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Abstract:

The present work constitutes an initial look at the use of tonna, an invariable form of tornare ‘return’, used as a relatively uncommon V1 in southern Italo-Romance pseudocoordination structures. Along with losing its ability to inflect, grammaticalization of tornare, frequent across Italo-Romance, has consisted in its shift from lexical motion verb to a functional one with repetitive aspectual value, i.e. tonna mmanciu ‘I eat again’. This paper presents novel data from the variety of Eolian (Italo-Romance dialect of the Eolian Islands), which shows constructions previously unattested with invariable V1s, such as its embedding under functional verbs in non-finite clauses. A cartographic approach building on existing accounts of pseudocoordination V1s – centered on Cinque’s (1999, 2006) hierarchy of functional projections – leads us to consider two overarching explanations for tonna: that it is (a) a functional, aspectual head (in one of the two “repetitive” projections, viz. AspRepetitive(I), AspRepetitive(II)) or (b) an adverb, a specifier in these respective projections. Ultimately, the conclusion that it has (re)grammaticalized to the point of becoming a (deficient) adverb in the lower AspRepetitive(II) proves to be the most convincing from a theoretical perspective. A potential structural consequence is the syncretic status of the AspRepetitive(II) head.
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1. Introduction: Southern Italo-Romance pseudocoordination

Pseudocoordination refers to a set of disparate structures, widespread cross-linguistically (Ross 2021: §2), which in southern Italian dialects (SIDs) consist primarily of a movement verb
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(V1) connected to a lexical verb (V2) by a linking element \( a,^2 \), \( e \) (which trigger the presence of fortition\(^1\) on V2), or \( \emptyset \). In their textbook manifestation, the two predicates are obligatorily coreferential and show the same TMA (tense-modality-aspect) features. Despite alternative accounts (cf. Manzini and Savoia 2005: 688ff.; Manzini, Lorusso and Savoia 2017), many scholars consider pseudocoordination structures to be monoclausal, due to their monoeventive interpretation, the ungrammaticality of adverb interpolation (1) and floating quantifiers (2), as well as obligatory clitic climbing (3), and the possibility for \( Wh \)-extraction (4), not permitted in canonical coordination (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2003; Di Caro 2019a; Ledgeway 2021). Furthermore, negation may only precede V1 (1), inasmuch as independent negation of V2 is excluded. Order of conjuncts is rigid and other coordinators may not be substituted.

(1) Un vaju (*mai) a ppigghiu (mai) u pani
  neg go.1sg.prs.ind never a fetch.1sg.prs.ind never the bread
  ‘I (never) go and/to fetch bread’

(2) I picciotti vannu (*tutti) a ppighianu (tutti) u pani
  the.pl boys go.3pl.prs.ind all a fetch.3pl.prs.ind all the bread
  ‘The boys (all) go and/to fetch bread’

(3) U vaju a (*u) ppigghiu (*lu)
  it= go.1sg.prs.ind a it= fetch.1sg.prs.ind =it
  ‘I go and/to fetch it’

(Marsala [TP], Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001: 388-90)

(4) Cchi bba piglia Ciccio?
  what go.3sg.prs.ind fetch.3sg.prs.ind Ciccio?
  ‘What is Ciccio going to fetch?’

(Cosenza, Ledgeway 2021: 11)

Though generally found in extreme southern Italian dialects (ESIDs), which this work focuses on, seemingly equivalent structures may be found in the Upper South (USIDs), above the Cetraro-Bisignano-Melissa (Calabria) and Taranto-Ostuni (Apulia) isoglosses which separate the two dialect groups (Manzini and Savoia 2005: 688ff.; Ledgeway 2021: 32). Neapolitan asyndeton to some degree (Ledgeway 1997), and even more so Barese pseudocoordination

\(^1\) Many scholars starting from Ascoli (1896) maintain that this \( a \) originates from Latin \( \text{ac} \), used to coordinate constituents perceived as closely related or forming a single event (cf. \( \text{viri ac feminae} \ 'men and women' \ [Rohlfs 1969: §760]), otherwise not continued as a productive coordinator in Italo-Romance (cf. a crystallized form in standard Italian numeral \( \text{diciassette} \ 'seventeen' \)). From a synchronic perspective, it is identical to the reflex of \( \text{ad} \ (> \ a 'to') \), the etymon proposed by Gaspari (1879) and Manzini, Lorusso and Savoia (2017).

\(^2\) On \( \text{raddoppiamento fonosintattico} \ (RF) \), cf. Loporcaro 1997b.
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(Andriani 2016: §5, forthcoming; cf. also Lorusso 2019) have been argued to be comparable to ESID pseudocoordination, but only from a synchronic perspective. They originate from a distinct diachronic path, where a rhizotonic infinitive was reanalyzed as an inflected form.

While not wishing to oversimplify the significant differences between the constructions of different southern varieties, which each show unique, productive systems, the present work features a comparative approach, where different regional manifestations are considered to be part of a single overarching phenomenon. In what follows, patterns of variation are outlined and serve as important linguistic context to understand the behavior of tonna, the particle under examination here. In particular, pseudocoordination constructions vary according to multiple factors, including but not limited to the predicates that can occur as V1 and V2, the moods and tenses in which it is licensed, and particularly relevant for the present discussion, the degree of grammaticalization of V1.

