializations and theoretical persuasion and be accessible to the non-linguistic world (cf. Giusti, Zegrean 2015). The urgency to create such a model with the characteristics of being theoretically ecumenic and accessible to non-linguists is grounded on the consideration that on the one hand, language is generally felt to be one of the major components of cultural identity; on the other hand, recent advances of one linguistic approach are unaccessible to the other as well as to the general public. In this way, they cannot be of use to a number of disciplines and environments such as social sciences and political planning, neuro-psychology and language rehabilitation, pedagogy and language education, which also have language as their object of study or application.

2.1 Cultural Identity and Italian Dialects

Italian dialects undoubtedly constitute some cultural richness that is subject to two contrasting trends. On the one hand, local cultural pride suggests extending the use of the dialect, now limited to informal and familiar registers, to more formal environments. With this aim, many Italian regional governments plan to introduce the teaching of the dialect in schools, with no clear notion of what variety should be taught, who should teach it, how the teachers should be instructed by whom. On the other hand, there are still strong cultural biases against dialects in favour of a supposed superiority of a national standard conceived as a monolithic entity, subdue to a highly prescriptive tradition.⁷ All this is the result of lack of awareness of the fact that human beings are naturally multilingual and that competence of numerous languages, registers and varieties can be acquired without detriment of one with respect to the other. In other words, the language awareness on which cultural identity is based can dangerously be the reason of either deconstructing national and supra-national identities in favour of local identities, limited to more and more restricted environments, or of losing the local language.

According to Giusti (2011), disseminating knowledge on differences and similarities across languages can contribute to construct a kind of language awareness which enhances inclusive cultural identity. PL can produce knowledge of language ready to be disseminated and create linguistic metacompetence, a form of language awareness that can stop people from conceiving the dialect in contrast with the national language, and the national language in contrast with English as a *lingua franca* or any other language, in particular the heritage languages that are more and more present in Italy and certainly constitute some cultural enrichment which should not get lost.

2.2 What is a Protocol?

The language documentation task we aim at regards a very special phenomenon in a representative sample of Sicilian dialects. Like most local varieties, these dialects have low prestige and are not standardized. They are therefore expected to display a certain degree of dialectal and dias-tratic variation, as well as contact with the regional variety of standard Italian, which does not display the IC, and a residue of contact with other

⁷ The Internet offers many examples of this tendency, as can be observed in the Facebook group 'La lingua batte', where posts about grammatical norms or lexical choices inflame the users with unjustified feelings of love and hatred. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/266491950145853/>.

non-Romance varieties, almost extinct nowadays, which had restricted or no use of the infinitive as Italo-Greek and Italo-Albanian, which have been present in Sicily as well as in southern Italy. We want to document and describe this kind of variation, which crucially involves recording optionality, namely the coexistence of competing constructions.

Since we focus on a very small portion of the grammar of the language, we need to set a linguistic protocol that will produce comparable data. The linguistic protocol must cross the two dimensions of research: the varieties and the syntactic features.

Giusti, Zegrean (2015) propose to represent the protocol as a simple table-chart with the languages indicated on the horizontal axis and the properties to be tested on the vertical axis. This allows to capture possible correlations at first sight and to draw implications and correlations among properties. Table 1 provides an example applied to the general questions formulated in section 1 above. The syntactic features are in the vertical axis and are formulated descriptively as 'infinitival construction', 'inflected construction' and 'finite construction'. In this perspective, we observe a continuum from Italian with just one construction (the infinitival one) to the two Italo-Balkan varieties (Griko and Arbëresh) with only one construction (the finite one). Marsala, Palermo, and Delia's dialects show two constructions (the infinitival and the inflected); Milazzo is the only variety with the three possibilities. We may wonder if we can find a dialect in Sicily in which the infinitival construction is missing, and the IC competes with the finite construction:⁸

Table 1. Different constructions with verbs of motion in Sicily

	Italian	Marsala	Palermo	Delia	Milazzo	?	Italo-Balkan
infinitival construction	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
inflected construction	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
finite construction	-	-	-	-	+	+	+

Once we have established that a given variety has a given feature, e.g. the IC, we can start setting out the different properties that arise with it. For example, the restrictions to tense and mood, as in Table 2. All the studies mentioned above report that the IC is only possible in simple tenses. All display the imperative and the indicative present. Variation is found in the possibility of preterite and imperfect. It is reasonable to ask whether the

⁸ As noted in section 1, this seems to be the case with the verb 'want' in the dialect of Torre S. Susanna (Manzini, Savoia 2005, p. 693). We do not know if it is also the case for motion verbs in that dialect. A broader protocollar research should therefore take Apulia dialects into account, but this cannot be done here for reasons of time and space.

more liberal varieties of Modica and Milazzo allow for the subjunctive (something like *jissi a pigghiassi*, go.SUB.1SG a take.SUB.1SG 'I would go and take') and whether there is a fully liberal variety that even allows for the IC in compound tenses (something like *haju ito a travagghiato*, have-1SG go.PAST.PART a work.PAST.PART 'I have gone to work'). In other words, we produce a protocol with more specific features, as in Table 2.

