COMING AND *GOING* IN CALABRIAN: THE SYNTAX OF PSEUDO-COORDINATION

ADAM LEDGEWAY[1]

Abstract. The present paper examines the syntax of the verbs of motion GO and COME in the dialects of northern Calabria. In these dialects both verbs of motion exceptionally license a case of pseudo-coordination, a monoclausal complementation structure in which two finite verbs occur in succession. In contrast to similar structures found in neighbouring southern dialects, it is argued that, despite their 'special' monoclausal syntax, GO and COME in the northern Calabrian pseudo-construction are not grammaticalized in that they have not undergone any process of grammaticalization. Rather, GO and COME indicate pure deictic motion and lack any of the typical functional (e.g. temporal) uses of their counterparts in other languages, Romance or otherwise. To capture their behaviour, it is proposed that GO and COME in northern Calabrian lexicalize a low functional head marking the aspectual deictic categories of andative and venitive viewpoint, but do not raise to higher positions within the functional domain to lexicalize grammaticalized categories such as future tense, as often happens in other Romance varieties where GO and COME are now also first-merged in such positions and therefore show the concomitant effects of grammaticalization. This leads to the claim that, in contrast to their equivalents in many other Romance varieties, GO and COME in northern Calabrian are grammatical, inasmuch as they are first-merged in a low aspectual head of the clausal functional domain, but they are not grammaticalized, in that they fail to raise to higher functional heads within the higher functional domain.

Keywords: Calabrian, pseudo-coordination, verbs of motion, andative, venitive, functional structure.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since Ascoli (1896), the dialects of Italy are known to present, alongside hypotactic infinitival structures such as (1a), paratactic structures variously involving asyndetic, ET- and AC-coordination of two finite verbs (1b-d):[2]

[1] University of Cambridge, anl21@cam.ac.uk.

[2] For an overview of the differing parameters involved in Italo-Romance parataxis, see Ledgeway (1997; 2007; 2016). See also Rohlfs (1969: §759, §761, §766), Leone (1973), Sornicola (1976), Sorrento (1977), Lombardi (1997: ch. 5), Cardinaletti and Giusti (1998; 2001; 2003; 2020), Amenta and Strudsholm (2002), Manzini and Savoia (2005,I: 688-701), Cruschina (2013), Di Caro and Giusti (2015; 2018), Accattoli and Todaro (2016), Andriani (2017: ch. 5), Manzini, Lorusso and Savoia (2017), Di Caro (2019a,b). For a discussion of pseudo-coordination constructions in English, see Faraci (1970), Carden and Pesetsky (1977), Jaeggli and Hyams (1993), for Swedish see Josefsson

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

(1) a. Vado a chiamare. (infinitival hypotaxis)
go.PRS.1SG to call.INF
b. Vado chiamo. (asyndetic coordination)
go.PRS.1SG call.PRS.3SG
c. Vado e chiamo. (ET-coordination)
go.PRS.1SG and call.PRS.1SG
d. Vado a chiamo. (AC-coordination)
go.PRS.1SG and call.PRS.1SG
'I am going to call.'

Although these paratactic structures prove most frequent in dialects of the south, no doubt a result of a sub-/adstrate contact with the surrounding Italo-Greek varieties which make quite productive use of such structures (cf. Rohlfs 1977: §338, Meliadò 1994: 64f., Ledgeway, Schifano and Silvestri in prep: ch.4), recent research (cf. footnote 2) has revealed that there is nonetheless much microvariation among these same dialects, including restrictions relating to grammatical person, tense, aspect and mood, verb class, and the availability of clitic climbing. While much of this recent research has concentrated on paratactic structures involving ET- and AC-coordination in the dialects of Sicily, Puglia and Salento, the distribution and properties of asyndetic structures in the dialects of northern Calabrian (province of Cosenza) remain essentially unexplored. In what follows, we therefore undertake a detailed description and analysis of parataxis in conjunction with motion verbs in northern Calabria, an important case study, as we shall see, since it forces to ask whether their special syntax implies a process of grammaticalization or whether the specific grammatical features of parataxis represent simple surface reflexes of the inherently grammatical nature of motion verbs. In particular, we shall see that northern Calabrian asyndeton lacks most typical reflexes of grammaticalization, but does show a special syntax as a result of an original case of biclausal (pseudo-)coordination (2a) subsequently reanalysed as a monoclausal subordination structure (2b). At the same time, these same structures will be shown to throw light on the fine structure of the clause and the functional projections lexicalized by verbs of motion.

(2) a [$_{\&P}$ [Vaiu] [$_{\&'}$ [chiamu]]] (biclausal coordination) ⇒
go.PRS.1SG call.PRS.1SG
b [Vaiu chiamu] (monoclausal subordination / restructuring)
go.PRS.1SG call.PRS.1SG

The article is structured as follows: Section 2 provides a descriptive overview of the main properties of asyndetic coordination in the dialects of northern Calabria, showing how such asyndetic structures fail to show any properties of coordination but, rather, should be analysed synchronically as cases of monoclausal pseudo-coordination. This is followed by an examination of the extent to which the change from coordination to subordination has had semantic (§3.1), morphological (§3.2) and syntactic (§3.3) repercussions on the

(1991) and Wiklund (1996), for Danish and Afrikaans see Biberauer and Vikner (2017), and for Faroese and Germanic more generally see Heycock and Peteresen (2012).

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

development of GO and COME and to the extent to which the latter can be considered to have been involved in a process of grammaticalization. Section 4 provides a formal analysis of northern Calabrian pseudo-coordination which shows how the formal semantic, morphological and syntactic properties of GO and COME can be understood from a cartographic approach, in which they are analysed as the lexicalization of aspectual deictic categories of andative and venitive viewpoint merged in a low functional projection of the aspectual field above the VP. Section 5 provides a brief summary of the findings.

2. PSEUDO-COORDINATION IN CALABRIA

Paratactic structures in conjunction with the verbs of motion COME and GO are widespread across the dialects of Calabria, in large part no doubt as a reflex of the historical Greek sub- and adstrates (Ledgeway 1997: 255-69; Ledgeway, Schifano and Silvestri in prep.: ch. 4). Such parataxis takes at least three distinct forms. In northern Calabria (province of Cosenza) and in some areas of central Calabria (province of Catanzaro) it surfaces in asyndetic structures (Rohlfs 1969: §766; Sorrento 1977: 224-27), as illustrated in (3a-b):

(3) a Jamu fatigamu! (Belmonte (CS), Vespucci 1994: 89)
go.PRS.1PL work.PRS.1PL
'Let's go and work!'

b Jati viditi chiddhu cchi resta d' o lungomara!
go.PRS.2PL see.PRS.2PL that what remain.PRS.3SG of the seafront
(Catanzaro, Colacino 1994: 11)
'Go and see what's left of the seafront!'

In the central and southern dialects of the region (provinces of Catanzaro and Reggio Calabria), by contrast, parataxis takes the form of ET-coordination (cf. Rohlfs 1969: §759):

(4) a Ppe 'ssi festi cchi arrìvanu jamu e facìmu 'a
for these holidays that arrive.PRS.3PL go.PRS.1PL and do.PRS.1PL the
spisa. (Catanzaro, Colacino 1994: 106)
shopping
'We're going shopping for the forthcoming celebrations.'

b sutta a la te finestra vengu e staju (Reggio Calabria,
under to the your window come.PRS.1SG and stand.PRS.1SG
Mandalari 1881: 79)
'beneath your window I shall come and stand.'

Finally, in the dialect of Crotone (Rohlfs 1969: 167; Sorrento 19977: 224ff.) we exceptionally find AC-coordination, a structure more typical of the dialects of Puglia and Salento (Ledgeway 2016; Andriani 2017: ch. 5) and Sicily (Cardinaletti and Giusti 1998; 2001; 2003; 2020; Cruschina 2013; Di Caro 2019a,b).

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

(5) a Veni a vvidi! (Crotone, Sorrento 1977: 224)
come.IMP.2SG AC see.IMP.2SG
'Come and see!'
b Vaju a bbinnu. (Crotone, Rohlfs 1969: §761)
go.PRS.1SG AC sell.PRS.1SG
'I am going to sell.'

2.1. Northern Calabrian parataxis

We now turn to examine in more detail the distribution of asyndetic parataxis in the dialects of northern Calabria, concentrating in what follows principally on the representative dialect of Cosenza. The verbs of motion that license asyndeton are restricted to VENA 'come' and Jì 'go' (6a), while other verbs of motion such as RUN, RETURN, PASS, SEND, which are variously involved in paratactic structures in other dialects of southern Italy (Di Caro 2019b: 121), are systematically excluded (6b), in that they only select for a hypotactic infinitival complement in northern Calabria (6c).

(6) a Vìeni/Va pigli u paccu. (Cos.)
come/go.PRS.2SG take.PRS.2SG the parcel
'You come/go and fetch the parcel.'
b *Fuji/Tuorni/Passi/Manni pigli u paccu. (Cos.)
run/return/pass/send.PRS.2SG take.PRS.2SG the parcel
c Fuji/Tuorni/Passi/Manni a piglià u paccu. (Cos.)
run/return/pass/send.PRS.2SG to take.INF the parcel
'You run/return/come by to fetch the parcel // You have the parcel sent for.'

Also excluded are aspectuals (STAND, START) and modals (WANT), which in Pugliese and Salentino dialects frequently license parataxis (cf. Ledgeway 2016), but which in northern Calabrian select a hypotactic gerundival or infinitival complement (7a-c).

(7) a Sta pigliannu / *Sta pigli u paccu. (Cos.)
stand.PRS.2SG take.GER stand.PRS.2SG take.PRS.2SG the parcel
b Ncuminci a piglià / *Ncuminci pigli u paccu. (Cos.)
start.PRS.2SG to take.INF start.PRS.2SG take.PRS.2SG the parcel
c Vu piglià / *Vu pigli u paccu. (Cos.)
want.PRS.2SG take.INF want.PRS.2SG take.PRS.2SG the parcel
'You are/start/ want (to) fetch(ing) the parcel.'

Although we have informally referred to the northern Calabrian paratactic construction as a superficial case of asyndetic coordination, there is little about the construction, at least synchronically, that allows us to consider it a *bona fide* case of coordination. Following Haspelmath (2007: 6–8), cross-linguistically we may recognise two types of coordination, namely overt (bi-/)monosyndetic coordination (8a) and covert or asyndetic coordination (8b), as illustrated in (9a–b).

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

(8) a (*co*-)**X** *co*-**Y…** ((Bi-/)Monosyndetic coordination)
b **X Y…** (Asyndetic coordination)

(9) a **Ueni** *et* **uidi** *et* **uici**. (Lat.)
come.PST.PFV.1SG and see.PST.PFV.1SG and conquer.PST.PFV.1SG
b **Ueni**, **uidi**, **uici**. (Lat.)
come.PST.PFV.1SG see.PST.PFV.1SG conquer.PST.PFV.1SG
'I came (and), I saw (and), I conquered.'

According to this distinction, on the surface the northern Calabrian construction appears to involve the asyndetic conjunctive coordination of two finite clauses, as sketched in (10):

(10) [$_{\&P}$ [$_{Spec}$ Vaiu] [$_{\&'}$ Ø [$_{Compl}$ pagu.]]] (Cos.)
go.PRS.1SG Ø pay.PRS.1SG
'I'm going to pay.'