The V1s most frequently licensed in this construction are go (found in most ESIDs), come (found in many Sicilian and Calabrian varieties), stay (cf. §3), and want (the latter two found primarily in Salento, in southern Apulia). To a lesser extent, other predicates may trigger this construction, including send, pass by, and – focus of the present account – return (cf. §2), all three of which have been documented in Sicily. In addition to different V1s, the following examples exhibit the different types of linking elements that may be found in southern varieties (e, ∅ – witness the lack of RF –, and a).

5 Hereafter, small caps will be used to refer to verb concepts, irrespective of their verbal morphology or morphosyntactic status (i.e. inflected vs. invariable V1).

6 As will be explored below, in the Salentino (ESID) varieties of Apulia, stay is often reduced to an invariable form (Manzini and Savoia 2005; Andriani 2016; Ledgeway 2016). Though technically below Apulia’s Taranto-Ostuni isogloss separating USIDs from ESIDs, the dialect of Martina Franca (TA) patterns with (southeastern) Apulo-Barese (USID) varieties: it presents an inflected form of stay, and in this particular variety, only in the 1sg and 3pl. (cf. also fn. 18).
present indicative      >     preterite / > imperfect     >     counterfactual

(Ledgeway 2021: 20; cf. Di Caro 2019a: 121)

In addition, in many varieties the use of this construction is not available in all grammatical persons, and distinct defective paradigms are recognized as productive patterns, which may vary according to tense (Cruschina 2013, 2022; Di Caro 2019a). Generalizing, Ledgeway (2021: 20) represents this variation with the following implicational hierarchy, which is exemplified below in Table 1:

2SG     >     3SG     >     1/2/3SG     >     1/2/3SG + 1PL (N-Pattern\textsuperscript{a})     >     full paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) Gravina (BA) (Andriani 2016: 217)</th>
<th>(b) Rutigliano (BA) (Andriani 2016: 219)</th>
<th>(c) Marsala (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2003: 380)</th>
<th>(d) Cosenza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>vóoucha a ssuné</td>
<td>vong a j'ʃəuk</td>
<td>vaju a ppigghiu</td>
<td>vaiu pigliu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>vè ssúna</td>
<td>ve (a) j'ʃəuk</td>
<td>vai a ppigghi</td>
<td>va pigli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>vè ssònə</td>
<td>ve (a) j'ʃəuk</td>
<td>va a ppigghi</td>
<td>va ppiglia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>scam'a ssuné</td>
<td>ñom a j'a'kwe</td>
<td>emu a ppigghiai</td>
<td>jamu pigliamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td>scaër'a ssuné</td>
<td>jət a j'a'kwe</td>
<td>iti a ppigghiai</td>
<td>jati pigliati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>vònn'a ssuné</td>
<td>vɔnn a j'a'kwe</td>
<td>vannu a ppighianu</td>
<td>vannu pigliamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'go and/to play'</td>
<td>'go and/to play'</td>
<td>'go and/to take'</td>
<td>'go and/to take'</td>
<td>'go and/to take'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. SID pseudocoordination paradigms

(Ibidem, 21)

Depending on the variety, those tenses and grammatical persons which do not allow pseudocoordination instead employ embedded infinitives, or, in the case of many ESIDs, which notoriously avoid these, a complementizer and a finite form (Rohlfs 1969: §717; Ledgeway 1998; De Angelis 2013, inter alia).

Finally, particularly important here is the degree of grammaticalization of V1: whether it is inflected or uninflected,\textsuperscript{9} invariable. In the latter case, which some have interpreted as a prefix,\textsuperscript{10} V1 go may be reduced to va / uo lo / jè / (jʃə / bba, come to vinn, and stay to sta / ste, commonly used regardless of the verb tense and grammatical person of V2. The linking element, if utilized, may no longer be visible, though its (erstwhile) presence can be observed through the retention of RF on V2 (Leone 1995: §46; Ledgeway 2016: 158).

(8) O ppigghjamu / O ppigghjai u pani  
    o fetch.1PL.PRS.IND o fetch.1SG.PST.IND il pane
    ‘Let’s go/I went to fetch the bread’

(Acireale [CT], Di Caro 2019a: 32)

\textsuperscript{7} The conditional or imperfect subjunctive, which in many SIDs form a syncrhetic category (Rohlfs 1969: §744).

\textsuperscript{8} On morphomes (cf. Aronoff 1994) and the so-called “N-Pattern” pervasive in Romance, see Maiden 2004, et seq.

\textsuperscript{9} Despite their assuming the presence of a theme vowel, not postulated by Ledgeway (2016: 168, 2021: 18), Calabrese (2020: §2.3) and Cruschina and Calabrese (2021) consider these constructions to be ‘uninflected’, unlike Manzini, Lorusso, and Savoia (2017: 46), who accordingly prefer the term ‘invariable’.

