a/bare finite complements in Southern Italian varieties: mono-clausal or bi-clausal syntax?
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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 abnormal 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.
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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
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 $mi/\text{mu}$ (Trumper and Rizzi 1985; Manzini and Savoia 2005, forthcoming). These languages have morphological infinitives, but they normally reserve them for a very restricted range of modal embeddings, mostly under the verb *potere* ‘can/may’.

(1) a. au ku llu iʃu
    \hspace{1cm} \textit{Carmiano}
    have-1s Prt it\textsubscript{el} see-1s
    ‘I have to see it’

    b. me mint\textsuperscript{h}u ku m\textsuperscript{z}u
    myself\textsubscript{el} put-1s Prt eat-1s
    ‘I am starting to eat’

(2) a. au ku m\textsuperscript{z}u
    \hspace{1cm} \textit{Copertino}
    have-1s Prt eat-1s
    ‘I have to eat’

    b. add\textsuperscript{z}u j\textsuperscript{t}rkatu ku dd\textsuperscript{rm}u
    have-1s tried Prt sleep-1s
    ‘I have tried to sleep’

    c. id\textsuperscript{d}u a nt\textsuperscript{f}n\textsuperscript{at}u ku m\textsuperscript{z}a
    he have-3s started Prt eat-3s
    ‘He has started to eat’

    d. id\textsuperscript{d}u sta bbae ku m\textsuperscript{z}a
    he stay-3s go-3s Prt eat-3s
    ‘He is going to eat’

(3) a. stannu ku sse ‘sk\textsuperscript{f}n\textsuperscript{e} ak\textsuperscript{kw}a
    \hspace{1cm} \textit{Nociglia}
    stay-3p Prt themselves\textsubscript{el} heat-3p the water
    ‘They are heating up the water’

    b. nu vvannu ku llu ‘cam\textsuperscript{a}n\textsuperscript{e}
    not go-3p Prt him\textsubscript{el} call-3p
    ‘They are not going to call him’
c.  
\[\text{vene} \quad \text{ku} \quad \text{llu} \quad \text{vide}\]  
\[\text{come-3s} \quad \text{Prt} \quad \text{him}_{cl} \quad \text{see-3s}\]  
‘He goes to see him’  

(4)  
a.  
\[\text{vau} \quad \text{ku} \quad \text{mmandzu} \] 
\[\text{go-1s} \quad \text{Prt} \quad \text{eat-1s}\]  
‘I go to eat’  
b.  
\[\text{non-tfi}^{1} \quad \text{vau} \quad \text{ku} \quad \text{llu} \quad \text{vefu}\]  
\[\text{not there}_{cl} \quad \text{go-1s} \quad \text{Prt} \quad \text{him}_{cl} \quad \text{see-1s}\]  
‘I am not going to see him’  
c.  
\[\text{vinia} \quad \text{ku} \quad \text{llu} \quad \text{fatsu}\]  
\[\text{came}_{\text{IMP}-1s} \quad \text{Prt} \quad \text{it}_{cl} \quad \text{do-1s}\]  
‘I came to do it’  
d.  
\[\text{mi} \quad \text{ssettu} \quad \text{ku} \quad \text{leggu}\]  
\[\text{myself}_{cl} \quad \text{seat-1s} \quad \text{Prt} \quad \text{read-1s}\]  
‘I sit down to read’  

(5)  
\[\text{ti} \quad \text{diku} \quad \text{ku} \quad (\text{no}) \quad \text{llu} \quad \text{cami}\]  
\[\text{you} \quad \text{say-1s} \quad (\text{not}) \quad \text{Prt} \quad \text{not} \quad \text{him}_{cl} \quad \text{call-1s}\]  
‘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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>lu veŋ(u) a fflattsu</td>
<td>‘I come to do it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itₐ come-1s to do-1s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>lu vinia a fflatʃia</td>
<td>‘I was coming to do it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itₐ came_IMP-1s to did_IMP-1s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>lu jeni a fflatʃi</td>
<td>‘You came to do it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itₐ come-2s to do-2s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>lu veni a fflatʃi</td>
<td>‘He comes to do it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itₐ come-3s to do-3s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>lu viniti a fflatʃi ti</td>
<td>‘You come to do it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itₐ come-2p to do-2p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>lu ‘venunu a fffannu</td>
<td>‘They come to do it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itₐ come-3p to do-3p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7) stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Ḷτɔn a k’kɔntanu</td>
<td>‘They are telling’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stay-3p to tell-3p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

want

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>lu vaŋŋ a vveku</td>
<td>‘I want to see it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itₐ want-1s to see-1s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(8) \textit{want} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Brindisi}

