Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali / Working Papers in Linguistics and Oriental Studies
n. 3 (2017), pp. 11-59
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/QULSO-2421-7220-21337

a/bare finite complements in Southern Italian varieties: mono-clausal or bi-clausal syntax?

M. Rita Manzini, Paolo Lorusso and Leonardo M. Savoia
Università degli Studi di Firenze
(<manzini@unifi.it>, <pavlovlo@gmail.com>, <leonardomaria.savoia@unifi.it>)

Abstract:

In dialects of Apulia, Calabria and Sicily a restricted number of verbs, including 'stay/be', 'go', 'come' and 'want' embed finite complements, either bare or introduced by *a*. One aim of the present work is to make the corpus of data in Manzini and Savoia (2005) accessible in English. The corpus displays a certain amount of microparametric variation, which is also known, in a less complete form, from independently collected data. On the basis of the evidence presented, we will discuss the two major syntactic analyses proposed for this type of sentences. Under the mono-clausal analysis, verbs like 'stay, 'go' etc. are functional heads embedding a lexical predicate (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003). The bi-clausal analysis on the contrary treats embedding under 'stay', 'go' etc. as anormal clausal embedding (Manzini and Savoia 2005). In this article we reiterate that the bi-clausal analysis is not only feasible, but also advantageous, from a morphosyntactic point of view. We conclude by sketching how this analysis can be rendered compatible with the mono-eventive interpretation that at least some of the relevant structures are reported to have.

Keywords: Biclausality, Clausal Embedding, Constructions, Finite Control, Inflected Progressive

1. *Narrowing down the evidence and setting it in context*[*]

Varieties of the extreme Italian South (Calabria, Sicily, Salento) display finite control and raising complements of the type familiar from Balkan languages (Romanian, Aromanian, Greek, Albanian). This is exemplified

[*] This work is the result of the collaboration of the authors in all respects. Nevertheless, for Italian administrative purposes Paolo Lorusso takes responsibility for Sections 1.1, 2.4 and 3.1 as well as for the redaction of Section 1 (on the basis partially of his own data). We would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their useful comments and suggestions.

ISSN 2421-7220 (online)
www.fupress.com/bsfm-qulso
2017 Firenze University Press

in (1)-(5) with varieties of the Salento, where the role of the so-called subjunctive particle is played by an element of the *k-* complementizer series, namely *ku* (Calabrese 1993; Manzini and Savoia 2005; Ledgeway 2015). Finite control and raising complements characterize also many Calabrian and Sicilian varieties, where the embedded finite verb is introduced by *mi/mu* (Trumper and Rizzi 1985; Manzini and Savoia 2005, forthcoming). These languages have morphological infinitives, but they normally reserve them for avery restricted range of modal embeddings, mostly under the verb *potere* 'can/may'.

(1) a. au ku llu iʃu *Carmiano*
have-1s Prt it$_{cl}$ see-1s
'I have to see it'

b. mɛ mint^{h}u ku mandʒu
myself$_{cl}$ put-1s Prt eat-1s
'I am starting to eat'

(2) a. au ku mmandʒu *Copertino*
have-1s Prt eat-1s
'I have to eat'

b. addʒu ʃirkatu ku ddɔrmu
have-1s tried Prt sleep-1s
'I have tried to sleep'

c. iḍḍu a ntʃiɲɲatu ku mmandʒa
he have-3s started Prt eat-3s
'He has started to eat'

d. iḍḍu sta bbaɛ ku mmandʒa
he stay-3s go-3s Prt eat-3s
'He is going to eat'

(3) a. stannu ku sse 'skarfane l akkwa *Nociglia*
stay-3p Prt themselves$_{cl}$ heat-3 p the water
'They are heating up the water'

b. nu vvannu ku llu 'camanɛ
not go-3p Prt him$_{cl}$ call-3p
'They are not going to call him'

c. vɛnɛ ku llu viðɛ
come-3s Prt him$_{cl}$ see-3s
'He goes to see him'

(4) a. vau ku mmandʒu *Mesagne*
go-1s Prt eat-1s
'I go to eat'

b. nɔn-tʃi[1] vau ku llu veʃu
not there$_{cl}$ go-1s Prt him$_{cl}$ see-1s
'I am not going to see him'

c. vinia ku llu fattsu
came$_{IMP}$-1s Prt it$_{cl}$ do-1s
'I came to do it'

d. mi ssettu ku leggu
myself$_{cl}$ seat-1s Prt read-1s
'I sit down to read'

(5) ti ðiku ku (nɔ) llu cami *Monteparano*
you say-1s (not) Prt not him$_{cl}$ call-1s
'I tell you (not) to call him'

From the data in (1)-(5) it can be seen that finite complements cover pretty much the entire spectrum of obligatory control or raising predicates. In the same Salento dialects illustrated in (1)-(5) other types of complementation are found which also involve obligatory control into – or raising from – finite sentences, but which are quite distinct from the Balkan-type 'subjunctive' complementation reviewed so far. The fact that at least in some Salento dialects the different types of complementation cooccur means that they must be considered two separate phenomena. Indeed, in dialects of Salento, in several other Apulian varieties and in Sicilian varieties a finite obligatory control/raising complement can be found embedded under an a element. The verbs embedding a complements are a much more restricted set than the obligatory control/raising verbs embedding *ku/mu* complements. In Salento varieties they include 'come', 'go', 'be/stay' and 'want', as illustrated in (6)-(8). Note that in the variety of Mesagne, 'come' can embed finite a complements, as in (6) or finite *ku* complements, as in (4) above.

[1] The *there* clitic is often found adjoined to the negation even if there is no overt locative meaning in many Apulian varieties (including Mesagne). In the examples of the present work, since the locative meaning is generally recoverable we will be glossing it as a proper locative clitic.

In order to present the data as completely as possible we group them first according to the choice of matrix verb and then according to person, i.e. (i) for 1P singular, (ii) for 2P singular and so on. With motion verbs, the meaning is roughly that of an English infinitival embedding or of a pseudo-coordination. With 'stay/be' the meaning is that of a progressive be -ing form; with 'want', the construct is interpreted as an infinitival embedding. We will return to interpretive matters, and especially to internal morphosyntactic differences in the example sets, in Sections 2-3.

(6) *come* *Mesagne*

i. lu veɲɲ(u) a ffattsu
it_{cl} come-1s to do-1s
'I come to do it'

i. lu vinia a ffatʃia
it_{cl} $came_{IMP}$-1s to did_{IMP}-1s
'I was coming to do it'

ii. lu jeni a ffatʃi
it_{cl} come-2s to do-2s
'You came to do it'

iii. lu veni a ffatʃi
it_{cl} come-3s to do-3s
'He comes to do it'

v. lu viniti a ffatʃiti
it_{cl} come-2p to do-2p
'You come to do it'

vi. lu ˈvenunu a ffannu
it_{cl} come-3p to do-3p
'They come to do it'

(7) *stay* *Monteparano*

vi. ʃtɔn a kˈkɔntanu
stay-3p to tell-3p
'They are telling'

want

i. lu vɔʝʝ a vveku
it_{cl} want-1s to see-1s
'I want to see it'

(8) *want* *Brindisi*

i.	ti	vɔʝʝu	a vveʃu
	you$_{cl}$	want-1s	to see-1s
	'I want to see you'		
i.	nɔn tʃi	vɔʝʝu	a ddɔrmu
	not there	want -1s	to sleep-1s
	'I do not want to sleep'		
iii.	lu vɔl(i)	a mmandʒa	
	it$_{cl}$ want-3s	to eat-3s	
	'He/she wants to eat it'		
iii.	vɔli	a ssi	lu mandʒa
	want-3s to	himself$_{cl}$	it$_{cl}$ eat-3s
	'He/she wants to eat it'		

The phenomenon of finite *a* complements is found in varieties of Apulia other than Salentine ones, for instance those in (9)-(12). In these varieties finite *a* complements alternate with infinitival ones. Comparison data involving the infinitive are introduced between square brackets; thus [i] is a 1P singular form with an infinitival complement etc.

(9) *stay* *Conversano*

i.	u	stek	a ffattsə
	it$_{cl}$	stay-1s	to do-1s
	'I am doing it'		
ii.	u	ste	a ffeʃə
	it$_{cl}$	stay-2s	to do-2s
	'You are doing it'		
ii.	nonə u	ste	a ffeʃə
	not it$_{cl}$	stay-2s	to do-2s
	'You are not doing it'		
iii.	u	ste	a ffeʃə
	it$_{cl}$	stay-3s	to do-3s
	'He/she is doing it'		
[iv.]	u	stɛmə	a fɛ
	it$_{cl}$	stay-1p	to do$_{INF}$
	'We are doing it'		

[v.]	u	stɛtə	a fɛ
	it_{cl}	stay-2p	to do_{INF}
	'You are doing it'		
vi.	u	stan	a f'faʃənə
	it_{cl}	stay-3p	to do-3p
	'They are doing it'		
go			
i.	u	vek	a ffatsə
	it	go-1s	to do-1s
	'I am going to do it'		
ii.	u	ve	a ffeʃə
	it_{cl}	go-2s	to do-2s
	'You are going to do it'		
ii.	nonə u	ve	a ffeʃə
	not it_{cl}	go-2s	to do-2s
	'You are not going to do it'		
iii.	u	ve	a ffeʃə
	it_{cl}	go-3s	to do-3s
	'He/she is going to do it'		
[iv.]	u	ʃɛmə	a fɛ
	it_{cl}	go-1p	to do_{INF}
	'We are going to do it'		
[v.]	u	ʃətə	a fɛ
	it_{cl}	go-2p	to do_{INF}
	'You are going to do it'		
vi.	u	vann	a f'faʃənə
	it_{cl}	go-3p	to do-3p
	'They are going to do it'		

(10) *stay* *Putignano*

i.	u	stok	a ffattsə
	it_{cl}	stay-1s	to do-1s
	'I am going to do it'		
i.	non u	stok	a ffattsə
	not it_{cl}	stay-1s	to do-1s
	'I am not going to do it'		

vi. u ston a fˈfaʃənə
it_{cl} stay-3p to do-3p
'They are going to do it'

go

i. u vok a ffattsə
it_{cl} go-1s to do-1s
'I am going to do it'

i. u ʃev a ffa
it_{cl} $went_{IMP}$-1s to do-3s
'I was going to do it'

vi. u von a fˈfaʃənə
it_{cl} go-3p to do-3p
'They are going to make it'

come

i. veŋg a mmandʒə
come-1s to eat-1s
'I come to eat'

ii. vin a mmandʒə
come-2s to eat-2s
'You come to eat'

iii. viən a mmandʒə
come-3s to eat-3s
'He comes to eat'

[iv.] vənim a mmanˈdʒa
come-1p to eat_{INF}
'We are going to eat'

(11) *stay* *Martina Franca*

vi. u stɔnə (a) cˈcaməna
him_{cl} stay-3p to call-3p
'They are calling him'

go

vi. vənə (a) mˈmandʒənə
go-3p to eat-3p
'They are going to eat'

(12) *stay* *Taranto*

i.	stɔk	a bbeivə
	stay-1s	to drink-1s
	'I am drinking'	
vi.	stɔnn	a bˈbɛvənə
	stay-3p	to drink-3p
	'They are drinking'	

Possibly the most productive use of finite *a* complementation is found in Sicilian dialects, as in (13)-(16). In these varieties the finite *a* complements productively alternate with infinitival complements.

