MULTIPLE AGREEMENT CONSTRUCTIONS: A MACRO-COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PSEUDO-COORDINATION WITH THE MOTION VERB *GO* IN THE ARABIC AND SICILIAN DIALECTS

Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro*

Abstract: I discuss some syntactic properties of GO in verbal Pseudo-Coordination, in which it is followed by an inflected lexical verb and preceded by an optional connecting element. Following the analysis in Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001, 2003), I consider examples from different Sicilian varieties to show that the ones from the Eastern Coast (Di Caro 2015), where GO can become grammaticalized as an aspect marker and thus lose its argument structure and its semantics of motion, are reminiscent of some Multiple Agreement Constructions displayed by most Arabic dialects (Jarad 2014). In both groups of languages, the grammaticalized GO can also occur in an invariant and phonetically eroded version. In the macro-comparison I am proposing, I suggest language contact between Arabs/Berbers and the indigenous people in Sicily from 9th to 13th century as a factor in the productivity of Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination as an isolated case in the Romance domain.

Keywords: grammaticalization of motion verb GO, multiple agreement constructions, Pseudo-Coordination, surprise effect

1. Introduction: a definition of Pseudo-Coordination[1]

Pseudo-Coordination (henceforth PseCo) can be found in many and unrelated languages of the world. It can be defined as the use of an overt or covert coordinating element (such as *and* in English) in verbal constructions featuring two verbs, V1 (and) V2, that behave unlike typical coordination. PseCo, which generally allows for only a restricted class of V1s to appear in the construction (usually GO, COME, TAKE, SIT and STAND), can be considered as a transitional state between coordination and subordination, in the sense that it, despite its diachronic origin as a coordination, displays the syntactic behaviour of subordination, prohibiting, for example, the inversion of V1 and V2 and allowing for the *wh*-extraction of the internal argument of V2.

Cross-linguistically, the discussions of the phenomenon go quite far back. According to Ross (2016) it has been observed as early as in comments on Spanish 'take and' by Juan de Valdés in the 1500s and later it can be found in several European and Semitic languages in discussions published in the late 1800s (see a.o. Jespersen 1895) which, sometimes, refer to it as "hendiadys" (Lillas 2012). The term *PseCo*, which is adopted in this paper, comes from descriptions of the Scandinavian Germanic languages (Kvist Darnell 2008), but the phenomenon has also been labelled in many other ways, such as "fake coordination", "serialization" or "verb-verb agreement".

* Ca' Foscari University of Venice, vincenzo.dicaro@unive.it.

[1] Parts of this paper have been presented at the 19th Annual International Conference of the English Department, University of Bucharest, June 2017, and at the 12th Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax-Morphology Meeting, University of Cambridge, July 2017. I thank the audiences for constructive criticisms. I also wish to thank Giuliana Giusti, Adam Ledgeway, Theresa Biberauer, Alessandro De Angelis, Io Manolessou and an anonymous reviewer for their supportive comments and suggestions.

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

In Germanic, this construction is quite common. Cases of PseCo can be found in English (Carden and Pesetsky 1977, Jaeggli and Hyams 1993), Swedish (cf. Wiklund 2007), Norwegian (Lødrup 2002), Icelandic, Danish, Afrikaans (de Vos 2005, Biberauer and Vikner 2017) and Faroese (Heycock and Petersen 2012, Ross 2015). On the other hand, in the Romance languages, only few varieties still display a productive form of PseCo, namely the Extreme Southern Italian dialects (i.e. Sicily, Southern Calabria and some areas of Salento, in Apulia). In literature regarding the Sicilian dialects, the expression "inflected construction" is also in use, following the detailed macro-comparative analysis between Sicilian and Germanic PseCo by Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001, 2003)[2]. Following the same path, in his morphological account of PseCo, Cruschina (2013) calls it the "doubly inflected construction".

In this paper, I suggest that the asyndetic construction of Arabic dialects, with GO as the first verb of the construction, can be considered an instance of PseCo which shares some interesting properties with the ones that are very productive in some Eastern Sicilian dialects. In doing so, I will mainly rely on Cardinaletti and Giusti's (2001, 2003) work on Marsalese for the description of the syntactic behaviour of PseCo, on Di Caro's (2015) account of invariable V1 GO in some varieties of Eastern Sicily and many Arabic dialects, on Jarad's (2014) work on the grammaticalization of GO in the Arabic dialects, and on ongoing personal fieldwork.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 will offer an overview of the phenomenon as found in the Sicilian dialects. Section 3 will focus on the construction with two inflected verbs, reminiscent of the Sicilian PseCo, as found in the Arabic dialects. In Section 4 a comparison between two instances of GO as V1 undergoing grammaticalization and prefixation in, respectively, the Sicilian dialects of the East coast and Arabic dialects is proposed. A protocol (in the sense of Giusti 2011) will highlight the properties that these constructions have in common. In Section 5 I will draw the conclusions and share some considerations for further research.

2. Pseudo-Coordination in the Sicilian dialects

Most Sicilian dialects display a typical instance of PseCo featuring:
(i) a verb (V1) taken from a restricted class of restructuring (usually motion) verbs;
(ii) an optional connecting element *a* (which is a pseudo-coordinator, see Rohlfs 1969 for a diachronic analysis of *a* from Latin AC);
(iii) a lexical verb (V2), sharing mood, tense and person features with V1.
This construction is subject to a high degree of micro-variation across Sicily: it shows different degrees of defectiveness in the paradigm, some lexical restrictions on V1 and V2 and some restrictions on the mood, tense and person features of both V1 and V2. The examples in (1a-a′) show the most widespread version of PseCo, that is the one featuring

[2] Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001: 374) refer to PseCo as the "Inflected Construction" to capture the fact that V1, which behaves like a semi-lexical verb, is parasitically inflected on the mood, tense and person features of V2. They propose that V1 is merged in *t*, a head immediately higher than T. Regardless of the difference in labels used in this paper, I will adopt Cardinaletti and Giusti's syntactic account.

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

the connecting element *a*. In some dialects, such as Pantesco (Tropea 1988), Ennese (Di Caro 2015) and Marinese (Delia Trentacosti, p.c.), as in (1b-c'), V1 and V2 are juxtaposed without *a*[3]. This latter PseCo is also referred to as *asyndeton* in literature (cf. Sornicola 1976; Ledgeway 1997, 2016):

(1) a. *Vaju a ppigliu lu pani*
go-1SG *a* fetch-1SG the bread
'I go and fetch the bread.'

(Delia, Caltanissetta)

a'. *Vjignu a ppigliu la spisa.*
come-1SG *a* fetchSG the shopping
'I come and fetch the shopping.'

b. *Vaju pigliu u pani.*
go.1SG fetch-1SG the bread
'I go and fetch the bread.'

(Enna)

b'. *Vignu pigliu a spisa.*
come.1SG fetch.1SG the shopping
'I come and fetch the shopping.'

c. *Vaju pigghju u pani.*
go.1SG fetch.1SG the bread
'I go and fetch the bread.'