i. ti vəµu a vveʃu
you\textsubscript{cl} want-1s to see-1s
‘I want to see you’

ii. nən tʃi vəµu a ddɔrmu
not there want\textsubscript{-}1s to sleep-1s
‘I do not want to sleep’

iii. lu vəl(ɨ) a mmandʒa
i\textsubscript{cl} want\textsubscript{-}3s to eat\textsubscript{-}3s
‘He/she wants to eat it’

iv. vɔli a ssi lu mmandʒa
want\textsubscript{-}3s to himself\textsubscript{cl} it\textsubscript{cl} eat\textsubscript{-}3s
‘He/she wants to eat it’

The phenomenon of finite \textit{a} complements is found in varieties of Apulia other than Salentine ones, for instance those in (9)-(12). In these varieties finite \textit{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) \textit{stay} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Conversano}

i. u stek a sfattsə
it\textsubscript{cl} stay\textsubscript{-}1s to do\textsubscript{-}1s
‘I am doing it’

ii. u ste a sfeʃə
it\textsubscript{cl} stay\textsubscript{-}2s to do\textsubscript{-}2s
‘You are doing it’

iii. nonə u ste a sfeʃə
not it\textsubscript{cl} stay\textsubscript{-}2s to do\textsubscript{-}2s
‘You are not doing it’

(iv.) u stɛmə a fe
it\textsubscript{cl} stay\textsubscript{-}1p to do\textsubscript{INF}
‘We are doing it’
You are doing it
They are doing it
I am going to do it
You are going to do it
He/she is going to do it
We are going to do it

Putignano

I am going to do it
I am not going to do it
vi. u ston a fˈafənə
itcl stay-3p to do-3p
‘They are going to do it’

**go**

i. u vok a fflattsə
itcl go-1s to do-1s
‘I am going to do it’

i. u jev a ffa
itcl wentIMP-1s to do-3s
‘I was going to do it’

vi. u von a fˈafənə
itcl go-3p to do-3p
‘They are going to make it’

**come**

i. veng 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. vion a mmandʒə
come-3s to eat-3s
‘He comes to eat’

[iiv.] vojm a mmanˈdʒə
come-1p to eatINF
‘We are going to eat’

(11) **stay**

vi. u stɔn (a) cˈamənə
himcl stay-3p to call-3p
‘They are calling him’

**go**

vi. vɔnə (a) mˈmandʒənə
go-3p to eat-3p
‘They are going to eat’
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.

(12) stay

\begin{align*}
\text{i.} & \quad \text{stok} \quad \text{a bbeivɔ} \\
& \quad \text{stay-1s} \quad \text{to drink-1s} \\
& \quad \text{‘I am drinking’} \\
\text{vi.} & \quad \text{stɔn} \quad \text{a bɛɛvɔnɔ} \\
& \quad \text{stay-3p} \quad \text{to drink-3p} \\
& \quad \text{‘They are drinking’}
\end{align*}

(13) go

\begin{align*}
\text{i.} & \quad \text{vaju} \quad \text{a mmandʒu} \\
& \quad \text{go-1s} \quad \text{to eat-1s} \\
& \quad \text{‘I go to eat’} \\
\text{[iv./v.]} & \quad \text{jamo/jete} \quad \text{a mmandʒare} \\
& \quad \text{go-1p/2p} \quad \text{to eat}_{\text{INF}} \\
& \quad \text{‘We/you are going to eat’} \\
\text{vi.} & \quad \text{viŋ} \quad \text{a m’mandʒanu} \quad \text{n a ma kasa} \\
& \quad \text{come-3p} \quad \text{to eat-3p} \quad \text{in the my house} \\
& \quad \text{‘They come to eat at my house’} \\
\text{[i.]} & \quad \text{jiv} \quad \text{a mmandʒari} \\
& \quad \text{went}_{\text{IMP}}-1s \quad \text{to eat} \\
& \quad \text{‘I was going to eat’}
\end{align*}