(13) *go* *Villadoro*

i.	vaju	a mmandʒu					
	go-1s	to eat-1s					
	'I go to eat'						
[iv./v.]	jamo/jete	a mmandʒare					
	go-1p/2p	to eat_{INF}					
	'We/you are going to eat'						
vi.	viən	a mˈmandʒanu	n	a	ma	kasa	
	come-3p	to eat-3p	in	the	my	house	
	'They come to eat at my house'						
[i.]	ɟɪv	a mmandʒarı					
	$went_{IMP}$-1s	to eat					
	'I was going to eat'						
come							
i.	viɲɲ	a mmaŋdʒu	n	a	tɔ	kasa	
	come-1s	to eat-1s	in	the	your	house	
	'I come to eat at your house'						
ii.	viəni	a mmandʒı					
	come-2s	to eat 2s					
	'You come to eat'						
iii.	vənı	a mmandʒa					
	come-3s	to eat 3s					
	'He/she comes to eat'						

	[iv./v.]	vɪnɪmʊ/	vɪnɪtɪ	a mmandʒarɪ
		come-1p/	come-2p	to eat$_{INF}$
		'We/you come to eat'		
	vi.	ˈvɪnɪnʊ	a mˈmandʒanʊ	
		come-3p	to eat-3p	
		'They come to eat'		

(14) *go* *Modica*

i.	vaju	a mmantʃu	
ii.	vai	a mmantʃi	
iii.	va	a mɪmantʃa	
iv.	jemu	a mmantʃamu	
v.	iti	a mmantʃati	
vi.	vanu	a mˈmantʃunu	
	go-1s	to eat-1s	etc.
	'I go to eat'		etc.
vi.	u vanu	a mˈmantʃunu	
	it$_{cl}$ go-3p	to eat-3p	
	'They go to eat it'		
[i.]	vaju	a mmantʃari	
	go-1s	to eat$_{INF}$	
	'I go to eat'		

went: imperfective

i.	u ia	a ffaʃia	
ii.	u ˈjeutu	a ffaˈʃieutu	
iii.	u ia	a ffaʃia	
iv.	u ˈjeumu	a ffaˈʃieumu	
v.	u ˈjeubbu	a ffaˈʃieubbu	
vi.	u ˈjeunu	a ffaˈʃieunu	
	it$_{cl}$ went$_{IMP}$-1s	to did$_{IMP}$-1s	etc.
	'I was doing it' etc.		
[ii.]	u ˈjeutu	a ffari	
	it$_{cl}$ went$_{IMP}$-2s	to do$_{INF}$	
	'You were doing it'		

[iv.] u ˈjeumu ffari
it$_{cl}$ went$_{IMP}$-1s to do$_{INF}$
'We were doing it'

went: perfective

i. u ji a ffiʃi
it$_{cl}$ went$_{PERF}$-1s to do$_{PERF}$-1s
'I went to do it'

vi. u jeru a fˈfiʃiru
it$_{cl}$ went$_{PERF}$-3p to do$_{PERF}$-3p
'They went to do it'

come

i. u vjeɲɲu a ffattsu
it$_{cl}$ come-1s to do-1s
'I come to do it'

ii. vjeni a ffai
come-2s to do-2s
'You come to do'

iii. u vɛni a ffa
it$_{cl}$ come-3s to do-3s
'He/she comes to do it'

(15) *go* *Calascibetta*

i. vaju (a) mmandʒʊ
go-1s to eat-1s

ii. va (a) mmandʒɪ
go-2s to eat-2s

vi. van a mˈmandʒanʊ
go-3p to eat-3p
'I/you/they go to eat'

[iv./v.] imu/iti a mmaɲdʒarɪ
go-1p/2p to eat$_{INF}$
'We/you go to eat'

[vi.] si nni van a mmaɲdʒarɪ
themselves$_{cl}$ partitive$_{cl}$ go-3p to eat$_{INF}$
'They go off to eat'

i.	u	vaj(u)	a ccamu	
	him$_{cl}$	go-1s	to call-1s	
	'I go to call him'			
i.	u	llu	vaj	a ccamu
	not	him$_{cl}$	go-1s	to call-1s
	'I do not go to call him'			
vi.	si		van	a k'kurkanʊ
	themselves$_{cl}$		go-3p	to lay down-3p
	'They go to lay down'			
[iv.]	n		im	a kkurkari
	ourselves$_{cl}$		go-1p	to lay down$_{INF}$
	'We go to lay down'			
[v.]	v		iti	a kkurkari
	yourselves$_{cl}$		go-2p	to lay down$_{INF}$
	'You go to lay down'			

come

i.	vɪɲɲu	(a) mmandʒʊ
	come-1s	(to) eat-1s
ii.	vin	a mmandʒɪ
	come-2s	to eat-2s
iii.	vɛn	a mmandʒa
	come-3s	to eat-3s
vi.	vinunu	a m'mandʒanʊ
	come-3p	to eat-3p
	'I/you/he/she/they come(s) to eat'	
[iv./v.]	vinimu/viniti	a mmandʒarɪ
	come1p/2p	to eat$_{INF}$
	'We/you were coming to eat'	
[i.]	viniv	a mmandʒarɪ kka
	came$_{IMP}$-1s	to eat here
	'I was coming to eat here'	

(16) *go* *Camporeale*

i.	vaju	a ffattsu	kistu
	go-1s	to do-1s	this
	'I go to do this'		

i.	lu	vaju	a ffattsu	
	it_{cl}	go-1s	to do-1s	
	'I go to do it'			
	mɪ	vaju	a llavu	
	$myself_{cl}$	go-1s	to wash	
	'I go to wash myself'			
ii.	va	a mmandʒi		
	go-2s	to eat-2s		
	'You go to eat'			
iii.	va	a mmandʒa		
	go-3s	to eat-3s		
	'He goes to eat'			
iii.	si	va	a llava	
	$himself_{cl}$	go-3s	to wash-3s	
	'He goes to wash himself'			
iii.	um va	a mmandʒa	ccu	
	not go-3s	to eat-3s	anymore	
	'He/she is not going to eat anymore'			
[iv.]	ni	ɛmu	a llavari	
	$ourselves_{cl}$	go-1p	$to\ wash_{INF}$	
	'We go to wash ourselves'			
[iv.-vi.]	ɛmu/	iti/	vannu	a mmandʒari
	go-1p/	2p/	3p	$to\ eat_{INF}$
	'We/you/they go to eat'			
[i.-vi.]	ia/iatu/ia/	iamu/iavu/ianu	a mmandʒari	
	go_{IMP}1s/2s/3s/	1p/2p/3p	$to\ eat_{INF}$	
	'I/you/he-she/we/you/they went to eat'			

In all of the languages exemplified so far, it is possible (to a variable extent) to embed a finite complement under the aspectual verbs *stare* 'stay', *venire* 'come', *andare* 'go' and under *volere* 'want' without any intervening connective. We begin as before by illustrating dialects of the Salento in (17)-(19) where we have attestations both for *ku* and for *a* finite control/raising complements. In principle therefore bare embedding could depend on either

ku or *a* deletion. One important piece of evidence that emerges from Salento varieties is that finite verb embedding is recursive, as can be seen from Mesagne's *sta va mandʒu* 'I am going to eat'.

(17) *stay* *Mesagne*

i-vi.	lu sta	ffattsu/	ffatʃi/	ffatʃi/	ffatʃimu/	ffatʃiti/	ffannu
	it_{cl} stay	do1s/	2s/	3s/	1p/	2p/	3p
	'I am doing it' etc.						
i-vi.	lu sta	ffatʃia/	ffatʃivi/	ffatʃia/	ffa'tʃiumu/	ffa'tʃiuvu/	ffa'tʃiunu
	it_{cl} stay	do_{IMP}1s/	2s/	3s/	1p/	2p/	3p
	'I was doing it' etc.						
i.	sta	vva	mmandʒu				
	stay	go	eat-1s				
	'I am going to eat'						
iii.	tʃe	sta	ffatʃi				
	what	stay	do-2s				
	'What are you doing?'						

go

i-iii/vi.	lu va	ffattsu/	ffatʃi/	ffatʃi/	ffannu
	it_{cl} go	do-1s/	2s/	3s/	3p
	'I go to do it' etc.				
iii.	nɔ llu va	ffatʃi			
	not it_{cl} go	do-3s			
	'He doesn't go to do it'				
iv./v.	lu sa/ʃa	fatʃimu/	fatʃiti		
	it_{cl} go	do-1p/	2p		
	'I go to do it' etc.				
i-vi.	lu sa/ʃa	fatʃia/	fatʃivi/	fatʃia/	fa'tʃiumu/	fa'tʃiuvu/	fa'tʃiunu
	it_{cl} go	do_{IMP}-1s/	2s/	3s/	1p/	2p/	3p
	'I was going to do it'						

want

i.	vɔʝʝʊ	mmandʒu/	lu	veʃu
	want-1s	eat-1s/	him_{cl}	see-1s
	'I want to eat/see him'			

ii. we mmandʒi
want-2s eat-2s
'You want to eat'

iii. vɔli mmandʒa
want-3s eat-3s
'He/she wants to eat'

iv. vulimu lu vitimu
want-1p it$_{cl}$ see-1p
'We want to see it'

vi. ˈvɔlunu mi ˈveʃunu
want-3p me$_{cl}$ see-3p
'They want to see me'

(18) *stay* *Monteparano*

i. ʃtɔ kkɔntu
stay-1s tell-1s
'I am telling'

i. lu ʃtɔ ccamu
him$_{cl}$ stay-1s call-1s
'I am calling him'

i. nɔn-tʃi lu ʃtɔ ccamu
not there$_{cl}$ him$_{cl}$ stay-1s call-1s
'I am not calling him'

ii.-v. ʃtɛ kkwɛnti/ kkɔnta/ kkuntamu/ kkuntatı
stay tell-2s/ 3s/ 1p/ 2p
'You are/he-she is/we are/you are telling'

i./iv./vi. lu ʃtɛ ccamava/ ccamammu/ ccaˈmavunu
him stay call$_{IMP}$-1s/ 1p/ 3p
'I was/we-they were calling him'

(19) *stay* *Brindisi*

i. iu ʃta ddɛrmu
I stay sleep-1s
'I am sleeping'

i.	ti	lu	ʃta	ddau	
	you$_{cl}$	it$_{cl}$	stay-1s	give-1s	
	'I am giving it to you'				
iii.	ʃta	ddɛrmi			
	stay	sleep-3s			
	'He/she is sleeping'				
iii.	nɔn ʧi		ʃta	ddɛrmi	
	not there$_{cl}$		stay	sleep-3s	
	'He/she is not sleeping'				
iii.	nɔn ʧi	ʃta	mmandʒa	pi	nnjɛnti
	not there$_{cl}$	stay	eat-3s	more	nothing
	'He/she is not eating anything more'				

With several Salento varieties, at least in our data, we do not have examples of *a* finite complements – but only of bare finite complements with the relevant set of verbs, for instance in (20)-(22). Again notice the recursion of the phenomenon in Copertino's examples *sta bba mandʒa* 'he is going to eat'.

