



Citation: S.N. Cardullo (2023)
The “Return” of Southern Italo-Romance Tonna: From Pseudocoordination to Adverb. A Case Study in Grammaticalization. *Qulso* 9: pp. 11-28. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/QULSO-2421-7220-15165>

Copyright: © 2023 S.N. Cardullo. This is an open access, peer-reviewed article published by Firenze University Press (<https://oaj.fupress.net/index.php/bsfm-qulso/index>) and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Competing Interests: The Author(s) declare(s) no conflict of interest.

The “Return” of Southern Italo-Romance *Tonna*: From Pseudocoordination to Adverb. A Case Study in Grammaticalization*

Sara N. Cardullo
University of Cambridge (<snc33@cam.ac.uk>)

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. $Asp_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$, $Asp_{\text{Repetitive(II)}}$) 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 $Asp_{\text{Repetitive(II)}}$ proves to be the most convincing from a theoretical perspective. A potential structural consequence is the syncretic status of the $Asp_{\text{Repetitive(II)}}$ head.

Keywords: *Grammaticalization, Left Adjunction, Pseudocoordination, Repetitive Aspect, Southern Italian Dialects*

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

* I would like to sincerely thank my informants for their openness and patience, and Leonardo Russo Cardona, Ștefania Costea, Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro, Marco Fioratti, Adam Ledgeway, and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful, constructive suggestions on this work. All remaining errors are my own.

(V1) connected to a lexical verb (V2) by a linking element *a*,² *e* (which trigger the presence of fortition³ on V2), or \emptyset .⁴ 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 ppigghianu (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

² Many scholars starting from Ascoli (1896) maintain that this *a* originates from Latin *ac*, used to coordinate constituents perceived as closely related or forming a single event (cf. *VIRI AC FEMINAE* ‘men and women’ [Rohlf 1969: §760]), otherwise not continued as a productive coordinator in Italo-Romance (cf. a crystallized form in standard Italian numeral *diciassette* ‘seventeen’). From a synchronic perspective, it is identical to the reflex of *ad* (> *a* ‘to’), the etymon proposed by Gaspari (1879) and Manzini, Lorusso and Savoia (2017).

³ On *raddoppiamento fonosintattico* (RF), cf. Loporcaro 1997b.

⁴ Ascoli (1896, 1901); Rohlf (1969: §759, §761, §766); Leone (1973); Sornicola (1976); Sorrento (1977); Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001, 2003, 2019); Manzini and Savoia (2005: 688ff.); Cruschina (2013, 2022); Di Caro and Giusti (2015); Di Caro (2019a, 2019b); Andriani (2016: §5, Forthcoming); Ledgeway (2016, 2021); Manzini, Lorusso and Savoia (2017); Lorusso (2019); Calabrese (2020); Cruschina and Calabrese (2021); Giusti, Di Caro and Ross (2022), *inter alia*.

(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 GO⁵ (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*, \emptyset – witness the lack of RF –, and *a*).

- (5) Vaju e ccattu u pani
 go.1SG.PRS.IND E buy.1SG.PRS.IND the bread
 ‘I go and/to buy the bread’
 (Feroletto [CZ], Toscano 2022)
- (6) Viegnu vivu
 come.1SG.PRS.IND drink.1SG.PRS.IND
 ‘I come and/to drink’
 (Cosenza, Ledgeway 2021: 10)
- (7) [u stɔnə⁶ (a) c’camənə]
 he= stay.3SG.PRS.IND A call.3SG.PRS.IND
 ‘They’re calling him’
 (Martina Franca [TA], Manzini and Savoia 2005: 690)

Furthermore, pseudocoordination may show both inter- and intra-paradigmatic restrictions. In particular, instead of being available in all tenses, this construction is frequently limited to only a subset. After the imperative – which licenses pseudocoordination across many Italo-Romance varieties (cf. Ledgeway 1997) – the frequency with which different tenses allow this type of finite hypotaxis follows an implicational hierarchy:

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 > counterfactual⁷
 (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-Pattern⁸) > full paradigm

