

Mixed auxiliary systems in Italian dialects as *inflectional classes*

Xavier Bach (University of Oxford) & Pavel Štichauer (Charles University, Prague)

In this paper, we start from the premise that alternating auxiliary selection, such as the well-known HABERE/ESSE (H/E) distinction in some Romance languages, could also be viewed in terms of partially arbitrary lexical stipulation, giving rise to two different inflectional classes (see, e.g., Bonami 2015: 97; Baerman, Brown & Corbett 2017: 28-29). In this perspective, a further process of grammaticalization could be invoked: auxiliary selection loses its original motivation and may thus give rise to - more or less - arbitrary inflectional classes.

We intend to demonstrate that grammaticalization of auxiliary selection can be seen on the example of mixed auxiliary perfective systems, attested in a range of Italian dialects, where we find a more intricate alternation of the two auxiliaries H/E within one and the same TAM paradigm (see, e.g., Loporcaro 2007; 2014; 2016), as in examples (1) and (2) (cf. Torcolacci 2015: 52; Manzini & Savoia 2005: 682, respectively):

(1)			(2)		
	SINGULAR	PLURAL		SINGULAR	PLURAL
1	so f'fatt I.am done.PTCP	am 'fatt we.have done.PTCP	1	so dur'mito I.am slept.PTCP	semo dur'mito we.are slept.PTCP
2	a 'fatt you.have.SG done.PTCP	avet 'fatt you.have.PL done.PTCP	2	si dur'mito you.are.SG slept.PTCP	sete dur'mito you.are.PL slept.PTCP
3	a f'fatt he/she.has done.PTCP	an 'fatt they.have done.PTCP	3	a dur'mito he/she.has slept.PTCP	a dur'mito they.have slept.PTCP

We espouse Stump's (2016) distinction between content paradigms and form paradigms, positing that in the case of only one auxiliary, as in Spanish (and also in some Italian dialects), we have one content paradigm and one form paradigm for all perfective inflection (i.e. within the periphrastic subpart of the verb's inflection); in the case of two auxiliaries we would thus have two form paradigms (and, accordingly, two or more different realizations depending on the distribution of the two auxiliaries).

However, we find yet another interesting system where one coherent class of lexemes, such as reflexives, is split between the two auxiliaries giving rise to *mixed systems which seem to be genuine instances of heteroclisis* (see, e.g., Kaye 2015, Bach 2018), as in example (3), reconstructed after Manzini & Savoia 2005, II, 652–653, and consulted with native speakers of the dialect:

(3)		TRANSITIVES	REFLEXIVES	UNACCUSATIVES
	1 sg.	aju la'vatu	maju la'vatu	sugnu vi'nutu/a
	2 sg.	a la'vatu	ti si lla'vatu/a	si vvi'nutu/a
	3 sg.	a lla'vatu	s ε lla'vatu/a	ghe vvi'nutu/a
	1 pl.	amu la'vatu	n amu la'vatu	simu vi'nuti/e
	2 pl.	ati la'vatu	v ati la'vatu	siti vi'nuti/e
	3 pl.	anu la'vatu	si su lla'vati/e	su vvi'nuti/e

In this variety (Altomonte, reg. Calabria, southern Italy), transitives (*lavare* ‘to wash’) select *h* (highlighted in blue) throughout the periphrastic section of the paradigm, and unaccusatives (*viniri* ‘to come’) consistently require *ε* (highlighted in red) (as in Standard Italian or French). However, reflexives (*lavarsi* ‘to wash oneself’) are curiously split between the two auxiliaries and thus give rise to a third class of lexemes (reflexives), where the intraparadigmatic distribution of the two auxiliaries does not seem to be motivated.

This situation is interesting from a purely theoretical point view, as heteroclisis is frequently found in inflection class systems but more rarely described in periphrastic systems (only alluded to in e.g., Kaye 2015: 22–23). We also adduce a potential diachronic scenario for the development of heteroclisis in such systems, based on a possible clash in features with the argument structure of reflexive and pseudo-reflexive verbs.

References

- Baerman, Matthew, Dunstan Brown & Greville G. Corbett. 2017. *Morphological Complexity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Bach, Xavier. 2018. *The Origins of Inflectional Classes*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Oxford.
- Bonami, Olivier. 2015. Periphrasis as collocation. *Morphology* 25. 63–110.
- Kaye, Steven J. 2015. *Conjugation class from Latin to Romance. Heteroclisis in diachrony and synchrony*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Oxford.
- Loporcaro, Michele. 2007. On triple auxiliatation in Romance. *Linguistics* 45. 173–222.
- Loporcaro, Michele. 2014. Perfective auxiliatation in Italo-Romance. The complementarity of historical and modern cross-dialectal evidence. In Paola Benincà, Adam Ledgeway & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*, 48-70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Loporcaro, Michele. 2016. Auxiliary selection and participial agreement. In Martin Maiden & Adam Ledgeway (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 802-818. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Manzini, Maria R. & Leonardo M. Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci: Morfosintassi generativa I-III*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- Torcolacci, Giuseppe. 2015. *Marking the Default. Auxiliary selection in Southern Italian dialects*. PhD Thesis, University of Leiden. Utrecht: LOT.