(20) *stay* *Torre S. Susanna*

i.	mi	sta	skarfu/	skarfavu
	myself$_{cl}$	stay-3s	warm up-1s/	warm up$_{IMP}$-1s
	'I am/was warming myself up'			
ii.	ti	sta	skarfi/	skarfavi
	yourself$_{cl}$	stay-3s	warm up-2s/	warm up$_{IMP}$-2s
	'You are/were warming yourself up'			
iii.	si	sta	skarfa/	skarfava
	himself$_{cl}$	stay-3s	warm up-3s/	warm up$_{IMP}$-3s
	'He is/ was warming himself up'			
iv.	ndi	sta	skarfamu/	skarfammu
	ourselves$_{cl}$	stay	warm up-1p/	warm up$_{IMP}$-1p
	'We are/were warming ourselves up'			
v.	vi	sta	skarfati/	skar'fauvu
	yourselves$_{cl}$	stay	warm up-2p/	warm up$_{IMP}$-2p
	'You are/were warming yourselves up'			

vi. si sta 'skarfanu/ skar'favunu
themselves$_{cl}$ stay warm up-3p/ warm up$_{IMP}$-3p
'They are/were warming themselves up'

i. mi nni sta skappu
me$_{cl}$ partitive$_{cl}$ stay-3s escape-1s
'I am escaping from there'

i. nɔ llu sta ffattsu
not it$_{cl}$ sta do-1s
'I am not doing it'

ii. tʃɛ sta llavi
what stay wash-2s
'What are you washing?'

iii. sta lu sta ffatʃia
stay-3s it$_{cl}$ stay-3s do$_{IMP}$-3s
'He was doing it'

v. vui sta rri'tiuvu
you stay-3s laugh-2p
'You were laughing'

want

i. vɔʝʝu fattsu/ veɲɲu
want-1s do-1s/ come-1s
'I want to do/come'

nɔl lu vɔʝʝu fattsu ccui
not it$_{cl}$ want-1s do-1s anymore
'I do not want to do it anymore'

iii. nɔm vɔli tʃi tɔrmi
not want-3s there sleep-3s
'He/she does not want to sleep'

iii. vulia vinia
want$_{IMP}$-3s come$_{IMP}$-3s
'He/she wanted to come'

iv. vulimu ddurmimu
'want-1p sleep-1p
'We want to sleep'

(21) *go* *Carmiano*

i.	au	llu	iʃu	
	go-1s	him_{cl}	see-1s	
	'I go to see him'			
want				
i.	ɔjju	bbɛɲɲu		
	want-1s	come-1s		
	'I want to come'			
i.	ɔjju	tɛ	lu tiku	
	want-1s	you_{cl} it_{cl}	tell-1s	
	'I want to tell it to you'			
i.	ulia	lu	fattsu/tɛ	lu tau
	$want_{IMP}$-1s	it_{cl}	do-1s/you_{cl}	it_{cl} give-1s
	'I wanted to do it/to give it to you'			
iv.	uˈliamu	llu fatʃimu		
	$want_{IMP}$-1p	it_{cl} do-1p		
	'We wanted to do it'			
vi.	ˈɔlɛnu	bˈbɛnɛnu		
	want-3p	come-3p		
	'They want to come'			
vi.	lu ˈɔlɛnɛ	bˈbitɛnɛ		
	it_{cl} want-3p	see-3p		
	'They want to see it'			
vi.	uˈlianu	lu	ˈfatʃɛnu	
	'want$_{IMP}$-3p	it_{cl}	do-3p	
	'They wanted to do it'			

(22) *stay* *Copertino*

i.	sta	bbɛɲɲu
ii.	sta	bbjɛni
iii.	sta	bbɛnɛ
iv.	sta	bbinimu
v.	sta	bbiniti
vi.	sta	bˈbɛninu
	stay	come-1s,2s,3s,1p,2p,3p
	'I am coming' etc.	

i.	ti	sta	rispɔnnu	
	you_{cl}	stay	answer-1s	
	'I am answering you'			
i.	ti	sta	rispunnia	
	you_{cl}	stay	$answer_{IMP}$-1s	
	'I was answering you'			
iii.	iḍḍu	sta	bbɛssɛ	
	he	stay	go out-3s	
	'He is going out'			
iii.	mi	sta	bbɛtɛ	
	me_{cl}	stay	watch-3s	
	'He/she is watching me'			
iii.	si	nni	sta	bbaɛ
	$reflexive_{cl}$	$partitive_{cl}$	stay	go-3s
	'He/she is going away'			
iii.	sta	bbaɛ	mmandʒa	
	stay	go-3s	eat-3s	
	'He is going to eat'			

(23) *stay* *Nociglia*

i.	sta	tte	viʃu
	stay	you_{cl}	see-1s
	'I am watching you'		
i.	sta	tʃ i	veɲɲu
	stay	$there_{cl}$	come-1s
	'I am coming there'		
ii.	sta	tʃi	vei
	stay	$here_{cl}$	come-2s
	'You are coming here'		
ii.	tʃe	ʃta	ffatʃi?
	what	stay	do-2s?
	'What are you doing?'		

iii. iɖɖu nɔ sta ffatʃe njentsi
he not stay do-3s nothing
'He is not doing anything'

iii. sta tʃi cɔve /tʃi skarfa l akkwa /sse llava /mmantʃava
stay there$_{cl}$ rain-3s /there$_{cl}$ heat-3s water /reflex$_{cl}$wash-3s / eat$_{IMP}$-3s
'It is raining/the water is heating up/he is washing himself/he was eating'

vi. ʃta mman'tʃavane
stay eat$_{IMP}$-3p
'They were eating'

go

i. va(u) ddɔrmu /me kurku /llu camu
go-1s sleep-1s me$_{cl}$ lay down-1s him$_{cl}$ call-1s
'I go to sleep/I go to lay down/I go to call him'

ii. vai llu cami
go-2s him call-2s
'You go to call him'

iii. vajɛ llu cama
go-3s him call-3s
'He/she goes to call him'

iv. ʃamu llu camamu
go-1p him call-1p
'We go to call him'

v. ʃati llu ca'mati
go-2p him call-2p
'You go to call him'

vi. vannu llu 'camanɛ
go-3p him call-3p
'They go to call him'

vi. tʃi vannu c'camanɛ?
who go-3p call-3p
'Who are they going to call?'

vi.	nu	vvannu	llu	ˈcamanɛ
	not	go-3p	him_{cl}	call-3p
	'They are not going to call him'			
come				
iii.	vɛnɛ	llu	viðɛ	
	come-3s	him_{cl}	see-3s	
	'He/she comes to see him'			
iii.	tʃɛ	vvɛnɛ	vviðɛ?	
	who	come-3s	see-3s	
	'Who does he/she come to see?'			

Finally, since dialects of Apulia which have *a* finite embedding, but otherwise present infinitival control/raising complements, also display bare embedding of the finite verb, as in (24)-(26), it would appear that the bare embedding pattern depends on the *a* embedding pattern – or is a variant of it.

(24) *stay* *Putignano*

ii.-iii.	u	ste	ffaʃə/ffaʃə				
	it_{cl}	stay-2/3s	do-2s/3s				
	'You are/he is doing it'						
iv./v.	u	sta	ffaʃeimə/ffaʃeitə				
	it_{cl}	stay	do-1p/ 2p				
	'We/you are doing it'						
i.-vi.	u	sta	ffaʃevə/ffaʃivə/ffaʃevə/ffaʃemmə/ffaˈʃivəvə/ffaˈʃevənə				
	'it$_{cl}$	stay	do$_{IMP}$ -1s/2s/ 3s/	1p/	2p/	3p/	
	'I was doing it' etc.						
go							
ii.	u	vɛ	ffaʃə				
	it_{cl}	go-2s	do-2s				
	'You go to do it'						
iv./v.	u	ʃe	faʃeimə/	faʃeitə			
	it_{cl}	go	do-1p/	2p			
	'We/you go to do it'						

i.	u	ʃe	ffaʃevə					
	it$_{cl}$	go	do$_{IMP}$-1s					
	‘I went to do it’							
ii.-vi.	u	ʃɛ	ffaʃivə/	ffaʃevə/	ffaʃemmə/	ffa'ʃivəvə/	ffa'ʃevənə	
	it$_{cl}$	go	do$_{IMP}$-2s/	3s/	1p/	2p/	3p	
	‘You went to do it’ etc.							
i./v./vi.	u	ʃɛ	faʃibbə/	fa'ʃistəvə/	f'feʃərə			
	it$_{cl}$	go	do$_{PERF}$-1s/	2p/	3p			
	‘I went to do it’ etc.							

(25) *stay* *Martina Franca*

i.	u	stɔ	ccɛ:mə					
	him$_{cl}$	stay-1s	call-1s					
	‘I am calling him’							
i.	nəɲ	tʃ	u	stɔ	ccɛ:mə			
	not	here$_{cl}$	him$_{cl}$	stay-1s	call-1s			
	‘I am not calling him here’							
ii.-v.	u	stɛ	ccə:mə/	ccɛ:mə/	ccamɛ:mə/	ccamɛ:tə		
	him$_{cl}$	stay	call-2s/	3s/	1p/	2p		
	‘You are calling him’ etc.							
i.-vi.	u	stɛ	camɛ:və/	camə:və/	camɛ:və/	camammə/	camavvə/	ca'mavənə
	him$_{cl}$	stay	call$_{IMP}$-1s/	2s/	3s/	1p/	2p/	3p
	‘I was calling him’ etc.							

go

i.	vɔ		mandʒə					
	go-1s		eat-1s					
	‘I go to eat’							
i.	u	vɔ	ccɛ:mə					
	him$_{cl}$	go-1s	call-1s					
	‘I go to call him’							
i.	na-	ntʃ	u	vɔ	ccɛ:mə			
	not	there$_{cl}$	him$_{cl}$	go-1s	call-1s			
	‘I am not going to call him’							

ii./iii.	vɛ	mmandʒə					
	go-2s/3s	eat-2s/3s					
	'You go/he-she goes to eat'						
iv./v.	ʃə	mandʒɛmə/	mandʒɛtə				
	go/3s	eat-1p/	2p				
	'We/you go to eat'						
i.-vi.	ʃə	mmandʒ- ɛ:və/-	ø:və/	-ɛ:və/	-ammə/	øtə/-avənə	
	go/3s	eat_{IMP}-1p/	2p/	3/	1p/	2p/ 3p	
	'I was going to eat' etc.						

(26) *stay* *Taranto*

ii.-v.	stɛ	bbi:və/	bbeivə/	bbəvi:mə/	bbəvi:tə	
	stay	drink-2s/	3s/	1p/	2p	
	'You are drinking' etc.					
i.-vi.	stɛ	bbəveivə/	bbəvi:və/	bbəveivə/	bbəvɛmmə/	bbəvi:və/ bbə'vɛvənə
	stay	$drink_{IMP}$-1s/	2s/	3s/	1p/	2p/ 3p
	'You were drinking' etc.					

While in Apulian dialects it is relatively more frequent to find bare embedding than *a* finite embedding, the reverse is true in Sicilian varieties. Nevertheless, bare embedding is attested, as exemplified in (27).

(27) *go* *Calascibetta*

ii.	tɪ	va	kʊrkɪ
	$yourself_{cl}$	go-2s	lay down -2s
	'You go to lay down'		
ii.	va	kkʊrka	tɪ
	$go\text{-}2s_{Imper}$	$lie.down\text{-}2s_{Imper}$	$yourself_{cl}$
	'Go lay down!'		
iii.	sɪ	va	kkʊrka
	$him/herself_{cl}$	go-3s	lie.down-3s
	'He/she goes to lay down'		

Summarizing so far, we have established that in dialects of the extreme Italian South, there are at least three different types of finite control/raising complements. One type, exemplified here with *ku* embedding in Salentine varieties in (1)-(5), covers all obligatory control and raising environments as

well non-obligatory control contexts and subjunctive contexts in general. This corresponds to the well-established Balkan (Albanian, Romanian, Greek) pattern on which here we will not dwell further. The second and third type of embedding target a very narrow class of matrix verbs, essentially 'stay', 'come', 'go', and 'want'. In this second instance, Apulian and Sicilian varieties present either embedding of a finite verb under *a* or bare finite verb embedding. This construction is not related to Balkan-type finite embedding; indeed in non-Salentine varieties it alternates with infinitival complementation.