Table 2. Tense and Mood restrictions in the IC

	Marsala (TP)	Palermo	Delia (CL)	Modica (RG)	Milazzo (ME)	?
compound tenses	-	-	-	-	-	+
imperative	+	+	+	+	+	+
indicative						
present	+	+	+	+	+	+
preterite	-	-	+	+	?	+
imperfect	-	-	-	+	?	+
subjunctive	-	-	-	?	?	+

The symbol '?' on the horizontal axis stands for a (group of) varieties, which are unknown but can be expected to exist. At this point they do not need to be spelled out individually. This will be clear in the more specific protocols discussed in the next sections.

In the rest of the paper, we will construct our protocols for the IC in Sicilian dialects based on the available literature mentioned above as well as on Di Caro's (2015) master's thesis. Comparison with other varieties outside Sicily discussed in the literature will be relevant to spell out research questions hypothesizing (groups of) possible Sicilian varieties, which we have not yet encountered, indicated with '?'.

3 Lexical Restrictions

The IC is 'asymmetrical', in the sense of Aikhenvald, Dixon (2006). This means that the lexical restrictions mostly regard V1, even if not all verbs can occur as V2. This section focusses on these two aspects.

3.1 Restrictions on V1

C&G (2001) report that only a restricted number of core motion verbs can enter the IC in Marsalese, namely: 'go', 'come', 'come by' and 'send'. The examples in (10b) show the ungrammaticality of other motion verbs

such as 'go up / down', 'go into'. The examples in (11a) show the same behaviour in Deliano and the ungrammaticality of other verbs, such as 'run' and 'go into' in (11b):

- (10) a. Vajo / vegno / passo / manno a pigghio u pani. (Mar.)
 go.1SG / come.1SG / come-by.1SG / send.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread
 'I go / come / come by / send (someone) to fetch the bread'
- b. *Acchiano / *scinno / *traso / *curro a pigghio u pani.
 go-up.1SG / go-down.1SG / go-into.1SG / run.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread
 'I go up / go down / go into / run to fetch the bread'
- (11) a. Vaju / vjignu / passu / mannu a ppigliu lu pani. (Del.)
 go.1SG / come.1SG / come-by.1SG / send.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread
 'I go / come / come by / send (someone) to fetch the bread'
- b. *Curru / *njisciu / *trasu a ppigliu lu pani.
 run.1SG / go-out.1SG / go-into.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread

Di Caro (2015) reports that differently from Marsalese (12a) 'come back' is possible in Deliano (12b) and Catanese, as shown in (13) which is a verse by the poet Nino Martoglio (1948, p. 153):

- (12) a. *Torno a pigghio u pani. (Mar.)
 come back.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread
 'I come back to fetch the bread.'
- b. Tuirnu a ppigliu lu pani. (Del.)
 come back.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread
 'I come back to fetch the bread'
- (13) Ti lu tornu a scrivu. (Cat.)
 to-youCL itCL come back.1SG a write.1SG
 'I write it to you again'

Note that in (13) *tornu* does not express motion but realizes iterative aspect.⁹ Another aspectual verb which can have the IC in Deliano is 'start', but limited to the 1st person singular and marginally possible in the 3rd

9 A reviewer points out that a grammaticalized meaning is also found with the semantically more basic verb 'go', as suggested by Sornicola (1976) and Leone (1973, 1978). This is certainly expected in view of the great variation in the type of verbs that can enter the IC as V1, and that the protocol methodology is able to represent, as already done in Table 3, which crucially has 'other' at the end of the for the moment short list of aspectual verbs entering the IC.

person plural. Note also that the sentences in (14) are not grammatical in the dialect of Canicattì (Agrigento), which is only 5 km away from Delia:

- (14) a. Ora accuminciu a bbiu cchi puizzu fari. (Del.)
 now start.1SG a see.1SG what can.1SG do.INF
 'I'll start thinking about what I can do now'
 b. Ora accumincianu a bbidinu cchi puinnu fari.
 now start.3PL a see.3PL what can.3PL do.INF
 'They'll start thinking what they can do now'

The protocol represented in Table 3 is very preliminary as regards the languages that are relevant to the distribution of lexical items as V1. Marsalese shows that not only the two core motion verbs like 'go' and 'come' can appear in this construction, but also the more lexical 'come by' and the causative 'send'. Deliano also has 'come back' as V1 with the semantics of motion and 'start' which clearly is aspectual, but both limited to one or two persons of the paradigm. It remains to be checked whether Catanese, which displays 'come back' with aspectual meaning, also maintains the motion meaning with this verb in the IC. Research is needed to investigate whether other aspectual verbs or other motion verbs are possible. For this reason we have hypothesized more restrictive varieties at the left of Marsalese with just one or both of the more basic motion verbs 'go' and 'come' and a more liberal group of varieties at the right of Catanese, where many more motion verbs can enter the IC. Research on this can show whether there is an implicational hierarchy of the possible verbs in the IC or not. The +/- value indicates that there are further restrictions beyond the general ones that apply to all verbs. The two values can be spelled out in separate cells of a lower level protocol, as will be suggested in section 5.