(14) come

\begin{align*}
\text{i.} & \quad \text{vįŋŋ} \quad \text{a mmaŋdʒu} \quad \text{n a to kasa} \\
& \quad \text{come-1s} \quad \text{to eat-1s} \quad \text{in the your house} \\
& \quad \text{‘I come to eat at your house’} \\
\text{ii.} & \quad \text{vįn} \quad \text{a mmandʒi} \\
& \quad \text{come-2s} \quad \text{to eat 2s} \\
& \quad \text{‘You come to eat’} \\
\text{iii.} & \quad \text{vɔn} \quad \text{a mmandʒa} \\
& \quad \text{come-3s} \quad \text{to eat 3s} \\
& \quad \text{‘He/she comes to eat’}
\end{align*}
\[\text{[iv./v.] vi\text{ni\text{m}}a/} \quad \text{vi\text{n}}\text{ti} \quad \text{a mm\text{m}d\text{z}a}\text{ri} \\
\text{come-1p/} \quad \text{come-2p} \quad \text{to eat}_{\text{INF}} \\
\text{‘We/you come to eat’} \\
\text{vi.} \quad \text{‘vi\text{n}}\text{n}\text{a} \quad \text{a m’mand\text{z}a}\text{n}a \\
\text{come-3p} \quad \text{to eat-3p} \\
\text{‘They come to eat’} \]

(14) \text{\textit{go} Modica}

\begin{align*}
i. & \quad \text{vaju} \quad \text{a mmantfu} \\
ii. & \quad \text{vai} \quad \text{a mmantf'i} \\
iii. & \quad \text{va} \quad \text{a mmantf'a} \\
iv. & \quad \text{jemu} \quad \text{a mmantf'amu} \\
v. & \quad \text{iti} \quad \text{a mmantf'ati} \\
vi. & \quad \text{vanu} \quad \text{a m'mantf'unu} \\
& \quad \text{go-1s} \quad \text{to eat-1s} \quad \text{etc.} \\
& \quad \text{‘I go to eat’} \quad \text{etc.} \\
\text{vi.} & \quad \text{u vanu} \quad \text{a m'mantf'unu} \\
& \quad \text{id\text{\text{g}}} \quad \text{go-3p} \quad \text{to eat-3p} \\
& \quad \text{‘They go to eat it’} \\
\text{[i.]} & \quad \text{vaju} \quad \text{a mmantf'ari} \\
& \quad \text{go-1s} \quad \text{to eat}_{\text{INF}} \\
& \quad \text{‘I go to eat’} \\
\text{\textit{went: imperfective} Modica}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
i. & \quad \text{u ia} \quad \text{a ffa'fia} \\
ii. & \quad \text{u ‘jeutu} \quad \text{a ffa’jeutu} \\
iii. & \quad \text{u ia} \quad \text{a ffa'fia} \\
iv. & \quad \text{u ‘jeum}u \quad \text{a ffa’jeum}u \\
v. & \quad \text{u ‘jeubbu} \quad \text{a ffa’jeubbu} \\
vi. & \quad \text{u ‘jeunu} \quad \text{a ffa’jeunu} \\
& \quad \text{id\text{\text{g}}} \quad \text{went}_{\text{IMP}} \quad \text{-1s} \quad \text{to did}_{\text{IMP}} \quad \text{-1s} \quad \text{etc.} \\
& \quad \text{‘I was doing it’} \quad \text{etc.} \\
\text{[ii.]} & \quad \text{u ‘jeutu} \quad \text{a ffari} \\
& \quad \text{id\text{\text{g}}} \quad \text{went}_{\text{IMP}} \quad \text{-2s} \quad \text{to do}_{\text{INF}} \\
& \quad \text{‘You were doing it’}
[iv.]  ‘jeumu फफ़री

\( \text{it}_1 \text{ went}_{\text{IMP}-1s} \) to do\(_{\text{INF}}\)

‘We were doing it’

\textit{went: perfective}

i.  u ji a फफ़ी

\( \text{it}_1 \text{ went}_{\text{PERF}-1s} \) to do\(_{\text{PERF}-1s}\)

‘I went to do it’

vi.  u jeru a फफ़ीरु

\( \text{it}_1 \text{ went}_{\text{PERF}-3p} \) to do\(_{\text{PERF}-3p}\)

‘They went to do it’

\textit{come}

i.  u vjeँँँ्ु फफ़ट्टस्य

\( \text{it}_1 \text{ come}_{-1s} \) to do\(_{-1s}\)

‘I come to do it’

ii.  vjeni a फफ़ai

\text{come-2s} to do-2s

‘You come to do’

iii.  u vjeni फफ़ा

\( \text{it}_1 \text{ come}_{-3s} \) to do-3s

‘He/she comes to do it’

(15) \textit{go}

\textit{Calascibetta}

i.  vaju (a) फफ़मन्द़०

\text{go-1s} to eat-1s

ii.  va (a) फफ़म्न०

\text{go-2s} to eat-2s

vi.  van a फफ़म्नद़ानो

\text{go-3p} to eat-3p

‘I/you/they go to eat’

[jiv./v.]  imu/iti फफ़मप्द़ारि

\( \text{go-1p/2p} \) to eat\(_{\text{INF}}\)