\textsuperscript{10} Cruschina (2013, 2022); Di Caro (2019b); Calabrese (2020); Cruschina and Calabrese (2021).
As described by Cruschina (2013: 270; cf. also Heine 1993; Hopper and Traugott 2003),
depending on the variety, V1s, especially invariable ones, tend to show many if not all the
hallmarks of grammaticalization, including (a) “desemantization of the original lexical value”,
i.e. with motion semantics giving way to an emphatic or aspectual/temporal value, a cross-linguistic
tendency (Heine 1993: 30); (b) decategorization (or the “loss of its morphosyntactic
status as a full verb”, where the inflectional features of the clause are fully dependent on V2);
(c) cliticization (or loss of status as an autonomous word); and (d) phonological erosion. Highly
grammaticalized, invariable V1s transition from lexical verbs to functional, aspectual particles

2. Invariable VI Tonna

Not unlike go and come (as well as stay), tornare (return) is frequently grammaticalized
across Italo-Romance, shifting from lexical motion verb to aspectual marker, and potentially to
adverb (Giacalone Ramat 2001; Parry 2022; cf. also Bertinetto and Squartini 2016). According
to Parry:

One of the typical clines of development is that represented by full verbs with an infinitival com-
plement that are reanalyzed as light verbs, then auxiliaries, and may eventually become invariable tense,
aspect, or mood markers or reduced to variable affixes on the main verb, as in the case of the Romance
future formed from the infinitive plus inflected forms of habere ‘have’ (2022: 146).

Grammaticalized tornare generally loses its motion semantics – as illustrated also by the
fact that it can be used with states and inanimate subjects – and acquires a repetitive aspectual
value which has scope over the whole proposition, shifting in meaning from ‘come back/return’
to ‘again’ (11).

(11) Torno a ripetere
return.1SG.PRS.IND to.repeat.INF
‘I say it again/I repeat’

(Standard Italian, Giacalone Ramat 2001: 127)
Parry addresses how this process is also evidenced in pseudocoordination constructions, where it appears as a V1 thus far documented only in a handful of Sicilian varieties, though is likely more widespread (Spanò 2017; Di Caro 2019a: 122ff.). It has been attested as an inflected V1 in Catania and Delia (Caltanissetta province) (12), and as an invariable V1 in a few towns of Sicily’s Messina province (Roccavaldina, Sinagra, Raccuja, Eolian Islands, Castanea delle Furie, cf. also in an unspecified variety in Leone 1995: §46) (13). In the latter case, it surfaces as torna, tonna, or tanna, regardless of the tense/mood or grammatical person of V2, which presents RF.

(12)

a. Ti lu tornu a scrivu
to.you=it=return.1SG.PRS.IND A write.1SG.PRS.IND
‘I’ll write it for you again’

(Catania, Martoglio 1948: 153 cited in Di Caro and Giusti 2015: 403)

b. Tuirnu a ppigliu lu pani
return.1SG.PRS.IND A fetch.1SG.PRS.IND the bread
‘I come back to fetch the bread’

(Delia [CL], Di Caro and Giusti 2015: 403)

As an invariable V1, where it presents many similarities with the Italo-Romance and English prefix ri/-re-, it may even appear alongside lexical tornare (13a), as well as with inanimate subjects (13b).

(13)

a. Dumani torna tornu a scola
tomorrow Torna return.1SG.PRS.IND to=the school
‘I’m returning to school again tomorrow’

(Sinagra [ME], Di Caro 2019a: 123-4)

---

11 The author, citing data from Faggin (1997: 198), also reports the use of return in asyndetic structures – but only in the 2sg imperative, the most common type of pseudocoordination – in Friulian (torne viô!, return.IMP.2SG see.IMP.2SG, ‘Check again!’).

12 The example in question is from a 19th-century collection of popular songs (Lizio-Bruno 1986: 199); it is unknown whether V1 return is still used here today.

13 During a past presentation on this work, Michele Loporcaro justly observed that tornare is a northern lexical item – indeed it is productively used as an adverb and auxiliary in varieties such as Piedmontese and Ligurian (Parry 2022: 146-147 and references therein) – and is often absent in southern varieties, at least until recently. This is supported by data from REW (8794), which lists Romanian and Tuscan as the only Eastern Romance varieties to present a reflex of Latin tornāre, from AIS’ (1635) few Southern examples using tornare for ‘return’, as well as from Parry’s (2022) sampling of infinitival periphrases, overwhelmingly from northern varieties, with few exceptions. This prompts an important question about the origin of both the lexical and functional use of tornare in the varieties under examination here.

14 While this form may be homophonous with the 3sg present indicative and 2sg imperative of the corresponding lexical verb in some varieties that present tonna (or any of its allomorphs) as an invariable V1, in at least one of these, it exists in synchrony without a lexical, inflected counterpart, even outside of pseudocoordination structures. For example, in Eolian, the lexical meaning ‘return’ is expressed by (ag)girare, rather than *tornare/tonnare.
b. L'erva tonna ccrisce  
the=grass TONNA grow.3SG.PRS.IND 
‘The grass grows again’ 

(Eolian Islands [ME], Cardullo, in prep.)