(Marineo, Palermo)

c'. *Vegnu pigghju a spisa.*
come.1SG fetch.1SG the shopping
'I come and fetch the shopping.'

PseCo can generally be replaced by the Infinitival Construction (V1+*a*+Inf.)[4], or InfCo, which is a biclausal construction common to all of the Western Romance varieties; this is also the only acceptable construction in Standard Italian (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001 2003). Examples in (2) show the infinitival counterpart of (1), where *a* is diachronically derived from Latin AD (Rohlfs 1969) and is thus glossed as "to"; this *a* is obligatory, unlike the *a* in PseCo:

(2) a. *Vaju a ppigliari lu pani.*
go-1SG to fetch-INF the bread
'I go to fetch the bread.'

(Delia, Caltanissetta)

[3] In the glosses, the Indicative Present is considered the default tense and thus is not indicated.

[4] Replacing PseCo with the InfCo is theoretically always possible in Sicilian, especially because the InfCo fills the ungrammatical cells of the PseCo paradigms, which are highly defective in most varieties (cf. Di Caro and Giusti 2015). Nevertheless, according to recent fieldwork throughout the island, the Imperative 2SG seems to be the case where speakers tend to turn exclusively to PseCo, to the point that most of them would not consider Imperative InfCo for 2SG as grammatical at all, despite the fact that the constant pressure of Italian on (especially younger) Sicilian speakers should favour the use of InfCo in the Imperative.

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

a'. *Vjignu a ppigliari la spisa.*
come-1SG to fetch-INF the shopping
'I come to fetch the shopping.'
b. *Vaju a ppigliari u pani.*
go-1SG to fetch-INF the bread
'I go to fetch the bread.'

(Enna)

b'. *Vignu a ppigliari a spisa.*
come-1SG to fetch-INF the shopping
'I come to fetch the shopping.'
c. *Vaju a ppigghjari u pani.*
go-1SG to fetch-INF the bread
'I go to fetch the bread.'

(Marinea, Palermo)

c'. *Vegnu a ppigghjari a spisa.*
come-1SG to fetch-INF the shopping
'I come to fetch the shopping.'

The InfCo allows for insertion of syntactic material between V1 and V2, thus behaving like a biclausal construction. PseCo, by contrast, always instantiates a monoclausal construction. Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001: 385-391) account for the monoclausality of PseCo in the dialect of Marsala (in the province of Trapani) by discussing the following properties:
(i) unique mood, tense and person specifications for V1 and V2[5] (3a-a');
(ii) obligatory single event interpretation of V1 and V2 (3b), according to which it is not possible to negate only the action expressed by the lexical verb in V2;
(iii) impossible insertion of sentential adverbs between V1 and V2 (3d);
(iv) impossible insertion of floating quantifiers between V1 and V2 (3e);
(v) obligatory clitic climbing to V1 (3e-e'), as opposed to optional clitic climbing in Italian (3f-f')[6].

[5] Interestingly, this holds true even in the case where the causative motion verb SEND is used as V1 and, thus, the person sent, that is the external argument of V2, cannot be coreferential with the causer (see Di Caro and Giusti 2016):

(i) a. *Mannu a ppigliu lu pani.*
send.1SG *a* fetch.1SG the bread

(Delia, Caltanissetta)

b. **Mannu a ppiglia lu pani.*
send.1SG *a* fetch.3SG the bread
'I send someone to fetch the bread.'

However, we will see in Section 4 that some Sicilian dialects display an invariable V1 GO and for that reason the property in (i) cannot be tested with those varieties.

[6] According to Cardinaletti and Giusti (forthcoming), since clitic pronouns target the first T-layer above them, they can be considered as a good diagnostic for the presence or absence of an independent T. However, they warn that this diagnostic works only in one direction. Clitic climbing onto V1 signals that there is no intervening T in the path, as is the case in Italian InfCo and in both Sicilian InfCo and PseCo. Lack of clitic climbing, on the other hand, tells us nothing about the presence of a lower independent T, since, according to

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

These properties hold true for all the Sicilian varieties featuring PseCo. Examples in (3), from Deliano, are all adapted from Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001):

(3) a. **Jiva / Jivu a ppigliu lu pani.*
go-IPF.1SG go-PAST.1SG *a* fetch-SG the bread

a'. **Vaju a ppigliava / ppigliavu lu pani.*
go.1SG *a* fetch-IPF.1SG fetch-PAST.1SG the bread

b. *Vaju a ppigliu la cicoria ognigghjuirnu*
go.1SG *a* etch-1SG the chicory every-day
[**ma nun la truivu mai*].
but NEG it.CL find-1SG never
'I go to fetch the chicory every day but I can never find any.'

c. *Lu pani nullu vaju* (**mai*) *a 'ccattu* (*mai*)
the bread NEG-it.CL go-1SG never *a* buy.1SG never
nni ddru furnu.
in that bakery
'I never go to buy the bread in that bakery.'

d. *Li carusi vannu* (**tutti*) *a 'ccàttanu* (*tutti*) *lu pani*
the boys go.3PL all *a* buy-3PL all the bread
nni ddru furnu.
in that bakery
'The boys all go to buy the bread in that bakery.'

e. *Lu vaju a ppigliu.*
it.CL go.1SG *a* fetch-1SG

e'. **Vaju a ppigliulu.*
go.1SG *a* fetch.1SG-it.CL
'I go and fetch it.'

f. *Lo vado a prendere.*
it.CL go.1SG to fetch-INF

f'. *Vado a prenderlo.*
fetch.1SG to fetch-INF-itCL
'I go to fetch it.'

Finally, some dialects of North Eastern Sicily can also display another Multiple Agreement Construction, namely the Finite Construction, or FinCo (see Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003, Manzini and Savoia 2005, De Angelis 2017). The FinCo should be kept separate from PseCo, since the former[7]:

Cinque (2006), the pronoun may cliticize onto the lower verb V2 even in monoclausal constructions, as in Italian InfCo:

(i) a. [TP lo vado [subito [andP V [a [VP prendere
it.CL go.1SG immediately to fetch.INF

b. [TP vado [subito [andP V [a [VP prenderlo
go.1SG immediately to fetch.INF-it.CL

[7] See De Angelis (2017) for an account of the FinCo in the Extreme Southern dialects of Italy and the competing FinCo, De Angelis and Krstic (2014) for a contrastive analysis between the FinCo of the Italian

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

(i) selects different connecting elements according to the area where the construction is used (see De Angelis 2017), namely *cu*[8] in Salentino (deriving from Latin QUOD) (see 4a) from Calabrese 1993: 28), *ma, (m)u, (m)i* in Calabrian and *mi* in the province of Messina (all etymologically derived from Latin MODO) (see also 4d), but it never selects *a*;
(ii) allows for the insertion of material between V1 and V2, as is the case of *kkwai* 'here' in (4b), from Calabrese 1993: 44), and does not allow for clitic climbing to V1, thus displaying a biclausal structure;
(iii) can compete with the InfCo and can co-occur with PseCo, as is the case of (4c) in Milazzese (see Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001: 374), where all of the three constructions are attested;
(iv) selects the V1 from a wider sets of verbs than the PseCo, such as WANT in (4a);
(v) can show two different mood, tense and person agreements for V1 and V2 (4e) from Rohlfs 1972: 334, cited in De Angelis 2017: 140).