	(a) Gravina (BA) (Andriani 2016: 217)	(b) Rutigliano (BA) (Andriani 2016: 219)	(c) Marsala (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2003: 380)	(d) Cosenza
1sg	vóuchə a ssuné	vɔŋg a fʃɔ:k	vaju a ppigghiu	vaiu pigliu
2sg	vè ssùnə	ve (a) fʃɔ:k	vai a ppigghi	va pigli
3sg	vè ssòunə	ve (a) fʃɔ:k	va a ppigghia	va ppiglia
1pl	scəm'a ssuné	fəm a fə'kwe	emu a ppigghiari	jamu pigliamu
2pl	scæ't'a ssuné	fət a fə'kwe	iti a ppigghiari	jati pigliati
3pl	vònn'a ssuné	vɔnn a fə'kwe	vannu a ppigghianu	vannu piglianu
	'go and/to play'	'go and/to play'	'go and/to take'	'go and/to take'

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 (Rohlf's 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,⁹ invariable. In the latter case, which some have interpreted as a prefix,¹⁰ V1 GO may be reduced to *va / uo lo / fè / (j)fa / bba*, COME to *vinn*, and STAY to *sta / stè*, 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)

⁷ The conditional or imperfect subjunctive, which in many SIDs form a syncretic category (Rohlf's 1969: §744).

⁸ On morphemes (cf. Aronoff 1994) and the so-called "N-Pattern" pervasive in Romance, see Maiden 2004, *et seq.*

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'.

¹⁰ Cruschina (2013, 2022); Di Caro (2019b); Calabrese (2020); Cruschina and Calabrese (2021).

- (9) Vinn a ffacimū / ffacìstivū / ffacirū a spisa
 VINN A do.1PL.PST do.2PL.PST do.3PL.PST the groceries
 ‘We/you/they went grocery shopping’
 (Mazzarino [CL], Di Caro 2019a: 117)
- (10) [lu sta f fattsu]
 it= STA go.1SG.PRS.IND
 ‘I’m doing it’
 (Mesagne [BR], Manzini and Savoia 2005: 691)

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 (Loporcaro 1997a: 347-348; Cardinaletti and Giusti 2003, 2019; Ledgeway 2016, 2021).

2. *Invariable V1* 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 complement 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,¹¹ 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,¹² 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*^{13,14} (13a), as well as with inanimate subjects (13b).

(13)

- a. Dumani torna ttornu 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 viôt!*, 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:

	Present Indicative	Preterite	Imperfect	Conditional
1SG	Tonna mmanciu	Tonna mmanciavu	Tonna mmanciava	Tonna mmanciasse
2SG	Tonna mmance	Tonna mmanciaste	Tonna mmanciave	Tonna mmanciasse
3SG	Tonna mmancia	Tonna mmanciò	Tonna mmanciava	Tonna mmanciasse
1PL	Tonna mmanciamu	Tonna mmanciammu	Tonna mmanciàumu	Tonna mmanciàssemu
2PL	Tonna mmanciate	Tonna mmanciate	Tonna mmanciàuvu	Tonna mmanciàssevù
3PL	Tonna mmàncianu	Tonna mmanciaru	Tonna mmanciàunu	Tonna mmanciàsseru

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 participles¹⁶ (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’addzu ʃʃa kkattatu
 it=have.PRS.1SG ʃA 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) Avia tonna mmanciatu
 AUX TONNA eat.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: 142ff.). They are thus said to be first-merged in the clausal spine, rather than re-merged, raised from the VP.

[Mod_{Epistemic/Alethic} [TP [Asp_{Habitual} [Asp_{Predispositional} [Asp_{Repetitive(I)} [Mod_{Volition} [Asp_{Terminative} [Asp_{Continuative(I)} [Asp_{Durative/Progressive} [Mod_{Obligation/Ability} [Asp_{Frustrative/Success} [Mod_{Permission} [Asp_{Conative} [Voice [Causative [Asp_{Inceptive} [Asp_{Continuative(II)} [Asp_{Andative/Venitive} **GO/COME** [Asp_{Completive} [Asp_{Repetitive(II)} [VP V...

Calabrian inflected GO and COME (viz. *vaju* and *viegnu*) are situated by Ledgeway in the 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_{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_{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 pùazzu / vùagliu / prùavu a / cuntinuu a / ncuminciu
 it= can / want/ try.1SG.PRS.IND to / continue.1SG.PRS.IND to / start.1SG.PRS.IND
 to (ggh)jì / vena a ppiglià.
 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.PRS.1SG can / must / know / want.PRS.1SG study.INF
 ‘I’m going to be able/to have/know how/want to study.’