‘We/you go to eat’

[vi.]  si ननी फफ़म्नद़ारि

\( \text{themselves}_1 \) partitive\(_1 \) \( \text{go-3p} \) to eat\(_{\text{INF}}\)

‘They go off to eat’
i. \( u \ vaj(u) \ a \ ccamu \)
   \( \text{him} \ go-1s \ to \text{call}1s \)
   ‘I go to call him’

ii. \( u \ llu \ vaj \ a \ ccamu \)
    \( \text{not} \ \text{him} \ go-1s \ to \text{call}1s \)
    ‘I do not go to call him’

vi. \( si \ van \ a \ k'kurkano \)
    \( \text{themselves} \ go-3p \ to \text{lay down}3p \)
    ‘They go to lay down’

[v.] \( n \ im \ a \ kkurkari \)
    \( \text{ourselves} \ go-1p \ to \text{lay down}_{\text{INF}} \)
    ‘We go to lay down’

[v.] \( v \ iti \ a \ kkurkari \)
    \( \text{yourselves} \ go-2p \ to \text{lay down}_{\text{INF}} \)
    ‘You go to lay down’

come

i. \( vju\nu \ (a) \ mmand30 \)
   \( \text{come}1s \ (to) \text{eat}1s \)

ii. \( vin \ a \ mmand31 \)
    \( \text{come}2s \ to \text{eat}2s \)

iii. \( ven \ a \ mmand3a \)
    \( \text{come}3s \ to \text{eat}3s \)

vi. \( vinunu \ a \ m'mand3ano \)
    \( \text{come}3p \ to \text{eat}3p \)
    ‘I/you/he/she/they come(s) to eat’

[i./v.] \( vinimu/viniti \ a \ mmand3ari \)
   \( \text{come}1p/2p \ to \text{eat}_{\text{INF}} \)
    ‘We/you were coming to eat’

[i.] \( viniv \ a \ mmand3ari \ kka \)
   \( \text{came}_{\text{IMP}}1s \ to \text{eat} \text{here} \)
    ‘I was coming to eat here’

(16) go

i. \( vaju \ a \ ffattsu \ kistu \)
    \( \text{go}1s \ to \text{do}1s \ this \)
    ‘I go to do this’
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 \textit{sta va mand\textsuperscript{z}u} ‘I am going to eat’.

(17) \textit{stay} \hfill \textit{Mesagne}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i-vi)</th>
<th>stay</th>
<th>Mussgna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{lu sta}</td>
<td>\textit{ffatstu}</td>
<td>\textit{ffat\textsuperscript{i}i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{it\textsubscript{cl} stay}</td>
<td>\textit{do1s}</td>
<td>\textit{2s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I am doing it’ etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{(i-vi.)}</td>
<td>\textit{lu sta}</td>
<td>\textit{ffat\textsuperscript{i}a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{it\textsubscript{cl} stay}</td>
<td>\textit{do\textsubscript{IMP}1s}</td>
<td>\textit{2s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I was doing it’ etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>\textit{sta}</td>
<td>\textit{vva}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I am going to eat’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>\textit{t\textsuperscript{fe} sta}</td>
<td>\textit{ffat\textsuperscript{i}i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘What are you doing?’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{go}

| (i-iii/vi)  | \textit{lu va}  | \textit{ffatstu}  | \textit{ffat\textsuperscript{i}i}  | \textit{ffat\textsuperscript{i}i}  | \textit{ffanunu}  |
| \textit{it\textsubscript{cl} go}  | \textit{do-1s}  | \textit{2s}  | \textit{3s}  | \textit{3p}  | \textit{‘I go to do it’ etc.}  |
| iii.  | \textit{na\textsuperscript{ll}u va}  | \textit{ffat\textsuperscript{i}i}  | \textit{not it\textsubscript{cl} go}  | \textit{do-3s}  |
| ‘He doesn’t go to do it’ |
| iv./v.  | \textit{lu sa/\textsuperscript{ja}}  | \textit{fat\textsuperscript{i}imu}  | \textit{fat\textsuperscript{i}iti}  | \textit{it\textsubscript{cl} go}  | \textit{do-1p}  | \textit{2p}  |
| ‘I go to do it’ etc. |
| i-vi.  | \textit{lu sa/\textsuperscript{ja}}  | \textit{fat\textsuperscript{i}a}  | \textit{fat\textsuperscript{i}ivi}  | \textit{fat\textsuperscript{i}ia}  | \textit{fat\textsuperscript{i}iumu}  | \textit{fat\textsuperscript{i}iuuvu}  | \textit{fat\textsuperscript{i}unu}  |
| \textit{it\textsubscript{cl} go}  | \textit{do\textsubscript{IMP}1s}  | \textit{2s}  | \textit{3s}  | \textit{1p}  | \textit{2p}  | \textit{3p}  |
| ‘I was going to do it’ |