Table 3. Distribution of lexical items as V1 in the IC

	?	Marsala (TP)	Delia (CL)	Canicattì (AG)	Catania	?
motion verbs						
go	+	+	+	+	+	+
come	+	+	+	+	+	+
send	-	+	+	+	?	+
come by	-	+	+	+	?	+
come back	-	-	+/-	-	?	?
go out	-	-	-	-	?	+
go into	-	-	-	-	?	+
run	-	-	-	-	?	+
other	-	-	-	-	?	+

aspectual verbs						
do again	-	-	+	-	+	+
start	-	-	+/-	-	-	+
other	-	-	?	?	?	+

3.2 Restrictions on V2

Sorrisi (2010) reports that in Palermitano the IC comes in two forms: the one in (15) has full inflection of V1, takes the linking element which triggers consonant doubling on V2, and only admits transitive verbs as V2 (15a), not intransitives (15b). The other (16) has an uninflected form of the motion verb and allows both transitive V2s (with the connecting element *a*) and intransitive V2s (without *a* and, consequently, without raddoppiamento fonosintattico):

- (15) a. Vaju a mmangiu a pasta. (Pal.)
 go.1SG a eat.1SG the pasta
 'I go and eat pasta'
- b. *Vaju a ttravagghiu.
 go.1SG a work.1SG
 'I go to work'
- (16) a. Va(*ju) mangiu a pasta. (Pal.)
 go eat.1SG the pasta
 'I go and eat pasta'
- b. Va(*ju) travagghiu.
 go work.1SG
 'I go to work'

The contrasts in (15)-(16) in Palermitano suggest that in Table 1, the feature that spells out the presence of the IC could be split in two (sub)features: the IC with a linking element and the IC without the linking element. We will go back to this issue in section 5.

C&G (2001) note that the IC in Marsalese can combine with a factive verb (17a) and with another andative verb (17b). We find that it cannot combine with modal and aspectual verbs (18) such as 'want', which selects a simple infinitive, or 'continue', which selects an infinitive introduced by *a*, or 'try' which selects an infinitive introduced by *di*:

- (17) a. U picciriddu u va a fa lavari a su matri. (Mar.)
 the child itCL go.3SG a make.3SG wash.INF by his mother
 'The child goes to have it washed by his mother'
- b. Peppe va a vene a accattari u pani.
 Peppe go.3SG a come.3SG to buy.INF the bread
 'Peppe goes and come to buy the bread'
- (18) Peppe va a *vole /*continua a /*cerca d'accattari u pani.
 Peppe go.3SG a want.3SG / continue.3SG to / try.3SG to buy.INF the
 bread
 'Peppe goes to want / continue to / try to buy the bread'

The IC in Marsalese distinguishes two types of psychological verbs with subject stimulus: those like 'disturb' in (19a) that can appear in the IC (cf. C&G 2001) and those like 'like' that cannot (19b):

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

The (in)compatibility in (19b) appears to be semantic and independent of the IC, as is also found in the infinitival construction:

- (20) a. A musica va a nguetari i cristiani djassupra. (Mar.)
 the music go.3SG to bother.INF the people upstairs
 'The music goes to disturb the people upstairs'
- b. *A musica va a piaciri ai cristiani djassupra.
 the music go.3SG to like.INF to-the people upstairs
 'The music goes to please the people upstairs'

On the one hand it is clear that there are verbs whose semantics is incompatible with the andative semantics of the motion verb, which is preserved in the IC. On the other hand, there are functional uses of motion verbs, as the passive *venire* in Italian (21a), or the Marsalese fixed expression *vèniri a diri* (21b), which do not display this incompatibility:

- (21) a. La musica viene sentita da tutti. (Ita.)
 the music come.3SG hear.PAST.PART by all
 'Music is heard by everybody'
- b. Soccu mi vene a diri / *dice chissu? (Mar.)
 What to-meCL come.3SG a say.INF/ IND.3SG that
 'What does this mean?'

The ungrammaticality of the IC in (21b) shows that *vèniri* in the Marsalese IC maintains the motion semantics. This is not necessarily the case for other verbs, and must be empirically established. This is made possible by checking the types of verbs it can combine with in the IC and in the competing infinitival construction.

The protocol for the distribution of V2 in the IC with the linking element is given in Table 4. It is quite complex and tentative:

Table 4. Distribution of V2 in the IC

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

For the moment, the first cluster regards the number of arguments as well as the argument structure of lexical verbs, the second cluster lists the hierarchy of aspectual verbs, and the third the hierarchy of modal verbs. In section 4 we will see that the inflectional paradigm of V2 may be also relevant. Since we have very little data on this issue, the gap between Palermitano and a logically possible variety where all combinations are grammatical is obviously conceived as a gradient possibility.

The protocol can be directly applied to competing constructions if present in the dialect: the IC without linking element, the finite construction, and the infinitival construction.

4 Verbal Inflection

The inflectional paradigm of V1 is directly relevant to the IC. We have seen above that not all persons or tenses of V1 may enter the IC. This section will present three different ways of realizing the reduplicated inflection on V1. In all cases it is clear that the genuine finite inflection is on V2 and the inflection on V1 is in some sense 'parasitic' and subject to restrictions, as in § 4.1. V1 may also be uninflected, as in § 4.2, or totally incorporated as a prefix on V2, as in § 4.3.