The present discussion focuses precisely on this more-grammaticalized, invariable V1 *tonna* (return), which has not been as extensively documented or studied as its counterparts *va,* *sta,* *o,* *vinn* (invariable V1s from *go,* *come,* *stay*). This study uses data from the Italo-Romance variety of Eolian (spoken in Sicily’s Eolian archipelago, cf. Fanciullo 1983), where previously unattested syntactic patterns relating to this construction have been observed.\(^{15}\)

As is the case for many invariable V1s deriving from other predicates, *tonna* may be used with the imperative, present indicative, preterite, imperfect, and conditional, and in all six grammatical persons, with nothing intervening between *tonna* and V2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present Indicative</th>
<th>Preterite</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciu</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciavi</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciava</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciassese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>Tonna mmance</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciaste</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciave</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciassese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>Tonna mmancia</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciò</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciava</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciassese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciamu</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciammu</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciàumu</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciàssemu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciante</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciàte</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciàuvi</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciàssevu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>Tonna mmàncianu</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciaru</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciàunu</td>
<td>Tonna mmanciàsseru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Invariable V1 *tonna* paradigm

This particle presents all the characteristics of V1 pseudocoordination syntax (cf. §1). What distinguishes *tonna*, as exemplified in this particular variety, is its use with non-finite forms, including infinitives and past participles\(^{16}\) (though not gerunds). Crucially, it may be embedded under modal verbs such as *want,* *can,* *must,* and under causative *make,* which must always precede *tonna*:

(14) U vole / pote / av’a tonna mmanciare
it= want / can / must.3SG.PRS.IND TONNA eat.INF 
‘S/he wants to/can/must eat it again’

(15) I jatarieddi i fazzu tonna mmanciare
the kittens they=make.1SG.PRS.IND TONNA eat.INF 
‘I’ll let the kittens eat again’

\(^{15}\) Hereafter, examples without sources are from my fieldwork, and refer to the variety of Eolian.

\(^{16}\) The possibility of using an invariable V1 with past participles, to the right of auxiliaries, appears to have been documented only by Calabrese (2020) and Cruschina and Calabrese (2021: 193, fn. 28), in the dialect of Campi Salentina (LE) with V1 *go*:

(i) l’addʒʊ jà kkattatu
it=have.PRS.1SG JA buy.PTCP 
‘I went to buy it’
It may also be used with past participles to form compound tenses. Since in Eolian the present perfect is limited to specific aspectual contexts such as the ‘inclusive’ and ‘experiential’ values (Cardullo, in prep.; cf. Bertinetto and Squartini 2016), this is more readily visible in the past perfect:

(16) Aviso tonna mmanciatu  
AUX TONNA cat. PTP 
‘I had eaten again’

Building on existing accounts of V1s in pseudocoordination, the present work aims to provide a formal account of tonna’s syntax, with particular attention to its previously unattested use with non-finite forms. This discussion necessarily considers the degree of grammaticalization of this particle: evidently no longer a lexical verb, has it now become a functional head, or is it an adverb? 17

3. Existing approaches to pseudocoordination V1s

One view of the morphosyntactic status of V1s, adopted by Ledgeway (2016, 2021), Cruschina and Calabrese (2021), and Andriani (2016: §5, for USIDs), is that they lexicalize various aspectual or modal heads within the complex IP defined by Cinque (1999, 2006), for whom restructuring verbs are intrinsically functional heads (2004: 142f.). They are thus said to be first-merged in the clausal spine, rather than re-merged, raised from the VP.

Calabrian inflected go and come (viz. vaju and viegnu) are situated by Ledgeway in the Asp [Asp Andative/Venitive] projection (Cinque 1999: 106; 2006: 47, 70; Anderson 2017; Ledgeway 2016; 2021; Cruschina and Calabrese 2021). They are said to encode the aspectual deictic values of andative and venitive viewpoint, though they do not show all the hallmarks of grammaticalization, namely they retain their ability to inflect as well as their semantics of motion (Cruschina 2013, 2022). Indeed, Ledgeway does not consider inflected vaju and viegnu to be fully grammaticalized (but rather ‘grammatical’) like their invariable counterparts in other varieties.

That these inflected V1s lexicalize the Asp [Asp Andative/Venitive] head is supported by evidence showing a rigid ordering between go/come and other functional predicates. Predictions are borne out that verbs lexicalizing the heads of projections above Asp [Asp Andative/Venitive] may only precede (17a), and not follow (17b) go/come (both within and outside pseudocoordination structures), as can be seen with can (Mod [Epistemic/Alethic] or Mod [Obligation/Ability]), want (Mod [Volition]), try (Asp [Conative]), continue (Asp [Continuative]), and begin (Asp [Inceptive]).

(17) a. U piazzu / vüagliu / püavu a / cunntiuu a / ncumintiu it = can / want/ try.1SG.PRS.IND to / continue.1SG.PRS.IND to / start.1SG.PRS.IND to (ggh)jì / vena a ppgilià. a go-INF / come.INF to take.INF  
‘I can/want to/try to/continue to/start to go/come and to fetch it.’

17 These possibilities do not exclude the view that it is a prefix (i.e. as a head or specifier), cf. Cinque 1999: §3.5; 2006: 81. Cruschina and Calabrese (2021) propose this analysis using Distributed Morphology.
b. *Vaiu pùazzu / aia / sacciu / vùagliu studià
go.PR.S.1SG can / must / know / want.PR.S.1SG study.INF
‘I’m going to be able/to have/know how/want to study.’

