Features of BE-perfect grammaticalization in the person-based auxiliation system of Barese

Danguolė Kotryna Kapkan

Vilnius University
Universiteto g. 5
LT-01131 Vilnius, Lithuania
E-mail: danguole.kapkan@flf.vu.lt
ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1673-9626

Abstract. This paper seeks to identify patterns of the BE auxiliary usage in the Barese perfect which features a person-based auxiliary usage pattern but does not strictly adhere to it. The analysis is based on the quantitative data from written texts in Barese. The paper presents an overview of the semantic functions of the Barese perfect along with the usage frequency of the BE auxiliary in the 3rd person, where it is not foreseen by the person-based auxiliary pattern in the perfect. The analysis shows that the 3rd person BE auxiliary in the data most frequently appears with statives and subject-oriented resultatives. These two semantic functions of the perfect coincide with the least grammaticalized values of an exclusively BE perfect in Lithuanian. This shows that the development of the BE + participle construction in Barese follows the steps that may be peculiar to the grammaticalization of BE perfects. As all uses of the Barese perfect in the data used for this study with the BE auxiliary in the 3rd person draw the system closer to the Standard Italian split-auxiliary model, these developments can be regarded not merely as the influence of Standard Italian upon the local dialect, but also as contact-induced grammaticalization.

Keywords: Barese, Italo-Romance, perfect, grammaticalization, person-based pattern, auxiliation

1 Introduction

Differently from Standard Italian as well as some other European languages such as French, German, and Dutch, that in the perfect employ HAVE or BE auxiliaries depending on the lexical verb (split-intransitivity, Vincent 1982, Perlmutter 1989, Shan-

non 1990, Sorace 2000, Aranovich 2007, *inter alia*), Barese, an Italo-Romance dialect spoken in the city of Bari (Apulia), features a person-based auxiliary usage pattern[1] – the usage of the auxiliary depends on the grammatical person. Person-based auxiliation systems are cross-linguistically rare, but common in the Italo-Romance dialects and also found in certain Northern Catalan varieties (Rohlfs 1966, Ledgeway 2012, Loporcaro 2007; 2022, Andriani 2017; 2018). Barese generally uses the BE auxiliary in 1st (1) and 2nd (2) person, and the HAVE auxiliary in the 3rd person (3), adhering to the EEHEEH[2] pattern that is the most common across the Italo-Romance dialects (Štichauer 2022).

(1) *Datz   ca   non   zò   ffatte   le   scole   fattìzze*,
    as   COMPL   NEG   be.PRS.1SG   do.PP   DEF   school.PL   large
    [*sfelgìdeve le rècchie e arrecherdàdeve chèdde ca ve digghe*].

    'Since I **haven't done** the high studies, [listen attentively and remember what I tell you].'[3]

(2) *Velàse,   ce   si   ffatte   le   scole   fattìzze   pe*
    PN   COMPL   be.PRS.2SG do.PP   DEF   school.PL large   PREP

    parlà   ndeghelètte   u   tagliane   sporche?
    speak.INF   smug.ADV   DEF.SG.M   Italian   dirty

    '*Velàse*, **have** you **done** your high studies to speak smugly in broken [dialectal] Italian?'

(3) **Ha   ffatte   le   scole   fattìzze.**
    HABERE[4].PRS.3SG   do.PP   DEF   school.PL   large

    'He/she **has done** the high studies.'

---

[1]   Regular usage of different auxiliaries with different grammatical persons is commonly referred to as 'person-based auxiliary selection systems' or 'patterns'. However, a term such as 'selection' assumes a cognitive mechanism that is so far obscure to linguists. Thus, in this paper, to avoid unnecessary assumptions, the phenomenon is referred to as 'person-based auxiliary usage pattern', more in line with a usage-based perspective on linguistics.

[2]   Here and henceforth, person-based auxiliation systems are referred to by an abbreviation of six letters, E for verbs deriving from Latin *esse*, and H for verbs deriving from Latin *habēre*. The first three letters of such abbreviation correspond to, respectively, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd person singular, and the last three letters, also respectively, correspond to 1st, 2nd, and 3rd person plural. Thus, EEHEEH stands for a person-based pattern where the auxiliary deriving from *esse* is used in the 1st and 2nd person, both in singular and plural, while the auxiliary deriving from *habēre* is used in the 3rd person (singular and plural).

[3]   Here and henceforth, all the examples provided are from the data described in Section 2, unless indicated otherwise.

[4]   The Barese *avè* auxiliary grammaticalized from Latin *habere* with the possessive meaning, but synchronically *avè* as a lexical verb can only mean 'to get/receive', which is a later specialisation which took place after its replacement by *tené* 'to have/possess' and is unrelated to the grammaticalization of the Barese perfect. Therefore, the *avè* auxiliaries here and henceforth are glossed with reference to the Latin *habere*.

However, it seems that in some cases the BE auxiliary also appears in the 3rd person (4).

(4) *Sò*   *sé*   *iànne*   *ca*   *u*   *chembagne*   *mì*   *se*
     be.PRS.3PL   six   years   COMPL   DEF.SG.M   friend   POSS.1SG   RFL

     n'   *è*   ***sciute***   *che*   *la*   *pèghera*   *sò*
     PRN   be.PRS.3SG   go.PP   with   DEF   sheep   POSS.3SG

     'It has been six years since my friend **has left** with his sheep'

Cennamo (2008) proposed for Campanian Italo-Romance varieties, which also feature the same person-based pattern, that the BE auxiliary is generalizing with certain classes of lexical verbs, which correspond to the first steps of Sorace's (2000) auxiliary selection hierarchy (ASH), described for split-auxiliary perfects.