4.1 Inflectional Paradigm

C&G (2001) report that in Marsalese, the IC is only possible in the present indicative and imperative, but excluded in the 1st and 2nd person plural, as represented in the paradigms in (22)-(23). Di Caro (2015) shows that Deliano displays the same restrictions:

(22) Present indicative

- a. Vajo a pigghio u pani. (Mar.)
go.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread
- b. Vai a pigghi u pani.
go.2SG a fetch.2SG the bread
- c. Va a pigghia u pani.
go.3SG a fetch.3SG the bread
- d. *Emo a pigghiamo u pani.
go.1PL a fetch.1PL the bread
- e. *Ite a pigghiate u pani.
go.2PL a fetch.2PL the bread
- f. Vanno a pigghiano u pani.
go.3PL a fetch.3PL the bread

(23) Imperative

- a. Va pigghia u pani.
go.2SG fetch.2SG the bread
- b. *Ite pigghiate u pani.
go.2PL fetch.2PL the bread

C&G (2001, pp. 382-383, 2003) note that these inflectional restrictions correspond to a divide in the paradigm of some of the verbs involved. The paradigm of the verb 'go' presents two allomorphs: *va-* and *e-/i-*. Only the forms built on *va-* can appear in the IC. The same restriction holds for the verb *vèniri* 'come', which displays the alternation of the allomorphs *ve-* and *vi-* in Marsalese (24), and analogous alternations in Deliano:

- (24) a. Vegno a pigghio u pani. (Mar.)
come.1SG a fetch.1SG the bread
'I come and fetch the bread'
- b. *Vinemo a pigghiamo u pani.
come.1PL a fetch.1PL the bread
'We come and fetch the bread'

Cruschina (2013) points out that C&G's (2001) restrictions on the IC correspond to Maiden's (2004) N-pattern in the inflectional paradigm of many verbs in Romance, displaying suppletive forms for the 1st/2nd plural persons of the present indicative. Unlike Cruschina, we believe that this observation is in line with C&G's hypothesis that the IC is a property of 'given lexemes', which in Maiden's terms can be reformulated as occupants of given cells of the paradigm of given verbs.

Furthermore, adopting Dressler and Thornton's (1991) and Thornton's (2007) proposal that the N-pattern is actually a property of all Italian verbs, which build 1/2/3SG and 3PL on the root of the verb and 1/2PL on the theme, we can include the regular verbs *passari* and *mannari* in C&G's generalization. In other words, C&G's proposal can be reformulated as follows: «In Marsalese only the "grey cells" of given verbs can enter the IC». This generalization is however too restricted for other varieties.

Manzini, Savoia's (2005, pp. 695-697) data confirm the N-pattern for Villadoro and Calascibetta (Enna), and for Camporeale (Palermo), but not for Modica (Ragusa), as anticipated in the introduction. In Modicano the IC displays the complete paradigm in the indicative present (cf. example (8) above), as well as in the imperfect (25) and preterite (26), where they only give two possible persons:

- (25) a. U ia a ffascìa. (Mod.)
 ItCL go.IMPERF.1SG a do.IMPERF.1SG
- b. U jeutu a ffascieutu.
 ItCL go.IMPERF.2SG a do.IMPERF.2SG
- c. U ia a ffascìa.
 ItCL go.IMPERF.3SG a do.IMPERF.3SG
- d. U jeumu a ffascieumu.
 ItCL go.IMPERF.1PL a do.IMPERF.1PL
- e. U jeubbu a ffascieubbu.
 ItCL go.IMPERF.2PL a do.IMPERF.2PL
- f. U jeunnu a ffascieunu.
 ItCL go.IMPERF.3PL a do.IMPERF.3PL
- (26) a. U ji a ffisci.
 ItCL go.PAST.3SG a do.PAST.3SG
- b. U jeru a ffisciru.
 ItCL go.PAST.3PL a do.PAST.3PL

Di Caro (2015) reports that in Deliano and in other dialects, including some in the provinces of Caltanissetta and Palermo, the IC in the preterite is possible with fewer verbs than in the present; namely, 'go', 'come' and marginally 'start', and different persons; namely, 1st and 3rd singular and plural, only excluding 2SG/PL, as in (27)-(28):

- (27) a. Jivu a ffici la spisa. (Del.)
 go.PAST.1SG a do.PAST.1SG the shopping
 'I went to do the shopping'
- b. *Jisti a ffacisti la spisa.
 go.PAST.2SG a do.PAST.2SG the shopping
 'You went to do the shopping'
- c. Ji a ffici la spisa.
 go.PAST.3SG a do.PAST.3SG the shopping
 'He went to do the shopping'
- d. Jammu a ffìcimu la spisa.
 go.PAST.1PL a do.PAST.1PL the shopping
 'We went to do the shopping'
- e. *Jìstivu a ffacìstivu la spisa.
 go.PAST.2PL a do.PAST.2PL the shopping
 'You went to do the shopping'
- f. Jiru a ffìciru la spisa.