(Cosenza, Ledgeway 2021: 14, 26)

Though distinct from (and more grammaticalized than) the inflected vaju and viegnu due to their near invariable and mostly desemanticized nature, Salentino va\textit{\textasciitilde} and sta (V1s from go and stay) are similarly said to have evolved into aspectual markers. Va “quite transparently” lexicalizes Asp\textsubscript{Andative}, though may be unambiguously employed as a marker of futurity. Similarly, imperfective \textit{sta}, “now representing the unmarked means of expressing on-going activity simultaneous with the moment of speech” is used with continuous, habitual, or generic aspectual value and lexicalizes Asp\textsubscript{Progressive} (Ledgeway 2016: 165; cf. also Rohlfs 1969: 133; Fanciullo 1976: 59; Loporcaro 1997: 337; 2021: 186-187).

As predicted by this view, go, come, and stay in all the aforementioned varieties can only embed verbs that lexicalize lower functional heads in the IP (like causatives, 18a), and not higher ones (like volitional modals, 18b).

(18)
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. La sta llassi durmire?
\textit{her\textasciitilde STAND let.2SG.PR.S.IND sleep.IND}
‘Are you letting her sleep?’
\item b. (*Sta/*va) uei ddurmisci ntorna
\textit{stand/go want.2SG.PR.S.IND sleep.2SG.PR.S.IND again}
‘You want to sleep again.’
\end{enumerate}

(Lecce, Ledgeway 2016: 174-5)

In this account, applied to both inflected and invariable V1s, the loss of inflectional features along with their thematic properties contributes to a syntactic shift whereby the V1 is first-merged as a functional head in the IP rather than originating in the lexical/thematic domain of the VP. Cardinaletti and Giusti (2003) similarly suggest that V1s in Sicilian are generated in the inflectional domain (defined as a \textit{t} head above T in their 2019 paper), though they propose that agreement is copied, either overtly or covertly (in the case of invariable V1s), from V2.

4. Formal approaches to Tonna

The following section explores this framework in application to invariable V1 tonna, and raises issues that emerge as a result of the unique syntactic configurations that have been documented with this particle in Eolian. The idea that it is a functional head, or even a specifier in the corresponding functional projection, is investigated.

\textsuperscript{18} Va (< uad-o/is/it/un\textit{\textasciitilde}) is used for all persons except the 1PL and 2PL, which instead employ a distinct stem \textit{\textasciitilde}a (< iamus/atis). So it is V1 selection that displays the N-pattern (not the availability of the periphrasis itself), but only in the present indicative. In the preterite, \textit{\textasciitilde}a is invariably used (Manzini and Savoia 2005: 691; Ledgeway 2016: §3.2).
4.1 Tonna as a functional head

This approach may be readily applied to *tonna* especially if we consider that at least one of the functional projections along the IP, a relatively high one, is specialized for iterative aspect: $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$. In fact, Cinque’s original (1999) formulation also included the existence of a lower $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}}$, as supported by examples where there can be two *di nuovo* ‘again’.\(^{19}\)

\begin{equation}
\text{(19)} \quad \text{Gianni ha } \text{di nuovo} \text{ battuto alla porta di nuovo / ancora} \\
\text{John aux again knock.ftp to=the door again again}
\end{equation}

‘John again knocked on the door again’

For Cinque, “the leftmost *di nuovo* quantifies over the event (of knocking on the door, perhaps many times), while the rightmost quantifies over the act itself [or “the state/process”] of knocking” (Cinque 1999: 92; cf. Cinque 2006: 83-5).

This would provide an explanation for the productive use of *tonna* (event reading) with the seemingly pleonastic adverb *nautra vota* ‘again’ (process reading): a straightforward interpretation could be that the former lexicalizes the higher $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$ head, and the latter lexicalizes the specifier of the lower $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}}$.

\begin{equation}
\text{(20)} \quad [\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}} \text{tonna [V2 mmancia]} \quad [\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}} \text{nautra vota [VP mmancia...]]}]
\end{equation}

‘(S)he goes and eats again’

This would also correctly predict that, in a marginally used construction, *tonna* can precede inflected V1 *go* (*vaju*) and *come* (*viegnu*), which are available in a separate type of pseudocoordination in Eolian (Cardullo, in prep.). The inverse order, as expected by the fact that $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$ precedes $\text{Asp}_{\text{Andative/Venitive}}$, is ungrammatical.

\begin{equation}
\text{(21)} \quad (*\text{Vace}) [\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}} \text{tonna [Asp}_{\text{Andative/Venitive}} \text{vace} \quad [\text{a [mmancia [VP mmancia...]]}]]}
\end{equation}

‘(S)he goes to eat again’

This runs into problems, however, when we go back to consider examples (14) and (15), where modal verbs *want*, *can*, *must* and causative *make* necessarily precede *tonna*. It does not square with the fact that the functional heads that host these predicates (Mod\(^{\text{Volition}}\), Mod\(^{\text{Obligation}}\) and Causative) actually follow $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$:

\begin{equation}
\text{(22)} \quad [(\text{Vole}) [\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}} \text{tonna [Mod}_{\text{Volition}} (*\text{vole)} \quad [\text{mmanciare want.3sg.prs.ind} \quad \text{TONNA want.3sg.prs.ind eat.inf} [\text{VP mmanciare...]]}]]}
\end{equation}

‘(S)he wants to eat again’

\(^{19}\)An anonymous reviewer rightfully points out that *tonna* could occupy different positions along the functional spine, or move from a lower to a higher projection. For reasons of space, the focus of this work remains on the (two) aspectual projections constituting the most evident loci for functional elements with repetitive value, as a starting point. Other projections are not excluded, but are left for future study.
The thesis that tonna is a functional head can still be potentially supported by sustaining that it is instead generated in the head of the lower Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(II)}\textsuperscript{*} in the same projection which hosts nautra vota in its Spec. While this would initially incorrectly generate a surface structure where tonna follows the non-finite V2 manciare ’to eat’ when the latter raises from the verbal to the inflectional domain (cf. Groothuis 2022), this can be resolved by positing left-adjunction of tonna to the lexical verb\textsuperscript{20} (cf. Baker 1988).