In order to facilitate the discussion we tabulate the data in Table 1; this can be compared with Table 1 of Di Caro and Giusti (2015: 401),[2] except that it includes one extra column, namely V-V_{fin}. Dialects are listed in rough geographical order, from Northern Apulia, to Salento[3] and Sicily. We notate only positively attested data, in keeping with the general criteria that informed our data collection. Umbriatico (Calabria) is exemplified in the text below.

Table 1. *ku*, *a* and bare complements

	ku-V_{fin}	*a*-V_{fin}	V-V_{fin}	*a*-V_{inf}
Conversano		+		+
Putignano		+	+	+
Martina Franca		+	+	
Taranto		+	+	
Brindisi		+	+	
Mesagne	+	+	+	
Monteparano	+	+	+	
Torre S. Susanna	+		+	
Carmiano	+		+	
Copertino	+		+	
Nociglia	+		+	
Umbriatico			+	+
Villadoro		+		+
Modica		+		+
Calascibetta		+	+	+
Camporeale		+		+

[2] In their terms, *a*-V_{fin} is the Inflected Construction (IC), while *ku*-V_{fin} is the finite construction.

[3] Manzini and Savoia (2005) exemplify three additional Salento varieties: Maglie, Alliste, Melissano.

1.1 *Microvariation patterns*

In the interest of presenting the fundamental data as completely and as rapidly as possible, so far we have omitted discussing the considerable microvariation in *a* and bare finite embeddings. First of all, the range of predicates admitting the relevant complements varies. In Sicilian dialects it is mostly restricted to motion verbs ('come', 'go'); in Apulian dialects it is wider, encompassing 'stay' and, at least in Salento, varieties 'want'.

By definition, the embedded verb is finite and bears fully specified agreement inflections. The interesting parameters therefore concern the matrix verb. First of all, the matrix verb can be fully inflected. This pattern is attested with *a* embedding, as in Modica in (14), but also with bare embedding, as can be seen in (28) with the Calabrian variety of Umbriatico; this is a variety where bare embedding alternates with infinitival complementation. Other fully inflected paradigms include 'go' in Nociglia in (23).

(28) *go* *Umbriatico*

i.	u	vəju	cəmu
ii.	u	vəji	cəmɪ
iii.	u	va	ccəmæ
iv.	u	jəmu	camə:mu
v.	u	jəti	caməti
vi.	u	vənu	ˈcamanu
	it	go	call-1s,2s,3s,1p,2p,3p
	'I go to/and call him' etc.		
[i.]	vəju	a mmantʃə:rɪ	
	go-1s	to eat	
come			
i.	u	viəɲɲu	viju
	him_{cl}	come-1s	see-1s
	'I come to see him'		
vi.	mi	ˈvɛnanu	ˈviðanu
	me_{cl}	come-3p	see-3p
	'They come to see me'		

At the opposite end of the scale, the matrix verb may be completely invariant; examples of this are provided by Salentine varieties and Apulian varieties in general. For instance, to take just one of many examples, in Me-

sagne's (17) the form *sta* of 'stay/be' is entirely invariant for person and tense. It consists of the lexical base *st-* followed by the so-called thematic vowel *-a*; in this sense it may be construed as a bare stem, though it also coincides with the 3P singular of the present indicative. Though examples of this type are missing from our *corpus*, Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001), Giusti and Di Caro (2015) document the possibility of matrix invariant forms with *a* finite embeddings (Marsala, Sicily).

More often, the matrix verb displays some inflected forms, but a more limited set than would be found in other contexts. The forms are reduced in two respects. First, there are fewer forms. Second, the forms that remain, though recognizably related to the full forms, are morphologically simplified with respect to them (often monosyllabic etc.). For instance aspectual 'stay' in the Putignano variety in (24) presents the form *ste* in the 2/3P singular, the form *sta* in the 1/2P plural and specialized forms only for the 1P singular and the 3P plural, namely *stok and ston*, as in (10). The comparison with 'stay' of location in (29a) shows that these latter two forms are shared with it. As discussed above, we may take *sta* to be the bare stem; *ste* may be analyzed as sensitive to person (2/3P singular) or perhaps just to singular number. In the past imperfective, 'stay' of location has a full set of inflections, as in (29b), while aspectual 'stay' in (24) takes the invariable *sta* form.

(29) a. stɔkə/ stiə/stiə/stamə/statə/stɔnə dda *Putignano*
stay-1s/2s/ 3s/ 1p/ 2p/ 3p there
'I stay there' etc.

b. stavə/stivə/stavə/stammə/ˈstivəvə/ˈstavənə dda
stay_{IMP}-1s/2s/3s/1p/ 2p/ 3p there
'I stayed there' etc.

Similar considerations hold for the variety of Martina Franca, of which we exemplify the paradigms for location 'stay' and motion 'go' in (30). In this variety, fully inflected forms of aspectual 'stay' and 'go' are found in the 3P plural of the present in (11) as well as in the 1P singular in (25); these are the same as for the lexical verbs in (30). Otherwise, aspectual 'stay' turns up as *stɛ* in all persons and tenses, as in (25). As for aspectual 'go', in the present it alternates between *vɛ* in the singular and ʃə in the 1/2P plural. The latter is a suppletive lexical base, which also turns up in (25) with embedded past verbs, in accordance with Romance suppletion patterns.[4]

[4] 'go' is suppletive in Romance as it is in English. Apart from present/past suppletion, Romance also has stem alternations between 1/2P plural and the other persons in the present indicative.

(30) a. stɔukə/stɛ/stɛ/stɛmə/stɛtə/stɔnə ddɔ *Martina Franca*
stay-1s/2s/3s/ 1p/ 2p/ 3p there
'I stay there' etc.

b. vɔukə/vɛ/vɛ/ʃɛmə/sɛtə/vənə ddɔ
go-1s/ 2s/3s/1p/ 2p/ 3p there
'I go there' etc.

Finite verbs are ordinarily tensed as well. Specifically, what we are interested in is whether the matrix and/or the embedded verb are inflected for the past tense. At least one of the two verbs needs to be inflected for tense. At one end of the variation spectrum we find varieties where both verbs bear past tense, in particular in the variety of Modica in (14). As for bare embeddings, we have only one example of a bare embedded verb agreeing with the matrix verb in past specifications, from Torre S. Susanna (*vulia vinia* 'he.wanted he.came') in (20). Otherwise one may expect that exactly as the embedded verb ordinarily carries the agreement inflection, it also carries Tense specifications. This is indeed what we observe in most varieties. Nevertheless, there is a single example of the matrix verb bearing past specifications to the exclusion of the embedded verb namely Carmiano in (21); again the matrix verb 'want' is involved. The overall situation with both agreement and tense in *a*/bare finite embedding contexts is laid out in Table 2 (partially comparable to Table 2 of Di Caro and Giusti 2015: 402).

Table 2. Inflected and non-inflected matrix and embedded verbs

	V_I V_I	$V_{(I)}$ V_I	V V_I	V_{Pas} V_{Pas}	V_{Pas} V	V V_{Pas}
Conversano	+					
Putignano		+	+			+
Martina Franca		+	+			+
Taranto		+	+			+
Brindisi			+			
Mesagne	+	+	+			+
Monteparano		+				+
Torre S. Susanna	+		+	+		+
Carmiano	+				+	
Copertino			+			+
Nociglia			+			+
Umbriatico	+					
Villadoro	+					
Modica	+			+		
Calascibetta	+					
Camporeale	+					

The other type of parameter to which the literature has paid full attention has to do with the positioning of free morphemes of the inflectional field, such as object clitics or the negation. In all of the varieties considered, whether with *a* or bare embedding, the negation is only attested on the matrix verb. Let us then consider object clitics. With *a* embedding, they tend to be on the matrix verb. But there is at least one example in the corpus, from Brindisi in (8), where the clitic group is on the embedded verb, namely *vɔli a ssi lu maɲdʒa* 'he wants A himself it he eats'. With bare embedding we find many attestations of cliticization on the matrix verb, but also consistent attestations for embedded clitics at least in the Salento varieties. The overall situation is summarized in Table 3 for both *a* embedding and bare embedding. While it is often the case that patterns of variation cross traditional dialectological boundaries, it must be noted that in Table 3, all varieties that allow the clitic to be associated with the embedded verb are Salentine, i.e. characterized by the possibility of the *ku* complementation pattern.

Table 3. Position of pronominal clitics

	Cl-V-a-V	V-a-Cl-V	Cl-V-V	V-Cl-V
Conversano	+			
Putignano	+			
Martina Franca	+			
Taranto				
Brindisi	+	+	+	
Mesagne	+		+	+
Monteparano	+		+	
Torre S. Susanna			+	+
Carmiano			+	+
Copertino			+	
Nociglia				+
Umbriatico			+	
Villadoro			+	
Modica	+			
Calascibetta	+		+	
Camporeale	+			

A final parameter has to do with paradigms alternating between *a* and bare embedding or between *a* finite and infinitival embedding according to person. Several of these alternations are documented in the present corpus, but they all conform to a restricted number of patterns. In the data from Conversano in (9), from Villadoro in (13) and Modica in (14), 1/2P plural embed an infinitive, while

the other persons present *a* finite embedding. A slightly different pattern emerges in Camporeale in (16) where *a* finite embedding in the singular contrasts with infinitival embedding in the plural. In Apulian varieties, we find paradigms where it is just the 1P singular and/or the 3P (generally plural) that has *a* finite complements – alternating in this instance with bare embedding. In Table 4 we lay out just a binary parameter between absence or presence of person splits.

Table 4. Person split vs full person paradigms

	split V-a-V_{fin}	full V-a-V_{fin}
Conversano	+	
Putignano	+	
Martina Franca	+	
Taranto	+	
Brindisi	+	
Mesagne		+
Monteparano		
Villadoro	+	
Modica		+
Calascibetta	+	
Camporeale	+	

Given the discussion of the person splits in Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001, 2003), Cruschina (2013), it is important to stress that there is no necessary correlation between splits in complementation pattern and the suppletion pattern whereby 1/2P plural forms of certain verbs, including 'go', are formed from a different root than the other persons (cf. fn. 3). Di Caro and Giusti (2015: 412) are aware of this, though they incorrectly construe the data of Camporeale in (16), which in reality shows a split between singular vs plural. If the splits between *a* and bare embedding is brought into the picture then the possible patterns increase. In particular, in the varieties of Monteparano in (7), Martina Franca in (11), Brindisi in (8), Putignano in (10) and Taranto in (12), *a* finite embeddings are only attested at the 1P singular and/or 3P (singular or plural).

Finally, we noted that certain parameters values tend to cluster together, specifically as concerns varieties of the Salento, such as the possibility of a downstairs clitic (Table 3) or of an upstairs Tense inflection (Table 2). These values would seem to correlate with the possibility of *ku* complementation. However, the variation crosses traditional dialectological boundaries: even if certain parametric values tend to be stronger in certain groups of languages than in others, it is generally possible to find them attested (more sparsely) elsewhere as well.