go.PAST.3PL a do.PAST.3PL the shopping
 'They went to do the shopping'

- (28) a. Accuminciavu a ffici la spisa. (Del.)
 start.PAST.1SG a do.PAST.1SG the shopping
 'I started doing the shopping'
- b. *Accuminciasti a ffacisti la spisa.
 start.PAST.2SG. a do.PAST.2SG the shopping
 'You started doing the shopping'
- c. Accumimcià a ffici la spisa.
 start.PAST.3SG a do.PAST.3SG the shopping in
 'He started doing the shopping'
- d. Accuminciammu a fficimu la spisa.
 start.PAST.1PL a do.PAST.1PL the shopping
 'We started doing the shopping'
- e. *Accuminciastivu a ffacistivu la spisa.
 start.PAST.2PL a do.PAST.2PL the shopping
 'You started doing the shopping'
- f. Accuminciaru a fficiru la spisa.
 start.PAST.3PL a do.PAST.3PL the shopping
 'They started doing the shopping'

Furthermore it is subject to a lexical restriction on V2, as shown by (29), (cf. Di Caro 2005 for a possible explanation related to the stress pattern of V2), which cannot be reduced to any verb class. In (29), for example, we see the first persons singular and plural giving ungrammatical results with different verbs. Thus, (29a) should be contrasted with (27a) where the only difference is the lexical choice for the type of (transitive) V2, and so on:

- (29) a. *Jivu a ppigliavu lu pani du voti. (Del.)
 go.PAST.1SG a fetch.PAST.1SG the bread two times
 'I went to fetch the bread twice'
- b. *Ji a piglià lu pani du voti.
 go.PAST.3SG a fetch.PAST.3SG the bread two times
 'He went to fetch the bread twice'
- c. *Jammu a accattammu lu giornali.
 go.PAST.1PL a buy.PAST.1PL the newspaper
 'We went to buy the newspaper'
- d. *Jiru a accattaru lu giornali
 go.PAST.3PL a buy.PAST.3PL the newspaper
 'They went to have the newspaper'

Note that in the morphological research there is no pattern that partitions 1/3SG/PL from 2SG/PL. The pattern in (27)-(28) is therefore unexpected in this framework. The protocollar approach adopted here allows us to ask empirical questions raised by different approaches and different proposals. In this particular case, we propose to formulate the features in the vertical axis of Table 5, in the most descriptive way, mentioning each cell of the paradigm of the verb. The first column represents a possible dialect displaying Maiden's (2004) U-pattern with 1SG and 3PL partitioned together and opposed to 2/3SG and 1/2PL. The last column represents a variety which has no restriction at all. The +/- value of Deliano's preterite indicates that there are further restrictions unspecified for in the protocol, namely the ones on V2, seen in (29), which would need to be addressed in a more specific protocol. As already specified, the edge columns marked as '?' are suggestive of gradient variation and, in a more detailed protocol, could be spelled out as separate types:

Table 5. Inflectional paradigm of V1 in the IC

	?	Marsala (TP)	Delia (CL)	Modica (RG)	?
indicative present	+	+	+	+	+
1SG	+	+	+	+	+
2SG	-	+	+	+	+
3SG	-	+	+	+	+
1PL	-	-	-	+	+
2PL	-	-	-	+	+
3PL	+	+	+	+	+
imperative	-	+	+	?	+
2SG	0	+	+	?	+
1PL	0	-	-	?	+
2PL	0	-	-	?	+
indicative preterite	-	-	+	+	+
1SG	0	0	+/-	+	+
2SG	0	0	-	+	+
3SG	0	0	+/-	+	+
1PL	0	0	+/-	+	+
2PL	0	0	-	+	+
3PL	0	0	+/-	+	+
indicative imperfect	-	-	-	+	+
subjunctive	-	-	-	?	+

4.2 Uninflected Forms

C&G (2001, p. 383) observe that in Marsalese the verb 'go' may have the invariant form *va* when occurring in the IC. Examples parallel to Marsalese (30) are found in the varieties spoken in Palermo, Naro (Agrigento), and Mazzarino (Caltanissetta):

- (30) a. Vajo / va a pigghio u pani. (Mar.)
 go.1SG / go a fetch.1SG the bread
- b. Vai / va a pigghi u pani.
 go.2SG / go a fetch.2SG the bread
- c. Vanno / va a pigghiano u pani.
 go.3PL / go a fetch.3PL the bread

They draw a parallel with two auxiliaries, perfect *aviri* (31a-b) and progressive *stari* (31c-d), which present the N-pattern as the IC, disallowing the uninflected form in the 1st and 2nd plural persons, as in (32):

- (31) a. Un ci hajo / ha stato mai. (Mar.)
 not thereCL have.1SG / have be.PAST.PART never
 I have never been there.
- b. Un ci hai / ha stato mai.
 NotthereCL have.2SG / have be.PAST.PART never
 'You have never been there'
- c. Ci stajo / sta enno.
 ThereCL stay.1SG / stay go-GER
 'I am going there'
- d. Ci stai / sta enno.
 ThereCL stay.2SG / stay go-GER
 'You are going there'
- (32) a. Un ci emo / *ha stato mai. (Mar.)
 Not thereCL have.1PL / have be.PAST.PART never
 'We have never been there'
- b. Ci stamo / *sta enno.
 ThereCL stay.1PL / stay go-GER
 'We are going there'

Deliano does not display the uninflected forms *va* and *sta* but has the uninflected form *ha* for the 3rd person singular, which contrasts with the full form *havi* when used lexically. Outside of Sicily, this is also the case of many dialects in Salento, as reported by Manzini, Savoia (2005, pp. 690-693). In these dialects, differently from Deliano, progressive *stare* enters the IC. As already stated above, for reasons of space, we restrict our protocols to Sicilian varieties.