(Cosenza, Ledgey 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 *val/fa*¹⁸ and *sta* (V1s from GO and STAY) are similarly said to have evolved into aspectual markers. *Va* “quite transparently” lexicalizes Asp_{Andative}, though may be unambiguously employed as a marker of futurity. Similarly, imperfective *sta*, “now represent[ing] 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_{Progressive} (Ledgey 2016: 165; cf. also Rohlf’s 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)

- a. La sta llassi durmire?
 her= STAND let.2SG.PRS.IND sleep.INF
 ‘Are you letting her sleep?’
- b. (*Sta/*va) uei dduर्मisci ntorna
 STAND/GO want.2SG.PRS.IND sleep.2SG.PRS.IND again
 ‘You want to sleep again.’

(Lecce, Ledgey 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 *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.

¹⁸ *Va* (< UAD-O/IS/IT/UNT) is used for all persons except the 1PL and 2PL, which instead employ a distinct stem *fa* (< 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, *fa* is invariably used (Manzini and Savoia 2005: 691; Ledgey 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: $Asp_{Repetitive(I)}$. In fact, Cinque's original (1999) formulation also included the existence of a lower $Asp_{Repetitive(II)}$, as supported by examples where there can be two *di nuovo* 'again'.¹⁹

- (19) Gianni ha di nuovo battuto alla porta di nuovo / ancora
 John AUX again knock.PTP to=the door again again
 '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 $Asp_{Repetitive(I)}$ head, and the latter lexicalizes the specifier of the lower $Asp_{Repetitive(II)}$.

- (20) [$Asp_{Repetitive(I)}$ *tonna* [V2 *mmancia* [$Asp_{Repetitive(II)}$ *nautra vota* [VP *mancia...*]]]]
 TONNA eat.3.SG.PRS.IND again
 '(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 $Asp_{Repetitive(I)}$ precedes $Asp_{Andative/Venitive}$, is ungrammatical.

- (21) (*Vace) [$Asp_{Repetitive(I)}$ *tonna* [$Asp_{Andative/Venitive}$ *vace* [a [*mmancia* [VP *mancia...*]]]]]]
 go.3.SG.PRS.IND TONNA go.3.SG.PRS.IND A eat.3.SG.PRS.IND
 '(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 ($Mod_{Volition}$, $Mod_{Obligation/Ability}$, and Causative) actually follow $Asp_{Repetitive(I)}$:

- (22) [(Vole) [$Asp_{Repetitive(I)}$ *tonna* [$Mod_{Volition}$ (*vole) [*mmanciare* want.3SG.PRS.IND TONNA want.3SG.PRS.IND eat.INF [VP *manciare...*]]]]]]
 '(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 $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}}$, 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 *mangiare* ‘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 verb²⁰ (cf. Baker 1988).

- (23) $[\text{Mod}_{\text{Volition}} \text{Vole} \quad [\text{tonna-mmangiare} \quad [\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}} \text{nautra vota}_{\text{spec}} \text{tonna}_{\text{head}}]$
 $[\text{VP} \text{mangiare...}]]]]$
 want.3SG.PRS.IND TONNA+eat.INF again
 ‘(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-adjoin to functional *vace* (GO), but not to *vole* (WANT) in (23), where it incorporates instead into the lexical infinitival verb?

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

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. $\text{Asp}_{\text{Andative/Venitive}}$), lower in the IP, but not yet higher modal predicates (viz. $\text{Mod}_{\text{Volition}}$).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 mangiare tonna*.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 $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}}$.

The solution that *tonna* lexicalizes a lower aspectual head ($\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}}$) 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 ($\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$), 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.

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).

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.

²² Cf. van Gelderen (2004: 235) for a similar problem with modal particles in German and Dutch.

4.2 *Tonna as an Adverb*

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_{Repetitive(I)} or Spec Asp_{Repetitive(II)})? Initial support for this view comes from dialects such as Cosentino, where *torna* 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_{Repetitive} head at some point along its grammaticalization pathway, could have been reanalyzed as a specifier. The higher Asp_{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_{Repetitive(I)} precedes Mod_{Volition}, it would generate the unattested order of *tonna* + *vole* + non-finite V2.

- (26) [Vole [Asp_{Repetitive(I)} tonna_{spec} [Mod_{Volition} (*vole) [mmanciare
 want.3SG.PRS.IND TONNA want.3SG.PRS.IND eat.INF
 [Asp_{Repetitive(II)} nautra vota_{spec}] [VP manciare...]]]]
 again
 ‘(S)he wants to eat again’

As the specifier of the lower Asp_{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_{Repetitive(II)} tonna_{spec}] [VP manciare...]]]]
 want.3SG.PRS.IND TONNA eat.INF
 ‘(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_{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).