Here are some examples:

(4) a. *Lu Karlu ole ku bbene krai.*
the Karlu want-3SG *ku* come-3SG tomorrow
'Karlu wants to come tomorrow.'
(Province of Lecce, Apulia)

b. *Addʒu inutu kkwai ku kkattu*
have-1SG come-PAST.PART here *ku* buy.1SG
ddru libbru.
that book
'I came here to buy that book.'
(Province of Lecce, Apulia)

c. *Vaju mi pigghju u pani.*
go-1SG *mi* fetch-1SG the bread
'I go to fetch the bread.'
(Milazzo, Messina)

d. *Jamu u pigghjamu u pani.*
go-1PL *u* fetch-1PL the bread
'We go to fetch the bread.'
(Cittanova, RC; Di Caro 2015)

e. *Iddu vulissi mi vegnu*
he want.SBJV.3SG *mi* come-1SG
'He would like me to come."
(Castroreale, Messina)

---

dialects and the one found in Serbian and Croatian, and Cardinaletti and Giusti (forthcoming) for an analysis of the structural differences between FinCo and PseCo.

[8] Other complementizers are also available in those areas. According to De Angelis (2017: 138-139), dependent clauses which are specified as [+deictic, −anaphoric], and labelled as *realis* clauses, are headed by the complementizer *ca*, deriving from Latin QUIA. Moreover, in most of the province of Messina and in some localities of Southern Calabria, *realis* complementation clauses are introduced by *chi* instead of *ca* (De Angelis 2017: 140-141). This complementizer can also replace *mi* in irrealis [−deictic, + anaphoric] (see Leone 1995).

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

In the present paper, I propose that the contact between Arabic speaking people (mainly Arabs and Berbers Muslims) and Sicilian people, which lasted for about four centuries, could have been a factor in the productivity of Sicilian PseCo since, as will be clear in the following sections, Arabic varieties display syntactic constructions that are reminiscent of Sicilian PseCo in many respects. It is worth noting, then, that the distribution of the FinCo in Sicily, which is restricted to the province of Messina as the result of contact with Greek speaking people, coincides with the area where Muslim people were less present.

3. Pseudo-Coordination in the Arabic dialects

In Standard Arabic, motion verbs can enter both the InfCo and the FinCo. In the former (5a), V1 in the nominal infinitive (*Masdar*) is preceded by the clitic *li-* 'to', 'for'. In the latter (5b), V2 is inflected in the Subjunctive mood and preceded by *li-*:

(5) a. *Aḏhabu li-širā'i l-ḫubz.*
go.1SG to.CL-buy.INF the.CL-bread
b. *Aḏhabu li-aštarī l-ḫubz*
go.1SG to buy.SBJV bread
'I go to buy the bread.'

(Standard Arabic)

The InfCo and the FinCo with motion V1s in Standard Arabic always instantiate a biclausal structure. Furthermore, Arabic also features an asyndetic construction in which V1 and V2 are juxtaposed without any preposition. Again, this construction does not imply any kind of monoclausal structure; in fact, it is used when the meaning of the action expressed by V2 "is future in relation to that of the main clause in which the action represents a necessary preparation as requirement for the subordinate. Generally, this construction is equivalent in meaning to an expression of purpose or finality in English." (Cantarino 1975: 249, cited in Di Caro 2015: 81):

(6) *ṯumma ḏahabat tadʕū umma-hā.*
then go.PAST-3SG.F 3SG.F-call mother-her.CL
'Then she went to call her mother.'

(Standard Arabic)

On the other hand, unlike Standard Arabic, what seems to be a constant in all the Arabic dialects is the juxtaposition of two verbs without any complementizer between them. The mere presence of two verbs in a serial construction in the Arabic dialects does not imply that they must always instantiate a monoclausal structure, but this seems to be the case when some motion verbs are involved (see Brustad 2000: 147). Some examples of this Arabic PseCo (from Di Caro 2015) are given in (7a-b):

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

(7) a. *Nemši nğīb ḥobz.*
go.1SG 3SG-fetch bread
(Tunis, Tunisia)

b. *Maši inğīb el-ḥəbza.*
go.1SG 1SG -fetch the-bread
'I go and fetch the bread.'
(Benghazi, Libya)

The similarity between Sicilian and Arabic PseCo is even more striking in the Imperative with GO and COME as V1, as Sicilian PseCo lacks the connecting element *a* in most varieties[9] in this case (with a corresponding absence of Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico on V2, see Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003). Compare the Sicilian examples from Deliano in (8a, a') with the Tunisian example in (8b) from Di Caro (2015) and the Moroccan example in (8c) from Di Caro and El Hansali (2016):

(8) a. *Va piglia lu pani!*
go.IMP.2SG fetch-IMP.2SG the bread
'Go (and) fetch the bread!'
(Delia, Caltanissetta)

a'. *Vjini piglia lu pani*
come-IMP.2SG fetch-IMP.2SG the bread
'Come (and) fetch the bread!'

b. *Imši ğīb ḥobz!*
go.IMP.2SG fetch.IMP.2SG bread
(Tunis, Tunisia)

c. *Sīr ğīb ḥobz!*
go.IMP.2SG fetch.IMP.2SG bread
'Go (and) fetch the bread!'
(Casablanca, Morocco)

The single-event requirement on the two actions expressed by V1 and V2, which consistently holds for PseCo (see Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003; see also Shopen 1971 for the English *go and* V2 construction), is also evident in the Arabic varieties. In the dialect of Tunis, for example, when the second action negates the first one, the preposition *bāš* 'to', 'for' is required before V2, thus rendering the whole construction finite. The alternative version without the preposition *bāš* (9b) yields an odd result:

(9) a. *Nemši bāš nğīb l-ḥobz mal ḥānūt hāḏā*
1SG-go to 1SG-fetch the-bread from shop this
kull yūm amma mā nalqā-he-š bi-l-kull.
all day but NEG 1SG-find-it.CL- NEG.CL at-the-all
(Tunis)

[9] The lack of the pseudo-coordinator *a* in the Imperative 2SG of PseCo with GO as V1 is widespread across Sicily. On the other hand, only some dialects display the lack of *a* when COME is in V1 position. Deliano displays the optional drop of *a* in this latter case, so that *Vjini a ppiglia lu pani* 'Come (and) fetch the bread!' is also accepted by the speakers, especially the younger ones.

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

b. ?*Nemši nğīb l-ḥobz mal ḥānūt hāḍā*
go.1SG SG-fetch the-bread from shop this
kull yūm amma mā nalqā-he-š bi-l-kull.
all day but NEG 1SG-find-it.CL- NEG.CL at-the-all
'I go to fetch the bread in this shop every day but I never find any.'