C&G (2001) also show that the uninflected forms are not possible with the lexical counterparts of these verbs:

In principle, there is always a possible intermediate variety between two attested ones. It is therefore fully expected in the protocollar methodology.

4.3 Reduced forms

The uninflected form is a clear sign of grammaticalization of V1. It is therefore interesting to observe a further stage in the grammaticalization of the motion verb in the IC which is reduced to a verbal prefix. According to Di Caro (2015), this is found in most dialects of the eastern coast of Sicily (Catania and Ragusa). The forms vary: e.g. in Marina di Ragusa the reduced form is *vo-* (34), in Acireale (Catania) it is *o-* (35), some informants also report the form *da-*, which we do not exemplify here:¹⁰

- (34) a. Voppigghju u pani. (MdR.)
 go+a+fetch.1SG the bread
 'I go and fetch the bread'
- b. Voppigghi u pani.
 go+a+fetch.2SG the bread
 'You go and fetch the bread'
- c. Voppigghjanu u pani.
 go+a+fetch.3PL the bread
 'They go and fetch the bread'
- (35) a. Occattu u giunnali. (Aci.)
 go+a+buy.1SG the newspaper
 'I go to buy the newspaper'
- b. Occatti u giunnali.
 go+a+buy.2SG the newspaper
 'You go to buy the newspaper'
- c. Occattunu u giunnali.
 go+a+buy.3PL the newspaper
 'They go to buy the newspaper'

¹⁰ An anonymous reviewer casts doubts on the claim that the elements are prefixes on the basis of the fact that they produce gemination of the verb initial consonant. In fact, these dialects present gemination with the *a* prefixes, which are found on deadjectival verbs, as *accurzari* ('shorten' > *curtu* 'short'), or denominal verbs as *addumannari* ('ask' > *dumanna* 'question'). Gemination distinguishes the prefix from clitics: u[pp]igghju (I) itCL-take.1SG, 'I'll take it') vs. *u[pp]igghju 'I take it'.

With the prefixal form, no person or tense restrictions are found:

- (36) a. Voppigghjamu / Voppigghjati u pani. (MdR.)
 go+a+fetch.1PL / 2PL the bread
 'We/You go and fetch the bread'
- b. Occattamu / Occattati u giunnali. (Aci.)
 go+a+buy.1PL / 2PL the newspaper
 'We/You go and buy the newspaper'
- (37) a. Voppigghjava u pani. (MdR.)
 go+a+fetch.IMPERF.1SG the bread
 'I used to go to fetch the bread'
- b. Voppigghjàutu u pani.
 go+a+fetch.IMPERF.2SG the bread
 'You used to go to fetch the bread'
- c. Voppigghjàumu u pani.
 go+a+fetch.IMPERF.1PL the bread
 'We used to go to fetch the bread'
- (38) a. Occattava u giunnali. (Aci.)
 go+a+fetch.IMPERF.3SG the newspaper
 'He used to go to buy the newspaper'
- b. Occattavati u giunnali.
 go+a+fetch.IMPERF.2PL the newspaper
 'You used to go to buy the newspaper'
- c. Occattàvunu u giunnali.
 go+a+fetch.IMPERF.3PL the newspaper
 'They used to go to fetch the bread'
- (39) a. Voppigghjai u pani. (MdR.)
 go+a+fetch.PAST.1SG the bread
 'I went to fetch the bread'
- b. Voppigghjasti u pani.
 go+a+fetch.PAST.2SG the bread
 'You went to fetch the bread'
- c. Voppigghjammu u pani.
 go+a+fetch.PAST.1PL the bread
 'We went to fetch the bread'

- (40) a. Occattau u giunnali. (Aci.)
 go+a+buy.PAST.3SG the newspaper
 'He went to buy the newspaper'
- b. Occattàstivu u giunnali.
 go+a+buy.PAST.2PL the newspaper
 'You went to buy the newspaper'
- c. Occattaru u giunnali.
 go+a+buy.PAST.3PL the newspaper
 'They went to buy the newspaper'

We also find the IC in the subjunctive mood, which in most Sicilian dialects has taken over the functions of the conditional mood:

- (41) a. Voppigghjassi u pani. (MdR.)
 go+a+fetch.SUB.1SG the bread
 'I would go and fetch the bread'
- b. Voppigghjassimu u pani.
 go+a+fetch.SUB.1PL the bread
 'We would go and fetch the bread'
- c. Occattassi u giunnali. (Aci.)
 go+a+buy.SUB.1SG the newspaper
 'I would go and buy the newspaper'
- d. Occattassiru u giunnali.
 go+a+buy.SUB.3PL the newspaper
 'they would go and buy the newspaper'

Interestingly in most of the dialects that display this extreme stage of grammaticalization of the verb 'go' in the IC, the IC is not present with any other verbs (i.e., neither with motion verbs proper nor with aspectual verbs, such as *accuminciari* 'start'). Only in the dialect of Marina di Ragusa is it possible to find the IC with 'come' (i.e., *vegnu a pigghju u pani* 'I come and fetch the bread.') or 'come by' (i.e., *passu a pigghju u pani* 'I come by to fetch the bread').