(23) \[ \text{[Mod\textsubscript{Volition}Vole \text{tonna-manciare [Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(II)} nautra vota tonna\textsuperscript{head} \text{VP manciare...}]}}] \]
\[ \text{want. 3SG.PRS.IND} \text{ TONNA+CAT.INF} \text{ again} \]
\[ \text{‘(S)he wants to eat again’} \]

This account still suffers from a few issues. To begin with, while it could also be used to explain example (21) (repeated below as (24)) where tonna precedes vace + V2, it would present some inconsistencies. In particular, why can tonna left-adjoint to functional vace (GO), but not to vole (WANT) in (23), where it incorporates instead into the lexical infinitival verb?

(24) \[ \text{[Asp\textsubscript{Andative} Tonna-vace [a [mmancia [Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(II)} tonna\textsuperscript{head} [VP mancia...]]]}}] \]

One possible solution would be to maintain that this is an instance of yet further grammaticalization, where tonna begins to incorporate into functional predicates, beginning with aspectual ones (viz. Asp\textsubscript{Andative/Venitive}), lower in the IP, but not yet higher modal predicates (viz. Mod\textsubscript{Volition}).\textsuperscript{21}

A deeper issue is that this account would necessarily presuppose a violation of the Head Movement Constraint, which dictates that raising heads must move through all intervening head positions to reach their landing site (cf. Travis 1984). If tonna incorporates into the lexical verb as it raises into the IP, we would expect the unattested order *vole manciare tonna.\textsuperscript{22} To adopt this view we would be thus forced to posit an exception to the HMC, whereby the lexical verb skips over, rather than transits through, the Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(II)}\textsuperscript{*}.

The solution that tonna lexicalizes a lower aspectual head (Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(II)}) is perhaps more attractive given its potential to derive the order of the attested constructions in (23) and (24), than the initially proposed idea that tonna is generated in the higher aspectual head (Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(I)}), which instead rules out the attested order ‘modal verb + tonna + INF’ in (23). However, it still encounters substantial issues, including a violation of the HMC and an unexplained inconsistency regarding the ability of tonna to incorporate only into some functional verbs (i.e. GO but not WANT). Neither view fully accounts for the different structural patterns attested, and as such, prove to be unsatisfactory explanations.

\textsuperscript{20} See Rivero (1992), Dobrovie-Sorin (1993: §2.2), Nicolae (2015: 79-81; 2019: 19) for accounts of adverbial left adjunction. With regards to Movement Verb Constructions including those under consideration here, a not too dissimilar view, consisting of the formation of complex heads through cyclic head movement, is proposed by Cruschina and Calabrese (2021).

\textsuperscript{21} A potential solution worth exploring further is that tonna constitutes a syncretic category (e.g. both a functional head and an adverb, see below), as suggested by an anonymous reviewer. This could indeed be an effective way to reconcile the seemingly incompatible structures generated.

\textsuperscript{22} Cf. van Gelderen (2004: 235) for a similar problem with modal particles in German and Dutch.
We must now ask whether *tonna* has instead grammaticalized to the point of becoming an adverb, as has been documented in SIDs with other types of constructions (cf. Cruschina 2015). Instead of lexicalizing repetitive aspectual heads, could it feasibly have become a specifier of these respective projections (viz. Spec Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(I)}, or Spec Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(II)})? Initial support for this view comes from dialects such as Cosentino, where *tonna* can be used adverbially, here in post-verbal position:

(25) Vaju torna
go.1sg.prs.ind again
‘I’ll go again’

*(Cosenza, Adam Ledgeway, p.c.)*

*Tonna*, plausibly following a stage as an Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive} head at some point along its grammaticalization pathway, could have been reanalyzed as a specifier. The higher Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(I)} projection should be excluded as a potential landing site, as it encounters the same obstacles as a head in the same projection: since Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(I)} precedes Mod\textsubscript{Volition}, it would generate the unattested order of *tonna* + *vole* + non-finite V2.

(26) [Vole [Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(I)} *tonna* spec] [Mod\textsubscript{Volition} (*vole)] [mmanciare want.3sg.prs.ind TONNA want.3sg.prs.ind eat.inf [Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(II)} nautra vota spec] [VP mancicare...]]]

‘(S)he wants to eat again’

As the specifier of the lower Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(II)}, on the other hand, it overcomes a key problem that it faced when analyzed as a head in the same projection: as a specifier, it wouldn’t obstruct the lexical verb as it raises, and so wouldn’t entail a violation of the HMC. The lexical V2 would successfully pass through all intervening heads between the VP and its landing site, after which adverbial *tonna* could incorporate into it.

(27) [Vole [tonna spec mmanciare Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(II)} *tonna* spec] [VP mancicare...]]

‘(S)he wants to eat again’

It thus appears that the view that *tonna* has (re)grammaticalized to become an adverb, lexicalizing the specifier of the lower Asp\textsubscript{Repetitive(II)}, is the most convincing one thus far. However, some empirical perplexities remain. For example, the (perhaps) puzzling position of *tonna* vis-à-vis object clitics:

(28) U tonna mmancia
it= TONNA eat.3sg.prs.ind
‘(S)he eats it again’

It isn’t puzzling, but rather expected, for SIDs that are characterized by low verb movement (with lexical predicates targeting functional heads in the lower adverb space, LAS) for LAS adverbs to interpolate between verbs and their proclitic arguments. This possibility exists in
several southern Italian varieties like Cosentino, Casertano among other Northern Campanian varieties, Salentino, as well as early varieties of Sicilian, Neapolitan, and Tuscan (Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005; cf. also Schifano 2018).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Cl} & - & \text{Adv} & - & \text{V} \\
(29) & \text{Si} & (\text{sempre}) & \text{lav} & (\text{sempre}) \\
& \text{self=} & \text{always} & \text{wash.3SG.PRS.IND} & \text{always} \\
& \text{‘He always washes himself’} & \\
\end{array}
\]

(Cosenza, Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005: 78)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Cl} & - & \text{Adv} & - & \text{V} \\
(30) & \text{Non lo} & \text{mai} & \text{rice} \\
& \text{neg} & \text{it=} & \text{never} & \text{say.3SG.PRS.IND} \\
& \text{‘He never says it’} & \\
\end{array}
\]

(Caserta, ibidem)

However, this is not the case in all southern varieties, and crucially, it is disallowed in the variety under study, Eolian, which implies that \textit{tonna}’s position is indeed unexpected. It is particularly problematic for this account that even the synonymous adverb \textit{nautra vota}, which would lexicalize the same specifier position as \textit{tonna}, cannot intervene between the verb and the clitic.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Cl} & - & \text{Adv} & - & \text{V} \\
(31) & \text{a. N’u} & (\text{*chiu}) & \text{fazzu} & (\text{cchiù}) \\
& \text{neg} & \text{it=} & \text{more} & \text{do.1SG.PRS.IND} & \text{more} \\
& \text{‘I won’t do it again’} & \\
& \text{b. U} & (\text{*sempre} / \text{*nautra vota}) & \text{mancia} & (\text{sempre} / \text{nautra vota}) \\
& \text{it=} & \text{always} / \text{again} & \text{eat.3SG.PRS.IND} & \text{always} \text{ again} \\
& \text{‘He always eats it’/‘He eats it again’} & \\
\end{array}
\]

Furthermore, in the variety under examination, \textit{tonna} cannot be used postverbally (i.e. in the position of \textit{nautra vota}), except with the noun \textit{vota} ‘time’ (which does not display RF), in a distinct, crystallized form \textit{tonna vota} ‘again’ (which conversely cannot replace \textit{tonna} in V1 position, 32a). While \textit{tonna vota} is synonymous with \textit{nautra vota}, only the latter may be used pleonastically with \textit{tonna + V2}.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Cl} & - & \text{Adv} & - & \text{V} \\
(32) & \text{a. (*Tonna vota) manciu} & \text{tonna *(vota)} \\
& \text{TONNA VOTA} & \text{eat.1SG.PRS.IND} & \text{TONNA VOTA} \\
& \text{b. Tonna mmanciu} & (\text{*tonna vota}) / (\text{n’autra vota}) \\
& \text{TONNA} & \text{eat.1SG.PRS.IND} & \text{TONNA VOTA} \text{ again} \\
& \text{‘I’ll eat again’} & \\
\end{array}
\]

The failure of these substitution tests points to the conclusion that \textit{tonna} is not a canonical adverb in Eolian, and more generally that it behaves differently from other adverbs which are presumed to lexicalize the same functional projection. Indeed, unlike most adverbs, \textit{tonna} cannot be focalized.
*Che fa, TONNA mmanci?
what do.2SG.PRS.IND TONNA eat.2.SG.PRS.IND
‘What, you’re eating again?’

Though tonna does not align with canonical, ‘strong’ adverbs, we must observe that Cardinaletti and Starke (1999: §9) demonstrate that these syntactic properties do apply to a specific class of adverbs that are considered ‘deficient’, and which accordingly cannot be coordinated, modified, or focalized (cf. also Cardinaletti 2011; Cruschina 2015). In particular, tonna’s distribution vis-à-vis pronominal clitics closely mirrors23 that of Romanian aspectual clitic adverb mai ‘still, again’, which besides “cluster[ing] around the inflected verb”, follows auxiliaries when used in compound tenses, and cannot be used in isolation. Adjunction analyses for mai have similarly been proposed (Dobrovie-Sorin 1993: 62, cf. 26ff., §2.2; Nicolae 2015: 79-81, 2019: 19).