- | | Cl | – | Adv | – | V |
|------|----------------------------|---|----------|---|------------------|
| (29) | Si | | (sempre) | | lava |
| | SELF= | | always | | wash.3SG.PRS.IND |
| | ‘He always washes himself’ | | | | (sempre) |
| | | | | | always |

(Cosenza, Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005: 78)

- | | | | | |
|------|--------------------|-------|--|-----------------|
| (30) | Non lo | mai | | rice |
| | NEG it= | never | | say.3SG.PRS.IND |
| | ‘He never says it’ | | | |

(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 *tonna*’s position is indeed unexpected. It is particularly problematic for this account that even the synonymous adverb *nautra vota*, which would lexicalize the same specifier position as *tonna*, cannot intervene between the verb and the clitic.

- | | | | | | | |
|------|----|--|--------------------------|-----------------|--|------------------------|
| (31) | a. | N’u | (*chiu) | fazzu | | (cchiù) |
| | | NEG=it= | more | do.1SG.PRS.IND | | more |
| | | ‘I won’t do it again’ | | | | |
| | b. | U | (*sempre / *nautra vota) | mancia | | (sempre / nautra vota) |
| | | it= | always / again | eat.3SG.PRS.IND | | always again |
| | | ‘He always eats it’/‘He eats it again’ | | | | |

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

- | | | | | | |
|------|----|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|---------|
| (32) | a. | (*Tonna vota) | manciu | tonna | *(vota) |
| | | TONNA VOTA | eat.1SG.PRS.IND | TONNA | VOTA |
| | b. | Tonna | mmanciu | (*tonna vota) / (n’altra vota) | |
| | | TONNA | eat.1SG.PRS.IND | TONNA VOTA | again |
| | | ‘I’ll eat again’ | | | |

The failure of these substitution tests points to the conclusion that *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, *tonna* cannot be focalized.

The non-viability of the $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$ projection for hosting *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 aspectual 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, *tonna* has an event reading, usually reserved for the higher $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I)}}$.

- (35) [Tonna mmanchia [$\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I/II)}}$ **tonna**_{head/spec} [VP mmanchia...]]]
 TONNA eat.3SG.PRS.IND
 ‘(S)he eats again’

5. Conclusions

This work has examined the relatively uncommon use of RETURN as an invariable 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 *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 (CAN, MUST, WANT, MAKE) and used with non-finite verbs such as infinitives and past participles. Building on existing approaches to both inflected (Cal. *vaju* and *viegnu*) and invariable (Sal. *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 *tonna*. Given the existence of at least two projections where repetitive aspectual value is realized, along with the typological observation that 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 *tonna*. Option (b) and (d), which consider $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}}$, both involve the left-adjunction of *tonna* to lexical verbs, and rarely, to aspectual 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 *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 *tonna*, leads us to propose that its features are instead realized syncretically in the lower repetitive projection, viz. $\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(II)}} > \text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive(I/II)}}$.

Tonna is a case study in the grammaticalization of 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 aspectual particle, and more specifically to (deficient) adverb.