2. *Syntactic analysis*

Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001, 2003) argue that in Sicilian dialects the type of constructions we are considering are monoclausal and the superordinate verb is therefore a functional head, despite the presence of two fully inflected verbs and of the *a* introducer. More moderate positions, such as the one expressed by Ledgeway (2016), concur on the conclusion that monoclausal structure is the last stage in a grammaticalization process affecting these structures, though the initial stage is biclausal. By contrast, Manzini and Savoia (2005) hold that an ordinary biclausal structure is involved throughout and in particular that *a* is the ordinary locative/dative preposition/complementizer of Romance. Manzini and Savoia (2005) already sketch some answers to proponents of monoclausal structures. In adopting their proposal, we will proceed here to a more systematic discussion of the theoretical and empirical points it raises.

2.1 *Basic structure*

The generative literature appears to be compact behind Chomsky (1981ff.) in assuming that infinitival control complements are sentences with a full CP layer and an empty subject (conventionally PRO). Consider Italian (31a). Following Kayne (1991), enclisis on the infinitive implies that it has moved to the C position. According to Manzini and Savoia (2005, forthcoming), the *a* element projects a PP. The embedded subject is either an anaphoric empty category PRO or a variable x created by lambda-abstraction (Manzini and Savoia 2007; Landau 2015) – in either instance the result is control, by anaphoric binding or by predication.

(31) a. Vado a vederlo
go-1s to see-it
b. … [$_{PP}$ a [$_{CP}$veder [$_{IP}$ PRO/x [$_{IP}$ lo

Even more straightforwardly, a sentential structure is adopted in the literature for embedded finite complements (whether controlled or not) embedded under so-called subjunctive particles, including Salentine *ku*. We reproduce an example from Nociglia in (32a), cf. (3); the relevant structure is in (32b); the empty category subject would conventionally be a *pro*, because of the finite agreement – as it undergoes obligatory control it displays the same variable properties as the conventional PRO in (31).

(32) a. vɛnɛ ku llu viðɛ *Nociglia*
come-3s that him see-3s
b. … [$_{CP}$ ku [$_{IP}$*pro*/x [$_{IP}$ llu [$_{I}$ viðɛ

Based on the obvious continuity (morpheme by morpheme) between (31)-(32) and *a* finite embeddings, Manzini and Savoia (2005) simply propose that *a* finite embeddings have a biclausal structure, namely (33c) for example (33a) from Calascibetta, cf. (15). To be more precise Manzini and Savoia (2005), consider a N (nominalization) layer to be present, which we avoid here.

(33) a. vaju a mmandʒu *Calascibetta*
go-1s to eat-1s

b. … [$_{\text{LocP}}$ a [$_{\text{N}}$ [$_{\text{I}}$ mmandʒu

c. … [$_{\text{PP}}$ a [$_{\text{IP}}$*pro*/x [$_{\text{I}}$ mmandʒu

(Manzini and Savoia 2005)

Issues pertaining to the status of the *a* introducer make the structures in (31) and (33) rather less straightforward than we have so far aknowledged. First, even though it is generally agreed that *a* in (31) is at least etymologically related to locative/dative *a* 'to/at', Rizzi (1997) adopts a C categorization for this and similar elements. The question then arises whether *a* should be categorized as P in (31) and by extension in (33). In this connection, we briefly point to current literature calling into question the category Complementizer. Specifically, Manzini and Savoia (2005, 2011), Arsenjievic (2009), Kayne (2010) argue that finite complementizers of the *k-* series in Romance (Italian *che*, French *que* etc.) ought to be treated as wh-operators, taking at face value their lexical coincidence with question and relative wh-operators. The idea developed by this literature is that so-called complementizers turn a propositional content into a relative clause headed by a silent N (Kayne 2010) or into a free relative (Manzini and Savoia 2011). The underlying assumption is that it is impossible to embed propositional content except by nominalizing it, essentially as proposed by Rosenbaum (1967).

Manzini and Savoia (forthcoming) further propose that the nominalization strategy is itself a response to the fact that propositions lack the phi-features content that allows DPs to Agree with *v* and I, therefore receiving case in Chomsky's (2001) terms. This 'Agree resistance' property, as they call it, can lead to various solutions. One of them is the obliquization observed in the Romance embedding of infinitival sentences under prepositions, mainly *a* and *di/de*. This raises the immediate question why this strategy should normally be restricted to infinitives in Romance, as in Italian (31), and why it would be extended to finite verbs precisely in structures like (33).

First, the impression one gets from standard Romance languages that prepositional introducers are restricted to non-finite sentences is incorrect. A case in point is Early Romanian, as illustrated by Hill (2013), where the *de* preposition could also precede finite complements, as in (34a). As noted by

Hill (2013) in Early Romanian *de* "heads possessives, complements of origin, 'by' phrases, complements of location", establishing its *bona fide* P categorization (cf. Dobrovie-Sorin *et al*. 2013 on standard Romanian). Sardinian varieties (Jones 1993) provide an interesting example of complement sentences which can equally be introduced by a *k*- complementizer or by a preposition, namely so-called inflected infinitives, as illustrated in (34b).

(34) a. au poruncitŭ de au făcut un sicreiu *Early Romanian*
has ordered of have-3p made a coffin
'He has ordered them to make a coffin'

b. l an fattu innantis dɛ/ki ˈɛnnɛrɛ-ɛɛ *Dorgali* (Sardinia)
it have-3p done before of/that come-2sg
'They did it be fore you came'

(Hill 2013)

Comparison between the Sardinian inflected infinitive and the Apulian/Sicilian *a* finite embedding is particularly telling. What seems to matter in these languages for the presence of an oblique introducer is the absence of independent tenses in the matrix and embedded clause. This is so by definition with inflected infinitives. As for *a* embeddings, matrix and embedded verb agree in tense necessarily, whether it is repeated on both verbs or it is lexicalized on just one of them (normally the embedded verb). In short, infinitival embeddings such as (31) and *a* finite embeddings like (33) share the property of lacking independent tense specifications – in other words, either the embedded sentence is tenseless (as normally assumed for infinitives) or it agrees in tense with the matrix sentences. Therefore the distribution of *a*, and in general of prepositional introducers, can be suitably restricted in terms of this property.

Therefore it seems to us that adopting the biclausal structure in (33) allows a relatively straightforward account of the *a* introducer, as identical with the ordinary *a* Romance subordinator. The monoclausal view lacks a cogent proposal in this respect, especially one capable of establishing a connection between the occurrences of *a* under discussion and other occurrences of what appears to be the same lexical item. In fact, Ledgeway (2016) adopts a biclausal structure for *a* finite embedding though he embraces the monoclausal structure for bare finite embedding. Cruschina (2013) suggests that *a* is a linker and as such meaningless; this is also what Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001) seem to have in mind when they refer to *a* as a connector. However *a* in this context appears to have no relation to linkers introducing modifiers – and it is far from clear that the latter are deprived of any interpretive content (Franco *et al.* 2015 and references quoted there).

Let us then consider bare embeddings. In present terms the simplest analysis is that the bare embedding structure is simply obtained from (33) by elimination of the PP layer. This is essentially what Manzini and Savoia (2005) propose, as illustrated in (35b) for example (35a) of Martina Franca, cf. (25).

(35) a. vɔ mandʒə
I.go I.eat
b. [$_{IP}$ vɔ [$_{VP}$ ~~vɔ~~ [$_{IP}$ *pro*/x [$_{I}$ mmandʒə

In short, it is easy to show that structures can be assigned to *a* and bare finite embeddings on the basis of the routine assumption that each inflected verb heads its own sentence. Vice versa there are technical difficulties in trying to force a monoclausal view. Evidently, in the absence of an *a* element to place in the cartographic architecture of functional positions, it becomes easier to claim that bare embedding structures are monoclausal. Nevertheless the issue remains that both matrix and embedded verbs are inflected.

2.2 *Clitic positions*

Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001, 2003) lay considerable emphasis on the fact that clitic climbing is obligatory in *a* finite embeddings. Cardinaletti and Giusti's argument is that the positioning of the clitic on the superordinate verb is predicted if a monoclausal structure is adopted. By contrast, biclausal structures may allow clitic climbing, but do not force it, witness the fact that Italian allows both the embedded position of the clitic in (31) and clitic climbing in (36).

(36) Lo vado a vedere
him go-1s to see
'I go to see him'

In order to evaluate this argument, we need to take a detour into auxiliary-perfect participle structures, routinely construed as mono-clausal. Indeed in most Romance languages the clitic cannot be associated with the participle and must climb to the auxiliary, despite the fact that cliticization is actually allowed in absolute participles, for instance in Italian (37).

(37) a. (Lo) ho lavato(*lo)
it have-1s washed
'I washed it'

b. Lavatolo, andai via
washed-it, went-1s away
'Having washed it, I left'

Now, Manzini and Savoia (2005: §5.1.3) show that in several Piedmontese varieties, clitics appear on the participle embedded under the 'be/have' auxiliary, as in (38); they otherwise show up on the finite verb, as in (39).

(38) ai ø vist-le/ -ɾa/ -ie *Cortemilia* (Piedmont)
I have seen-him/ her/ them
'I have seen him/her/them'

(39) i l/ɾa/i vugu
I him/her/them see
'I see him/her/them'

Manzini and Savoia (2005, 2011) take the data in (38)-(39) to show that Kayne (1993) is correct in proposing a bi-clausal syntax for the present perfect of Romance. If so, the embedded position of the clitic depends simply on the fact that clitic climbing from the embedded participial clause does not take place. If one keeps assuming that auxiliary-perfect participle structures are monoclausal, then (38)-(39) means that Cardinaletti and Giusti's inference from monoclausal structure to obligatory clitic climbing is not licenced. Monoclausal structures make clitic climbing possible, not necessary; therefore if it is necessary, it is because of some parameter.

There are then other less expensive accounts of what makes clitic climbing possible and obligatory. Let us detail an alternative proposal. Lack of clitic climbing depends on the presence of an intervening CP phase, as in (32). In the absence of a CP phase, both clitic climbing and embedded cliticization are in principle possible. In some languages, the possibility of clitic climbing actually triggers its obligatoriness. This yields the obligatory clitic climbing of varieties like Calascibetta in (15), (27) both with a finite embedding, as in (40) and with bare finite embedding, as in (41).

(40) a. u vaju a ccamu *Calascibetta*
him go-1s to I.call-1s
b. [$_{IP}$ u [$_{IP}$ vaju [$_{VP}$vaju [$_{PP}$ a [$_{IP}$ pro/x [$_{I}$ ccamu

(41) a. tɪ va kʊrkɪ
yourself go-2s lay down-2s
b. [$_{IP}$ ti [$_{IP}$ va [$_{VP}$va [$_{IP}$ pro/x [$_{I}$ kʊrkɪ

At the same time, we can account for the alternation between embedded and climbed position of clitics in varieties of the Salento, by assuming that they reflect the simpler theoretical situation in which lack of phasal boundaries allows but does not force clitic climbing. This is true in particular of Brindisi in (8), of which we reproduce the example with *a* embedding and downstairs cliticization in (42). It is also true of the several Salento varieties where bare finite embedding admits the two possibilities, including embedded cliticization, as in Mesagne in (17), reproduced in (43) with its structure.