In the Moroccan dialect of the Grand Casablanca region, the counterpart of (9a) with *bāš* is shown in (10a). On the other hand, the version without *bāš* in (10b) does not yield an odd result because *bāš* is covert. This interpretation is forced by the fact that V2 is negated:

(10) a. *Kanmši bāš nğīb l-ḥobz mən hadāk l-ḥānūt*
1SG-go to 1SG-fetch the-bread from that the-shop
yawmiyan wa-lakin maʃamrni ma-knlqā-h.
daily and-but never-I NEG.CL-find-1SG-it.CL-CL
'I go to fetch the bread in that shop every day but I never find any.'
(Casablanca)

b. *Kanmši nğīb l-ḥobz mən hadāk l-ḥānūt*
1SG-go 1SG-fetch the-bread from that the-shop
yawmiyan wa-lakin maʃamrni ma-knlqā-h.
daily and-but never-I NEG.CL-find-1SG-it.CL-CL
'I go to fetch the bread in that shop every day but I never find any.'

The example in (11) is ambiguous between two readings: the biclausal reading implies a covert *bāš* 'to', whereas the monoclausal one does not:

(11) *Kanmshi nğīb l-ḥobz mən hadāk l-ḥānūt.*
1SG-go fetch.1SG the-bread from that the-shop
a. 'I go to fetch the bread in that shop.' (biclausal interpretation, covert *bāš*)
b. 'I go and fetch the bread in that shop.' (monoclausal interpretation)

If we put the example in (11) in the past this difference emerges. In fact, the biclausal version, with covert *bāš*, has to display the V2 in the present (12b)), whereas the monoclausal version, without covert *bāš* (12a), has to display both verbs in the past. The monoclausality of constructions such as the one in (12a) is accounted for by the fact that V2 cannot be negated:

(12) a. *Mšit ğebt l-ḥobz mən hadāk l-ḥānūt.*
go.PAST-1SG fetch.PAST-1SG the-bread from that the-shop
'I went to fetch the bread in that shop.' (monoclausal interpretation)

b. *Mšit nğīb l-ḥobz mən hadāk l-ḥānūt.*
go.PAST-1SG 1SG-fetch the-bread from that the-shop
'I went in order to fetch the bread in that shop.' (covert *bāš*)

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

Finally, although PseCo is attested in other Indo-European languages (especially in Germanic), the contact between the Sicilian dialects and the Arabic varieties spoken by the Arab and Berber conquerors in Sicily could have fostered the use of the PseCo in Sicily and in some parts of Southern Italy, since no instances of PseCo are attested either in the rest of Italy or in the other Romance varieties. As a matter of fact, one of the most significant periods in the history of Sicily, especially from the cultural point of view, was undeniably the Islamic rule of the Emirate of Sicily, which lasted for more than two centuries, from 827 to 1091, that is from the landing of the Arab conquerors in Mazara del Vallo (Western Coast of Sicily) to the conquest of the town of Noto by the Normans.

Moreover, the Arab influence in Sicily's life did not end with the fall of the Emirate. For more than a century after the onset of Norman, in fact, Arabs and Muslims held high clerical positions in Palermo[10] (cf. Mack Smith 1976). Moreover, in his description of Messina during the Norman period, the Muslim writer Ibn Jubayr highlights the liveliness of the town's port and its multicultural and multilingual nature. Messina, with its low prices, was then the marketplace for many merchants from all over the Muslim world and most of them were Arabic native speakers or people who spoke Arabic as a *lingua franca*. On the opposite side of Sicily, besides the port of Palermo, the port of Trapani was also commercially relevant (Agius 2007: 28-29).

Assessing the size of the linguistic contact under consideration is not as easy a task as it surely is for the Arab domination in al-Andalus (Spain): most of the buildings and the documentation in public and private archives from that period were destroyed or lost, with the exception of some pieces of poetry that were kept in libraries outside Sicily, mainly in Spain or in Damascus (Mack Smith 1976). Fortunately, at the end of the 19th century the Sicilian historian Michele Amari managed to collect a corpus of literary, geographical and historical accounts of Sicily during the Islamic rule, together with some biographical data, which he referred to as "Siculo-Arabic" (cf. Amari 1880). Siculo-Arabic may remain a speculation but, as Agius (2007: 27) states, "shying away from discussing the issue would mean denying the possibility of such a variety and further inquiry".

Sgroi (1986: 52-3) confirms the hypothesis that the contact with Arabic speaking people could have helped Sicilian PseCo to survive by providing the following examples of asyndetic Multiple Agreement Construction in different Arabic dialects:

(13) General Maghreb Arabic

a. *Ǧīt nšūfək.*[11]
'I came to see you.'

b. *Nǧi nšūfək.*
'I come (or I will come) and see you.'

[10] For a comprehensive account of the Royal Diwan, the Arabic administration during Norman Sicily, which was modelled on the contemporary administration of Fatimid Egypt, I refer the interested reader to Johns (2002).

[11] Note that Sgroi (1986) focuses only on the similarity of the Arabic and Sicilian dialects with respect to the construction under analysis just relying on the fact that both versions display two inflected verbs, but not all the examples listed in (13)-(20) should be considered as instances of PseCo.

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

(14) Libyan Arabic of Tripoli
a. *Māšī netġaddā.*
'I go and have lunch.'
b. *Emšī ešbaḥ.*
'Go and have a look.'
c. *TʃʿAla ya ʃʿali gă ʃmĭz.*
'Hey, Ali, come and sit!'

(15) Libyan Arabic of Benghazi
a. *Žā ħdā el-kětāb u ʃʿaddā yežrī.*
'He came to take the book and ran away.'
b. *ʃʿaddī nādī-h.*
'Go and call him.'

(16) Algerian Arabic of Algiers
Ḫreğ (bâš) iḍarḍo la-hwâ.
'He came out to get some fresh air.'

(17) Moroccan Arabic
Mša šra l-lḥem.
'He went and bought some meat.'

(18) Maltese
Mur ħu l-kafè.
'Go to take the coffee.'

(19) Egyptian Arabic
a. *Anā arūḥ aštirî l-ʃʿēś.*
'I'll go and buy the bread.'
b. *Hūwa gāy yāḫd-ak.* (or *yāḫod-ak.*)
'He is coming to pick you up.'
c. *Rūḥ indah Maḥmūd.*
'Go and call Mahmud.'
d. *TaʃʿāIa ḫod kursī.*
'Come and take a chair.'

(20) Syrian Arabic
a. *Bəkra bəži bətġadda ʃʿandek.*
'Tomorrow I'll come and have lunch with you.'
b. *Rāyeḥ bžəb-lak yāha.*
'I'll go and get her for you.'

Lack of any available literature which offers a comprehensive syntactic account of Arabic motion verbs within asyndetic constructions like the ones discussed here suggests that we consider this paper a starting point for further research in this direction. In the following section, I will go into the substance of this issue by discussing the grammaticalization of the lexical verb GO turning into a functional verb in both Sicilian and Arabic dialects.

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

4. The grammaticalization of GO as V1 in Sicilian and Arabic

When a grammaticalized motion verb becomes a tense or aspect marker, it undergoes structural, phonological and semantic change. Furthermore, it loses its argument structure (see Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003 for Marsalese). With respect to this change, the similar syntactic behaviour that PseCo displays in some Sicilian and Arabic dialects when GO is used as V1 is discussed here. In particular, the two instances of PseCo that display the same path of grammaticalization that turned GO into an aspect marker serving different purposes are described.