However, as is evident from the representation in (10), the second verbal coordinate *pagu* is formally a complement of the null coordinator head '&', hence already not too dissimilar from a subordination complement structure (cf. also Ross 1967; Kayne 1994). Coupled with the frequent semantic weakening of COME and GO from full verb of motion to (semi-)auxiliary, it is therefore easy to understand how an erstwhile coordination structure such as (10) comes to be reanalysed as a pseudo-coordination structure such as (11), in which the verb of motion simply selects for a clausal complement headed by a null complementizer.

(11) [$_{IP}$ Vaiu [$_{CP}$ Ø [$_{IP}$ pagu]]] (Cos.)
go.PRS.1SG pay.PRS.1SG
'I'm going to pay.'

Indeed, the sort of reanalysis witnessed in (10)-(11) is further supported by the frequent fuzziness that characterizes the boundaries between coordination and subordination, whose precise definitions and uses are often blurred (cf. Culicover and Jackendoff 1997; Haspelmath 2007: 45-48), as illustrated in the classic examples in (12a-c)

(12) a You drink another can of beer and I'm leaving.
b You drink another can of beer, I'm leaving.
c If you drink another can of beer, I'll leave.

On the surface, the sentences in (12a-b) exemplify respectively monosyndetic and asyndetic coordination with another root clause. However, a comparison with the synonymous but formally distinct sentence in (12c) reveals that the relation which holds between the two clauses is not after all one of formal (bi-/asyndetic) coordination but, rather, functionally one of subordination. Such examples highlight how syntactic coordination and semantic subordination may be readily blended, giving rise to a mismatch between formal syntactic structure and semantic representation. Our analysis of northern

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

Calabrian in (10)-(11) perfectly fits this scenario where an original formal case of asyndetic coordination has been reanalysed as a case of syntactic subordination with minimal changes in the underlying structure (viz. the formal categorial label & > C).

Proof that the northern Calabrian GO and COME constructions involve a case of pseudo-coordination along the lines of (11) is confirmed by a number of standard tests for pseudo-coordination, as well as tests for monoclausality highlighting how the subordinate complement has been further integrated into the main clause. These empirical and theoretical considerations are briefly reviewed below.

(i) If we were genuinely dealing with a case of asyndetic conjunctive coordination (13a), then the use of an overt conjunctive coordinator, viz. ET > *e* 'and', should also prove possible (13b). However, as the example in (14b) demonstrates, use of the overt conjunctive coordinator produces a biclausal structure which, although perfectly grammatical, receives a quite distinct interpretation from its pseudo-coordinate variant in (14a): whereas the former yields a genuine case of coordination involving two events, the latter licenses only a complementation structure involving a single event, as shown by its free variation with the infinitival complement in (15). Note furthermore that the independent status of GO in the former case also entails a formally distinct verb, namely the reflexive variant of the verb of motion (whether COME or GO), which is not possible in the corresponding pseudo-coordinate structure.

(13) a Vuagliu pane(,) furmaggiu. (Cos.)
b Vuagliu pane e ffurmaggiu. (Cos.)
want.PRS.1SG bread and cheese
'I want bread (and) cheese.'

(14) a Vaiu pagu. (Cos.)
go.PRS.1SG pay.PRS.1SG
'I am going to pay.'
b (Mi nni) vaiu e ppagu. (Cos.)
me= thence= go.PRS.1SG and pay.PRS.1SG
'I go and I pay' (*'I am going to pay.')

(15) mà vaiu a parrà ccù chistu haiu pensatu. Vaiu
but go.PRS.1SG to speak.INF with this.one have.PRS.1SG think.PTCP go.PRS.1SG
parru ccù poveru fissa. (Belmonte (CS), Vespucci 1994: 73)
speak.PRS.1SG with.the poor idiot
'but I'm going to speak with him, I thought. I'm going to speak with the poor idiot.'

(ii) In a similar fashion to what we have just seen in relation to the impossibility of replacing apparent asyndetic conjunctive coordination with an overt conjunctive coordinator (cf. 14a-b), it is not possible in the northern Calabrian pseudo-coordinate structure to insert an overt disjunctive (16a) or adversative (16b) coordinator, as is generally possible in cases of asyndetic coordination, without sacrificing the relation of complementation between the two verbs.

(16) a [[Mi nni vaiu] [**o** [pagu.]]] (Cos.)
me= thence go.PRS.1SG or pay.PRS.1SG
'I'm leaving or I'll pay' (*'I'm going to pay')

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

b [[Mi nni vaiu] [**ma** [pagu.]]] (Cos.)
me= thence go.PRS.1SG but pay.PRS.1SG
'I'm leaving but I'll pay' (*'I'm going to pay')

(iii) Unlike canonical case of asyndetic coordination, the distribution of the northern Calabrian paratactic construction is restricted to occurring in conjunction with just the two functional predicates COME and GO (cf. 6a-c, 7a-c), an unexpected result if such structures genuinely involved asyndetic complementation which typically does not show any such lexical restrictions.

(iv) Following Shopen (1971: 251f.) and Anderson (2017), we observe that the northern Calabrian construction yields a single event interpretation (cf. also Cardinaletti and Giusti 1998; 2001; 2003; Manzini and Savoia 2005: 698f.; Manzini, Lorusso and Savoia 2017: 48f.), witness (17a) in contrast to genuine cases of coordination such as (17b) which involve two events (cf. also 14a-b) and, once again, require the reflexive variant of the verb of motion. In this respect, examples such as (17a) are entirely comparable to monoclausal auxiliary examples such as (18a-c) which equally require a single eventive interpretation.

(17) a Jamu bballamu. (Cos.)
go.PRS.1PL dance.PRS.1PL
'We're going dancing/We go and dance.' (*'We go and we dance.')
b Ni nni jamu e bballamu. (Cos.)
us= thence= go.PRS.1PL and dance.PRS.1PL
'We go (= leave) and we dance.'

(18) a Stamu ballannu. (Cos.)
stand.PRS.1PL dance.GER
'We're dancing.' (*'We are standing (and) dancing.')
b Amu bballatu. (Cos.)
have.PRS.1PL dance.PTCP
'We (have) danced.' (*'We have, (we) danced.')
c Vulimu bballà. (Cos.)
want.PRS.1PL dance.INF
'We want to dance.' (*'We want, we dance.')

(v) Whereas in genuine coordination structures the order of conjuncts – pragmatic-semantic factors aside – is free (19a), in pseudo-coordination the order is not free (19b) but follows the canonical order of Romance structures involving auxiliary + non-finite verbal complement (cf. Ledgeway 2012: 122-40):

(19) a Mangianu e bballanu / Bballanu e mmangianu. (Cos.)
eat.PRS.3PL and dance.PRS.3PL dance.PRS.3PL and eat.PRS.3PL
'They eat and (they) dance.' / 'They dance and (they) eat.'
b Vannu mangianu / *Mangianu vannu. (Cos.)
go.PRS.3PL eat.PRS.3PL eat.PRS.3PL go.PRS.3PL
'They're going to eat' / *'They eat (they) go'

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

(vi) In contrast to genuine coordination structures where there may be disjoint reference between the subjects of both conjuncts (20a), in north Calabrian pseudo-coordination structures subject coreference is obligatory (20b), a classic hallmark of certain types of subordination such as complementation involving obligatory subject control and subject-raising/restructuring:

(20) a Iu mi nni vaiu ma/e (c)chiova. (Cos.)
I me= thence go.PRS.1SG but/and rain.PRS.3SG
'I'm leaving and/but it's raining.'
b Vìegnu vivu / *vivi. (Cos.)
come.PRS.1SG drink.PRS.1SG drink.PRS.2SG
'I'm coming to drink / *for you to drink.'

(vii) In coordination structures clitics dependent on the finite verb of the second conjunct cannot climb to the verb of the first conjunct (21a), whereas in the pseudo-coordination cases under investigation climbing is obligatory (21b) in line with what is found in many monoclausal complementation structures (Manzini and Savoia 2005: 698):

(21) a (*Cci) torna e cci parra. (Cos.)
DAT.3= return.PRS.3SG and DAT.3= speak.PRS.3SG
'He returns and speaks to her.'
b M' 'u viniti (*m' 'u) purtati? (Cos.)
me= it= come.PRS.2PL me= it bring.PRS.2PL
'Are you coming to bring it to me?'

(viii) Whereas under genuine coordination the verb of both conjuncts may be independently negated (22a), under pseudo-coordination the second verb shows reduced autonomy with negation appearing uniquely on the first verb (22b), just as in canonical auxiliary structures (22c), in accordance with the monoclausal single-event interpretation observed under (iv):

(22) a (U) mmi nni vaiu e (u) (p)pagu. (Cos.)
neg= me= thence= go.PRS.1SG and neg= pay.PRS.1SG
'I'm (not) going and I'm (not) paying.'
b Iddu u bba (*ur) rapa. (Cos.)
he neg= go.PRS.3SG neg= open.PRS.3SG
'He's not going to answer the door.'
c Iddu unn a (*ur) raputu. (Cos.)
he neg= have.PRS.3SG neg= open.PTCP
'He's not answered the door.'

(ix) While genuine coordination does not impose any adjacency requirements on the coordinator and the second verb, witness the possibility of intervening material such as temporal adverbs in (23a), in the northern Calabrian pseudo-structure nothing may separate the verb of motion and the lexical verb it embeds (23b), apart from a small class of aspectual adverbs to be examined in §4 below. This undoubtedly points to a greater degree of semantico-syntactic cohesion between the constituent parts:

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

(23) a Parta e oja/mo/prìestu si ricoglia. (Cos.)
leave.PRS.3SG and today/now/soon self= return.PRS.3SG
'He's leaving and today/now/soon is returning home.'
b Si va (*oja/*mo/prìestu) ricoglia
self= go.PRS.3SG today/now/soon return.PRS.3SG
oja/mo/prìestu. (Cos.)
today/now/soon
'He's going to return home today/now/soon.'

(x) Finally, the most important observation for our purposes concerns the Coordinate Structure Constraint (Ross 1967; 1986; Déchaine 1993) which predicts that in genuine coordination structures extraction of the object out of a conjoined VP such as (24a) is ungrammatical. By contrast, extraction of the internal argument out of a pseudo-coordinated complement (24b) proves entirely grammatical, a behaviour readily replicated in northern Calabrian pseudo-coordination examples such as (25a–b).

(24) a Ann slept all day and missed **the train** > ***What** did Ann sleep all day and miss ~~**what**~~?
b Ann went to the store and bought **some whisky** > **What** did Ann go to the store and buy ~~**what**~~?

(25) a Cicciu va piglia **u pane** > **Cchi** bba piglia
Ciccio go.PRS.3SG take.PRS.3SG the bread what go.PRS.3SG take.PRS.3SG
~~**cchi**~~? (Cos.)
'Ciccio is going to fetch the bread.' > 'What is he going to fetch?'
b Venìa durmìa **addu nua** > **Unni** venìa
come.PST.IPFV.3SG sleep.PST.IPFV.3SG at ours where come.PST.IPFV.3SG
durmìa ~~**unni**~~? (Cos.)
sleep.PST.IPFV.3SG
'He used to come and sleep at our place.' > 'Where did he used to come and sleep?'

3. FROM COORDINATION TO SUBORDINATION

In the following sections we explore to what extent the change from coordination to monoclausal subordination sketched above has had semantic, morphological and syntactic repercussions on the development of COME and GO and to what extent they present evidence of having undergone a grammaticalization process.