(42)	a.	vɔli	a	ssi	lu	mandʒa	*Brindisi*
		want-3s	to	himself	it	eat-3s	
	b.	…	[$_{PP}$ a [$_{IP}$ pro/x	[$_{IP}$ ssi	[$_{IP}$ llu	[$_{I}$ mandʒa	
(43)	a.	vɔʃʃu		lu	veʃu		*Mesagne*
		want-1s		him	see-1s		
	b.	… [$_{IP}$ pro/x		[$_{IP}$ lu	[$_{I}$veʃu		

Before we conclude this review of clitic climbing, we must consider the fact that the patterns in (42)-(43) are found only in Salento varieties which independently display *ku* embedding with no clitic climbing. Therefore, the question arises whether the two patterns depend on the availability of *ku* structures. First of all, (42) cannot be derived from a *ku* structure, since the presence of the *a* introducer excludes that of *ku*. As for (43), it is certainly possible to argue that it represents an instance of *ku* deletion, of the kind proposed by Ledgeway (2015). However, except for Nociglia, where only embedded clitic placement is attested, in the other Salento varieties, including Mesagne, clitic climbing is equally present. This means that by Ledgeway's (2015) own assumptions, these structures cannot derive from *ku* deletion.

2.3 *Inflection patterns and issues of interpretation*

In introducing our basic structures in Section 2.1, we pointed out that they involve obligatory control. Even though *want* is not necessarily a control verb and indeed admits non-control readings when embedding *ku* finite complements, nevertheless it requires control when embedding *a*/bare finite complements. The traditional assumption about control is that it involves a specialized empty category PRO (Landau 2013), though we favour a predicational construal of control (Landau 2015), especially suited to control into finite sentence (Manzini and Savoia 2007, forthcoming; Manzini 2009). In either instance, we will have to say that the lack of a CP phase in *a*/bare finite embeddings forces obligatory control (in the languages at hand). In

presenting the data in Section 1, we were careful to mention raising in the same bracket as obligatory control, since by classic tests, some of the verbs embedding *a*/bare finite complements must surely be raising predicates, especially 'stay/be'. The discussion of phases now explains the possibility of raising as well.

Obligatory control/raising correlates with lack of independent tense specifications in the matrix and embedded sentence. This means that either one of the two verbs lacks tense specifications altogether – or else if tense specifications are present on both verbs, then they agree. This is indeed what we witness in our data, as partially summarized in Table 2. On the other hand, a certain amount of asymmetries observed in Table 2 require further attention. With *a* finite embedding, both matrix and embedded verb are fully inflected for tense and in fact for phi-features. As for bare embedding it is relatively rare to find matrix and embedded verb both inflected for phi-features; this is found only in the varieties of Nociglia and Umbriatico. Even rarer is the pattern where both matrix and embedded verb are inflected for past tense, as in Torre S. Susanna. When inflection is realized only on one verb, we have a single attestation for tense on the superordinate verb (Carmiano) and none for superordinate phi-features. The majority of dialects have inflections on the embedded verb – with the possibility of partial phi-features inflection on the matrix verb. We exemplify this pattern in its starkest form, i.e. both tense and phi-features realized only downstairs, with the Salentine variety of Mesagne in (44), cf. (17).

(44) lu sta ffatʃi-v-i *Mesagne*
it$_{cl}$ stay do$_{IMP}$-2p
'You were doing it'

It is the pattern in (44) that the accounts of Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001, 2003) and of Ledgeway (2016) concentrate on. According to Cardinaletti and Giusti, the single finite Agr projection in their monoclausal structure is lower than 'stay'/'go' etc. and is therefore picked up by the embedded verb, rather than by the superordinate verb. Whatever inflections the latter has, they are parasitic on those of the embedded verb. According to Ledgeway (2016) only a lexical VP can project Agr – so that in bare embedding structures, which he construes as monoclausal, the functional verb cannot bear Agr. For cases of overtly inflected superordinate verbs in bare embeddings, he would probably have to resort to the same claim as Cardinaletti and Giusti that the higher agreement is parasitic on the lower one.

Cardinaletti and Giusti's (2001) solution, positioning the relevant class of verbs above Agr, while made possible by cartographic notation, encodes the facts, rather than explaining them. Indeed it is not clear why other functional

verbs (auxiliaries) are normally inflected, i.e. lower than Agr, as Ledgeway (2016) also points out. Ledgeway's own proposal, if we understand it correctly, does not overcome the same problem. Suppose 'stay' etc. are directly merged under a functional head and not in VP; this must surely be true of auxiliaries in general, which are nevertheless fully inflected.

Let us then consider the predictions of the present approach. Instances where the inflection is realized on both matrix and embedded verb are predicted under a bi-clausal structure. But how come lack of inflection, specifically on the matrix verb, is also licenced? To begin with, it is morphologically inaccurate to speak of this phenomenon in terms of lack of inflection. As already indicated in discussing Table 2, so-called uninflected forms consist of the root of the verb (or one of its roots in the case of suppletive 'go') followed by a thematic vowel. These formations in Romance often coincide with the 3P singular of the indicative and systematically show up in the 2P singular imperative (see also Manzini and Savoia 2007 on corresponding forms in Albanian). Therefore, we prefer to refer to them as invariable rather than uninflected. If we are correct, monoclausal theorists would have to account for a residual inflection in examples like (44) as well.

Let us consider phi-features first. Within the present bi-clausal, hence bi-inflectional model, the relation between the two inflections in (44) is akin to the relation between an expletive and a referential pronoun/DP. The expletive does not express any referential content independent of that of its associate; this is expressed by Chomsky (1995) by an operation of expletive replacement at the C-I interface. In fact, at least in null subject languages like the ones we are dealing with, it is natural to construe verb inflections as D elements. Let us then say that as concerns phi-features, the relevant structure of (44) is as in (45); whatever operation applies to identify an expletive D(P) with its associate D(P) applies between the two D inflections in (45). To be slightly more specific, we may assume that the content of the upstairs D, like of all expletives, can be equated to that of an unbound variable. Therefore it must be bound by the embedded D, by expletive replacement, or other equivalent operation.

(45) $[_{IP}\ [_{I}$ st- $[_{D}$ a]] $[_{VP}$ $[_{IP}[_{I}$ ffatʃiv-$[_{D}$i]]

The same account holds in principle of tense. In order to be reasonably explicit on this point we adopt the notation of Tense structures in Higginbotham (2009), which has the distinct advantage to be syntactically transparent. A present tense sentence like the one in (46) means that the predicate 'happy' includes the 'reference time', i.e. the time of the context, here the time of utterance. The syntax from which this meaning is computed is (46b) "where the numerals in angled brackets stand for the open positions or implicit arguments in the head T and the VP. The implicit argument 3 of the VP, which ranges over events, is identified with argument 1 of T, and argu-

ment 2 of T set to the speech-time or utterance u. The feature -past is interpreted as meaning that 1 surrounds 2". The resulting semantic representation is (46c), i.e. roughly, there is an event *e* of John being happy that surrounds (≈) the time of the utterance *u*.

(46) a. John is happy

b. [$_{T}$ –past <1,2> [$_{VP}$ John happy<3>]]

c. [∃e≈u] happy (John, e)

Applying the relevant notation to examples like (44), we obtain representations like (47) for the embedded sentence. Suppose the matrix clause has what we may call an expletive tense position, lacking positively specified content, in the form of a free variable. Then presumably the equivalent of an expletive replacement operation takes place so that the embedded tense properties are interpreted as taking scope over the whole sentence. This is notated in (48) as a copying operation.

(47) a. … [$_{IP}$ +past <1,2> [$_{VP}$ you did it<3>]]

b. … [∃e<u] do (you, it, e)

(48) [$_{IP}$ +past <1,2> … [+past <1,2> [$_{VP}$ you did it<3>]]

In short, invariable tense and phi-features inflections are licenced by the same mechanisms, essentially locality and movement, that allow expletive subject pronouns. Nothing prevents the matrix and embedded verb from being fully inflected for phi-features and tense – in which case Agree presumably takes care of identifying them. However, it is also possible for the higher inflection (which must be present in order to head the sentence) to have mere place-holder features. We note that this second structural solution is possible only with verbs of obligatory control/raising, i.e. 'stay/be', 'come', 'go'. In other words, as also pointed out by Ledgeway (2016), the pattern excludes 'want', which admits a non-control construal (for instance with *ku* embedding).

Interestingly, Balkan languages include a considerable number of invariable predicates embedding the so-called subjunctive particle. In Greek, the core modals *bori* 'can' and *prepi* 'must' are invariable and embed *na* subjunctive complements. Within the Romance family, the future of Aromanian is formed by the invariable predicate *va* followed by the subjunctive particle *si* (Manzini and Savoia forthcoming, see also Romanian o să forms). Perhaps most tellingly, Manzini and Savoia (2007) document causative constructions in several Arbëreshe varieties, all involving a matrix verb 'make' and an embedded finite complement introduced by the subjunctive particle *të*. But only in some varieties is the verb 'do' fully inflected; in several others,

it is an invariable form. This means that expletive inflections are in principle available whenever there is a bi-clausal structure with no intervening CP phase, which is essentially what we would optimally expect on the basis of our model. Only in the single language and dialect, do we witness restrictions to certain classes of predicates and complements (only bare complements in Apulian varieties).

2.4 *Residual issues: monoeventivity, typological connections*

A final major element that according to Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001, 2003) favours a monoclausal analysis, namely that *a*/bare finite embeddings involve not two events but a single event interpretation.[5] Indeed 'stay' followed by *a*/bare finite embedding has the same meaning as the English *being* progressive. Matters are less clear with 'go'/'come'. Yet, as indicated by Cruschina (2013) for Sicilian, and by Tellier (2015) for the French infinitival construction, they may easily be construed without any implication of physical motion. Just two Italian examples are provided in (49); note that the clitic is not necessarily climbed, for instance in (49b), indicating a (potentially) bi-clausal structure. As for 'want', its complement must clearly configure an independent event in non-control complements. Mono-clausal theories presumably consider that control readings, corresponding to *a*/bare finite embeddings, are monoeventive.

(49) a. Va sempre a pensare il peggio
go-3s always to think the worst
'He always (goes and) thinks the worst'

b. Viene a mancarmi il suo appoggio
come-3s to lack-me his support
'His support is failing me'

Evidently, in order to complete the picture we sketched, we must show that a reasonable semantics for our structures can be implemented at the C-I interface, hence a mono-eventive semantics if interpretive considerations require it. In the next section, we offer one case study, concerning 'stay/be' structures, which instantiate the progressive. Since a rich semantic literature is available on progressive aspect, it should be possible to show that there is a comfortable mapping from a bi-clausal syntax to at least some of the relevant Logical Forms.

[5] Manzini and Savoia (2005) point out that the same problem arises, in even clearer form, if one adopts a bi-clausal analysis of auxiliary-perfect participle structures.

This will also allow us to touch on an issue that we have not yet mentioned, namely the typological setting of the constructions we are considering. So-called pseudo coordinations (e.g. English 'What did you go and buy?') are potential candidates for comparison (Carden and Pesetsky 1977; Jaeggli and Hyams 1993; de Vos 2005 among others), and so are serial verbs. Indeed both Manzini and Savoia (2005), based on Déchaine (1993), and Cruschina (2013), based on Aikhenvald *et al.* (2006) point out that less restrictive definitions than Baker (1989) are possible (and necessary) for serial verb constructions opening this possible comparison as well. Though this is beyond the scope of the present contribution, in the next section, we will also exploit the fact that locative constructions are well-known to express the progressive cross-linguistically.

3. *A case study in interpretation: the progressive*

In Apulian dialects, 'stay/be' is a core verb for *a*/bare finite embedding, yielding a progressive reading. Now, progressives are expressed as locative constructions in languages of different families (Mateu and Amadas 1999; Bybee *et al.* 1994; Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria 1997; Lorusso forthcoming) as we will discuss in Section 3.1. This generalization is upheld by the present characterization of the *a* finite introducer as being nothing else than the dative/locative *a* preposition. In Section 3.2 we will endeavour to show that the bi-clausal syntax of Section 2 provides a reasonable match to an event semantic treatment of the progressive interpretation (see Parsons 1989; Landman 1992; Higginbotham 2009 for a range of proposals).