In a particular type of PseCo with GO as V1found in some dialects of the Eastern Coast of Sicily, the functional verb occurs as a prefixed and invariable form, namely: *va-*, *vo-*, *uo-* or *o-* (see Di Caro 2015)[12]. This PseCo displays a lower degree of mood, tense and person restrictions with respect to Marsalese (see Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003) since the latter is limited to 1SG, 2 SG, 3SG and 3PL of the Indicative Present and 2SG of the Imperative[13]. The examples in (21)-(25) from Acese (the dialect spoken in Acireale, in the province of Catania) show that this type of PseCo is grammatical also in the 1PL and 2PL of the Indicative Present (21d-e), in the 2PL of the Imperative (22b), and that it displays a fully-fledged paradigm in the Indicative Imperfect (23), Preterite (24) and in the Subjunctive (25), where 1SG, 2SG and 3SG are homophonous:

(21) a. *Oppigghju u pani.*
o-fetch-1SG the bread
'I go and fetch the bread.'
(Acireale, Catania)

b. *Oppigghji u pani.*
o-fetch-2SG the bread
'You go and fetch the bread.'

[12] According to the traditional literature on the grammaticalization of motion verbs, these verbs can become more closely linked to the lexical verb they modify to the point of losing their own inflections and becoming verbal affixes, even undergoing phonological reduction, as is the case of GO in Acese. Interestingly, the loss of the initial consonant of GO in this process in Sicilian (e.g. Acese *vo* > *o*) is parallel to what happens in some Arabic varieties. According to Di Caro and El Hansali (2017), in the Moroccan dialect spoken in El Jadida (in the region of Casablanca-Settat), for example, GO is realized following three different roots, depending on the tense: *ġadi* is the Present Participle, *məša* is used in the Preterite and Present and *sīr* in the Imperative. The progressive variety is the one that gets grammaticalized to convey the sense of futurity, completely losing its semantics of motion, as the co-occurrence of another GO in (i) demonstrates. In its most phonological reduced form, this instance of GO occurs as *a-* (*ġadi* > *ġa-* > *a-*):

(i) a. *ġadi nməši l-mdrassa.*
FUT 1SG-go the-school
b. *ġa-nməši l-mdrassa.*
FUT-1SG-go the-school
c. *A-nmši l-mdrassa.*
FUT-1SG-go the-school
'I will go to school.'

[13] The mood, tense and person restrictions found in the PseCo of Marsalese are the most widespread within the Sicilian dialects. For an overview of other possible restrictions in the paradigm of PseCo in different Sicilian varieties see Di Caro and Giusti (2015).

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

c. *Oppigghja u pani.*
o-fetch-3SG the bread
'(S)he goes to fetch the bread.'

d. *Oppigghjamu u pani.*
o-fetch-1PL the bread
'We go and fetch the bread.'

e. *Oppigghjati u pani.*
o-fetch-2PL the bread
'You go and fetch the bread.'

f. *Oppìgghjunu u pani.*
o-fetch-3PL the bread
'They go and fetch the bread.'

(22) a. *Oppigghja u pani!*
o-fetch- MP.2SG the bread
'Go (and) fetch the bread!'

b. *Oppigghjati u pani!*
o-fetch-IMP.2PL the bread
'Go (and) fetch the bread!'

(23) a. *Oppigghjava u pani.*
o-fetch-IPF.1SG the bread
'I used to go and fetch the bread.'

b. *Oppigghjavi u pani.*
o-fetch-IPF.2SG the bread
'You used to go and fetch the bread.'

c. *Oppigghjava u pani.*
o-fetch-IPF.3SG the bread
'(S)he used to go and fetch the bread.'

d. *Oppigghjàumu u pani.*
o-fetch-IPF.1PL the bread
'We used to go and fetch the bread.'

e. *Oppigghjàuvu u pani.*
o-fetch-IPF.2PL the bread
'You used to go and fetch the bread.'

f. *Oppigghjàunu u pani.*
o-fetch-IPF.3PL the bread
'They used to go and fetch the bread.'

(24) a. *Oppigghjai u pani.*
o-fetch-PAST.1SG the bread
'I went to fetch the bread.'

b. *Oppigghjasti u pani.*
o-fetch-PAST.2SG the bread
'You went to fetch the bread.'

c. *Oppigghjau u pani.*
o-fetch-PAST.3SG the bread
'(S)he went to fetch the bread.'

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

d. *Oppigghjammu u pani.*
o-fetch-PAST.1PL the bread
'We went to fetch the bread.'
e. *Oppigghjàsturu u pani.*
o-fetch-PAST.2PL the bread
'You went to fetch the bread.'
f. *Oppigghjaru u pani.*
o-fetch-PAST.3PL the bread
'They went to fetch the bread.'

(25) a. *Oppigghjassi u pani.*
o-fetch-SUB.1SG the bread
'I would go and fetch the bread.'
b. *Oppigghjassi u pani.*
o-fetch-SUB.2SG the bread
'You would go and fetch the bread.'
c. *Oppigghjassi u pani.*
o-fetch-SUB.3SG the bread
'(S)he would go and fetch the bread.'
d. *Oppigghjàssimmu u pani.*
o-fetch-SUB.1.PL the bread
'We would go and fetch the bread.'
e. *Oppigghjàssivu u pani.*
o-fetch.SUB.2.PL the bread
'You would go and fetch the bread.'
f. *Oppigghjàssiru u pani.*
o-fetch.SUB.3.PL the bread
'They would go and fetch the bread.'

In dialects such as Acese, PseCo generally preserves its semantics of motion and in this case it competes with the InfCo (i.e. *Vaju a ppigghjari u pani* 'I go to fetch the bread'). But sometimes GO can undergo desemanticization to become either a progressive marker (cf. 26a) or an emphatic marker involving emotional participation of the speaker, as in (26b) and (26c)[14], see also (Cruschina 2013: 278-281)[15]:

(26) a. *Ora ottravagghju e poi u chjamu.*
now *o*-work-1SG and then him.CL call-1SG
'I'm going to work now. I'll call him later.'
(Acireale, Catania)

[14] Example (26c) is to be read with the following context, which was provided to native speakers before asking for grammaticality judgements: the washing machine broke while they were away and when they came back they found the floor flooded. The utterance time of (26c) refers to a moment, subsequent to that event, in which the speaker is telling a friend what happened.
[15] Interestingly, we can find similar emphatic effects in the PseCo of Germanic languages (see e.g. the "surprise effect" in Swedish in Wiklund 1998 and Josefsson 2014).

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

b. *Ci oddesi un pugnu…*
to-him.CL *o*-give.PAST.1SG a punch
'I suddenly punched him...'
c. *Ottrovu a casa allagata / anniata!*
o-find-1SG the house flooded flooded
'I found my house flooded!'