References

- AIS = Jaberg, Karl, and Jacob Jud. 1928-1940. *Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz*, 8 voll. Zofingen: Ringier.
- Anderson, Carolyn J. 2017. “The Andative and Venitive Construction in San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec”. Paper presented at University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Andriani, Luigi. 2016. *The Syntax of the Dialect of Bari*. PhD Thesis, Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Andriani, Luigi. Forthcoming. “On the Border between Hypotaxis and Parataxis: Assessing the Status of Pseudo-Coordination in Apulian Varieties”. *L'Italia dialettale* 85.
- Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by Itself: Stems and Inflectional Classes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ascoli, Graziadio I. 1896. “Un problema di sintassi comparata dialettale”. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 14: 453-468.
- Ascoli, Graziadio I. 1901. “Appendice all’articolo un problema di sintassi comparata dialettale”. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 15: 221-225.
- Baker, Mark. 1988. *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Calabrese, Andrea. 2020. *The Morphosyntax of Andative Forms in the Campiota Vernacular. The Synthetic Behavior of Restructuring Roots*. Ms, Storrs: University of Connecticut.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 2011. “German and Italian Modal Particles and Clause Structure”. *The Linguistic Review* 28 (4): 493-531. DOI: 10.1515/tlir.2011.014.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Giuliana Giusti. 2001. “Semi-Lexical Motion Verbs in Romance and Germanic”. In *Semi-Lexical Categories*, ed. by Norbert Corver, and Henk Van Riemsdijk, 371-414. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Giuliana Giusti. 2003. “Motion Verbs as Functional Heads”. In *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, ed. by Christina Tortora, 31-49. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Giuliana Giusti. 2019. “Multiple Agreement in Southern Italian Dialects”. In *Linguistic Variations: Structure and Interpretation – Studies in Honor of M. Rita Manzini*, ed. by Ludovico Franco, and Paolo Lorusso, 125-148. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michal Starke. 1999. “The Typology of Structural Deficiency: A Case Study of the Three Classes of Pronouns”. In *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, ed. by Henk van Riemsdijk, 145-233. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Cardullo, Sara N. 2021. “Dual Complementation in the Dialect of the Eolian Islands”. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* <<https://lingv.ro/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/RRL-2-3-2021-10-Sara.pdf>> (07/2023).
- Cardullo, Sara N. In prep. *Eolian Morphosyntax: A Comparative Romance Perspective*. PhD Thesis, Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004. “‘Restructuring’ and Functional Structure.” In *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, ed. by Adriana Belletti, 132-191. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo, 2006. *Restructuring and Functional Heads – The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 4*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2013. “Beyond the Stem and Inflectional Morphology: An Irregular Pattern at the Level of Periphrasis”. In *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology: Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives*, 262-283. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2015. “The Expression of Evidentiality and Epistemicity: Cases of Grammaticalization in Italian and Sicilian”. *Probus* 27 (1): 1-31. DOI: 10.1515/probus-2013-0006.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2022. “Periphrases and Irregular Paradigms in Italo-Romance”. In *Periphrasis and Inflection in Diachrony*, ed. by Adam Ledgeway, John Charles Smith, and Nigel Vincent, 169-190. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Cruschina, Silvio, and Andrea Calabrese. 2021. “Fifty Shades of Morphosyntactic Microvariation. Motion Verb Constructions in Southern Italian Dialects”. In *Formal Approaches to Romance Morphosyntax*, ed. by Marc-Olivier Hinzelin, Natascha Pomino, and Eva-Maria Remberger, 145-198. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- De Angelis, Alessandro. 2013. *Strategie di complementazione frasale nell'estremo Meridione italiano*. Messina: SGB.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo N. 2019a. *Multiple Agreement Constructions in Southern Italo-Romance: The Syntax of Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination*. PhD Thesis, Venezia: Università di Venezia “Ca’ Foscari.”
- Di Caro, Vincenzo N. 2019b. “The Inflected Construction in the Dialects of Sicily: Parameters of Micro-Variation”. In *Italian Dialectology at the Interfaces*, ed. by Silvio Cruschina, Adam Ledgeway, and Eva-Maria Remberger, 63-78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo N., and Giuliana Giusti. 2015. “A Protocol for the Inflected Construction in Sicilian Dialects”. *Annali di Ca’ Foscari. Serie occidentale* 49: 393-421. DOI: 10.14277/2385-3034/AnnOc-49-15-20.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1993. *The Syntax of Romanian: Comparative Studies in Romance*. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Faggin, Giorgio. 1997. *Grammatica friulana*. Udine: Ribis.
- Fanciullo, Franco. 1976. “Il trattamento delle occlusive sonore latine nei dialetti salentini”. *Italia Dialettale* 39: 1-82.
- Fanciullo, Franco. 1983. *Dialetto e cultura materiale alle isole eolie*. Palermo: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.
- Gaspary, Adolf. 1879. “Zu dem Ausdruck Vattel’ a pesca”. *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 3 (2): 257-259.
- Giacalone Ramat, Anna. 2001. “Emergent Auxiliaries and the Theory of Grammaticalization”. In *Naturally! Linguistic Studies in Honour of Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler Presented on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, ed. by Chris Schaner-Wolles, John R. Rennison, and Friedrich Neubarth, 121-131. Torino: Rosenberg and Sellier.
- Giorgi, Alessandra, and Fabio Pianesi. 1997. *Tense and Aspect: From Semantics to Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giusti, Giuliana, Vincenzo N. Di Caro, and Daniel Ross (eds). 2022. *Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Groothuis, Kim A. 2022. “Non-Finite Verb Movement in Romance”. *Probus* 34 (2): 273-315. DOI: 10.1515/probus-2021-0010.
- Heine, Bernd. 1993. *Auxiliaries. Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Elisabeth C. Traugott. 2003 [1993]. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 1997. “Asyndetic Complementation in Neapolitan Dialect”. *The Italianist* 17 (1): 231-273. DOI: doi.org/10.1179/ita.1997.17.1.231.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 1998. “Variation in the Romance Infinitive. The Case of the Southern Calabrian Inflected Infinitive”, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 96 (1): 1-61.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2016. “From Coordination to Subordination: The Grammaticalisation of Progressive and Andative Aspect in the Dialects of Salento”. In *Coordination and Subordination. Form and Meaning. Selected Papers from CS1 Lisbon 2014*, ed. by Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira, and Clara Pinto, 157-184. Newcastle: Cambridge Publishing Scholars.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2021. “Coming and Going in Calabrian: The Syntax of Pseudo-Coordination”. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* <<http://www.lingv.ro/images/RRL%201%202121%2002-Ledgeway.pdf>> (07/2023).
- Ledgeway, Adam, and Alessandra Lombardi. 2005. “Verb Movement, Adverbs and Clitic Positions in Romance”. *Probus* 17 (1): 79-113. DOI: 10.1515/prbs.2005.17.1.79.
- Leone, Alfonso. 1973. “Vattel’ a pesca, vieni a piglialo”. *Lingua Nostra* 37: 117-119.

- Leone, Alfonso. 1995. *Profilo di sintassi siciliana*. Palermo: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.
- Lizio-Bruno, Letterio. 1986 [1871]. *Canti popolari delle isole Eolie e di altri luoghi di Sicilia*. Bologna: Arnaldo Forni Editore.
- Loporcaro, Michele. 1997a. "Puglia and Salento". In *The Dialects of Italy*, ed. by Martin Maiden and Mair Parry, 338-348. London: Routledge.
- Loporcaro, Michele. 1997b. *L'origine del raddoppiamento fonosintattico: saggio di fonologia diacronica romanza*. Basel: Francke.
- Loporcaro, Michele. 2021. *La Puglia e il Salento. Dialetti d'Italia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Lorusso, Paolo. 2019. "A Person Split Analysis of the Progressive Forms in Some Southern Italian Varieties". In *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*, ed. by Silvio Cruschina, Adam Ledgeway, and Eva-Maria Remberger, 203-236. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Maiden, Martin. 2004. "Verb Augments and Meaninglessness in Early Romance Morphology". *Studi di grammatica italiana* 22: 1-61.
- Manzini, Maria R., Paolo Lorusso, and Leonardo Savoia. 2017. "A/Bare Finite Complements in Southern Italian Varieties: Mono-clausal or Bi-clausal Syntax?" *QULSO* 3: 11-59. DOI: 10.13128/QULSO-2421-7220-21337.
- Manzini, Maria R., and Leonardo Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. morfosintassi generativa*, vol 1. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Nicolae, Alexandru. 2015. *Ordinea constituenților în limba română: o perspectivă diacronică. Structura propoziției și deplasarea verbului*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Nicolae, Alexandru. 2019. *Word Order and Parameter Change in Romanian: A Comparative Romance Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parry, Mair. 2022. "The Tornare-Periphrasis in Italo-Romance". In *Periphrasis and Inflection in Diachrony: A View from Romance*, ed. by Adam Ledgeway, John C. Smith, and Nigel Vincent, 145-168. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rivero, María-Luisa. 1992. "Adverb Incorporation and the Syntax of Adverbs in Modern Greek". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 15 (3): 289-331.
- REW = Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm, 1935. *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, vol. 3. Torino: Einaudi.
- Ross, Daniel. 2021. *Pseudocoordination, Serial Verb Constructions and Multi-Verb Predicates: The Relationship between Form and Structure*. PhD Thesis, Champaign: University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign.
- Schifano, Norma. 2018. *Verb Movement in Romance: A Comparative Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sornicola, Rosanna. 1976. "Vado a dire, vaiu a ddicu: problema sintattico o problema semantico?" *Lingua Nostra* 37 (3/4): 65-74.
- Sorrento, Luigi. 1977. *Sintassi romanza. ricerche e prospettive*. Varese-Milano: Cisalpino.
- Spanò, Lea. 2017. *L'impopolarità dell'infinito nel dialetto di Sinagra (ME)*. Bachelor's Thesis, Messina: Università degli Studi di Messina.
- Toscano, Carmelina. 2022. "Su alcuni parametri di variazione: la pseudo-coordinazione in Calabria". Paper presented at *Romance Linguistics Circle seminars*, University Cambridge-University of Newcastle.
- Travis deMena, Lisa. 1984. *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation*. PhD Thesis, Cambridge (MA): MIT.
- van Gelderen, Elly. 2004. *Grammaticalization as Economy*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.