3.1 *Typology of the progressive*

In the typological literature, progressives have been claimed to often involve locative constructions. Indeed a widespread characteristic of human language is that the progressive is realized in syntax in the form of a locative predication. The pervasiveness of this connection between progressive and spatial location is documented by Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1994).[6] At a purely descriptive level, the progressives involving locative constructions can be distinguished according to whether the locative relation is expressed by a preposition and/or by an auxiliary. Italian or Spanish encode the progressive through the use of the aux-

[6] Languages do not only recruit locative periphrasis to render the progressive. As Cinque (forthcoming) points out in his cross-linguistic survey, languages may express progressive also through temporal periphrasis (involving 'during' or 'after/before'), lexical auxiliaries ('be engaged in' as in the Basque examples in (53) and (54)) or markings that are not transparent. In our analysis, all progressive periphrases share a primitive relation of inclusion of an event within a set of events, not necessarily locative and in fact not primitively so, as it will become clear in our proposal about the interpretation of progressive in paragraph 3.2.

iliary 'stay' which is normally used for locative constructions in both languages: *stare* (in Italian) in (50a) and *estar* in Spanish (50b) which embed a gerund. As saw in Sections 1-2, Apulian dialects use constructions which involve 'stay' embedding bare finite verbs, as in the variety of Martina Franca in (50c), cf. (25), or in the Salento dialect of Copertino in (50d), cf. (21).

(50) a. Gianni sta mangiando *Italian*
Gianni is eating

b. Juan está estudiando *Spanish*
Juan is studying

c. u stɔ ccɛ:mə *Martina Franca*
him_{cl} stay-1s call-1s
'I am calling him'

d. mi sta bbɛtɛ *Copertino*
me_{cl} stay-3s watch-3s
'He is watching me'

Progressives may also be expressed through the use of locative prepositions (Mateu and Amadas 1999). Examples (51) exemplify this possibility in typologically different languages, namely Dutch (51a), French (51b), Gungbe (51c).[7] As Higginbotham (2009) points out, the historical origin of the English Progressive is a 'nominalized' locative construction involving a gerundive object, as in (52): "the relic of the preposition is still heard, of course, in those English speakers who say 'John is a' crossing (of) the street'" (Higginbotham 2009: 54); he also mentions Chinese in (51d).

(51) a. Ik ben aan het/'t werken. *Dutch*
I am on the working
'I am working'.

(van Gelderen 1993: 180-182)

b. Zazie est en train de miauler. *French*
Zazie is in along of miaowing
'Zazie is miaowing'.

(Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria 1997: 9)

[7] In Gungbe there is a progressive particle *tò* which means literally 'be at' (Aboh 2004).

c. ɛtɛ wɛ mi tò ḍiḍa na Aluku *Gungbe*
what_ FOC 2PL be at cook to Aluku
'What are you cooking for Aluku?
(Aboh 2004)

d. Jangsan tsai chih fan. *Chinese*
Jangsan at eat (rice)
'Jangsan is eating (rice)'
(Higginbotham 2009: 170)

(52) John is at [PRO crossing the street]
(Higginbotham 2009: 154)

Basque encodes the progressive through both the auxiliary *ari* and a locative PP (Laka 2006). In fact the *ari* progressive is of particular interest in the context of the present discussion in that it involves a biclausal syntactic structure. Thus *ari* is a main verb 'to be engaged' which takes a locative PP; this can be either a nominal complement (53a), or anominalized clause (53b), in both instances yielding a progressive.

(53) a. emakume-a dantza-n ari da *Basque*
woman-DET dance- LOC engaged is
'The womanis engaged in dance' (i.e. 'The woman is dancing')
b. emakume-a ogi-a ja-te-n ari da
woman-DET bread-DET eat-NOM-LOC engaged is
'The woman is (engaged in) eating the bread'
(Laka 2006)

The fact that the embedded verb in (53b) is selected by a real locative P is confirmed by the fact that the change to progressive aspect induces a change in case-assignment, as well as a change in the choice of matrix auxiliary/verb. In (54a) the external argument *emakumea* 'the woman' carries ergative case (marked by *-k*); the internal argument *ogia* '(the) bread' receives absolutive case, marked zero, In contrast, (54b) has no ergative-marked argument. Following Laka (2006), this is because the verb embedded in the nominalized clause, *jan* 'eat', is not involved in assigning either case or thematic role to 'the woman'. Rather the different theta marking of the subject of the progressive

construction is strictly linked to the *ari* matrix verb that selects a Locative phrase and determines absolutive (i.e. zero) case assignment to its subject, as in all other locative constructions in Basque.

(54) a. emakume-a-k ogi-a jaten du *Basque*
woman-DET-ERG bread-DET eating has
'The woman eats the bread'

b. emakume-a ogi-a ja-te-n ari da
woman- DET bread- DET eat- NOM-LOC engaged is
'The woman is (engaged in) eating the bread'

According to Laka (2006), therefore, (54b) has the structure in (55) where the embedded non-finite (nominalized) verb is in a locative phrase selected by the progressive auxiliary and the matrix subject 'the woman' controls the embedded subject PRO.

(55) [emakume-a_i [[[[PRO_iogi-a ja-$_{VP}$] te-$_{NP}$] n $_{PP}$] ari $_{VP}$] da_{IP}]

The Basque structure in (55) allows us to introduce some considerations about the reading of the progressive construction: despite the fact that in (55) there is only one transitive event, we have seen that there is no ergative marking for the agent of the event. In other words, the progressive interpretation relies on a biclausal structure. In turn the locative structure extends to all the different languages we have briefly described in this section. Specifically, the bare finite embedding construction (not involving a locative/dative preposition) of Apulian dialects can provisionally be accounted for in similar terms by assuming that location is encoded by the verb 'stay', as we did in introducing the examples in (50). The same holds for Italian/Spanish, except that at least etymologically the gerund is also an oblique (nominal/adjectival) form of the verb. The next section is devoted to spelling out our proposal to some extent, by reviewing the semantic analysis of progressives.

3.2 *The interpretation of progressives*

Before we proceed to the semantics literature, a parenthesis may be usefully inserted on the nature of locative Ps, and specifically of the Romance *a* preposition whose basic content may be argued to be dative. This is not the contentless linker or connector envisaged by Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001) or Cruschina (2013), rather, according to Manzini and Savoia (2011), Manzini and Franco (2016) the preposition *a* 'to' instantiates a relation (⊆) whose con-

tent they take to be part/whole, akin to what Belvin and den Dikken (1997: 170) call zonal inclusion. In other words, in sentence like *I gave the book to Peter*, 'to' introduces a relation between its object 'Peter' and the theme of the verb 'the book' such that 'Peter' includes 'the book', i.e. possesses it. They further construe locative as a specialization of the part-whole relation, which involves instances where the internal argument of (⊆) is a location (i.e. 'x included by y, y location') or is otherwise locatively restricted.

In addressing possible approaches to the semantics of the progressive it must be kept in mind that we are not interested, or in fact equipped, to enter the semantic debate; we are simply interested in establishing whether a reasonable point-by-point mapping is possible between the rather detailed syntactic model constructed in Section 2 and some semantic model. Of particular interest here are event theoretical models, especially because the work of Higginbotham (2009), briefly reviewed in Section 2.3 makes them easily mappable to standard generative syntax.

A well-known treatment of the progressive is provided by Parsons (1989). In his terms, "semantically, changing an event verb to the progressive requires that it be treated as a state verb; this simply means the sentence in question will require for its truth that the event in question *holds*, not that it *culminates*". Thus the *a* non-progressive sentence like *Agatha crossed the street* and a progressive sentence like *Agatha was crossing the street* differ only because of the fact that the event *e* in the former culminates at time *t*, namely Cul (e,t) – while the event *e* in the latter holds at time *t*, namely Hold (e,t).

This semantics however does not evoke any obvious mapping to a locative syntax. This is not so for an equally well-known treatment, proposed by Landman (1992), which he summarizes as the Part-of Proposal, namely that "Mary is crossing the street is true iff some actual event realizes sufficiently much of the type of events of Mary's crossing the street". For instance, the sentence in (56a) is true "iff some event is realized in w in the past and that event stands in the PROG relation to the type of events of Mary building a house", as indicated in (56b), where PROG is the relation between events and types (sets) of events mentioned in the part-whole proposal.

(56) a. Mary was building a house

b. ∃e'[t(e') < now & PROG(e', λe.∃y [house(y) & Build(e) & Agent(e)=Mary & Theme(e)=y])]

Two points about Landman's treatment are salient for present purposes. First of all the logical syntax of the progressive in (56) is bi-eventive, rather than mono-eventive, making it particularly suited to the bi-clausal syntax that we are proposing. In fact, in the terms of Manzini and Savoia's (2005, 2011) treatment of Romance perfects, even ordinary Romance progressives,

consisting of a copula and an embedded gerund, are bi-clausal. An operation of lambda-abstraction at the C-I interface, which turns the embedded clause/predicate/event into an event type (set), is necessary in order to map the syntax in Section 2 to the semantics in (56b). But this is the kind of enrichment that can reasonably be expected to take place at the interface.

The second important point concerns the nature of PROG. In Landman's terms, "E, the set of events, is ordered by two relations: a relation of 'part-of' and a relation of 'stage-of' [...] a stage of an event is a special sort of part of that event". For instance "if an event is a complete accomplishment event (Mary's building of a house), the result (the house being built) is part of that event". Importantly for present purposes, this is true in exactly the same sense in which "Hanny's hand at a certain interval is part of Hanny at that (or a larger) interval". The last passage is that "not every part of *e* at an interval is a stage of *e*; to be a stage, a part has to be big enough and share enough with *e* so that we can call it a less developed version of *e*". In practice, coming back to (56), what it means is that "in some world, an event of building a house by Mary goes on, a stage of which goes on in our world at some past interval, a stage, which develops into that event".[8]

In Section 2 we concluded that *a* finite embeddings in Sicilian and Apulian dialects, for instance in (57a) (cf. (12)), involve the dative/locative preposition; this conclusion was strengthened by cross-linguistic comparison in Section 3.1, highlighting locative constructions with progressive meaning in genetically and typologically unrelated languages. In terms of the syntactic notation introduced by Higginbotham (2009) and reviewed in (48) above, the *a* finite embedding structure in (57a) looks like (57b) at the syntax-semantics interface. The responsibility for introducing a relation between the event introduced by the main verb <3> and the event property introduced by the embedded sentence falls to the *a* elementary predicate. The dotted part of the logical form in (57b) is supplied by the migration of tense properties from the embedded verb to the matrix verb – via expletive replacement or equivalent mechanism as discussed in Section 2.3.

(57) a. stɔk a bbeivə *Taranto*
stay-1s to drink-1p
'I am drinking'

b. … [$_{VP}$ stɔk<3> [$_{P}$ a <4, 5> [$_{IP}$*pro* mangia <6>]]]

[8] We omit the notion of "continuation branch of an event", despite it being crucial to Landman, for which we refer the reader directly to his test.