The protocol for the prefixal form of the verb 'go' is given in Table 7. At the left extreme we wonder whether there is a variety in which the prefixal form is not mandatory, in the sense that it coexists with a reduced or even a full form of the verb 'go'. If this is the case we may also wonder if this would affect the productivity of the prefixal form. The other logically possible case is a dialect in which the prefixal form presents any restriction in the paradigm. The 0 value for the person/mood restrictions are due to the + choice for the full productivity:

Table 7. Distribution of prefixal forms of 'go'

	?	M. di Rag (RG)	Aci (CT)	?
mandatory in IC	-	+	+	+
coexisting with full forms of V1 in IC	+	+	-	?
fully productive	?	+	+	-
with person restrictions	?	0	0	?
with tense/mood restrictions	?	0	0	?

5 Conclusions

The bi-dimensionality of the protocol design makes it easy to use but restricts the variables that can be put in interplay. For this reason in some tables we have clustered the features of the vertical axis in two levels. This can be done, for example, to distinguish the IC with and without linking element, which turns out to give different results, as suggested by Sorrisi's (2010) analysis of Palermitano (15)-(16). Furthermore, if we want to enhance awareness of the fact that local varieties are interesting (neither superior nor inferior to other local or national varieties), we may extend the comparison to other languages of Europe and note that the linking element is optional in American English but mandatory in British English or Swedish (cf. Carden, Pesetsky 1977; Wiklund 1996). We may also show that the local Italo-Balkan varieties in this respect behave exactly like the cognate national languages Greek and Albanian, which are well-known to miss the infinitive form and to display the finite construction (cf. a.o. Mišeska Tomić 2006), as in Table 8:

Table 8. Different constructions with verbs of motion across Europe

	Italian.	Swed./ Br.Engl	Am. English	West/Cen. Sicilian	Milazzo	Torre S. Susanna	Greek/ Albanian
infinitival construction	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
inflected construction	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
IC with linker	0	+	+	+	+	+	0
IC without linker	0	-	+	+	?	?	0
finite construction	-	-	-	-	+	+	+

In order to obtain a general view of given aspects of the phenomenon, it may be useful to define the features maintaining a certain degree of generalization. However, this may make it impossible to give a straightforward positive or negative answer. For example, in Table 3, the productivity of the IC with 'come back' and 'start' in Deliano is indicated with the +/- value, meaning that it is not present in all persons that are possible with the other

verbs. We propose a finer grade protocol that displays the interaction of two featural dimensions, as in Table 9, which crosses Table 3 with Table 5. The protocol can of course be applied to any variety. Note that the first level feature 'preterite' is indicated as +/- due to the restrictions on V2 discussed in § 4.1. The +/- values thus only refer to the case in which V2 is independently grammatical:

Table 9. Inflectional productivity of V1 in the IC in Delia (CL)

		'go'	'come'	'come by'	'send'	'come back'	'start'
Ind. present		+	+	+	+	+	+
	1SG	+	+	+	+	+	+
	2SG	+	+	+	+	+	-
	3SG	+	+	+	+	+	-
	1PL	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2PL	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3PL	+	+	+	+	+	+
imperative		+	+	+	+	-	-
	2SG	+	+	+	+	0	0
	1PL	-	-	-	-	0	0
	2PL	-	-	-	-	0	0
ind. preterite		+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
	1SG	+	+	+	+	+	+
	2SG	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3SG	+	+	+	+	+	+
	1PL	+	+	+	+	+	+
	2PL	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3PL	+	+	+	+	+	+
ind. imperfect		-	-	-	-	-	-
subjunctive		-	-	-	-	-	-

The use of the glosses instead of the actual lexical entries in the horizontal axis of Table 9, as well as in the vertical axis of Table 3, avoids lexical, phonological, and morphological interference. If these aspects are of relevance, they can be spelled out in the protocols.

In general, we hope to have shown that PL has some merits in planning fieldwork. It allows the interaction of advances in different and often incompatible linguistic theories. It helps to pinpoint the many gaps that need to be filled in and to highlight the varieties relevant for the comparative study of certain phenomena. Finally and most importantly, it suggests possible combinations and correlations of features (constructions, properties, parameters) that need to be empirically confirmed.