3.1. Semantic effects of grammaticalization

Following Cinque (2006:47 n.4, 70) and Anderson (2017), for our present purposes we distinguish here between the aspectual categories andative and venitive. Essentially, both types of aspect signal a distance to be covered relative to the deictic centre in order for a given action to be completed. In particular, andative (or 'itive') aspect indicates

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

movement away from the speaker(s' adopted viewpoint location), whereas venitive (or 'ventive') aspect marks movement towards the speaker('s adopted viewpoint location). In line with widely attested cross-linguistic patterns, the Romance verbs of motion COME and GO frequently grammaticalize across different Romance varieties as temporal, aspectual, modal and voice auxiliaries.[3] In the case of COME- and GO- futures (cf. Heine, Kuteva and Narrog 2017: 15f.), the typical inferential pathway of grammaticalization involves for de-andative futures like those found in French, Portuguese and Spanish (26a) a development from directed motion to intention and then finally to future time, whereas de-venitive futures like that found in Surselvan (26b; cf. Haiman and Benincà 1992: 86f., 106; Anderson 2016: 177) develop from directed motion to future time through an intermediate phase of inchoativity like that illustrated for Italian in (26c).

26 a Vou cantar. (Pt.)
go.PRS.1SG sing.INF
'I'll sing.'

b Jeu vegnel a cantar. (Srs.)
I come.PRS.1SG to sing.INF
'I'll sing.'

c Viene a piovere. (It.)
come.PRS.3SG to rain.INF
'It's starting/going to rain.'

In these varieties, the future uses of COME and GO have therefore undergone a particularly high degree of desemanticization as a consequence of the grammaticalization process. As such, the acts of 'coming' and 'going' are not only compatible with their own grammaticalized reflexes without any risk of tautology or redundancy (27a, 28a), but they are also compatible with each other (27b, 28b) which under any pure motion interpretation would prove ill-formed given their contrasting deictic values. By the same token, COME and GO also prove entirely compatible with stative predicates (27c–d, 28c–d), including restructuring predicates such as modals (27e, 28e), which would otherwise prove ill-formed with the literal deictic values of 'going' and 'coming'.

(27) a Elle va aller loin cette actrice! (Fr.)
she go.PRS.3SG go.INF far this actrice
'This actress will go far!'

b Les autres vont venir d' ici peu de temps. (Fr.)
the others go.PRS.3SG come.INF of here little of time
'The others will be coming shortly.'

c Ton père va être la risée de la ville. (Fr.)
your father go.PRS.3SG be.INF the laughing.stock of the town
'You're going to be the laughing stock of the town.'

[3] For an overview, see Amenta and Strudsholm (2002), Ledgeway (2012: §4.3.1), Adams and Vincent (2016: 289–292), Squartini and Bertinetto (2016), Strik Lievers (2017).

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

d Et comment va-t-on savoir que ça a marché (Fr.)
and how go.PRS.3SG =one know.INF that that have.PRS.3SG work.PTCP
'And how will we know that it has worked?'

e Plus les tarifs sont bas, plus tu vas devoir bosser. (Fr.)
more the rates be.PRS.3PL low more you go.PRS.2SG must.INF work.INF
'The lower the rates, the more you will have to work.'

(28) a Jeu vegnel a vegnir. (Srs., Decurtins 1901:264, 24)
I come.PRS.1SG to come.INF
'I'll come.'

b ei vegn ad ir sco nus havein detg. (Srs., v. *vegnir* in
it come.PRS.3SG to go.INF as we have.PRS.1PL say.PTCP
Niev vocabulari, *Sursilvan online*, https://www.vocabularisursilvan.ch/index.php)
'It will go (turn out) as we said.'

c Vus vegnis ad esser stupefatg. (Srs.,
you come.PRS.2PL to be.INF surprised
https://www.suedostschweiz.ch/panorama/2016-06-27/bis-zum-hals-in-den-schulden)
'You'll be surprised.'

d Il mument che nus vegnin a savair da talas violaziuns dal
the moment that we come.PRS.1PL to know.INF of such violations of.the
dretg. (Srs., http://www.gr.kath.ch/rm/impressum-2/)
right
'The moment that we'll find out about those violations of the law.'

e quels muments che ti vegns a stuair supercar (Srs.,
those moments that you come.PRS.2SG to must.INF overcome.INF
https://www.smokefree.ch/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/SMOKEFREE-raetoromanisch.pdf)
'those moments which you'll have to overcome.'

By contrast, in the northern Calabrian pseudo-coordination construction COME and GO exclusively denote actual motion, never futurity (29) or inchoativity (30).

(29) a Ti vaiu accattu i scarpe. (Cos.)
you= go.PRS.1SG buy.PRS.1SG the shoes
'I'm going to buy you the shoes.' / *'I'm gonna/will buy you the shoes.'

b Ni jìanu mannàvanu i sordi. (Cos.)
us= go.PST.IPFV.3PL send.PST.IPFV.3PL the money
'They used to go and send us the money.' / *'They would send us the money.'

c Si vannu vèstanu. (Cos.)
self= go.PRS.3PL dress.PRS.3PL
'They are going to get dressed.' / *'They're gonna/will get dressed.'

(30) a A persiana t' 'a vìegnu cunzu dumani. (Cos.)
the blind you= it= come.PRS.1SG repair.PRS.1SG tomorrow
'I'll come and repair your blind tomorrow.' / *'I'll start repairing your blind tomorrow.'

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

b E ssi u vìentu vena distruggia ra casa? (Cos.)
and if the wind come.PRS.3SG destroy.PRS.3SG the house
'And what if the wind comes and destroys the house?' / *'And what if wind begins to destroy the house'

c Quannu u ttenìanu cchiù sordi, mi venìanu
when neg=have.PST.IPFV.3PL more money me= come.PST.IPFV.3PL
rumpìanu. (Cos.)
break.PST.IPFV.3PL
'When their money ran out, they would come and annoy me.' /*'When their money ran out, they would begin to annoy me.'

In short, northern Calabrian GO and COME retain their full literal meanings and show no signs whatsoever of semantic bleaching. As such that, they are incompatible both with themselves (31a, 32a), on account of the resultant redundancy, and with each other (31b, 32b), on account of their opposing deictic values.

(31) a *Ca pu vaiu vaiu addu tia. (Cos.)
that then go.PRS.1SG go.PRS.1SG at yours
Intended meaning: 'I'm gonna go to your place.'

b *Vaiu vìegnu ccu ra màchina 'i sòrama. (Cos.)
go.PRS.1SG come.PRS.1SG with the car of sister-my
Intended meaning: 'I'm gonna come with my sister's car.'

(32) a *Vìegnu vìegnu cchiù spessu. (Cos.)
come.PRS.1SG come.PRS.1SG more often
Intended meaning: 'I'll start coming more often.'

b *Vìegnu vaiu a ra cchiesia. (Cos.)
come.PRS.1SG go.PRS.1SG to the church
Intended meaning: 'I'll start going to church.'

At this point a comparison with standard Italian is also of interest. In contrast to many other Romance varieties, the Italian predicates COME and GO show very limited reflexes of any future-related uses, insofar as their use in conjunction with an infinitival complement generally gives rise to a purely literal andative and venitive movement reading, respectively. Notable exceptions, however, include their respective culminative and inchoative values (Strik Lievers 2017) in conjunction with a small number of infinitives according to a usage which appears in large part to be lexicalized. In these uses both verbs involve a case of unplanned metaphorical movement, resulting in the culmination or the initiation of the event denoted by the infinitival verb. In Italian, the verbs typically used in the culminative construction with GO include FINISH (33a) and REPLACE (33b), whereas COME is typically found with such predicates as RAIN (cf. 26c), KNOW (33c) and PLEASE (33d). Significantly, although these same culminative and inchoative values are also found with the infinitive with the same classes of verbs in northern Calabrian, perhaps as a result of direct borrowing from Italian, they are not available in conjunction with the pseudo-coordination construction where, as we have seen, COME and GO only license their literal movement meanings (33a'–d').

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

(33) a Non so come va a finire. (It.)
a' U ssacciu cumu va a finì(scia) / *ffiniscia. (Cos.)
neg= know.PRS.1SG how go.PRS.3SG to finish.INF finish.PRS.3SG
'I don't know how it will turn out.'
b Luca andava a sostituire Ciccio. (It.)
b' Luca jìa a rimpiazzà /*rimpiazzava a Cicciu. (Cos.)
Luca go.PST.IPFV.3SG to replace.INF replace.PST.IPFV.3SG DOM Ciccio
'Luca was (going) to replace Ciccio.'
c Se poi io lo vengo a sapere… (It.)
c' Si pu iu u viegnu a sapì / *sacciu… (Cos.)
if then I it= come.PRS.1SG to know.INF know.PRS.1SG
'If I (happen to) find out about it…'
d Se poi ti viene a piacere… (It.)
d' Si pu ti vena a piacia / *piacia… (Cos.)
if then you=come.PRS.3SG to please.INF please.PRS.3SG
'If you begin to like it…'

In light of these facts regarding the exclusive literal movement readings of COME and GO in northern Calabrian, it will come as no surprise to learn that they are incompatible with verbs that do not allow the andative and venitive construal, including statives (34) and predicates indicting change of state (35) and mental processes (36).

(34) a *Accussì vannu su' ncazzati neri. (Cos.)
thus go.PRS.3PL be.PRS.3PL pissed.off black
'That way they are going to be really pissed off.
b *Màmmata va para na ciota fricata! (Cos.)
mum=your go.PRS.3SG seem.PRS.3SG a idiot robbed
'Your mum's going to look like a right fool!'
c *Pìensu ca si vena senta miegliu. (Cos.)
think.PRS.3SG that self= come.PRS.3SG feel.PRS.3SG better
'I think that she's coming to feel better.'
(35) a *I juri u bbannu criscianu. (Cos.)
the flowers neg= go.PRS.3PL grow.PRS.3PL
'The flowers are not going to grow.'
b *A picceridda si va risbiglia. (Cos.)
the small self= go.PRS.3SG awake.PRS.3SG
'The child is going to wake up.'
c *Mi para ca si vena rimbambiscia. (Cos.)
me= seem.PRS.3SG that self=come.PRS.3SG lose.mind.PRS.3SG
'I think he is coming to lose his mind.'

(36) a *Mi vaiu sunnu a pàtritta. (Cos.)
me= go.PRS.1SG dream.PRS.1SG DOM father=your
'I am going to dream of your father.' (Ok: 'I'll go to bed where I'll dream of your father')

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

b *Venanu capiscianu a lezzione. (Cos.)
come.PRS.3PL understood.PRS.3PL the lesson
'They come to understand the lesson.'
c *Cci vaiu pìensu. (Cos.)
LOC= go.PRS.1SG think.PRS.1SG
'I'm going to think about it.' (Ok: 'I'm going there to think.')

By the same token, GO and COME largely prove incompatible with most restructuring/functional predicates since the latter are simply not amenable to the andative/venitive construal (cf. also §4):

(37) a *Vaiu pùazzu / aia / sacciu / vùagliu
go.PRS.1SG can.PRS.1SG must.PRS.1SG know.PRS.1SG want.PRS.1SG
studià. (Cos.)
study.INF
'I'm going to be able/to have/know how/want to study.'
b *'I vìeni tùarni / cuntìnui / rìesci /
them= come.PRS.2SG return.PRS.2SG continue.PRS.2SG succeed.PRS.2SG
prùavi a bbinna. (Cos.)
try.PRS.2SG to sell.INF
'You are coming to sell them again // to continue/manage/try to sell them.'
c *Jìanu / Venìanu stàvanu spiannu. (Cos.)
go.PST.IPFV.3PL come.PST.IPFV.3PL stand ask.GER
'They went/came to ask.'