\textit{want}

| (i)  | \textit{v\textsuperscript{a\textup{\textmu\textmu}}o}  | \textit{mmand\textsuperscript{z}u}  | \textit{lu}  | \textit{ve\textsuperscript{\textmu\textmu}}u  | \textit{want-1s}  | \textit{eat-1s}  | \textit{him\textsubscript{cl}}  | \textit{see-1s}  |
| ‘I want to eat/see him’ |
ii. we mmandži
want-2s eat-2s
‘You want to eat’

iii. vɔli mmandža
want-3s eat-3s
‘He/she wants to eat’

iv. vulimu lu vitimu
want-1p it see-1p
‘We want to see it’

vi. ‘vɔlunu 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/ ccamamu/ ccamavunu
him stay callIMP-1s/ 1p/ 3p
‘I was/we-they were calling him’

(19) stay

Brindisi

i. iu ʃta ddermu
I stay sleep-1s
‘I am sleeping’
i. ti lu jta ddau
   youₐ stay-1s give-1s
   ‘I am giving it to you’

ii. jta ddermi
    stay sleep-3s
    ‘He/she is sleeping’

iii. nən tʃi jta ddermi
    not thereₐ stay sleep-3s
    ‘He/she is not sleeping’

iv. nən tʃi jta mmandʒa pi nnjenti
    not thereₐ 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/ skarfu
   myselfₐ stay-3s warm up-1s/ warm up₁ₐ
   ‘I am/was warming myself up’

ii. ti sta skarfì/ skarfì
    yourselfₐ stay-3s warm up-2s/ warm up₂ₐ
    ‘You are/were warming yourself up’

iii. si sta skarfa/ skarfava
    himselfₐ stay-3s warm up-3s/ warm up₃ₐ
    ‘He is/ was warming himself up’

iv. ndi sta skarfa’mu/ skarfa’mmu
    ourselvesₐ stay warm up-1p/ warm up₁₉
    ‘We are/were warming ourselves up’

v. vi sta skarfatì/ skarfatì
    yourselvesₐ stay warm up-2p/ warm up₂₉
    ‘You are/were warming yourselves up’
vi. si sta 'skarfanu/ skar' favunu
themselves  stay warm up-3p/ warm up\textsubscript{IMP}-3p
‘They are/were warming themselves up’

i. mi nni sta skappu
me\textsubscript{cl} partitive\textsubscript{cl} stay-3s escape-1s
‘I am escaping from there’

i. nɔ llu sta ffattsu
not it\textsubscript{cl} stay 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\textsubscript{cl} stay-3s do\textsubscript{IMP}-3s
‘He was doing it’

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

\textit{want}

i. ðɔŋu fattsu/ veŋu
want-1s do-1s/ come-1s
‘I want to do/come’

nɔl lu ðɔŋu fattsu ccui
not it\textsubscript{cl} want-1s do-1s anymore
‘I do not want to do it anymore’

iii. nɔm voli tʃi toɾmi
not want-3s there sleep-3s
‘He/she does not want to sleep’

iii. vulia vinia
want\textsubscript{IMP}-3s come\textsubscript{IMP}-3s
‘He/she wanted to come’

iv. vulimu ddurrimimu
‘want-1p sleep-1p
‘We want to sleep’
(21) **go**

**Carmiano**

1. **au** `llu` `ifu`
   
   go-1s `him` `see-1s`
   
   ‘I go to see him’

2. **want**

   1. **əjju** `bbeŋnu`
      
      want-1s `come-1s`
      
      ‘I want to come’

   2. **əjju** `te` `lu tiku`
      
      want-1s `you` `it` `tell-1s`
      
      ‘I want to tell it to you’

   3. **ulia** `lu` `fatstu/te` `lu tau`
      
      want `it` `do-1s` `you` `it` `give-1s`
      
      ‘I wanted to do it/to give it to you’

   4. **u’liamu** `llu` `fatʃimu`
      
      want `it` `do-1p`
      
      ‘We wanted to do it’

   5. **‘ələnu** `b’benenu`
      
      want-3p `come-3p`
      
      ‘They want to come’

   6. **lu** `‘ələne` `b’bitene`
      
      `it` `want-3p` `see-3p`
      
      ‘They want to see it’