On the other hand, according to Jarad (2014)[16], Syrian Arabic *raḥ* 'go' can occur either as a lexical verb (27a), or as prospective future marker V1 of a PseCo in both its full (27b) or phonetically eroded version (27c), following the unidirectional grammaticalization tendency: content word > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix (see Bybee et al. 1994):

(27) a. *Rāḥa l-ḥadiqata li-n-nuzha.*
go.PAST.3SG the-park to-theCL-outing
'He went to the park for an outing.'
b. *Rāḥ yūʔaʃ.* (said of a clown walking on a rope)
raḥ 3SG-fall
'He is going to fall.'
c. *L-madrasə ḥa-təʃlin n-nətāyiğ bukra.*
the-school *ha*-3SG-announce the-results tomorrow
'The school is going to announce the results tomorrow.'

(Syrian Arabic)

According to Cowell (2005: 322-23), *raḥ* is the particle of anticipation which generally indicates that what V2 refers to is impending in the future, as a consequence of present intentions or a course of events already under way. It can be translated either as 'going to' or, when it carries a sense of imminence or immediacy, as 'about to'. Jarad (2014: 106) provides the following example:

(28) a. *ʔaddēš raḥ tidfaʃ ağār l-bēt?*
how much *raḥ* 2SG-pay rent the-house
'How much are you going to pay for house rental?'

(Syrian Arabic)

The example in (28) from Syrian Arabic can be crucially compared with (29) from Acese:

(29) a. *Quantu oppavi ppi l'affittu?*
how much *o*-pay.2SG for the rental
'How much are you going to pay for house rental?'

(Acireale, Catania)

[16] Jarad (2014) analyses the grammaticalization of Syrian Arabic *raḥ* 'go' from Classical/Standard Arabic and compares it with Hopper and Traugott's (2003)'s analysis of the grammaticalization of English 'be going to' as a future marker. He refers to the well-documented development of the grammaticalization path that goes from andative to purposive to future intention uses (see Bybee et al. 1994, Croft 2000, Heine and Kuteva 2002a, 2002b).

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

So far Syrian Arabic has been used to discuss a phenomenon that is actually widespread in all the Arabic speaking world. Jarad (2014) provides further evidence from Lebanese, Jordanian and Palestinian Arabic (the so called Levantine Arabic dialects), from Egyptian and Iraqi Arabic and from Maltese as well. Here are some examples:

(30) a. *Raḥ yədrus.*
raḥ 3SG-read
'He will read.'
(Lebanese Arabic, Aoun et al. 2010)

b. *Miš ḥa-yibʔa ḥilw ʃalayya.*
NEG *ha*-3SG-become pretty on-me
'It won't look good on me.'
(Egyptian Arabic, Brustad 2000)

c. *Ġaḥ nəštəġi bēt ʃa-l-baḥaġ.*
ġaḥ 1PL-buy house on-the-sea
'We shall buy a house by the sea.'
(Christian Arabic of Baghdad, Abu-Haidar 1991: 89)[17]

Furthermore, an interesting parallel to the development of *raḥ* from lexical verb to a functional particle in the Arabic dialects that we have seen above is the future particle *ġad(i)/ġa* found in Moroccan Arabic. This particle, denoting prospective aspect, developed from another motion verb, the Classical Arabic root *ġada* meaning 'go away' (see Caubet 1993, Rubin 2005, Benmamoun 2000).

Since in the syntactic structures of both Sicilian and Arabic dialects under analysis the motion verb subject to grammaticalization is GO, one could wonder why this verb is more likely to get grammaticalized than other motion verbs (e.g. COME or COME BACK)[18]. According to Hopper and Traugott (2003: 101), the semantic generality of a lexical item plays a key role in its grammaticalization. If a lexical item is semantically highly specific and then has very limited distribution, this limited distribution does not allow for it to get grammaticalized. The verb GO, cross-linguistically, is the motion verb that has the widest distribution and, thus, it is the first candidate for grammaticalization.

A final remark is to be made. As regards the presence of two different versions of GO in both Sicilian and Arabic dialects, namely one with full lexical content and a functional one, it is important to underline that when a lexical item splits into two uses, it is the lexical form that retains its full phonetic form. The grammaticalized item undergoes phonetic erosion (as in the English *gonna* < *going to*), which is the result of frequency increase (see Bybee 2003, 2007). Note also that phonetic erosion, which is usually the

[17] The example in (28c) is cited in Jarad (2014), who highlights the fact that the alveolar liquid [r] is pronounced as a velar fricative [ġ] in the Christian Arabic of Baghdad. Thus, the particle *ġaḥ* in this variety is parallel to the Syrian Arabic *raḥ* 'go'.

[18] As a matter of fact, PseCo of the Sicilian dialects allows for other motion verbs, mainly COME and COME BY together with the causative motion verb SEND, to appear as V1 (see Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003, Di Caro and Giusti 2015). Nevertheless, the number of grammatical V1s is very limited and seems to follow frequency criteria. Thus, if only two motion verbs are allowed as V1, the second one is always COME, that is the second most used motion verb after GO.

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

last step of grammaticalization processes, is not necessary for grammaticalization to happen (Heine and Kuteva 2007: 42). In some Sicilian dialects, such as the ones spoken in Delia and Mussomeli (in the province of Caltanissetta), the grammaticalization of the motion verb GO within PseCo as an aspect marker does not result in an obligatory phonetically eroded version. The examples in (31) of Mussomelese are from Cruschina (2013: 279):

(31) a. *Cuannu u vitti ca sunava nna banna,*
when himCL see.PAST.1SG that play-IPF.3SG in-the band
vaju a pruvu nna gioia!
go-1SG *a* feel-1SG a joy
'When I saw him play in the band, I felt such a joy!'

b. *Arrivammu dda, nn'u ristoranti, e mi vannu a*
arrive-PAST.1PL there in-the restaurant and to-meCL go-3PL *a*
dunanu nna pizza accussì ladia!
give-3PL a pizza so ugly
'We arrived there, at the restaurant, and they gave me such a bad pizza!'

c. *Oggellannu va a capita ca ci vinni*
last-year go.3SG *a* happen-3SG that to-himCL come.PAST.3SG
a frevi tri boti!
the fever three times
'Last year it happened that he had the fever three times!"

After having analysed in detail the properties that make the constructions under consideration similar, we can put them into a protocol to offer a synoptic view of the phenomenon. By using the term "protocol" I refer to Protocol Linguistics, which is a metamodel for linguistic research, first proposed by Giusti (2011), which can be shared by linguists of different empirical specializations and theoretical persuasions. It is theoretically ecumenic and is also accessible to the non-linguistic world. In this metamodel, languages are indicated on the horizontal axis and the properties to be tested on the vertical axis. It is then possible to see if a given variety has a given feature by adding +/−.

The dialects that are displayed in the protocol are the Sicilian varieties of Marsala (Mar, Western Coast), Delia (Del, Central Sicily) and Acireale (Aci, Eastern Coast), and the Arabic varieties of El Jadida (Mor, Morocco), the Levantine (Lev, representing Lebanese, Jordanian and Palestinian Arabic) and Egyptian Arabic (EA).