In conclusion, we have seen that, in contrast to many other Romance varieties, in their pseudo-coordinate uses COME and GO in northern Calabrian have failed to develop functional, viz temporal or aspectual, uses or values, but indicate, rather, pure deictic motion. From a grammaticalization perspective, this is an unexpected result if the special behaviour of COME and GO witnessed in the otherwise exceptional use of the pseudo-coordinate structure is to be understood as reflex of a grammaticalization process, as appears to be the case in other dialects of southern Italy where the grammaticalization of predicates such as COME, GO and STAND by way of a special pseudo-coordinate structure goes hand in hand with their desemanticization (Ledgeway 2016).

3.2. Morphological effects of grammaticalization

Turning now to the morphological repercussions of the shift from coordination to subordination, much of the literature on pseudo-coordination in the dialects of southern Italy (cf. footnote 2) has highlighted how this development has in many cases led to varying degrees of inflectional attrition. This morphological reflex highlights an important change in the nature of predicates such as STAND, GO and COME, inasmuch as the availability of a full inflectional paradigm constitutes the hallmark of what it means to belong to the lexical category of verb in Romance. Consequently, any attrition in the inflectional paradigms of STAND, GO and COME can be taken to represent a weakening in their defining verbal

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

characteristics and, at the same time, to signal a concomitant change in their category from lexical verb (V) to functional predicate (Aux).

Indeed, across Romance there is quite considerable evidence to support the claim that as erstwhile lexical predicates increasingly develop functional uses in an on-going process of grammaticalization, their morphological paradigms concomitantly display increasing degrees of morphophonological attrition and specialization (for an overview of Romance cases, see Ledgeway 2012: §4.3.1.3). A revealing example in this respect is the development of progressive (> imperfective) STAND in the dialects of Puglia and Salento (cf. Ledgeway 2016). From Table 1, we can see that in the present it is possible to identify three patterns variously distributed across Apulia which display increasing degrees of inflectional attrition as we move southwards from Pugliese to Salentino. For instance, in the Pugliese dialect of Putignano in (a) STAND displays a near full inflectional paradigm (albeit with syncretism in the 2/3SG (STAS/-T AC >) *ste*, 1/2PL (STA(MUS/TIS) AC >) *sta*), whereas in the more southerly Pugliese dialect of Martina Franca in (b) the paradigm shows reduced agreement with distinctive forms, based on the stem stɛ(-), in just the 1SG and 3PL according to a morphomic U-pattern widespread across Romance (cf. Maiden 2011; 2016: §43.2.3). More drastic are Salentino dialects such as Leccese in (c) where STAND has lost all agreement and is now reduced to an aspect marker occurring as a bare stem. This same pattern is generalized across all varieties in the past where original inflected forms STA-BA-M/-S/-T/-MUS/-TIS/-NT + AC have also been reduced to the invariable forms sta or stɛ.

Table 1

Pugliese-Salentino STAND paradigms

		(a) Putignano (BA) 'stand do'	(b) Martina Franca (TA) 'stand call'	(c) Lecce 'stand lose'
Present	1sg	stok a f'fattsə	stɔ c'cɛmə	sta p'pɛrdu
	2sg	ste f'faʃə	stɛ c'cəmə	sta p'pɛrdi
	3sg	ste f'faʃə	stɛ c'cɛmə	sta p'pɛrdɛ
	1pl	sta ffa'ʃeimə	stɛ cca'mɛmə	sta ppɛr'dimu
	2pl	sta ffa'ʃeitə	stɛ cca'mɛtə	sta p'pɛr'diti
	3pl	ston a f'faʃənə	stɔnə (a) c'camənə	sta p'pɛrdɛnu
Past	1sg	sta ffa'ʃevə	stɛ cca'mɛvə	sta ppɛr'dia
	2sg	sta ffa'ʃivə	stɛ cca'məvə	sta ppɛr'dia
	3sg	sta ffa'ʃevə	stɛ cca'mɛvə	sta ppɛr'dia
	1pl	sta ffa'ʃemmə	stɛ cca'mammə	sta ppɛr'diamu
	2pl	sta ffa'ʃivəvə	stɛ cca'mavəvə	sta ppɛr'diuvu
	3pl	sta ffa'ʃevənə	stɛ cca'mavənə	sta ppɛr'dianu

Not too dissimilar is the situation with GO (cf. Ledgeway 2016) where, in the present, we can identify the two patterns illustrated in Table 2. In the Pugliese dialect of Putignano in (a) we see once again a near full inflectional paradigm (again with syncretism in the 2/3SG (*VAS/VAT AC >) *va/ve* and 1/2PL (EA(MUS/TIS) AC >) *scià*), whereas the Salentino dialect Leccese in (b) shows a drastically reduced agreement paradigm where there is effectively no exhaustive marking for person/number, but the 1/2PL are marked off

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

from all other persons through the fossilization of a previous morphomic N-pattern (Maiden 2011; 2016: §43.2.4) which contrasts a ʃa stem (< IAMUS/ATIS 'we/you.PL.go') with a stem in va for all other persons (< UAD-O/-IS/-IT/-UNT 'I/you.SG/(s)he/they.go(es)'). Once again, in the past all dialects show an invariable form with zero inflectional marking, variously realized as ʃɛ, ʃa, sa, or ʃə according to dialect.

Table 2

Pugliese-Salentino GO paradigms

		(a) Putignano (BA) 'go do'	(b) Lecce 'go lose'
Present	1sg	vok a f'fattsu	va p'pɛrdu
	2sg	vɛ f'faʃə	va p'pɛrdi
	3sg	vɛ f'faʃə	va p'pɛrde
	1pl	ʃa fa'ʃeimə	ʃa ppɛr'dimu
	2pl	ʃa fa'ʃeitə	ʃa ppɛr'diti
	3pl	von a f'faʃənə	va p'pɛrdɛnu
Past	1sg	ʃɛ f3plfa'ʃevə	ʃa ppɛr'dia
	2sg	ʃɛ ffa'ʃivə	ʃa ppɛr'dia
	3sg	ʃɛ ffa'ʃevə	ʃa ppɛr'dia
	1pl	ʃɛ ffa'ʃemmə	ʃa ppɛr'diamu
	2pl	ʃɛ ffa'ʃivəvə	ʃa ppɛr'diuvu
	3pl	ʃɛ ffa'ʃevənə	ʃa ppɛr'dianu

If we now turn to compare the situation in the dialects of northern Calabria, we see barely any such inflectional attrition or specialization of the verbs COME and GO in their pseudo-coordinate use. The relevant facts are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Cosentino asyndetic GO and COME

		'go do'	'come do'
Present	1sg	vaiu/ve fazzu	vìegnu fazzu
	2sg	va fa	vìeni fa
	3sg	va ffa	vena ffa
	1pl	jamu facimu	venimu facimu
	2pl	jati faciti	veniti faciti
	3pl	vannu fannu	venanu fannu
Past	1sg	jìa facia	venìa facìa
	2sg	jìe facìe	venìe facìe
	3sg	jìa ffacìa	venìa ffacìa
	1pl	jìamu facìamu	venìamu facìamu
	2pl	jìati facìati	venìati facìati
	3pl	jìanu facìanu	venìanu facìanu

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

With the exception of the first person singular present of GO, all the forms given in Table 3 are those which are also found outside of the pseudo-coordinate structure (e.g. *vaiu/vìegnu addu Cicciu stasira* 'I'm going/coming to Ciccio's this evening'), displaying the expected morphologically distinct forms for all six persons.[4] Even in the case of the first person singular present of GO, the specialized reduced form *ve*, unavailable outside of pseudo-coordination (cf. *vaiu/*ve addu Cicciu stasira*), is only optional, regularly occurring alongside the fuller agreeing form *vaiu*, witness alternations such as (38a-b).

(38) a e mmi **vaju** curcu (Barca 1996: 15)
b mi **ve** curcu (Barca 1996: 34)
and me= go.PRS.1SG lie.down.PRS.1SG
'(and) I'm off to bed.'

Interestingly, the behaviour of GO, but not COME, parallels that found with the perfective and progressive auxiliaries HAVE and STAND in northern Calabrian which show comparable optional reduced forms again just in the first person singular, namely *e* (*fattu*) 'have.PRS.1SG (done)' (alongside fuller *aiu fattu*) and *ste* (*faciennu*) 'stand.PRS.1SG (doing)' (alongside fuller *staiu faciennu*).

Another significant morphological concomitant of the grammaticalization process visible in the development of pseudo-coordination in the dialects of southern Italy concerns the frequent temporal, aspectual and modal restrictions placed on the verbs in the construction. In particular, the available evidence allows us to construct an implicational hierarchy along the lines of (39a) which highlights that pseudo-coordination in some varieties, including those of northern and central Italy (cf. Ledgeway 1997), is limited to the positive imperative. If it is extended beyond the imperative, as is common in the dialects of the extreme south of Italy, then it is found in the present, the most frequent extension, much more rarely in the preterite and, in turn, the imperfect and, finally, the counterfactual (a label we use here to subsume the conditional and imperfect subjunctive which typically fall together formally in the dialects of the south). Thus, for example, (39b) sketches the distribution of pseudo-coordination in Sicilian which is typically limited to the imperative and the present, witness the representative examples from the dialects of Marsala in (40) taken from Cardinaletti and Giusti (2003: 380f.), with only rare extensions beyond these two paradigms in particular dialects (Di Caro 2019b: 124-30). (39c), by contrast, summarizes the distribution of pseudo-coordination in the dialects of Puglia and Salento (Ledgeway 2016; Andriani 2017: ch. 5) where, as noted in Tables 1-2, it is systematically extended to the imperfective. In this respect, the behaviour of pseudo-coordination in the dialects of northern Calabria once again stands out as it shows no such morphological restrictions: as the representation in (39d) and examples in (41) illustrate, pseudo-coordination is extended along the entire hierarchy, freely applying to all available finite paradigms (note that the preterite fell out of use in the dialects of northern Calabria during the course of the nineteenth century).

[4] Observe that, unlike the other singular persons, the third person singular causes initial consonantal lengthening of the initial consonant of the following word, thereby distinguishing itself from the second person singular (present) and the third person singular. For full discussion, see Ledgeway (2018; in press).

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

(39) a Imperative > Present > Preterite / > Imperfect > Counterfactual
b Imperative > Present (/ > Preterite / > Imperfect > Counterfactual) (Sicily)
c Imperative > Present > Imperfect (Puglia/Salento)
d Imperative > Presence > Imperfect > Counterfactual (northern Calabria)

(40) a Va pigghia u pani! (Marsala)
go.IMP.2SG take.IMP.2SG the bread
'Go and get the bread!'
b Vaju a pigghiu u pani. (Marsala)
go.PRS.1SG AC take.PRS.1SG the bread
'I'm going to get the bread.'
c *II a pigghiai u pani. (Marsala)
go.PST.PFV.1SG AC take.PST.PFV.1SG the bread
'I went and got the bread.'
d *Ia a pigghiava u pani. (Marsala)
go.PST.IPFV.1SG AC take.PST.IPFV.1SG the bread
'I was going to get the bread.'
e *Si tinn' issi a accattassi u pani. (Marsala)
if you=thence= go.IRR.2SG AC buy.IRR.2SG the bread
'If you were to go and buy the bread.'

(41) a Va / Vena t' 'u piglia! (Cos.)
go.IMP.2SG come.IMP.2SG you= it= take.IMP.2SG
'Go/Come and fetch it!'
b M' 'u vaju / vìegnu pigliu. (Cos.)
me= it= go.PRS.1SG come.PRS.1SG take.PRS.1SG
c M' 'u jìa / venìa pigliava. (Cos.)
me= it= go.PST.IPFV.1SG come.PST.IPFV.1SG take.PST.IPFV.1SG
d M' 'u jissa / venissa pigliassa. (Cos.)
me= it= go.IRR.1SG come.IRR.1SG take.IRR.1SG
'I am/was going/coming // would go/come to fetch it.'