   7. **u’lianu** `lu` `fatʃenu`
      
      want `it` `do-3p`
      
      ‘They wanted to do it’

(22) **stay**

**Copertino**

1. **sta** `bbeŋnu`

2. **sta** `bbjeni`

3. **sta** `bbeñe`

4. **sta** `bbinimu`

5. **sta** `bbiniti`

6. **sta** `b’beninu`

   stay `come-1s,2s,3s,1p,2p,3p`
   
   ‘I am coming’ etc.
i. ti sta risponnu
   you
   stay answer-1s
   'I am answering you'

ii. ti sta rispunnia
   you
   stay answer\textsubscript{IMP}-1s
   'I was answering you'

iii. iiddu sta bbesè
    he stay go out-3s
    'He is going out'

iii. mi sta bbète
    me stay watch-3s
    'He/she is watching me'

iii. si nni sta bbaë
    reflexive stay go-3s
    'He/she is going away'

iii. sta bbaë mmandʒa
    stay go-3s eat-3s
    'He is going to eat'

(23) stay

i. sta tte viju
    stay you
    see-1s
    'I am watching you'

i. sta tfi vejnu
    stay there
    come-1s
    'I am coming there'

ii. sta tfi vei
    stay here
    come-2s
    'You are coming here'

ii. tfc fta ffatfì?
    what stay do-2s?
    'What are you doing?'
iii. idţu no sta ʃfatje njentsi
   he not stay do-3s nothing
   ‘He is not doing anything’

iii. sta ʃfį cove /ʃfį skarfa l akkwa /sse ʃlava /mmantʃava
   stay there_d rain-3s /there_d heat-3s water /reflex_wash-3s / eat_imp-3s
   ‘It is raining/the water is heating up/he is washing himself/he was eating’

vi. ji ʃta mmanʃavane
   stay eat_imp-3p
   ‘They were eating’

go

i. va(u) ddɔrmu /me kurku /llu camu
   go-1s sleep-1s me_l lay down-1s him_l call-1s
   ‘I go to sleep/I go to lay down/I go to call him’

ii. vai ʃta cami
   go-2s him call-2s
   ‘You go to call him’

iii. vaje ʃta cama
   go-3s him call-3s
   ‘He/she goes to call him’

iv. jαmu ʃta camamu
   go-1p him call-1p
   ‘We go to call him’

v. ʃati ʃta ca’mati
   go-2p him call-2p
   ‘You go to call him’

vi. vannu ʃta camane
   go-3p him call-3p
   ‘They go to call him’

vi. ʃfį vannu c’camane?
   who go-3p call-3p
   ‘Who are they going to call?’
vi. nu vvannu llu ‘camanę
not go-3p him cl call-3p
‘They are not going to call him’

come

iii. vene llu vidię come-3s him cl see-3s
‘He/she comes to see him’

iii. tfe vvene vviđę 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 ffäʃə/ffäʃə
it cl stay-2/3s do-2s/3s
‘You are/he is doing it’

iv./v. u sta ffäʃəimə/ffäʃeitə
it cl stay do-1p/ 2p
‘We/you are doing it’

i.-vi. u sta ffäʃəvə/ffäʃivə/ffäʃəvə/ffäʃəmə/ffäʃjəvə/ffäʃjəvənə
‘it cl stay do IMP -1s/2s/ 3s/ 1p/ 2p/ 3p/
‘I was doing it’ etc.

go

ii. u və ffäʃə
it cl go-2s do-2s
‘You go to do it’

iv./v. u fə fəʃeimə/ fəʃeitə
it cl go do-1p/ 2p
‘We/you go to do it’
i. u ʃe ʃaʃevə
it_d go do_{IMF}−1s
‘I went to do it’

ii.-vi. u ʃe ʃafjiva/ ʃafjeva/ ʃafjemma/ ʃafjivə/ ʃafjevə
it_d go do_{IMF}−2s/ 3s/ 1p/ 2p/ 3p
‘You went to do it’ etc.

i./i.-vi. u ʃe ʃajibba/ ʃajistəvə/ ʃeʃora
it_d go do_{PERF}−1s/ 2p/ 3p
‘I went to do it’ etc.