Bibliography

- Ascoli, Graziadio Isaia (1986). «Un problema di sintassi comparata dialettale». *Archivio glottologico italiano*, 14, pp. 453-468.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Yurieva; Dixon, Robert Malcom Ward (eds.) (2006). *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biberauer, Theresa; Roberts, Ian (2012). «Towards a Parameter Hierarchy for Auxiliaries: Diachronic Considerations». *Paper presented at DGfS*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Calabrese, Andrea (1993). «The Sentential Complementation of Salentino: A Study of a Language without Infinitival Clauses». In: Belletti, Adriana (ed.), *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier, pp. 28-98.
- Carden, Guy; Pesetsky, David (1977). «Double-Verb Constructions, Markedness, and a Fake Coordination». *Papers from the Thirteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp. 82-92.
- Cardinaletti, Anna; Giusti, Giuliana (2001). «'Semi-lexical' Motion Verbs in Romance and Germanic». In: Corver, Norbert; Van Riemsdijk, Henk (eds.), *Semi-lexical categories*. Berlin: De Gruyters, pp. 371-414.
- Cardinaletti, Anna; Giusti, Giuliana (2003). «Motion Verbs as Functional Heads». In: Tortora, Christina (ed.), *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 31-49.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (2006). *Restructuring and Functional Heads: The Cartography of Syntactic Structure*, 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chierchia, Gennaro (1986). «Length, Syllabification and the Phonological Cycle in Italian». *Journal of Italian Linguistics*, 8, pp. 5-34.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2013). «Beyond the Stem and Inflectional Morphology: an Irregular Pattern at the Level of Periphrasis». In: Cruschina, Silvio; Maiden, Martin; Smith, John Charles (eds.), *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 262-283.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò (2015). «Syntactic Constructions with Motion Verbs in Some Sicilian Dialects: a Comparative Analysis» [Master Thesis]. Venice: Ca' Foscari University of Venice.
- Dressler, Wolfgang Ulrich; Thornton, Anna (1991). «Doppie basi e binarismo nella morfologia italiana». *Rivista di Linguistica*, 3 (1), pp. 3-22.
- Giusti, Giuliana (2011). «Structural Protocols for Linguistic Awareness Enhancing Language Identity» [online]. Research project at CRASSH. University of Cambridge, October-December 2011. Available at <http://www.crassh.cam.ac.uk/people/profile/giuliana-giusti>.
- Giusti, Giuliana; Zegrean, Iulia (2015). «Syntactic Protocols to Enhance Inclusive Cultural Identity: A Case Study on Istro-Romanian Clausal Structure». *Quaderni di linguistica e studi orientali*, 1, pp. 129-150.

- Jaeggli, Osvaldo; Hyams, Nina (1993). «On the Independence and Interdependence of Syntactic and Morphological Properties: English Aspectual Come and Go». *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 11, pp. 313-346.
- Joseph, Brian; Zwicky, Arnold. (eds.) (1990). «When Verbs Collide: Papers from the Ohio State Mini-Conference on Serial Verbs». *Working papers in Linguistics*, 39. Columbus, OH.
- Ledgeway, Adam (1997). «Asyndetic Complementation in Neapolitan Dialect». *The Italianist*, 17, pp. 231-273.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2015). «From Coordination to Subordination: the Grammaticalisation of Progressive and Andative Aspect in the Dialects of Salento». In: Cardoso, Adriana; Martins, Ana Maria; Pereira, Sandra; Pinto, Clara; Pratas, Fernanda (eds.), *Coordination and Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leone, Alfonso (1973). «Vattel'a pesca, vieni a piglialo». *Lingua Nostra*, 34, pp. 11-13.
- Leone, Alfonso (1978). «Sullo scadimento semantico di andare». *Lingua Nostra*, 39, pp. 50-54.
- Maiden, Martin (2004). «When Lexemes Become Allomorphs: On the Genesis of Suppletion». *Folia Linguistica*, 38 (3/4), pp. 227-256.
- Manzini, M. Rita; Savoia, Leonardo M. (2005). *I dialetti Italiani e Romanci: Morfosintassi Generativa*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Martoglio, Nino (1948). *Centona: Raccolta completa di poesie siciliane con l'aggiunta di alcuni componimenti inediti e di una prefazione di Luigi Pirandello* [online]. Catania: Giannotta Editore. Progetto Manuzio. Acc. Oct, 10, 2015. Available at <http://www.culturasiciliana.it/Page/poesia/martoglio%20nino/martoglio%20centona.pdf> (2015-12-01).
- Mišeska Tomić, Olga (2006). «Balkan Sprachbund Morphosyntactic Features». *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 67. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rohlf, 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*, pp. 254-263.
- Sornicola, Rosanna (1976). «“Vado a dire” o “vaiu a ddico” problema sintattico o problema semantico?». *Lingua Nostra*, 37.3-4, pp. 65-74.
- Sorrise, Fabrizio (2010). «Le costruzioni flesse con va + verbo lessicale in palermitano». In: Garzonio, Jacopo (ed.), *Quaderni di lavoro ASIt*, 11. Studi sui dialetti della Sicilia. Padova: Unipress, pp. 111-120.
- Thornton, Anna (2007). «Is There a Partition in the Present Indicative of Italian Irregular Verbs?». *Annali Online di Ferrara - Lettere*, 2, pp. 43-61.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena (1996). «Pseudocoordination is subordination». *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, 58, pp. 29-54.