We must also remember that a frequent morphological reflex of grammaticalization of the pseudo-coordinate structure is its restriction to specific persons of the paradigm, which can be summarized by the implicational hierarchy in (42).

(42) 2SG > 3SG > 1/2/3SG > Maiden's N-pattern > all

(42) captures the fact that in some varieties pseudo-coordination is found just in the second person singular, as happens in many varieties which, as already noted (cf. 39a), limit its distribution to the positive imperative. The next stage in its extension is exemplified by the dialects of Puglia where, as shown by Andriani (2017: ch. 5), the emergence of pseudo-coordination outside of the imperative first emerges in the second and third persons singular (cf. (a) in Table 4) before spreading to the first person singular to produce a symmetric singular vs plural opposition (cf. (b) in Table 4). A further stage of development can be observed in many Sicilian dialects where pseudo-coordination is extended also to the third person plural (cf. (c) in Table 4), yielding a morphomic distribution reminiscent of Maiden's (2011; 2016) N-pattern (cf. Cruschina 2013). Once

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

again, the dialects of northern Calabria stand out within this overview in that they show no such morphological restrictions on person distribution, with pseudo-coordination attested in all six grammatical persons (cf. (d) in Table 4).

Table 4: Person extension 2/3sg > 1/2/3sg > N-pattern (Maiden 2011; 2016) > all

	(a) Gravina (BA) (Andriani 2017: 217)	(b) Rutigliano (BA) (Andriani 2017: 219)	(c) Marsala (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2003: 380)	(d) Cosenza
1sg	vóuchə a ssuné	vɔɲg a ʃ'ʃɔ:uk	vaju a pigghiu	vaiu pigliu
2sg	vè ssùnə	ve (a) ʃ'ʃu:k	vai a pigghi	va pigli
3sg	vè ssòunə	ve (a) ʃ'ʃɔ:uk	va a pigghia	va ppiglia
1pl	scəm'a ssuné	ʃəm a ʃə'kwe	emu a pigghiari	jamu pigliamu
2pl	scət'a ssuné	ʃət a ʃə'kwe	iti a pigghiari	jati pigliati
3pl	vònn'a ssuné	vɔnn a ʃə'kwe	vannu a pigghianu	vannu piglianu
	'go and/to play'	'go and/to play'	'go and/to take'	'go and/to take'

A final morphological restriction that we must briefly consider is that of finiteness. In most southern Italo-Romance varieties pseudo-coordination is limited to finite contexts, as is the case in Sicilian (cf. Cardinaletti and Giusti 2020: §2.2). However, in Salentino, though not in Pugliese, it is also extended to the infinitive and participle of GO, namely *sci'* (< *scire*) and *sciu'* (< *sciutu*), respectively (Ledgeway 2016). In this respect, northern Calabrian behaves like most dialects of the extreme south of Italy, limiting pseudo-coordination to finite contexts.

(43) a M' 'u pùazzu jì / vena a piglià / *piglià. (Cos.)
me= it= can.PRS.1SG go.INF come.INF to take.INF take.INF
'I can go/come and fetch it.'

b M' 'u staiu jìennu / venìennu a piglià / *pigliannu. (Cos.)
me= it= stand.PRS.1SG go.GER come.GER to take.INF take.GER
'I'm going/coming to fetch it.'

c M' 'u signu jutu / vinutu a piglià / *(aiu)
me= it= be.PRS.1SG go.PTCP come.PTCP to take.INF have.PRS.1SG
pigliatu. (Cos.)
take.PTCP
'I went/came to fetch it.'

d Signu jutu a saglia / *(signu) sagliatu. (Cos.)
be.PRS.1SG go.PTCP to ascend.INF be.PRS.1SG ascend.PTCP
'I went to go up.'

In conclusion, with the exception of non-finite forms (infinitive, gerund and participle) the morphological restrictions typically found among other Italo-Romance dialects in the distribution of pseudo-coordination are largely absent in northern Calabrian, where GO and COME are attested in all available temporal, aspectual and modal paradigms, and in all grammatical persons.

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

3.2. Syntactic effects of grammaticalization

The tests reviewed above in (13)-(25) demonstrate how in the passage from asyndetic coordination to pseudo-coordination the resultant biclausal complement structure underwent a process of monoclausal restructuring. This is clearly visible in the Pugliese and Salentino developments briefly introduced in §3.1 above where we saw that the resultant biclausal complement structure found in the more conservative dialects of Puglia (44a) and its subsequent monoclausal development found in the more innovative dialects of Salento (44b) show notable differences (cf. Ledgeway 2016; Andriani 2017: ch.5). In particular, the increased pragmatico-semantic integration between the two events/states (Givón 1990: 826) is paralleled by a commensurate degree of syntactic integration and dependency between matrix and complement clauses, an immediate reflex of which is immediately manifested in the absorption (Pugliese dialects) and subsequent loss (Salentino dialects) of the erstwhile coordinator > complementizer *a* (< AC). Furthermore, as observed in Tables 1-2, interlacing (cf. Lehmann 1988) between both clauses may result in the gradual erosion of morphological marking for person/number, still visible in Pugliese, and tense (present vs past), such that the person/number and temporal evaluation of these clauses is now wholly determined by the person/number and temporal reference of the verb of the erstwhile second conjunct/complement clause, the typical outcome in Salento. This sharing of inflectional features has contributed, in turn, to increased bonding between matrix and subordinate clauses, leaving fossilized forms of STAND/GO in Salentino to be reinterpreted wholly as aspect markers in conjunction with their associated lexical verb (for detailed further discussion, see Ledgeway 2016).

(44) a [$_{AgrP}$ Stoc' [$_{CP}$ a [$_{AgrP}$ ffazzu]]] (Pugliese) ⇒
stand.PRS.1SG AC do.PRS.1SG
b [$_{AgrP}$ Sta ffazzu] (Salentino)
stand do.PRS.1SG
'I'm doing'

As a consequence of this clause union, there can only be one finite verb in the resultant monoclausal construction, such that the two AgrP projections in (44a) have been reduced to one (44b) in line with the inflectional attrition observed in Salentino and the concomitant loss of verbal characteristics of STAND/GO which no longer license independent AgrP projections. In the dialects of northern Calabria, by contrast, where many of the facts of pseudo-coordination reviewed in (13)-(25) equally point to a monoclausal outcome (45b), both verbs continue nonetheless to show full inflectional forms despite the apparent presence of a single AgrP.

(45) a [$_{AgrP}$ Vaiu [$_{CP}$ Ø [$_{AgrP}$ ffazzu]]] (Cos.) ⇒
go.PRS.1SG Ø do.PRS.1SG
b [$_{AgrP}$ Vaiu ffazzu] (Cos.)
go.PRS.1SG do.PRS.1SG
'I'm going to do.'

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

The monoclausal nature of the northern Calabrian pseudo-coordinate structure is further substantiated by contrasts with infinitival adjuncts like that in (46a). On the uncontroversial assumption that infinitival adjunct clauses in conjunction with GO and COME instantiate full CP clauses, hence yielding a biclausal structure, the impossibility of replacing the infinitive with an inflected verb by way of a pseudo-coordinate structure in (46b) follows without further stipulation: the second inflected verb in the pseudo-coordinate structure is not an autonomous piece of structure, but, rather, forms with the verb of motion a single complex verbal predicate lexicalizing positions within the sentential core (viz. T-*v*P) as part of a monoclausal structure. Consequently, the only pseudo-coordination structure available is that in (46c) where the instrumental PP *ccu ra màchina* 'by car' must follow the complex verbal complex and the act of 'fetching' is integrated with the verb of motion to instantiate a single event.

(46) a Vaiu ccu ra màchina [$_{CP}$ a piglià u pane]. (Cos.)
go.PRS.1SG with the car to take.INF the bread
b *Vaiu ccu ra màchina [$_{CP}$ pigliu u pane]. (Cos.)
go.PRS.1SG with the car take.PRS.1SG the bread
'I am going with the car in order to fetch the bread.'
c [$_{T\text{-}vP}$ Vaiu pigliu (ccu ra màchina) u pane ccu ra màchina]. (Cos.)
go.PRS.1SG take.PRS.1SG with the car the bread with the car
'I am going to fetch (by car) the bread (by car).'

Analogous results regarding the lack of autonomy of the second inflected verb in the pseudo-coordination structure come from the distribution of focus fronting. As illustrated in (47a), the infinitival complement of a subject-control verb such as LEARN may freely undergo corrective focus-fronting to the higher left periphery on a par with other arguments and non-selected constituents. The same possibility is also available in (47b) where the infinitival complement is selected by GO. If, however, we replace the hypotactic infinitival construction in (47b) with the pseudo-coordinate construction in (47c), then focusing proves ill-formed. This highlights again how in the pseudo-coordinate structure both inflected verbs form a single verbal complex characterized by a high degree of structural cohesion, such that the lexical verb, as a non-constituent, is not available to undergo operations such as focus-fronting.

(47) a A CUCINÀ m' aiu mbaratu, unn' a bballà! (Cos.)
to cook.INF me= have.PRS.1SG learn.PTCP NEG= to dance.INF
'It was cooking that I learnt, not dancing!'
b A CUCINÀ vaiu, unn' a bballà! (Cos.)
to cook.INF go.PRS.1SG NEG= to dance.INF
'I'm going to do some cooking, not dancing!'
c *CUCINU vaiu, u bballu! (Cos.)
cook.PRS.1SG go.PRS.1SG neg= dance.PRS.1SG

A further typical syntactic repercussion of the grammaticalization process in the emergence of verbal periphrasis manifests itself in the gradual loss of the verbal characteristics, namely V features, of the incipient auxiliary which is no longer first-merged

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

in the lexical-thematic domain of the VP on a par with lexical verbs, but, rather, is directly inserted within functional heads of the Infl-domain in line with Roberts and Roussou's (1993) theory of upwards grammaticalization. In the prototypical case, prospective auxiliaries end up therefore no longer behaving syntactically like verbs in many key respects. Take for example the case of Romance object clitics. Following Renzi (1989), these are typically ad-verbal such that a hallmark of the Romance verb is its ability to host object clitics. At one extreme are Salentino dialects such as Scorranese (48a) where the auxiliation process is so well developed that weakened reflexes of the erstwhile verb GO such as *va*, presumably to be analysed synchronically as a particle (cf. Ledgeway 2016), are today no longer able to host clitics which instead procliticize on the lexical verb. In other cases, by contrast, behaviour is uneven, as in the case of modern French where most restructuring predicates today are no longer able to host clitics (48b), with the notable exception of perfective auxiliaries and causatives which license obligatory clitic climbing (48c). Such obligatory clitic climbing is also what we find with northern Calabrian COME and GO (49a–b) on par with all other functional predicates in the dialect, hence an undeniable hallmark of the highly grammatical(ized) behaviour of these verbs of motion.

(48) a Canussia va tte visciu cchiù tardu. (Scorrano)
perhaps GO you= see.PRS.1SG more later
'Perhaps I'll see you later.'

b Elle (*te) veut / peut / doit te parler. (Fr.)
she you= want.PRS.3SG can.PRS.3SG must.PRS.3SG you= speak.INF
'She wants to/can/must speak to you.'

c Elle t' a (*te) parlé / Elle te fait (*te) parler. (Fr.)
she you=have you=speak.PTCP she you=make.PRS.3SG you=speak.INF
'She has spoken to you / She makes you speak.'

