A person split analysis of the progressive forms in some southern Italian varieties

Paolo Lorusso Università degi studi di Firenze / CRIL Università del Salento

The present continuous in some varieties of the Barese (a dialect spoken in the Apulia region) is formed by an inflected stative verbs ste (=to stay) a connecting element a (=to) and the present indicative of the lexical verb which agrees in person and number with the matrix verbs. Similar constructions are found with motion verbs in Barese and in other different southern Italian dialects (Cardinaletti & Giusti, 2003). These progressive constructions (as all progressive) are linked to the location of the subject (Mateu,2002) in the event denoted by the lexical verbs selected. The agreement with the subject is marked with both verbs: the functional and the lexical one. The morphology of the subject seems to play a central role in the derivation of progressive form (i.e. subject clitics see Loporcaro, 2012, Franco 2013).

(1)	'Stek a Stay-1s <i>I am doing</i>	′fatsə to do-1s	(Present continuous)
(2)	'Vek a go-1s to I go to fetch the	'pegjə u p3n fetch-1s sthe bread e bread	(Motion verb constructions)

The progressive constructions in (1) share many properties with the motion verb construction (2), however by the difference between the two constructions will lead us to propose a person split analysis to account for the distribution of the progressive inflected forms in Barese.

In both type of constructions, only the morpheme *a* can intervene between the two verbs. Adverbs like *semp* (=always), which encodes frequentative aspectual properties (Cinque 1999), can not be found between the functional and the lexical verb but they are only allowed after the complex predicate (in a low Asp_{FREQ} position in Cinque's hierarchy).

 (3) 'Mari: 'st3 (*'sembə) a (*'sembə) 'mandʒə 'sembə Maria stay-3S (*always) to (*always) eat-3S always Maria is always eating

The lexical verb that follow the stative predicates can also be non inflected (infinitive), but its use is restricted or to the case in which a frequency adverbial modifier is found between the matrix and the embedded verb (4) or when the matrix verb agrees with $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ Plural person (5). Interestingly the remaining person ($1^{st}/2^{nd}$ plural) can never be found with infected forms (6) (also in Cardinaletti & Giusti).

(4)	'Mariː 'st3 ' sembə a	man'd3e
	Maria stay-3S (*always)	to (*always) eat-(infinitive)
(5)	'Nɔjɜ _j /'vəʊ _k 'stɛmə _j /'stɛtə _k We / you(2P) stay-1P/ -2P	a man'd 3ε to eat-(infinitive)
(6)	'Nɔj3 _j /'vəʊ _k 'stɛmə _j /'stɛtə _k We / you(2P) stay-1P/ -2P	a * man'dʒɛmə _j /*mangɛtə _k k to ea -1P/ -2P

With other persons $(1^{st}/2^{nd}/3^{rd} \text{ S} \text{ and } 3^{rd} \text{ P})$, although we can find the infinitive verb in some varieties, the use of the in inflected is crucially preferred (7).

(7)
$$'J_{3_j}/'t_{\overline{\upsilon}}'Mari:$$
 'stek /'ste /'st3 a (* /??mang)/mange.
We / you(2P) stay-1P/ -2P to eat-(infinitive)

The a+ inflected lexical verbs seem to behave like the gerundive in the Italian progressive constructions for the distribution of frequentative adverbs: frequency adverbs are not compatible with progressive forms, which are episodic operator (Chierchia,1995), in Italian (8) and in the inflected verb progressive construction in Barese (3). The a+ infinitive Barese constructions seem to pattern with the 'control-like' periphrasis in Italian in allowing the intermediate position for the frequency adverbs (Johannsdottir, 2005), in which a distributional reading is available. The parallelism between (8) and (3) might support an analysis in which the complex a+inflected is compatible with constructions involving a gerund (as in Gallego,2010).

- (8) Maria sta (?/# sempre) mangiando Maria stay-3s always eating
- (9) Maria sta sempre a mangiare Maria stay-3s always to eat

Why 1 st and 2nd plural person do not allow the a+inflected form construction? Our answer is that there is a person split in the distribution of progressive forms in Barese. In theoretical literature different person split have been attested especially in the distribution of auxiliaries (Manzini & Savoia, 2011): for example between 1st and 2nd singular persons (discourse anchored pronouns) vs 3rd singular person event-anchored pronouns). In our respect 1st and 2nd plural are the inclusive or exclusive version of the 1st singular person pronouns (Harley & Ritter, 2002). The episodic value of the progressive aspectual forms can be incompatible with the distributive properties of the 1st and 2nd plural pronouns in Barese, whose distributional properties of inclusion/exclusion of the speaker/hearer in the event might pattern with the distributive reading available in the a-infinitive constructions.

References

Cardinaletti A and G. Giusti, 2003, "Motion verbs as functional heads" in TortoraC., *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 31-49

Chierchia G., 1995. 'Individual-level Predicates as Inherent Generics'. In G.N. Carlson and F.J. Pelletier (eds.), *The Generic Book* University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London. 176–223.

Cinque, G., 1999, Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective, Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax, Oxford New York: Oxford University Press.

Franco, L. 2013, "On the syntax of Pantiscu aspectual subject clitics"ms, https://www.academia.edu/11071952/On_the_syntax_of_Pantiscu_aspectual_subject_clitics

Gallego, Á., 2010), "On the prepositional nature of non-finite verbs", in *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 9: 79-102

Harley, H. and E. Ritter (2002) 'Person and number in pronouns: a feature geometric analysis' ms., University of Arizona and University of Calgary.

Johannsdottir, K., 2005, Temporal adverbs in Icelandic: Adverbs of quantification vs. frequency adverbs.

Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax76:31-72. University of Arizona and University of Calgary.

Loporcaro, Michele. 2012. A new strategy for progressive marking and its implications for grammaticalization theory. The subject clitic construction in Pantiscu. Studies in Language . 36(4). 747-784.

Manzini, M. R. and Savoia, L., 2005. I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manzini, M. R. and Savoia, L., 2007. A Unification of Morphology and Syntax. London: Routledge.

Manzini, M. R. and Savoia, L., 2011. "(Bio)linguistic diversity: Have/Be alternations in the present perfect". In The Biolinguistic Enterprise, ed. by Di Sciullo, A., and C. Boeckx, 222–265. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Mateu, J., 2002. Argument Structure. Relational Construal at the Syntax-Semantics Interface, PhD dissertation, Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona