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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.
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1 Introduction

1.1 A Serial Verb Construction in Southern Italo-Romance

Sicilian dialects display a particular construction with verbs of motion combining with a lexical verb inflected for finite tense and subject agreement,
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. The examples in (1) are from the dialect spoken in Delia (Caltanissetta):

(1) a. Vaju a ffazzu la spisa.  
    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.  
    the evening to-meCL come.3SG to tell.INF two things  
    ‘He comes to tell me some stories at night’

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) 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)):
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’, *vèniri ‘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:

    go.3SG a fetch.3SG the bread  
    ‘He goes to fetch the bread’

b. Va [p]iggia 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.  
    go.1PL a eat.1PL  
    ‘We go to eat’

b. u jeumu a ffasciemu  
    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 Rohlfs (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.
The data in (5)-(8) display the kind of microvariation which is of particular interest to parametric syntax. It can be generalized along at least two major dimensions: the lexical restrictions on the verbs and their inflectional paradigms. These two dimensions clearly relate to the grammaticalized status of the V1. However, it is not clear how and in what terms a parametric account should be set out. Are the properties above the result of the interaction of one, two or more parameters? What is the level of these parameters, in the sense of Biberauer, Roberts (2012)? Are we dealing with a grammaticalization process of motion verbs that display a ‘restructuring’ behaviour in the sense of Cinque (2006) even in the infinitival construction? Is the variation displayed in (5)-(8) to be analysed as the reflex of different stages of this grammaticalization process? How can we capture the optionality with the infinitival construction in the minimalist perspective? In other words, which of the two constructions is more economical?

As regards contact linguistics, other interesting questions arise, namely how does the IC relate to contact with Italo-Greek or Italo-Albanian varieties (historically present in Sicily, even though almost extinct at present) which presumably displayed a wider regression of the infinitive, typical of Balkan languages? C&G (2001) suggest the IC is different from the finite construction of Salentino, cf. Calabrese (1993), in that the latter applies to many more aspectual verbs, does not often compete with the infinitive, and is biclausal in the sense that it does not undergo restructuring.

According to Cinque (2006), there are many tests to check whether restructuring takes place between two verbs, position of the clitic is just one of them. If a given language has proclitics on the tensed verb, as is generally the case in southern Italian varieties, a restructured construction would have CL-V1 V2, a non-restructured construction would have V1 CL-V2.6

Manzini, Savoia (2005, p. 693) report the minimal pair in (9) for the dialect of Torre S. Susanna (Lecce), with the verb ‘want’ which does not trigger insertion of a linking element. In (9a), the clitic object of V2 is proclitic on V1, providing evidence for restructuring. In (9b) it is proclitic on V2, showing lack of restructuring. In this dialect the infinitival is supposedly not possible with ‘want’:

6 We abstract away here from the presence and nature of a linking element.
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 mistakingly 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. 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 supranational 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 diastatic 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Marsala</th>
<th>Palermo</th>
<th>Delia</th>
<th>Milazzo</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Italo-Balkan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>infinitival construction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inflected construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finite construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marsala (TP)</th>
<th>Palermo</th>
<th>Delia (CL)</th>
<th>Modica (RG)</th>
<th>Milazzo (ME)</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>compound tenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preterite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjunctive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Catanesi, 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. 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

---

Note

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 bbìu 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 bbìdinu 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Marsala (TP)</th>
<th>Delia (CL)</th>
<th>Canicattì (AG)</th>
<th>Catania</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>motion verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>send</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come by</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come back</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go out</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go into</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>run</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 raddoppimento fonosintattico):

(15) a. Vaju a mmanjui a pasta.  
   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.  
   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 va a fa lavari a su matri. (Mar.)
   the child itCL go.3SG 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 ngettari 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 incom-
patible 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Palermo</th>
<th>Marsala (TP)</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lexical verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transitive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psychological</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unaccusative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspectual verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>andative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causative</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repetitive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terminative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modal verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volitional</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permissive</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidential</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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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 ffascía.
   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 ffascia.
   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.
   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 fficiru la spisa.
go.PAST.3PL a do.PAST.3PL the shopping
‘They went to do the shopping’