(49) a Ti vìegnu trùavu. (Cos.)
you=come.PRS.1SG find.PRS.1SG
'I'm coming to visit you.'

b Ti ve preparu ncuna cosa? (Cos.)
you=go.PRS.1SG prepare.PRS.1SG some thing
'Shall I go and prepare you something?'

A further syntactic side-effect of the growing grammaticalization of specific verbs is observable in the loss of the verb's original argument structure and in this respect northern Calabrian COME and GO are no exception. As lexical verbs, COME and GO are characterized by an argument structure which includes a directional complement. When the latter is represented by a full lexical argument, it can be optionally doubled by a corresponding clitic on the verb, including an accompanying reflexive clitic (50a), but when it is null, it must be spelt out by the corresponding clitic on the verb (50b). By contrast, in the pseudo-coordination structure COME and GO no longer present these same typical verbal properties but, rather, are devoid of any independent argument structure and as such prove incompatible with these same clitics (50c).

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

(50) a (Si nni) va / vena a ra scola. (Cos.)
self= thence= go.PRS.3SG come.PRS.3SG to the school
'He's going/coming to school.'
b *(Si nni) va / vena. (Cos.)
self= thence= go.PRS.3SG come.PRS.3SG
'He goes/comes.'
c (*Si nni) va ccanta / (*Si nni) vena
self= thence= go.PRS.3SG sing.PRS.3SG self= thence= come.PRS.3SG
ccanta. (Cos.)
sing.PRS.3SG
'He's going/coming to sing.'

Also illustrative of the presence/absence of argument structure with the lexical/grammatical(ized) uses of GO and COME are minimal contrasts such as (51a-b) where, if the directional complement is expressed, only the lexical reading obtains and the second verb must consequently be realized by means of a hypotactic infinitival clause.

(51) a Va / Vena a ra scola a fatigà. (Cos.)
go.PRS.3SG come.PRS.3SG to the school to work.INF
'He goes/come to school to work.'
b Va / Vena (*a ra scola) ffatiga a ra scola. (Cos.)
go.PRS.3SG come.PRS.3SG to the school work.PRS.3SG to the school
'He's going/coming to work at school.'

Similar conclusions can be drawn from the contrasts in (52) and (53). In the former case we see that the infinitival clause which functions as the directional complement of GO can be readily questioned via wh-extraction and also serve as the answer to the same, inasmuch as it is an argument selected by the verb. If, however, we substitute the infinitival complement with a pseudo-coordinate structure as in (53), then wh-extraction now proves impossible, since the pseudo-coordinated inflected verb form does not instantiate an argument of GO. Rather, it forms a complex predicate with the latter which inherits the lexical verb's arguments (cf. Harris and Campbell's (1995: 193) *Heir-Apparent Principle*).

(52) a Stasira vaiu a bballà. (Cos.)
this.evening go.PRS.1SG to dance.INF
'This evening I'm going dancing.'
b Unni va stasira? – A bballà! (Cos.)
where go.PRS.2SG this.evening to dance.INF
'Where are gong this evening?' – Dancing!'
(53) a Stasira vaiu bballu. (Cos.)
this.evening go.PRS.1SG dance.PRS.1SG
'This evening I'm going dancing.'
b *Unni va stasira? – Bballu! (Cos.)
where go.PRS.2SG this.evening dance.PRS.1SG
'Where are gong this evening?' – Dancing!'

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

Another typical consequence of the grammaticalization process is the observation that auxiliaries fail to impose any selectional restrictions on the external argument. For instance, in the examples in (54) CAN proves equally compatible with human (54a), non-human animate (54a) and inanimate (54a-c) subjects. Nonetheless, the minimally contrasting examples in (55) where CAN has been replaced by GO in a pseudo-coordinate structure now reveal how GO continues to place thematic restrictions on its external argument on a par with lexical predicates. In particular, as a verb of motion GO continues to require a 'mobile' subject as in (55a) and one which is typically also animate, hence the ungrammaticality of (55b-c).

(54) a Irena / U lupu / A ruspa pò scassà a porta. (Cos.)
Irena the wolf the bulldozer can.PRS.3SG break.INF the door
'Irena/The Wolf/The bulldozer can break the door down.'
b U vìentu pò scassà a porta. (Cos.)
the wind can.PRS.3SG break.INF the door
'The wind is able to break the door down.'
c A porta si pò scassà. (Cos.)
the door self=can.PRS.3SG break.INF
'The door can be broken down.'

(55) a Irena / U lupu / A ruspa va scassa a porta. (Cos.)
Irena the wolf the bulldozer go.PRS.3SG break.PRS.3SG the door
'Irena/The wolf/The bulldozer is going to break the door down.'
b *U vìentu va scassa a porta. (Cos.)
the wind go.PRS.3SG break.PRS.3SG the door
'The wind is going to break the door down.'
c *A porta si va scassa. (Cos.)
the door self=go.PRS.3SG break.PRS.3SG
'The door is going to be broken down.'

If COME and GO were completely dethematicized showing no selectional restrictions on argument structure, a typical consequence of the grammaticalization process and an inevitable stage in the development of auxiliaries and subsequent grammaticalization stages, then we should expect them to behave like other examples of grammaticalized COME and GO in Romance which, devoid of any argument structure, are not only compatible with their own lexical counterparts, without any risk of pleonastic repetition (cf. 27a, 28a), but are also compatible with each other (cf. 27b, 28b), despite the contrasting deictic values (viz. coming vs going) of their underlying lexemes. As we have already seen, however, this is not the case in the dialects of northern Calabria, where COME and GO prove both incompatible with their lexical counterparts (31a, 32a) and with each other (31b, 32b).

To sum up, we have seen how an original asyndetic coordination structure with COME and GO has been reanalysed as a case of monoclausal pseudo-coordination. Despite this bi- to monoclausal reanalysis which *a priori* would lead us to expect COME and GO to display an advanced degree of auxiliarihood, we have observed how some of the morphosyntactic properties of the monoclausal structure do not readily map onto the expected outcomes of a typical grammaticalization pathway. Rather, what we find is a mixed behaviour where some morphosyntactic properties are clearly lagging behind the

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

completed change from biclausal to monoclausal structure, while others are fully in line with the increased structural bonding and integration between both verbs that results from monoclausal subordination. Thus, as a result of the observed monoclausality of the pseudo-coordinate structure, the second inflected verb is in complementary distribution with the infinitive, which instantiates a full CP clause occurring within a biclausal structure. The second inflected verb in the pseudo-coordinate structure, by contrast, shows a high degree of structural integration with the verb of motion from which it cannot be separated by intervening constituents or in order to undergo fronting operations. At the same time, the grammaticalized nature of the verb of motion is also underlined by the fact that: (i) it induces obligatory clitic climbing as the sole available host within the clause; and (ii) it lacks its own independent argument structure, inheriting that of the lexical verb with which it forms a complex predicate. On the other hand, despite a monoclausal structure, both verbs in the pseudo-coordinate structure still display full inflection in line with the original biclausal structure, and COME and GO continue to present selectional and thematic restrictions, as witnessed by their incompatibility with their lexical counterparts and with each other, and by their compatibility with only certain semantic classes of external argument.

4. GRAMMATICAL OR GRAMMATICALIZED?

Our examination of northern Calabrian pseudo-coordination has demonstrated that in semantic, morphological and syntactic terms COME and GO fail to present any obvious reflexes of a process of grammaticalization in that, alongside their grammatical functions, they continue to display many properties typical of lexical predicates. Rather, what the data appear to show quite clearly is that in their pseudo-coordinate uses COME and GO are grammatical, namely functional, but they have not undergone any particular process of grammaticalization. More specifically, in the grammars of northern Calabria COME and GO stand out among all (functional and lexical) verbs, in that they alone uniquely partake in a specialized monoclausal pseudo-coordination construction: in this construction they respectively mark the aspectual deictic categories of venitive and andative viewpoint through their lexicalization of the venitive/andative functional head situated low within the sentential core (Cinque 1999: 105; 2006: 47 n.4, 70).

(56) [$\text{Mod}_{\text{Epistemic/Alethic}}$ [TP [$\text{Asp}_{\text{Habitual}}$ [$\text{Asp}_{\text{Predispositional}}$ [$\text{Asp}_{\text{Repetitive}}$ [$\text{Mod}_{\text{Volition}}$ [$\text{Asp}_{\text{Terminative}}$ [$\text{Asp}_{\text{Continuative(I)}}$ [$\text{Asp}_{\text{Durative/Progressive}}$ [$\text{Mod}_{\text{Obligation/Ability}}$ [$\text{Asp}_{\text{Frustrative/Success}}$ [$\text{Mod}_{\text{Permission}}$ [$\text{Asp}_{\text{Conative}}$ [Voice [Causative [$\text{Asp}_{\text{Inceptive}}$ [$\text{Asp}_{\text{Continuative(II)}}$ [$\textbf{Asp}_{\textbf{Venitive/Andative}}$ 'GO/COME' [$\text{Asp}_{\text{Completive}}$ [$_{\text{VP}}$ V…

Consequently, any grammatical properties of COME and GO are simply to be understood as a reflex of their first-merger position within an venitive/andative functional head of the inflectional core of the sentence, and not as a result of a (re)grammaticalization process which reanalyses COME and GO as the exponents of functional positions higher in the functional domain related to such categories as future time and inchoative aspect. This presumably lies at the heart of differences between, for example, the future uses of COME

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

and GO in Portuguese and Surselvan (26a–b), on the one hand, and their exclusively movement-based uses in northern Calabria (29)–(30), on the other: whereas in the latter case COME and GO are restricted to lexicalizing the purely deictic $Asp_{Venitive/Andative}$ head, in the former they can and have undergone upwards regrammaticalization from this base position to lexicalize the T_{Future} head in the highest layers of the Infl-field. Unlike in northern Calabrian, the verbs COME and GO in Surselvan and Portuguese are therefore potentially ambiguous, in that they can lexicalize both the lower aspectual and the higher temporal heads in accordance with their respective movement and future uses. This therefore explains our contention that, in contrast to their equivalents in many other Romance varieties, COME and GO in northern Calabrian are grammatical, inasmuch as they are first-merged in a low aspectual head of the clausal functional domain, but are not grammaticalized, in that they fail to raise to higher functional heads within the higher functional domain. As such, they are unable to embed further iterations of COME and GO (31a, 32a), in contrast to varieties such as Surselvan and Portuguese where future uses of COME and GO (27a–b, 28a–b) first-merged in a high T- related position are free to embed venitive /andative uses of COME and GO first-merged in a lower Asp-related position.

In turn, this analysis of northern Calabrian COME and GO makes a number of correct predictions about the formal properties of the pseudo-coordinate construction. First, given their merger in the head of $Aspect_{Venitive/Andative}$, COME and GO are predicted to be available for selection by all higher functional predicates in (56), as illustrated in (57a–c) and, second, that they themselves cannot embed higher functional predicates merged above them in (56), as borne out by the examples already presented in (37a–c).

(57) a U pùazzu / vùagliu / prùavu a / cuntìnuu a /
it= can.PRS.1SG want.PRS.1SG try.PRS.1SG to continue.PRS.1SG to
ncuminciu a (ggh)jì / vena a ppiglià. (Cos.)
start.PRS.1SG to go.INF come.INF to take.INF
'I can/want to/try to/continue to/start to go/come and fetch it.'

b U staju jìennu / venìennu a piglià. (Cos.)
it= stand.PRS.1SG go.GER come.GER to take.INF
'I am going/coming to fetch it.

c U fazzu jì / vena a piglià. (Cos.)
it= make.PRS.1SG go.INF come.GER to take.INF
'I have someone go and fetch it.'

