

Dimensions of variation. The Inflected Construction in the dialect of Delia (Caltanissetta).

Sicilian dialects display a monoclausal construction with a motion verb (V1) followed by a connecting element *a* and a lexical verb (V2), as in (1). Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) call it Inflected Construction:

- (1) a. *Vaju a pigghiu u pani.* b. *Veni a mangia ni mia.* (Marsala, Trapani)
go.1sg *a* fetch.1sg the bread come.3sg *a* eat.3sg at me
'I go and fetch the bread.' 'He comes to eat at my place.'

The Inflected Construction (henceforth IC) competes with the infinitive, more widely spread in Italian and other Romance varieties: *Vaju/Vegnu a mangiari*. 'I'm going/coming to eat'.

Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) report that in the dialect of Marsala (province of Trapani), the IC displays the following restrictions:

- (i) Lexical restrictions on V1: Only a restricted number of motion verbs appear in the IC, namely the most basic 'go' / 'come', 'come by' and the causative 'send'. No other motion or modal verb can enter the IC. In Marsalese these verbs maintain the motion semantics.
- (ii) Inflectional morphology restrictions: Only five cells of the paradigm of these verbs enter the IC, namely indicative present 1, 2, 3sg., 3pl. and imperative 2sg. This pattern corresponds to Maiden's (2004) N-pattern, as noted by Cruschina (2013).
- (iii) Presence / absence of a connecting element: In the indicative present, all V1 are connected to V2 by the connecting element *a* (> Lat. AC, cf. Rohlfs, 1969:§761). The connecting element does not occur in the imperative when V1 is 'go' or 'come'.

Manzini & Savoia (2005) and Cruschina (2013) report that these restrictions do not apply to all varieties. E.g., Modica (Ragusa) presents a full paradigm with the indicative preterite and imperfect. In the dialect of Pantelleria, the linking element *a* is not present. In a parametric perspective, this kind of variation is in need of explanation.

Aims and goals

- (i) to pin down the dimensions of variation that are relevant to this construction;
- (ii) to investigate the division of labor between syntactic and morphomic parametrization.

We reach these two goals, focussing on the dialect of Delia (Caltanissetta), which appears to be an intermediate variety between the more restricted Marsalese and the more productive Modicano.

Data: The dialect of Delia features the following properties:

- (i) The same four motion verbs 'go', 'come', 'come by' and 'send' enter the IC as V1, with the addition of a fifth motion verb 'come back' and the modal verb 'start';
- (ii) The cells of the paradigm of the five motion verbs in the indicative present and imperative are the same as in Marsalese; they therefore display Maiden's N-pattern. Unlike the motion verbs, the verb 'start' only presents two cells in the indicative present, i.e. 1sg. and 3pl. and no imperative (which corresponds to the indicative portion of Maiden's 2005 U-pattern).
- (iii) The connecting element *a* has roughly the same distribution as in Marsalese.
- (iv) The IC can be found in the indicative preterite with a further restriction that involves V2: It is limited to verbs derived from the Latin third conjugation (in *-ĕre*) and to the following four cells of the paradigm 1sg., 3sg., 1pl.; 3pl. To the best of our knowledge, this pattern has not been identified by morphomic accounts. We will call it the W-pattern.

Methodology: The argument will be based on two interacting dimensions of variation; i.e. restrictions and morphological properties of V1 and restrictions and morphological properties of V2. The distribution of the linking element will be shown to derive from the interaction of these.

Results:

On the empirical side, the paper will provide original data, collected by a native speaker interviewer, trained in eliciting judgements as well as spontaneous production. The data on the IC in Deliano will be systematic, with the aim to verify the general validity of the restrictions on V1, the nature and distribution of the connecting element *a*, as well as the combinations with V2. On the theoretical side, it will address the issue of the relation of inflectional morphology to syntactic structure from the syntactic perspective. From the morphological perspective, according to Corbett's (2015) four criteria for morphological splits [(i) form vs. composition; (ii) morphomic vs. motivated; (iii) lexically specified vs. regular; and (iv) internal vs. external], the Marsalese IC is an example of irregular morphomic forms that are externally relevant, cf. Corbett (2015: 179).

Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) analyse the Marsalese IC in parallel with the English 'go and V' and the Swedish construction to show that semi-lexical verbs are lexical verbs merged in functional heads. They claim: (i) that the independent parametric choice in the point of merging V and T+Agr can derive the different properties of the andative construction in the three languages; (ii) that this particular use of a lexical verb in a functional head is restricted to morphologically less marked forms; (iii) that the forms that can enter the construction must be acquired as having this property individually. Cruschina (2013) argues that the IC is a periphrastic suppletive form, which can be considered as part of the extended paradigm of V2.

Analysis: We will show that while Deliano's preterite displaying the W-pattern (2) confirms Cruschina's proposal, the behaviour of the modal 'start' in the indicative present (3) goes in the direction of Cardinaletti & Giusti's (2001) idea that individual forms of a paradigm must be specified in the lexicon as having semi-functional properties:

(2)	V1 'go'	V2 'do'	V2 'eat'		(3)	V1 'start'	V2 'do'
1.sg.	<i>jivu</i>	<i>a ffici</i>	<i>a *mmangiavu</i>		1.sg.	<i>accuminciu</i>	<i>a ffazzu</i>
2.sg.	<i>*jisti</i>	<i>a ffacisti</i>	<i>a *mmangiasti</i>		2.sg.	<i>*accuminci</i>	<i>a ffa</i>
3.sg.	<i>ji</i>	<i>a ffici</i>	<i>a *mmangià</i>		3.sg.	<i>*accumincia</i>	<i>a ffa</i>
1.pl.	<i>jammu</i>	<i>a fficimu</i>	<i>a *mmangiammu</i>		1.pl.	<i>*accuminciammu</i>	<i>a ffaciimmu</i>
2.pl.	<i>*jistivu</i>	<i>a ffacìstivu</i>	<i>a *mmangiaìstivu</i>		2.pl.	<i>*accuminciati</i>	<i>a ffaciti</i>
3.pl.	<i>jiru</i>	<i>a fficiru</i>	<i>a *mmangiaru</i>		3.pl.	<i>accumincianu</i>	<i>a ffannu</i>

Selected references

- Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) 'Semi-lexical motion verbs in Romance and Germanic'. In Corver, N. & Van Riemsdijk, H. (eds.), *Semi-lexical categories*, 371-414. De Gruyter.
- Corbett, G. (2015) 'Morphosyntactic complexity: A typology of Lexical Splits'. *Language* 91.1: 145-93.
- Cruschina, S. (2013). 'Beyond the stem and inflectional morphology: an irregular pattern at the level of periphrasis'. In Cruschina, S., Maiden, M. and Smith, J. C. (eds.), *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology*, 262-283. OUP.
- Maiden, M. (2004). 'When lexemes become allomorphs – on the genesis of suppletion', *Folia Linguistica* 38: 227-56.
- Maiden, M. (2005). 'Morphological autonomy and diachrony', in Booij, G. van Marle, J (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 2004*. Kluwer, 137-75.
- Manzini, R. and Savoia, L. (2005). *I dialetti Italiani e Romanci. Morfosintassi Generativa*. Ed. dell'Orso.
- Rohlf, G. (1969). *Grammatica Storica della Lingua Italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, vol.3. Einaudi.