Table 1. A protocol for PseCo in Sicilian and Arabic dialects

	Mar	**Del**	**Aci**	**Mor**	**Lev**	**EA**
V1 other than GO	+	+	−	+	+	+
Full-fledged paradigm	−	−	+	+	+	+
PseCo in the Preterite	−	+	+	+	+	+
Invariable V1	+	+	+	+	+	+
V1 as an aspect marker	+	+	+	+	+	+

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

Acese is a good representative of the dialects of the Eastern Coast provinces, where many varieties, such as the ones spoken in Catania, Giarre and Pedara (province of Catania), Ragusa, Modica and Marina di Ragusa (province of Ragusa), and Siracusa, Augusta, Lentini and Pachino (province of Siracusa) display the same features listed in Table 1: a PseCo with a full-fledged paradigm that also occurs in the Indicative Preterite, featuring an invariable V1 GO that can turn into an aspect marker[19]. I believe that all of these properties make the comparison with the Arabic dialects – where these are much more consistent throughout all the Arabic speaking countries – worth proposing.

5. Conclusions

In this paper I have proposed a macro-comparison between two groups of languages, namely the Sicilian and the Arabic dialects, which feature different instances of a typical verbal Multiple Agreement Construction which is found in many unrelated languages of the world and is referred to as *Pseudo-Coordination*. Although the two groups display very different verbal systems, that often force us to rule out some diagnostics, and although Sicilian dialects display a high degree of micro-variation with respect to PseCo, in the constructions of both groups the motion verb GO can undergo a process of grammaticalization. As a consequence of this process, GO loses its argument structure, can turn into an aspect marker serving different purposes – namely, the expression of (i) progressivity, and (ii) the surprise effect in Sicilian and the expression of futurity in Arabic – and can also occur as a phonetically eroded prefix.

Based on the similar syntactic behaviour that the structures of the two groups, *mutatis mutandis*, display, I have suggested that the every-day contact between Arabic speaking people and the native people in Sicily, both during the Sicilian Emirate (9th-11th centuries) and during the following Norman rule (11th-13th centuries), could have helped Sicilian dialects retain a structure that has lost its productivity elsewhere in Romance (with the exception of some areas of Calabria and Apulia). I am aware of the fact that the historical background of the centuries taken into account should also make us consider the role that Greek speaking people and the Finite Constructions their varieties display could have played in the preservation of infinitiveless constructions in Sicily.

In fact, this is well attested in literature for the North-Eastern part of Sicily (cf. Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003, Manzini and Savoia 2005, De Angelis 2017). Nevertheless, the characteristics that Sicilian and Arabic constructions with GO as V1 share, which are summarized in the Protocol at the end of Section 4, seem to point to a possible effect of language contact between Arabic and Sicilian with this respect, provided that the nature of that contact was so intense that it had well documented effects on lexicon[20] (especially on onomastics, toponimy and the maritime, agricultural and agrarian terminology), phonology, and other aspects of syntax (cf. Sgroi 1986).

[19] Note also that in some of these varieties some speakers also accept COME, COME BY, SEND and COME BACK as V1 (but never with a full-fledged paradigm).

[20] Agius (2007: 31) reports a very interesting though probably less known phenomenon related to language contact between Arabic and Sicilian, namely the switching of genders, as described in Ibn Makki (1966: 206-207):

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

Moreover, although the literature regarding the grammaticalization of motion verbs, especially of GO, is quite vast on both the Romance and the Arabic sides, this paper is a first attempt at providing a comparative account of the behaviour of GO within a Multiple Agreement Construction with its different types of grammaticalization that emerge both morphologically and semantically. Further research is surely needed to find, among other things, which diagnostics are the most suitable to assess how close the two constructions are, and to what extent it is reasonable to consider a motion verb as still part of such a construction or rather as a completely grammaticalized future marker.

References

Abu-Haidar, F. 1991. *Christian Arabic of Baghdad*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Agius, D. A. 1996. *Siculo Arabic*. London: Kegan Paul International.

Agius, D. A. 2007. Who spoke Siculo-Arabic? In M. Moriggi (ed.), *XII Incontro Italiano di Linguistica Camito-Semitica (Afroasiatica)*, 25-35. Rubbettino: Soveria Mannelli.

Amari, M. 1880. *Biblioteca arabo-sicula*, vol. 2. Turin-Rome: Loescher

Aoun, J., Benmamoun, E., Choueiri, L. 2010. *The Syntax of Arabic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benmamoun, E. 2000. *The Feature Structure of Functional Categories: A Comparative Study of Arabic Dialects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Biberauer, T., Vikner S. 2017. Having the edge: A new perspective on pseudo-coordination in Danish and Afrikaans. In: N. LaCara, K. Moulton and A-M. Tessier (eds.), A Schrift to Fest Kyle Johnson. Linguistics Open Access Publications 1, 77-90. (http://scholarworks.umass.edu/linguist_oapubs/1).

Brustad, K. E. 2000. *The Syntax of Spoken Arabic: A Comparative Study of Moroccan, Egyptian, Syrian and Kuwaiti Dialects*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Bybee, J. 2003. Mechanisms of change in grammaticalization: The role of frequency. In R. Janda and B. Joseph (eds.), *Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, 602-623. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bybee, J. 2007. *Frequency of Use and the Organization of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bybee, J., Pagliuca, W., Perkins, R. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Calabrese, A. 1993. The sentential complementation of Salentino: A study of a language without infinitival clauses. In A. Belletti (ed.), *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, 28-98. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Cantarino, V. 1975. *Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose: The Expanded Sentence*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Carden, G., Pesetsky, D. 1977. Double-verb constructions, markedness, and a fake coordination. In W. A. Beach and S. E. Fox (eds.), *Papers from the Thirteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 82-92. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistics Society.

Cardinaletti, A., Giusti, G. 2001. "Semi-lexical" motion verbs in Romance and Germanic. In N. Corver and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Semi-Lexical Categories*, 371-414. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Cardinaletti, A., Giusti, G. 2003. Motion verbs as functional heads. In C. Tortora (ed.), *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, 31-49. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cardinaletti, A., Giusti, G. forthcoming. Multiple agreement in southern Italian dialects. In L. Franco and P. Lorusso (eds.), *Linguistic Variations: Structure and Interpretation – Studies in Honour of M. Rita Manzini*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Caubet, D. 1993. *L'arabe marocain*. Louvain: Peters.

nouns that were masculine in Classical Arabic became feminine in Sicilian Arabic presumably due to the contact with a Romance variety in which that noun was feminine. Here are some examples: *sayf* 'sword' was masculine in Arabic, but feminine in Sicilian Arabic (compare with Italian *spada* and Sicilian *spata* 'sword', which are feminine), *jumma* 'flock' was feminine in Arabic, but masculine in the Sicilian Arabic counterpart *giummu* (compare with Italian *fiocco* 'flock', 'tassel').