(25) stay

Martina Franca

i. u stƏ cce:mo
him_d stay-1s call-1s
‘I am calling him’

i. nən tf u stƏ cce:mo
not here_d him_d stay-1s call-1s
‘I am not calling him here’

ii.-v. u stə ccamə/ cce:mo/ ccame:mo/ ccamə:to
him_d stay call-2s/ 3s/ 1p/ 2p
‘You are calling him’ etc.

i.-vi. u stə cama:vo/ camə:vo/ camamma/ camavə/ camava/ ca’ma:vo
him_d stay call_{PERF}−1s/ 2s/ 3s/ 1p/ 2p/ 3p
‘I was calling him’ etc.

go

i. vo mandə
go-1s eat-1s
‘I go to eat’

i. u vo cce:mo
him_d go-1s call-1s
‘I go to call him’

i. na- ntf u vo cce:mo
not there_d him_d go-1s call-1s
‘I am not going to call him’
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. ti va korki
you yourself go-2s lay down -2s
‘You go to lay down’

ii. va kkorka ti
go-2s_imper lie.down-2s_imper yourself
‘Go lay down!’

iii. si va kkorka
him/herself 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), except that it includes one extra column, namely V-V\textsubscript{inf}. Dialects are listed in rough geographical order, from Northern Apulia, to Salento\textsuperscript{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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ku-V\textsubscript{fin}</th>
<th>a-V\textsubscript{fin}</th>
<th>V-V\textsubscript{fin}</th>
<th>a-V\textsubscript{inf}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversano</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putignano</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina Franca</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brindisi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesagne</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monteparano</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torre S. Susanna</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmiano</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copertino</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nociglia</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbriatico</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villadoro</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modica</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calascibetta</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camporeale</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{2} In their terms, a-V\textsubscript{fin} is the Inflected Construction (IC), while ku-V\textsubscript{fin} is the finite construction.

\textsuperscript{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

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>vɔju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>vɔji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>jəmu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>jətɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>vənu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ i. \text{ go to/and call him' etc.} \]

\[ i. \text{ go-1s to eat} \]

[1.]  vəjəu a mmantʃərɪ

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. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1s/2s/3s/1p/2p/3p</th>
<th>dda</th>
<th>Putignano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stay-1s/2s/3s/1p/2p/3p</td>
<td></td>
<td>there</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Stay there' etc.

b. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1s/2s/3s/1p/2p/3p</th>
<th>dda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stay_IMP-1s/2s/3s/1p/2p/3p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'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 *ste* in all persons and tenses, as in (25). As for aspectual ‘go’, in the present it alternates between *ve* in the singular and *fo* 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. stay-1s/2s/3s/1p/2p/3p there
'I stay there' etc.
b. 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 (\textit{vil\ii\ia v\i\i\ia ‘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 all 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>V₁</th>
<th>V₁</th>
<th>V₁</th>
<th>V₁</th>
<th>V_{Pas}</th>
<th>V_{Pas}</th>
<th>V_{Pas}</th>
<th>V_{V_{Pas}}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversano</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putignano</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina Franca</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brindisi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesagne</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monteparano</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torre S. Susanna</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmiano</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copertino</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nociglia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbriatico</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villadoro</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modica</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calascibetta</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camporeale</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 voli a ssi lu mandza ‘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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Position of pronominal clitics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cl-V-a-V</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putignano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina Franca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brindisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesagne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monteparano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torre S. Susanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmiano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copertino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nociglia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbriatico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villadoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calascibetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camporeale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>split V-a-V_{fin}</th>
<th>full V-a-V_{fin}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversano</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putignano</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina Franca</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brindisi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesagne</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monteparano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villadoro</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modica</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calascibetta</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camporeale</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. véné ku llu vidê
    come-3s that him see-3s

    b. … [cp ku [ip pro/x [ip llu [i vidê

Nociglia
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)  
\[ \text{a. } \text{vaju a mmandʒu} \]  
Calascibetta  
\[ \text{b. } \ldots [\text{LocP a } N \{i \text{ mmandʒu} \} \]  
\[ \text{c. } \ldots [\text{PP a } \{i_{\text{pro/x} pro} \{i \text{ mmandʒu} \} \]  
(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 acknowledged. 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 poruncitū de au făcut un sicreiu
   has ordered of have-3p made a coffin
   ‘He has ordered them to make a coffin’

   b. l an fattu innantis de/ki ˈɛnnɛ-ɛɛ Dorgali (Sardinia)
      it have-3p done before of/that come-2sg
      ‘They did it before 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.  \[ I.go\ I.eat \]

b.  \[
\begin{array}{c}
[\text{IP} \ \text{v} \\
[\text{VP} \ \text{v} \\
[\text{IP} \ \text{prol} \\
[\text{IP} \ \text{mand}z\d]
\end{array}
\]

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, bi-clausal 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)  \[ Lo \ vado \ a\ vedere \\
\text{him} \ \text{go-1s} \ \text{to see} \\
‘I go to see him’
\]