Third, we now also have a natural explanation for why pseudo-coordination is excluded in non-finite contexts (cf. 43a-d): unlike finite verbs which, by definition, are autonomous and hence not selected and free to co-occur in succession, non-finite verbs do not occur in isolation in northern Calabrian dialects but are always c-selected by a specific auxiliary, namely perfective active participles by ESSA 'be' and AVÌ 'have', passive participles by ESSA 'be' and VULÌ 'want', and continuous/progressive gerunds by STÀ 'stand', or in the case of the infinitive c-selected by a functional predicate (e.g. PUTÌ 'can', AVÌ A 'must') or a specific preposition(al complementizer), e.g. *a* 'to', *i* 'of', *ppi* 'for'. It thus follows that these non-finite verb forms are not available in pseudo-coordination since they require c-selection by a specific auxiliary or a preposition which cannot be met by (a non-finite form of) COME or GO.

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

Fourth, our earlier observation that COME and GO cannot co-occur (cf. 31b, 32b) now follows from the structure in (56), inasmuch as they represent lexicalizations of opposing (venitive vs andative) values of the same head, only one of which can be lexicalized at any one time.

Finally, the merger of COME and GO in the head of $Asp_{Venitive/Andative}$ in (56) makes the further prediction that the only functional predicates they are able to embed are those lexicalizing the head of $Asp_{Completive}$ (Cinque 2006: 79 n.17), as is borne out by example (58).

(58) Vaiu / Viegnu finisciu 'i pulizzà a cucina. (Cos.)
go.PRS.1SG come.PRS.1SG finish.PRS.1SG of clean.INF the kitchen
'I am going/coming to finish cleaning the kitchen.'

Let us now turn to the apparent problem of inflectional duplication noted in §3.2 where, given the resultant monoclausal structure and the presence of a single Agr projection, the occurrence and licensing of two fully-inflected finite verb forms within the same clause is unexpected under standard assumptions about mechanisms of syntactic agreement. However, we suggest following Cardinaletti and Giusti (2020) that the inflectional features of the second verb under pseudo-coordination are not to be interpreted as the PF reflex of a syntactic Agree relation (viz. a probe-goal valuation) between Agr and V, since the closest goal in the search domain of Agr and with which it enters into an Agree configuration is the verb of motion under $Asp_{Venitive/Andative}$. Rather, the inflectional features borne by the second verb constitute a superficial case of concord. Thus, in the same way that within the nominal domain we see copying of phi-features between D and the extended projection of NP on accompanying quantifiers and adjectives (59a), in the pseudo-coordinate structure we observe within the verbal domain copying of features between Infl-Agr and the extended projection of VP to include the second verb form in the pseudo-coordinate structure (59b).

(59) a [$_{DP}$ 'Ss**i** / **I** [$_{NP}$ bb**i**el**l**i guagliun**i**]] (Cos.)
these.MPL the.MPL handsome.MPL boys
'These/The handsome boys'

b [$_{TP}$ **Jìanu** [$_{VP}$ mangià**vanu**]] (Cos.)
go.PST.IPFV.3PL eat.PST.IPFV.3PL
'They used to go and eat.'

This analysis in terms of concord also explains the observed obligatory clitic climbing in conjunction with the verbs of motion (60a). Although we have already noted that clitics in northern Calabrian always cliticize to functional predicates when present (60b), cliticization to the lexical verb in pseudo-coordination is also excluded since the latter is only superficially, but not syntactically, finite as the result of a concord operation of morphological feature copying. Consequently, as a non-finite form the lexical verb fails to exert a blocking effect on the climbing of clitics to the verb of motion.

(60) a Mi vaiu (*mi) lavu. (Cos.)
me= go.PRS.1SG me= wash.PRS.1SG
'I go and wash.'

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

b Mi pùazzu (*mi) lavà. (Cos.)
me= can.PRS.1SG me= wash.INF
'I can wash.'

Finally, we turn to consider verb positions and movement. As established in Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005), finite verbs in northern Calabrian do not raise very high, but, rather, are restricted to targeting one of the head positions of the Lower Adverb Space (LAS) illustrated in (61), namely the lower portion of the inflectional domain of the sentential core situated below the sentential adverbs of the High Adverb Space (HAS) which is demarcated to its left by NegP1 (whose specifier is lexicalized by presuppositional negators such as It. *mica* and Cal. *mancu* '(in any case) not') and to its right by $AspP_{Completive(I)}$ (whose specifier is lexicalized by adverbs such as 'completely' and 'all'). From its various positions above and below different classes of lower adverb exemplified in (62), we thus see that the finite verb can surface in any one of the many positions available in the LAS, but can never target a position lower than $AspP_{Completive(I)}$ or within the HAS, witness the ungrammaticality of (63a-b) where the finite verb occurs to the right of the manner adverb *bùanu* 'well' and to the left of higher adverb *forse* 'perhaps'.

(61) HAS (*fortunately*, *once, perhaps, usually*)…[***mica*** $Neg1_{PRESUP}$ [*already* $T(_{ANTERIOR})$ [*no longer* $Asp_{TERMINATIVE}$ [*still* $Asp_{CONTINUATIVE}$ [*always* $Asp_{PERFECT}$ [*guère* 'hardly' Neg2 [*just* $Asp_{RETROSPECTIVE}$ [*soon* $Asp_{PROXIMATIVE}$ [*briefly* $Asp_{DURATIVE}$ [*characteristically* Asp_{PROG} [*almost* $Asp_{PROSPECTIVE}$ [***Completely/All*** $Asp_{COMPLETIVE(I)}$ [*well* Voice [*fast/early* $Asp_{CELERATIVE(PROCESS)}$ [*again* $Asp_{REPETITIVE(PROCESS)}$ [*often* $Asp_{FREQUENTATIVE}$ [**COME/GO-**$Asp_{VENITIVE/ANDATIVE}$ [*completely* $Asp_{COMPLETIVE(II)}$ [$_{VP}$ V…

(62) a Un mi [$_{LAS}$ mancu cchiù tantu piacìa [$_{VP}$ ~~piacìa~~]] ($Neg1/Asp_{TERM}/Asp_{COMPL}$)
NEG=me= not no.more so.much pleased
b Un mi [$_{LAS}$ mancu cchiù piacìa tantu [$_{VP}$ ~~piacìa~~]] ($Neg1/Asp_{TERM}/Asp_{COMPL}$)
NEG=me= not no.more pleased so.much
c Un mi [$_{LAS}$ mancu piacìa cchiù tantu [$_{VP}$ ~~piacìa~~]] ($Neg1/Asp_{TERM}/Asp_{COMPL}$)
NEG=me= not pleased no.more so.much
d Un mi [$_{LAS}$ piacìa mancu cchiù tantu [$_{VP}$ ~~piacìa~~]] ($Neg1/Asp_{TERM}/Asp_{COMPL}$)
NEG=me= pleased not.even no.more so.much
'In any case I no longer liked it much.'

(63) a Cicciu capiscia bùanu (*capiscia). (Cos.)
Ciccio understand.PRS.3SG well understand.PRS.3SG
'Ciccio understands well.'
b Cicciu (*capiscia) forse capiscia. (Cos.)
Ciccio understand.PRS.3SG perhaps understand.PRS.3SG
'Ciccio perhaps understands.'

In light of these observations, we predict that the only adverbs that may intervene between COME/GO and the second verb are those that lexicalize specifiers of projections situated between NegP1 (*mancu*) and $AspP_{Compl}$ (*tantu*), as sketched in (64).

(64) Un mi [$_{LAS}$ vaiu mancu … tantu lavu [$_{Voice}$ bùanu
NEG=me= go.PRS.1SG not so.much wash.PRS.1SG well
[$_{AspAND}$ ~~vaiu~~ [$_{VP}$ ~~lavu~~]]]].

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

This prediction is indeed borne out, as the grammaticality of (65a-e) and the ungrammaticality of (65f) illustrate.

(65) a Un mi mancu cchiù vaiu lavu bùanu…
NEG=me= not no.more go.PRS.1SG wash.PRS.1SG well
b Un mi mancu vaiu cchiù lavu bùanu…
NEG=me= not go.PRS.1SG no.more wash.PRS.1SG well
c Un mi mancu vaiu lavu cchiù bùanu…
NEG=me= not go.PRS.1SG wash.PRS.1SG no.more well
d Un mi vaiu mancu cchiù lavu bùanu…
NEG=me= go.PRS.1SG not no.more wash.PRS.1SG well
e Un mi vaiu mancu lavu cchiù bùanu…
NEG=me= go.PRS.1SG not wash.PRS.1SG no.more well
f *Un mi vaiu lavu mancu cchiù bùanu…
NEG=me= go.PRS.1SG wash.PRS.1SG not no.more well
'In any case I am no longer going to wash myself properly.'

By the same token, higher adverbs must precede both verbs (66a) whereas manner adverbs and all lower classes must follow (67a), but neither class of adverb can intervene between both verbs (66b, 67b).

(66) a Oja / Forse / Nurmalmente mi vaiu lavu. (Cos.)
today perhaps usually me= go.PRS.1SG wash.PRS.1SG
b *Mi vaiu oja / forse / nurmalmente lavu. (Cos.)
me= go.PRS.1SG toady perhaps usually wash.PRS.1SG
'I'm going to wash today // I perhaps/usually go and wash.'
(67) a Mi vaiu lavu bùanu / prìestu / tuttu. (Cos.)
me= go.PRS.1SG wash.PRS.1SG well early completely
b *Mi vaiu bùanu / prìestu / tuttu lavu. (Cos.)
me= go.PRS.1SG well early completely wash.PRS.1SG
'I'm going to wash well/early/thoroughly.'

5. CONCLUSION

In contrast to their equivalents in many Romance varieties, COME and GO in northern Calabrian have been shown to lack the typical grammaticalized behaviours that verbs of motion tend to develop cross-linguistically as prototypical candidates for the grammaticalization of verbal aspect and tense (cf. Heine 1993:30). In principle, this would not be a surprising result, since there is no *a priori* expectation for all verbs of motion to develop grammaticalized uses, if it were not for the fact that these two verbs, and only these two verbs, are characterized by a special syntax in northern Calabrian. This special syntax, namely pseudo-coordination, places them with other dialects of the extreme south of Italy (as well some Germanic varieties; cf. footnote 2) where these two same verbs, as well as a small number of others (e.g. STAND, WANT), have also been drawn into a pseudo-coordination structure. However, in these other dialects the same verbs show quite

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

unmistakable signs of grammaticalization (cf. Lehmann 1985; Hopper and Traugott 1993:87-89; Ramat 2001) including, for instance, semantic weakening and concomitant development of non-lexical uses (e.g. futurity, inchoativity, durativity), morphophonological specialization and inflectional attrition (according to tense, aspect, mood and grammatical person), and the loss of canonical verbal syntax (e.g. ability to host negation and clitics, loss of argument structure) as they shift from lexical V(erb) to Aux(iliary).