(28) a. Accuminciavu a ffici la spisa.
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 ffacìstivu la spisa.
start.PAST.2PL a do.PAST.2PL the shopping
‘You started doing the shopping’
f. Accuminciaru a ffìciru 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.
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.
start.PAST.3SG a fetch.PAST.3SG the bread two times
‘He went to fetch the bread twice’
c. *Jammu a accattammu lu giornali.
start.PAST.1PL a buy.PAST.1PL the newspaper
‘We went to buy the newspaper’
d. *Jiru a accattaru lu giornali
start.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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marsala (TP)</th>
<th>Delia (CL)</th>
<th>Modica (RG)</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indicative present</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicative preterite</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicative imperfect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjunctive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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):
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.
   not thereCL 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:
(33) a. (Eo) c’ha*(ju) na soro.
   I thereCL a sister
   ‘I have a sister’

b. Minni sta*(ju) cà.
   REFLCL-LOCCL stay.1SG here
   ‘I’ll stay here’

c. Minni va*(ju).
   REFLCL-LOCCL go.1SG
   ‘I’ll go’

An empirical question is whether lexical verbs can display defective inflection, but we leave it out of the protocol for the moment, since we found no evidence that this is the case in any variety. The options that are not attested but are logically possible considering some sporadic data found in the literature raise the following questions. Is the uninflected form the only form of the grammaticalized element? This is suggested by Palermitano (16) above. Are there fully productive uninflected forms such as va a mmangiai go.UNINFL a eat.PAST.1SG; va a mmangiavu go.UNINFL a eat.IMPERF.2SG? These are ungrammatical in e.g. Marsalese or Deliano but are conceivable given that Manzini, Savoia (2005) report cases of uninflected sta with preterite or imperfect forms for the progressive IC in some Salentino varieties. Table 6 presents a case in which a ?-variety is not at the edge of the protocol:

Table 6. Distribution of uninflected functional forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delia (CL)</th>
<th>Palermo</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Marsala (TP)</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>motion V in IC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressive Aux</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfective Aux</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandatory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fully productive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with person restrictions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with tense/mood restrictions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.  
    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.  
    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[p]jiggju (I itCL-take.1SG, ‘I’ll take it’) vs. *u[pp]jiggju ‘I take it’.
With the prefixal form, no person or tense restrictions are found:

(36) a. Voppigghjamu / Voppigghjati u pani. \(\text{(MdR.)}\)
    go+a+fetch.1PL / 2PL the bread
    ‘We/You go and fetch the bread’

    b. Occattamu / Occattati u giunnali. \(\text{(Aci.)}\)
    go+a+buy.1PL / 2PL the newspaper
    ‘We/You go and buy the newspaper’

(37) a. Voppigghjava u pani. \(\text{(MdR.)}\)
    go+a+fetch.IMPERF.1SG the bread
    ‘I used to go to fetch the bread’

    b. Voppigghjautu 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. \(\text{(Aci.)}\)
    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. \(\text{(MdR.)}\)
    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’
We also find the IC in the subjunctive mood, which in most Sicilian dialects has taken over the functions of the conditional mood:

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

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’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M. di Rag (RG)</th>
<th>Aci (CT)</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mandatory in IC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coexisting with full forms of V1 in IC</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fully productive</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with person restrictions</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with tense/mood restrictions</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Italian.</th>
<th>Swed./Br.Engl</th>
<th>Am. English</th>
<th>West/Cen. Sicilian</th>
<th>Milazzo Torre S. Susanna</th>
<th>Greek/Albanian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>infinitival construction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inflected construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC with linker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC without linker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finite construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘go’</th>
<th>‘come’</th>
<th>‘come by’</th>
<th>‘send’</th>
<th>‘come back’</th>
<th>‘start’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind. present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind. preterite</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind. imperfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjunctive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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