(*Mai) îl mai examinez din cind in cind
MAY him=MAI examine from when in when
‘I still examine him from time to time’
([Standard] Romanian, Dobrovie-Sorin 1993: 11)

Understanding whether tonna is better characterized as a ‘weak’ vs. a ‘clitic’ deficient adverb in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999) is an important question which cannot be explored here for reasons of space and which I leave open for future research. A crucial point which has important implications for this analysis is that clitic adverbs are explicitly considered to be heads (ibidem; Nicolae 2015, 2019), while ‘weak’ adverbs are considered (phrasal) specifiers (cf. also Cruschina 2015).

To conclude, while tonna can be argued to have become a specifier of Asp\Repetitive(II) on a par with nautra vota – with pseudocoordination structures obtained through left-adjunction to the lexical verb –, it would constitute a novel, defective syntax with respect to the behavior of existing (specifically ‘strong’) adverbs in Eolian.

4.3 Structural Consequences

The reflections of the previous sections have brought us to exclude the conclusion that tonna lexicalizes either the head or the specifier position of the higher Asp\Repetitive(I), since it cannot explain the structures where tonna is embedded under modal verbs with non-finite V2s.

Out of the two repetitive functional heads, this leaves Asp\Repetitive(II) as the only viable projection for this particle, either as a head or as a specifier. As shown, interpreting tonna as a head leads to theoretical problems such as the violation of the HMC, since tonna would block the lexical verb, and incorporation would produce the wrong surface word order. By contrast, interpreting it as a specifier remains the most plausible solution, and is compatible with its deficient syntax with respect to strong adverbs.

23 Though this similarity ends when considering that it must precede modal a putea ‘can’, one of the limited predicates that allows (optional) embedding of the infinitive in Romanian, which otherwise employs Balkan-style complementation (ibidem, 26):

(i) (Nu) (mai) poate (*mai) scrie
NEG MAY can.3SG.PRS.IND MAY write.INF
‘(S)He can(’t) write again’
The non-viability of the $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$ projection for hosting $\text{tonna}$, or any adverb, emerges as an important observation. A potential structural outcome that is proposed here for Eolian is that the higher and lower heads ($\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive}(I/II)}$) should be analyzed as a syncretic head (Giorgi and Pianesi 1997), in which the two repetitive aspecual values (event repetition vs process/act repetition) are not formally distinguished (for another case of such syncretism in the Eolian C-domain, see Cardullo 2021). Indeed, in the above examples, $\text{tonna}$ has an event reading, usually reserved for the higher $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$.

(35)  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Tonna} \quad \text{mmancia} \quad [\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)/(II)}} \text{tonna}_{\text{head/spec}} \text{VP} \text{mancia...}]] \\
\text{TONNA} \quad \text{eat.3sg.prs.ind} \\
\text{‘(S)he eats again’}
\end{array}
\]

5. Conclusions

This work has examined the relatively uncommon use of \textit{return} as an invariable \textit{V1} in pseudo-coordination structures in southern Italo-Romance varieties. It draws on novel data from the variety of Eolian, which employs the invariable particle $\text{tonna}$, and does not present paradigmatic restrictions with regard to the TMA and grammatical person of the verb. Alongside the canonical characteristics of clitic climbing, Wh- extraction, absence of interpolation/floating quantifiers, this particle presents as of yet undocumented structural patterns, whereby it can be embedded under modal and causative verbs (\textit{can, must, want, make}) and used with non-finite verbs such as infinitives and past participles. Building on existing approaches to both inflected (Cal. \textit{vaju} and \textit{viegnu}) and invariable (Sal. \textit{sta, va}) V1s, which analyze them as functional heads in Cinque’s universal hierarchy of functional projections, this work investigates the morphosyntactic status and level of grammaticalization of \textit{tonna}. Given the existence of at least two projections where repetitive aspecual value is realized, along with the typological observation that \textit{return} frequently grammaticalizes as an adverbial, in total four structural possibilities are considered: that it is an (a) $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$ head, (b) $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}}$ head, (c) $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$ Spec, or (d) $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}}$ Spec.

In sum, options (a) and (c), which evaluate the $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$ projection, do not adequately account for the novel data, since it incorrectly predicts that modal verbs should follow \textit{tonna}. Option (b) and (d), which consider $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}}$, both involve the left-adjunction of \textit{tonna} to lexical verbs, and rarely, to aspecual verbs. As a head (option b) it would constitute a violation of the Head Movement Constraint, which is not the case for the view that it is an adverb (option d). While from a theoretical perspective, the latter is the strongest possibility of those considered, it still suffers empirical problems in its different syntax as compared to canonical, strong adverbs in this variety. In particular, its unique ability to interpolate between clitics and their verbal hosts along with its resistance to focalization may indicate that it is better analyzed as a deficient adverbial, though whether ‘weak’ or ‘clitic’, remains unclear at this stage. This first formal approach to \textit{tonna} thus leaves us with open questions, which are clearly worth examining further. As a final point, the ready exclusion of $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$ as a viable site, along with the otherwise unexpected event interpretation of \textit{tonna}, leads us to propose that its features are instead realized synchronically in the lower repetitive projection, viz. $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}} > \text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I/Ii)}}$.

\textit{Tonna} is a case study in the grammaticalization of \textit{return}, which has undergone several stages: from a lexical motion verb to a functional one, from an inflected functional verb to an invariable one, and from invariable functional verb to aspecual particle, and more specifically to (deficient) adverb.
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