Nonetheless, we have observed that COME and GO in northern Calabrian do present some grammatical properties, the major one being their co-occurrence in a monoclausal construction with a lexical predicate which, in turn, explains, among other things, obligatory clitic climbing and the strict restrictions on the class of elements that may intervene between verb of motion and lexical verb. This has led us to argue that COME and GO in northern Calabrian are grammatical, but are not grammaticalized in that they have not undergone any process of grammaticalization, a behaviour sometimes referred to in the literature with the term 'light verb'. Rather, as we have seen, COME and GO continue to indicate pure deictic motion and lack any of the typical grammaticalized (temporal, aspectual) uses or values of their counterparts in other languages, Romance or otherwise. To capture their grammatical nature, we have therefore proposed that in northern Calabrian COME and GO lexicalize the functional head of $AspP_{Venitive/Andative}$, hence their role in marking the aspectual deictic categories of venitive and andative viewpoint. However, they do not raise to higher positions within the functional domain to lexicalize grammaticalized categories such as future tense, as often happens to their counterparts in other Romance varieties where they are now also first-merged in such positions and therefore show the concomitant effects of grammaticalization. This analysis also explains the 'special' syntax exhibited by COME and GO in northern Calabria which, in line with other functional heads that lexicalize the Infl-domain, show idiosyncratic c-subcategorization properties not shared by other (especially lexical) predicates; for example, durative/progressive *stà* 'stand' exceptionally selects for a gerund, perfective *avì/essa* 'have/be' and deontic passive *vulì* 'want' for a(n active/passive) participle, and *putì/avì a* 'can/must' for a bare infinitive. In a similar fashion, we can now add to this list COME and GO which c-subcategorize for a 'finite' verb.

REFERENCES

Accattoli, M., G. Todaro, 2017, "La grammaticalisation des constructions andatives dans le domaine roman: le cas du sicilien vaffazzu", in M. Velinoca (ed.), *Actes du Colloque* '*Normes et grammaticalisation', 2015, Sofia, Bulgaria*, Sofia, CU Romanistika, 187–210.

Adams, J., N. Vincent, 2016, "Infinitives with verbs of motion from Latin to Romance", in J. Adams, N. Vincent (eds), *Early Latin and Late Latin. Continuity or Change?*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 265–293.

Amenta, L., E. Strudsholm, 2002, "‹‹*Andare a* + infinito›› in italiano. Parametri di variazione sincronici e diacronici", *Cuadernos de filología italiana*, 9, 11–29.

Anderson, C., 2017, "The andative and venitive construction in San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec", UMass Amherst, ms.

Anderson, S., 2016, "Romansh (Rumantsch)", in A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 169–184.

Andriani, L., 2017, *The Syntax of the Dialect of Bari*, University of Cambridge, doctoral thesis.

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

Ascoli, G.I., 1896, "Un problema di sintassi comparata dialettale", *Archivio glottologico italiano*, 14, 453–468.
Biberauer, T., S. Vikner, 2017, "Having the edge: a new perspective on pseudo-coordination in Danish and Afrikaans", in N. LaCara, K. Moulton, A-M. Tessier (eds), *A Schrift to Fest Kyle Johnson*, Linguistics Open Access Publications 1, 77–90.
Carden, Guy, D. Pesetsky, 1977, "Double-verb constructions, markedness, and a fake co-ordination", *Papers from the Thirteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 82–92.
Cardinaletti, A., G. Giusti, 1998, "Motion verbs as functional heads", *GenGenP* 6, 50–60.
Cardinaletti, A., G. Giusti, 2001, "Semi-lexical motion verbs in Romance and Germanic", in N. Corver, H. Van Riemsdijk (eds), *Semi-lexical Categories*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 371–414.
Cardinaletti, Anna, G. Giusti, 2003, "Motion verbs as functional geads", in C. Tortora (ed.), *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 31–49.
Cardinaletti, A., Giusti, 2020, "Multiple agreement in southern Italian dialects", in G. Bellucci, L. Franco, P. Lorusso (eds), *Linguistic Variation: Structure and Interpretation* (Studies in Generative Grammar), Berlin: de Gruyter, 125–148.
Cinque, G., 1999, *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Cinque, G., 2006, *Restructuring and Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Volume 4*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Colacino, E., 1994, *E cchi ni manca?* Catanzaro, VIP Comunicazione.
Cruschina, S., 2013, "Beyond the stem and inflectional morphology: an irregular pattern at the level of periphrasis", in S. Cruschina, M. Maiden, J.C. Smith (eds), *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology: Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 262–283.
Culicover, P., R. Jackendoff, 1997, "Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28, 195–217.
Déchaine, R.-M., 1993, "Serial verb constructions", in J. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Sternefeld, T. Vennemann (eds), *Syntax. Volume 1*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 799–825.
Decurtins, C., 1901, *Rätoromanische Chrestomathie II*, Erlangen, F. Junge.
Di Caro, V., 2019a, "The inflected construction in the dialects of Sicily: parameters of micro-variation", in S. Cruschina, A. Ledgeway, E-M. Remberger (eds), *Italian Dialectology at the Interfaces (Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics Today)*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 63–78.
Di Caro, V., 2019b, *Multiple Agreement Constructions in Southern Italo-Romance. The Syntax of Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination*, University of Venice, doctoral thesis.
Di Caro, V., G. Giusti, 2015, "A protocol for the inflected construction in the dialects of Sicily", *Annali Ca' Foscari, Serie Occidentale* 49, 393–422.
Di Caro, V., G. Giusti, 2019, "Dimensions of variation: the inflected construction in the dialect of Delia (Caltanisetta)", in L. Repetti, F. Ordoñez (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 14. Selected Papers from the 46th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Stony Brook, New York*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 54–68.
Faraci, R., 1970, "*And* as a verb complementizer", 1st *NELS*.
Givón, T., 1990, *Syntax. A Functional-Typological Introduction. Volume II*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
Haiman, J., P. Benincà, 1992, *The Rhaeto-Romance Languages*, London, Routledge.
Harris, A., L. Campbell, 1995, *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Haspelmath, M., 2007, "Coordination", in T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume II: Complex Constructions*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1–51.
Heine, B., 1993, *Auxiliaries. Cognitive forces and grammaticalization*, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Heine, B., T. Kuteva, H. Narrog, 2017, "Back again to the future: how to account for directionality in grammatical change", in W. Bisang, A. Malchukov (eds), *Unity and Diversity in Grammaticalization Scenarios*. Berlin, Language Sciences Press, 1–29.

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

Heycock, C., H. Petersen, 2012, "Pseudo-coordinations in Faroese", in K. Braunmüller, C. Gabriel (eds), *Multilingual Individuals and Multilingual Societies. Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism*, vol. 13, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 259–280.

Hopper, P.J., E.C. Traugott (eds), 1993, *Grammaticalization,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Jaeggli, O., N. Hyams, 1993, "On the independence and interdependence of syntactic and morphological properties: English aspectual *come* and *go*", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 11, 313–346.

Josefsson, G., 1991, "Pseudocoordination – A VP + VP coordination", *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, 47, 130–156.

Kayne, R., 1994, *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Ledgeway, A., 1997, "Asyndetic complementation in Neapolitan dialect", *The Italianist*, 17, 231–273.

Ledgeway, A., 2007, "Diachrony and finiteness: subordination in the dialects of southern Italy", in I. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 335–365.

Ledgeway, A., 2012, *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press

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, F. Pratas (eds), *Coordination and Subordination. Form and Meaning. Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*, Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 157–184.

Ledgeway, A., 2018. "Phonological correlates of syntactic structure: the distribution of *raddoppiamento fonosintattico* in Calabrian", in M. Grimaldi, R. Lai, L. Franco, B. Baldi (eds), *Structuring Variation in Romance Linguistics and Beyond. In Honour of Leonardo M. Savoia* (*Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics Today*), Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 283–296.

Ledgeway, A., In press, "The syntactic distribution of *raddoppiamento fonosinttatico* in Cosentino: a phase-theoretic account", in A. Dragomirescu, A. Nicolae (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistics Theory*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 181–222.

Ledgeway, A., A. Lombardi, 2005, "Verb movement, adverbs and clitic positions in Romance", *Probus*, 17, 79–113.

Ledgeway, A, N. Schifano, G. Silvestri, In prep., *Greek-Romance Contact: The Fading Voices of Southern Italy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Lehmann, C., 1985, "Grammaticalization: synchronic variation and grammatical change", *Lingua e Stile*, 20, 303-318.

Lehmann, C., 1988, 'Towards a typology of clause linkage', in J. Haiman, S. Thompson (eds), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 181–225.

Leone, A., 1973, "Vattel 'a pesca, vieni a pìglialo", *Lingua nostra,* 37, 117–119.

Lombardi, A., 1997, *The Grammar of Complementation in the Dialects of Calabria*, University of Manchester, doctoral thesis.

Maiden, M., 2011, "Morphophonological innovation", in M. Maiden, J.C. Smith, A. Ledgeway (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages. Volume 1: Structures*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 216–267.

Maiden, M., 2016, "Morphomes", in A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 708–721.

Mandalari, M., 1881/1883, *Canti del popolo reggino*, Naples, Arnaldo Forni.

Manzini, M.R., P., Lorusso, L.M. Savoia, 2017, "A/bare finite complements in southern Italian varieties: monoclausal or bi-clausal syntax?", *Qulso Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali*, 3, 11–59.

Manzini, M.R., L. Savoia, 2005, *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa. Volume I*, Alesssandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.

Meliadò, R., 1994, *Le radici linguistiche e psico-antropologiche del dialetto reggino*, Reggio Calabria, Jason.

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

Ramat, P., 2001, "Degrammaticalization or transcategorization?", in C. Schaner-Wolles, J. Renison, F. Neubarth (eds), *Naturally! Linguistic Studies in Honour of Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler presented on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday,* Turin, Rosenberg and Sellier, 393-401.

Renzi, L., 1989, "Sviluppi paralleli in italiano e nelle altre lingue romanze. I pronomi clitici nella lunga durata", in F. Foresti, E. Rizzi, P. Benedini (eds), *L'italiano tra le lingue romanze. Atti del XX congresso internazionale di studi, Bologna 25-27 settembre 1986*, Rome, Bulzoni, 99–113.

Roberts, I., A. Roussou, 2003, *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Rohlfs, G., 1969, *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. III. Sintassi e formazione delle parole*, Turin, Einaudi.

Rohlfs, G., 1977, *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci (Calabria, Salento). Nuova edizione interamente rielaborata ed aggiornata*, Munich, C.H. Beck'sche.

Ross, J.R., 1967, *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, Cambridge Mass., MIT, unpublished doctoral thesis.

Ross, J.R., 1986, *Infinite Syntax*, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shopen, T., 1971, "Caught in the act: an intermediate stage in a would-be historical process providing syntactic evidence for the psychological reality of paradigms", *Chicago Linguistic Society*, 7, 254–263.

Sornicola, R., 1976, "*Vado a dire, vaiu a ddicu*: problema sintattico o problema semantico", *Lingua Nostra*, 37, 65–74.

Sorrento, Luigi (1977) *Sintassi romanza. Ricerche e prospettive*, Varese-Milan, Cisalpino.

Strik Lievers, F., 2017, "Infinitive con verbi di movimento. Una prima ricognizione fra sincronia e diacronia", in G. Marotta, F. Strik Lievers (eds), *Strutture linguistiche e dati empirici in diacronia e snicronia*, Pisa, Pisa University Press, 169–196.

Squartini, M., P.M. Bertinetto, 2016, "Tense and aspect", in A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 939–953.

Vespucci, V., 1994, *Terra nostra*, Piano Lago, Nuova Comunità.

Wiklund, A.-L., 1996, "Pseudocoordination is subordination", *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, 58, 29–54.

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)

BDD-A31980 © 2021 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.123 (2026-11-20 03:00:13 UTC)