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

Cinque, G. 2006. *The Cartography of Syntactic Structure*, vol. 4, *Restructuring and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Cowell, M. W. 2005. *A Reference Grammar of Syrian Arabic*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
Croft, W. 2000. *Explaining Language Change: An Evolutionary Approach*. London: Longman.
Cruschina, S. 2013. Beyond the stem and inflectional morphology: An irregular pattern at the level of periphrasis. In S. Cruschina, M. Maiden and J. C. Smith (eds.), *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology*, 262-283. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
De Angelis, A. 2017. Between Greek and Romance: Competing complementation systems in Southern Italy. In P. Molinelli (ed.), *Language and Identity in Multilingual Mediterranean Settings. Challenges for Historical Sociolinguistics*, 135-156. Berlin · New York: de Gruyter.
De Angelis, A., Krstić, M. 2014. Perdita dell'infinito e obviation effect in alcune varietà slave e italo-romanze: per un'analisi contrastiva. In I. Peša Matracki, M. Ljubičić, N. Zupanović Filipin, V. Kovačić (eds.), *Zbornik međunarodnoga znanstvenog skupa u spomen na prof. dr. Žarka Muljačića / Atti del Convegno internazionale in onore del Prof. Žarko Muljačić (1922-2009)*, 249-260. Zagreb: FF-press.
Di Caro, V. N. 2015. Syntactic Constructions with Motion Verbs in Some Sicilian Dialects: A Comparative Analysis. Master dissertation. Venice: Ca' Foscari University.
Di Caro, V. N., El Hansali, A. 2017. Multiple agreement verbal constructions with 'go' in the Arabic and Sicilian dialects. Poster at the PseCoMAC 2017 Workshop, Ca' Foscari University of Venice.
Di Caro, V. N., Giusti, G. 2015. A protocol for the inflected construction in Sicilian dialects. *Annali di Ca' Foscari, serie occidentale* 49: 393-422.
Di Caro V. N., Giusti, G. 2016. Dimensions of variation: The Inflected construction in the dialect of Delia. Paper delivered at the 42nd IGG, February 2016, Lecce, and at the 46th LSRL, May 2016, Stony Brook, NY.
Giusti, G. 2011. Structural protocols for linguistic awareness enhancing language identity. http://www.crassh.cam.ac.uk/people/profile/giuliana-giusti.
Heine, B., Kuteva, T. 2002a. On the evolution of grammatical forms. In A. Wray (ed.), *The Transition to Language*, 376-397. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Heine, B., Kuteva, T. 2002b. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Heine, B., Kuteva, T. 2007. *The Genesis of Grammar: A Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Heycock, C., Petersen, H. 2012, Pseudo-coordinations in Faroese. In K. Braunmüller and C. Gabriel (eds), *Multilingual Individuals and Multilingual Societies*, 259-280. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Hopper, P. J., Closs Traugott, E. 2003. *Grammaticalization*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Ibn Jubayr. n.d. *Rihlat Ibn Jubayr*. Beirut/Cairo: Dar al-Kitab al-Lubnani/Dar al-Kitab al-Misri.
Ibn Makki l-Siqilli. 1966. *Tathqif al-lisan wa-talqih al-janan*. Cairo: Dar al-Tahrir.
Jarad, N. I. 2014. The grammaticalization of the motion verb "raḥ" as a prospective aspect marker in Syrian Arabic. *Al-'Arabiyya*: 101-118.
Jaeggli, O., Hyams, N. 1993. On the independence and interdependence of syntactic and morphological properties: English aspectual *come* and *go*. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 11: 313-346.
Jespersen, O. 1895. En sproglig værdiforskydning: og = at. *Dania: Tidsskrift for Folkemål og Folkeminder* 3: 145-183.
Johns, J. 2002. *Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily. The Royal Diwan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Josefsson, G. 2014. Pseudo-coordination in Swedish with *gå* 'go' and the "surprise effect". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 93: 26-50.
Kvist Darnell, U. 2008. Pseudosamordningar i Svenska: särskilt sådana med verben *sitta*, *ligga* och *stå*. PhD dissertation. Institutionen för lingvistik, University of Stockholm.
Ledgeway, A. 1997. Asyndetic complementation in Neapolitan dialect. *The Italianist* 17: 231-273.
Ledgeway, A. 2016. From coordination to subordination: The grammaticalisation of progressive and andative aspect in the dialects of Salento. In A. Cardoso, A. M. Martins, S. Pereira, C. Pinto and F. Pratas (eds.), *Coordination and Subordination. Form and Meaning. Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*, 157-184. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
Leone, A. 1995. *Profilo di sintassi siciliana*. Palermo: Centro di Studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

Lødrup, H. 2002. The syntactic structures of Norwegian pseudocoordination. *Studia Linguistica* 56: 121-143.
Lillas, R. 2012. Hendiadys in the Hebrew Bible. An Investigation of the Applications of the Term. Phd dissertation. University of Gothenburg.
Mack Smith, D. 1976. *Storia della Sicilia medievale e moderna*, vol. 1. Bari: Laterza.
Manzini, R., Savoia, L. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa.* Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
Ouali, H., Al Bukhari, J. (2016). Motion light verbs in Jordanian Arabic and Moroccan Arabic. In A. Haddad and E. Potsdam (eds.), *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics XXVIII*, 173-191. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Rohlfs, G. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*, vol. 3, *Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Turin: Einaudi.
Rohlfs, G. 1972 [1965]. La congiunzione *mi* (in sostituzione dell'infinito) in Sicilia. In *Studi e ricerche su lingua e dialetti d'Italia*, 333-338. Florence: Sansoni.
Ross, D. 2015. What can Faroese pseudocoordination tell us about English inflection? *LSO Working Papers in Linguistics* 10. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison.
Ross, D. 2016. Between coordination and subordination: Typological, structural and diachronic perspectives on pseudocoordination. In (eds.), A. Cardoso, A. M. Martins, S. Pereira, C. Pinto and F. Pratas (eds.), *Coordination and Subordination. Form and Meaning. Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*, 209-243. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
Rubin, A. 2005. *Studies in Semitic Grammaticalization*. Winona Lake, PA: Eisenbrauns.
Ryding, K. C. 2005. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Shopen, T. 1971. Caught in the act. In D. Q. Adams and M. A. Campbell (eds.), *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 254-263. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistics Society.
Sgroi, S. C. 1986. *Interferenze fonologiche, morfo-sintattiche e lessicali fra l'arabo e il siciliano*. Palermo: Centro di Studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.
Sornicola, R. 1976. Vado a dire, vaiu a ddicu: problema sintattico o problema semantico? *Lingua Nostra XXXVII*: 65-74.
Tropea, G. 1988. *Lessico del dialetto di Pantelleria*. Palermo: Centri di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani.
de Vos, M. 2005. *The syntax of verbal pseudocoordination in English and Afrikaans*. LOT Dissertation Series 114. Utrecht: LOT.
Wiklund, A.-L. 2007. *The Syntax of Tenselessness. Tense/Mood/Aspect-agreeing Infinitivals*. Berlin · New York: De Gruyter.
Wiklund, A.-L. 2008. Creating surprise in complex predication. *Nordlyd* 35, 163-187.

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)

BDD-A29077 © 2017 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:11:40 UTC)