Now, as discussed at the beginning of this section, the *a* preposition in its dative/locative occurrences has a part-whole content, as amply motivated Manzini and Savoia (2011ff.). Manzini and Franco (2016), Franco and Manzini (2017) especially insist on this and similar relations holding between events and participants in the event. Suppose now that the (⊆) part/whole relation may hold of event pairs, saying that one event is part of, or a stage of, a second event – or rather a set of events/an event type. This is part of the semantics required by Landman's PROG. In fact, Higginbotham (2009), who develops an analysis of the progressive along the same general lines as Landman (1992), also notes the locative encoding of progressives favored by many languages, though it is not clear to us that he advances any specific proposal concerning this connection.

In present terms, the cross-linguistic generalization of Section 3.1 translates into the conclusion that the ⊆ inclusion/location content is a natural candidate to instantiate the relation between events and event properties that a considerable part of the formal semantics literature identifies with the progressive.[9] What holds of examples like (57) including an overt dative/locative preposition, also holds of bare finite embeddings, for instance the Salentine example (50d) if the role of PROG (i.e. part/whole) is played directly by the main verb 'stay' in virtue of its locative content (or in virtue of the selection of an abstract preposition etc.).

Languages that do not express the progressive through an overt locative construction still can be accounted for in the terms of the ⊆ inclusion/location relation. Languages, in fact, vary as to how they encode the part/whole relation involved in the interpretation of progressive (Cinque forthcoming). The latter may be expressed through temporal prepositions such as *during* or *after/before* in Québécois or in Tinrin. Other languages may use a non locative auxiliary, as we have seen for *ari* (= be engaged in) in the Basque examples (53)-(54): once more the embedded complement introduces an ⊆ inclusion/location relation with the embedded verbs.[10]

[9] It should be stressed that these conclusions differ from those of Mateu and Amadas (1999) that we took as our starting point. For us, the locative relation holds between events/event types; for Mateu and Amadas the locative relation heald of an event and of an argument of that event, namely the subject.

[10] Cinque (forthcoming) also reports languages which encode progressives through monoclausal constructions involving adverbials (such as 'now'), morphological reduplication on the verb or no mark at all. Our main aim was to account for the monoeventive interpretation of the bi-clausal structures, so the analysis of languages which express progressive through monoclausal structures is outside the scope of the present work. At the same time the fact that languages may encode the progressive only though an enrichment at the C-I interface does not seem to create any particular problem for the present account of languages that overtly express the logical syntax of progressives through morphosyntactic means.

In conclusion, our main aim in going through semantic accounts of the progressive was to establish that it is possible for such accounts to be mapped to bi-clausal structures of the type proposed in Section 2. As far as we can tell, this is indeed the case. In fact, structures of the type we propose, with two distinct event positions associated with the matrix and embedded verb and a locative content attributed to *a* are much better candidates to express a Landman/Higginbotham type semantics that competing monoclausal structures, which lack comparable internal complexity.

4. *Concluding Remarks*

Two different approaches have been proposed to the data in Section 1.1. Conceptually, the differences between the two approaches depend on whether one does or does not adopt the cartographic program as to the 'syntacticization of semantics' (Cinque and Rizzi 2009) – which implies the Uniformity Hypothesis of Culicover and Jackendoff (2005), namely that to the same meaning corresponds the same syntactic structure. Thus a two-events proposition will correspond to a bi-clausal structure; a mono-eventive proposition will be mapped to a mono-clausal structure even if the latter surfaces as two finite verbs connected by a complementizer-like element. This is not an uninteresting hypothesis, but it typically leads to massive opacity at the morpholexical interface. Elements like *a* are freely interspersed in syntactic structures as meaningless fillers; inflections do not necessarily signal syntactically relevant positions, but potentially only morphological parasitism and so on.

Under the approach of Manzini and Savoia (2005ff.) syntax simply restricts meaning and does not determine it – which applied to the data at hand means that several different syntactic structures could converge to a single meaning. The advantage of holding such a position is that it becomes possible to maintain a more transparent relation between the syntax and the lexicon/morphology. Thus *a* has an identifiable content as a locative/dative preposition, inflected verbs head IP structures and so on. It should be stressed that this has learnability advantages, to the extent that morphophonology represents the access of the learner to his/her target language.

In Section 3 we specifically addressed the feasibility of this second line of analysis, by addressing the question whether bi-clausal structures could be matched to the semantics of progressives, based on the considerable semantic literature on the latter. Our conclusion was that there is no reason why the PROG relation of Landman (1992), Higginbotham (2009) could not be introduced by a locative main verb or a locative preposition.

Several questions remain open for future research. One of them has to do with the implications of the present discussion for various types of structures to which *a*/bare finite embeddings have either structural or interpretive affinity. This includes the question of progressives as locatives, the connec-

tion with English-type pseudo-coordination and with serial verbs. The view of the syntax/semantics interface argued for here ought to strike a cautionary note as to the possibility of overarching generalizations. Specifically, the same semantics, under the present view, can be supported by non-identical syntaxes – as much as the same syntax may be liable to ambiguities (different interpretations) subject to language-specific restrictions.

References

Aboh, Enoc O. 2004. *The Morphosyntax of Complement-head Sequences. Clause Structure and Word Order Patterns in Kwa*. New York: Oxford UP.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., and Robert M.W. Dixon (eds.). 2006. *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford-New York: Oxford UP.

Arsenijević, Boban. 2009. "Clausal Complementation as Relativization." *Lingua* 119: 39-50.

Baker, Mark C. 1989. "Object Sharing and Projection in Serial Verb Constructions." *Linguistic Inquiry* 20 (4): 513-553.

Belvin, Robert, and Marcel den Dikken. 1997. "There, Happens, to, Be, Have." *Lingua* 101: 151-183.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.

Calabrese, Andrea. 1993. "The Sentential Complementation of Salentino: A Study of a Language without Infinitival Clauses." In *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, ed. by Adriana Belletti, 28-98. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Carden, Guy, and David Pesetsky. 1977. "Double-verb Construction, Markendess, and a Fake Coordination." In *Papers From the Thirteenth Regional Meeting*, ed. by Woodford E. Beach, Samuel E. Fox, and Shulamith Philosoph, 82-92. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Cardinaletti, Anna, and Giuliana Giusti. 2001. "Semi-lexical Motion Verbs in Romance and Germanic." In *Semi-lexical Categories: The Function of Content Words and the Content of Function Words*, ed. by Norbert Corver, and Henk van Riemsdijk, 371-414. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Cardinaletti, Anna, and Giuliana Giusti. 2003. "Motion Verbs as Functional Heads." In *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, ed. by Christina Tortora, 31-49. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. "Derivation by Phase." In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo, and Luigi Rizzi. 2009. "The Cartography of Syntactic Structures." In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*, ed. by Bernd Heine, and Heiko Narrog, 65-78. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Cinque, Guglielmo. Forthcoming. "On the Status of Functional Categories (Heads and Phrases)." *Language and Linguistics*.

Cruschina, Silvio. 2013. "Beyond the Stem and Inflectional Morphology: An Irregular Pattern at the Level of Periphrasis." In *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology*, ed. by Silvio Cruschina, Martin Maiden, and John Charles Smith, 262-283. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Culicover, Peter, and Ray Jackendoff. 2005. *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

de Vos, Mark A. 2005. *The Syntax of Verbal Pseudo-coordination in English and Afrikaans*. Utrecht: LOT.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie. 1993. "Serial Verb Constructions." In *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, vol. 1, ed. by Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann, 799-825. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Demirdache, Hamida, and Miriam Uribe-Etxebarria. 1997. "The Primitives of Temporal Relations." In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Martin David Michaels Roger, and Juan Uriagereka, 157-186. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Di Caro, Vincenzo, and Giuliana Giusti. 2015. "A Protocol for the Inflected Construction in Sicilian Dialects." *Annali di Ca' Foscari. Serie occidentale* 49, 393-421.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen, Isabela Nedelcu, and Ion Giurgea. 2013. "Genitive DPs and Pronominal Possessors." In *A Reference Grammar of Romanian*, vol. 1, *The Noun Phrase*, ed. by Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin, and Ion Giurgea, 309-354. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Franco, Ludovico, Leonardo M. Savoia, and M. Rita Manzini. 2015. "Linkers and Agreement." *Linguistic Review* 32: 277-332.

Franco, Ludovico. and M. Rita Manzini. 2017. "Instrumental Prepositions and Case: Contexts of Occurrence and Alternations with Datives." *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 2 (1): 8. <doi: 10.5334/gjgl.111>.

Van Gelderen, Elly. 1993. *The Rise of Functional Projections*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Higginbotham, James. 2009. *Tense, Aspect, and Indexicality. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Hill, Virginia. 2013. "The Emergence of the Romanian Supine." *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 3 (2): 230-271.

Jaeggli, Osvaldo, and Nina Hyams. 1993. "Aspectual Come and Go." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11: 313-346.

Jones, Michael. 1993. *Sardinian Syntax*. London: Routledge.

Kayne, Richard. 1991. "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement and PRO." *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647-686.

Kayne, Richard. 1993. "Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection." *Studia Linguistica* 47: 3-31.

Kayne, Richard. 2010. *Comparisons and Contrasts*, 190-227. New York: Oxford UP.

Laka, Itziar. 2006. "Deriving Split-ergativity in the Progressive: The Case of Basque." *Ergativity: Emerging Issues*, ed. by Alana Johns, Diane Massam, and Juvenal Ndayiragije, 173-195, Dordrecht-Berlin: Springer.

Landau, Idan. 2013. *Control in Generative Grammar. A Research Companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Landau, Idan. 2015. *A Two-tiered Theory of Control*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Landman, Fred. 1992. "The Progressive." *Natural Language Semantics* 1: 1-32.
Ledgeway, Adam. 2015. "Reconstructing Complementiser-drop in the Dialects of the Salento: A Syntactic or Phonological Phenomenon." In *Syntax Over Time: Lexical, Morphological, and Information-structural Interactions*, ed. by Theresa Biberauer, and George Walkden, 146-162. Oxford: Oxford UP.
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 CSI Lisbon 2014*, ed. by Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira, and Clara Pinto, 157-184. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
Lorusso, Paolo. Forthcoming. "A Person Split Analysis of the Progressive Forms in Barese". In *Local and Non-Local Dependencies in the Nominal and Verbal Domains*, ed. by Ludovico Franco, Mihaela Moreno Marchis, and Matthew Reeve.
Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*. 3 vols. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2007. *A Unification of Morphology and Syntax*. London: Routledge.
Manzini, M. Rita. 2009. "PRO, pro and NP-trace (Raising) are Interpretations." In *Explorations of Phase Theory*: *Features and Arguments*, ed. by Kleanthes K. Grohmann, 131-180. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2011. *Grammatical Categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
Manzini, M. Rita, and Ludovico Franco. 2016. "Goal and DOM Datives." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34: 197-240.
Manzini, M. Rita, and Leonardo M. Savoia. Forthcoming. "Finite and Non-finite Complementation, Particles and Control in Aromanian, Compared to other Romance Varieties and Albanian." *Linguistic Variation*.
Mateu, Jaume, and Laia Amadas. 1999. "Extended Argument Structure: Progressive as Unaccusative." *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 7: 159-174.
Parsons, Terence. 1989. "The Progressive in English: Events, States and Processes." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12 (2): 213-241.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery." In *Elements of Grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Rosenbaum, Peter. 1967. *The Grammar of English Complement Constructions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Tellier, Christine. 2015. "French Expressive Motion Verbs as Functional Heads." *Probus* 27 (1): 157-192.
Trumper, John, and Luigi Rizzi. 1985. "Il problema sintattico di CA/MU nei dialetti calabresi mediani". *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Linguistica* (Università della Calabria) 1: 63-76.