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.  \[ (Lo) \ \text{ho} \ lavato(*lo) \]

b.  \[ \text{it} \ \text{have-1s} \ \text{washed} \]

‘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/ -ra/ -ie Cortemilia (Piedmont)
 I have seen-him/ her/ them
‘I have seen him/her/them’
(39) i l/ra/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
   him go-1s to I.call-1s
   Calascibetta
b. [ip u [vp vaju [vp a [ip pro/x [i ccamu
(41) a. ti va korki
   yourself go-2s lay down-2s
b. [ip ti [vp va [ip pro/x [i korki
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. \textipa{vɔli} a ssi lu mandʒa \textit{Brindisi}  
\hspace{1cm} want-3s to himself it eat-3s  

b. \ldots \text{[IP a [IP pro/x [IP ssi [IP llu [IP mandʒa]}} 

(43) a. \textipa{vɔɟɟu} lu veʃu \textit{Mesagne}  
\hspace{1cm} want-1s him see-1s  

b. \ldots \text{[IP pro/x [IP lu [IP 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 \textit{ku} embedding with no clitic climbing. Therefore, the question arises whether the two patterns depend on the availability of \textit{ku} structures. First of all, (42) cannot be derived from a \textit{ku} structure, since the presence of the \textit{a} introducer excludes that of \textit{ku}. As for (43), it is certainly possible to argue that it represents an instance of \textit{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 \textit{ku} deletion.

2.3 \textit{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 \textit{want} is not necessarily a control verb and indeed admits non-control readings when embedding \textit{ku} finite complements, nevertheless it requires control when embedding \textit{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 \textit{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 (Car- miano) 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 starker form, i.e. both tense and phi-features realized only downstairs, with the Salentine variety of Mesagne in (44), cf. (17).

(44) lu sta ʃfatʃi-v-i
     itcl 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.

\[
(45) \quad [\text{IP} \left[ i \right] \text{st-} [D \text{a}] \right] [\text{VP} \left[ i \right] \text{ffat}\text{iiv-} [i]]
\]

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. \([_t \text{-past} <1,2> [\_vp \text{John happy}<3>]]\)
   c. \([\_\exists e=u] \text{happy (John, e)}\)

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. \(\ldots [\_ip \text{+past} <1,2> [\_vp \text{you did it}<3>]]\)
   b. \(\ldots [\_\exists \text{e<u]} \text{do (you, it, e)}]\)
(48) \([\_ip \text{+past} <1,2> \ldots [\text{+past} <1,2> [\_vp \text{you did it}<3>]]]\)

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 prepì ‘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 monoclusal analysis, namely that al/bare finite embeddings involve not two events but a single event interpretation. Indeed ‘stay’ followed by al/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 al/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.

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 Déchaîne (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-Etxebarría 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). 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
   Gianni is eating
b. Juan está estudiando
   Juan is studying
c. u stɔ cɛɛ:mo
   himcl stay-1s call-1s
   ‘I am calling him’
d. mi stɔ bbɛtɛ
   mecl 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). 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.
   I am on the working
   ‘I am working’.
   (van Gelderen 1993: 180-182)
b. Zazie est en train de miauler.
   Zazie is in along of miaowing
   ‘Zazie is miaowing’.
   (Demirdache and Uribe-Etxebarria 1997: 9)

7 In Gungbe there is a progressive particle *tɔ* which means literally ‘be at’ (Aboh 2004).
c. ɛtɛ we mi tɔ dɪdɑ 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
   woman-det dance-loc engaged is
   ‘The woman is 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.

\[(54)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{emakume-a-}k \text{ ogi-a jaten du } \quad \text{Basque} \\
& \text{woman-DET-ERG bread-DET eating has} \\
& \text{‘The woman eats the bread’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{emakume-a ogi-a ja-te-n ari da} \\
& \text{woman-DET bread-DET eat-NOM-LOC engaged is} \\
& \text{‘The woman is (engaged in) eating the bread’}
\end{align*}
\]

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.

\[(55)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{[emakume-a}_i [\text{[[[PRO}_i \text{ogi-a ja-vp}] te-}\_\text{NP}_p] \text{n}_{\text{pp}} [\text{ari}_\text{vp}] \text{ da}_{\text{pp}}]}
\end{align*}
\]

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)  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Mary was building a house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>( \exists' e[e'(e')&lt;\text{now} &amp; \text{PROG}(e', \lambda e. \exists y [\text{house}(y) &amp; \text{Build}(e) &amp; \text{Agent}(e)=Mary &amp; \text{Theme}(e)=y])] )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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”.

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 bbeivɔ
    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. 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.

---

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 held 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.
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