This paper, adopting a gram-based approach (Dahl 2000), seeks to identify patterns of BE auxiliary usage in the Barese perfect, intended as a construction formed from the BE/HAVE present tense auxiliary and the past participle of the lexical verb, and to relate them to the grammaticalization tendencies of the Perfect category cross-linguistically. Since perfects that employ the two auxiliaries may also be seen as a conflation of two different constructions with two different histories of grammaticalization, this paper suggests that the expansion of the BE-sphere in a mixed-auxiliary perfect system such as Barese might be parallel to that found in a single-auxiliary BE perfect, such as in Lithuanian (Kapkan 2021).

The paper is structured as follows. Section 1 introduces the reader to the Perfect category and to the main tendencies of its grammaticalization in European languages (1.2), as well as to the Barese dialect and its perfect (1.3). Section 2 describes the data used for this study. Section 3 contains the analysis of the Barese perfect, with a focus on those semantic functions that most frequently feature the BE auxiliary in the 3rd person. Conclusions are presented in section 4.

1.1 The Perfect and its grammaticalization

The cross-linguistic Perfect category is defined as a gram whose function is "to speak of how the present is different from the past, especially from the immediate past. A perfect typically relates how a past state of affairs changes into the present one, thus involving two different states and one connecting event" (Dahl 2022, 280). In the European languages, which synchronically feature no synthetic perfects, they are formed periphrastically, using a form of a lexical verb, most frequently a participle, and an auxiliary. Such European languages predominantly feature BE (copular) and HAVE (possessive) auxiliaries.

For a gram from a certain language to qualify as a perfect, the usual requirement is to be used to express at least the two core meanings of the perfect (Velupillai & Dahl 2013): the

resultative (5), which conveys a past event with current relevance (CR) for the present, where CR may be understood both as a direct result and as a more general consequence (Dahl & Hedin 2000), and the experiential (6), whose meaning is defined as that of a situation that has held at least once in the interval leading up to the moment of speech.

(5) *I have taken a bath.*[5]

(6) *Bill has been to America.*[6]

Velupillai & Dahl (2013) also set a negative requirement for perfects, i.e., not to be used in narrative contexts. This is related to the grammaticalization tendencies of perfects, that, through the expansion of the concept of CR, tend to become past tenses, gradually taking over the functions of erstwhile pasts (Dahl 1985, Bybee & Dahl 1989, Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994, Kuteva 2004, Squartini & Bertinetto 2000, Lindstedt 2000, Thieroff 2000). This process is commonly referred to as the 'aorist drift'. When the perfect has become a past, a language may start developing a new perfect from another resultative construction. Thus, the perfect grammaticalization chain may also be cyclic: such developments have been observed in Latin and the Romance languages, where the Romance synthetic aorist, currently almost pushed out of use in some Romance varieties (Northern Italian, French, standard Romanian) by the 'new' periphrastic perfect, itself once developed from the Latin *perfectum*.

There are some areal tendencies to be observed in the development of the European perfects. First, Thieroff (2000, 284–285) surveys the stages of grammaticalization of the European perfects and shows that languages in the center of the continent (or the nucleus of the European linguistic area), such as German, French, or Italian[7], employ perfects already affected by the 'aorist drift', while the perfects which do not show signs of the drift towards the past (English, Greek, Baltic languages, some Southern Italo-Romance varieties) are mainly located on the 'fringes of the continent'. Second, Drinka (2017, 2–3) describes a BE/HAVE perfects' isogloss, i.e. how in Western and Central European languages perfects are mainly formed with HAVE (possessive perfects) or both HAVE and BE auxiliaries (split-auxiliary perfects), while languages on the Eastern side of the continent tend to use the BE auxiliary exclusively (BE or copular perfects). A detailed perfect grammaticalization chain needs to take into account the different lexical sources of the perfects.

The research on possessive perfects demonstrates how, starting from the Possession schema (Heine 1993), a gram undergoes a range of changes, encompassing semantic, syntactic, pragmatic, and morphological phenomena. Heine and Kuteva (2006) describe

---

[5] Constructed.
[6] Constructed.
[7] See Map 3 'Development of present anteriors' in Thieroff (2000, 285) with detailed indications which also include regional varieties of these languages.

a scale of evolution of possessive perfects, including both primary grammaticalization and the 'aorist drift' in European languages. They distinguish a set of intermediate stages of the development from a possessive construction, via a resultative construction, on to a perfect, and then towards a past tense. The analysis is based on various linguistic parameters, including the valency of the lexical verb in the perfect. In the initial stages, the construction admits only transitive verbs, and the overt object is obligatory. In subsequent stages, when a resultative construction becomes a perfect, intransitive verbs are also possible (Heine & Kuteva 2006, 152).

The development of BE perfects, which have so far received less attention, would be exactly inverse from the point of view of the expansion of lexical input: in the initial stages, the gram should only admit intransitive verbs, and only in later stages should it reach the possibility of being used with transitive verbs. Studies conducted on the perfect show that grams formed with the copula and an active past participle may undergo similar developments to possessive perfects, having resultative constructions as their starting point, prototypical perfect grams in the middle, and past tenses at the end of their grammaticalization chain (Dahl 1985, Bybee & Dahl 1989, Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994, Drinka 2017, and Lindstedt 2000). The specific grammaticalization of BE perfects has not yet been studied cross-linguistically. The available studies on (mainly) BE perfects feature, *inter alia*, Arkadiev & Wiemer (2020) on Baltic and Slavic perfects, Plungian & Urmanchieva (2017; 2018) on the Old Church Slavonic perfect, Hristov (2019) on the Bulgarian perfect, Daugavet & Arkadiev (2021) on the Baltic perfects as well as Kapkan (2021) on the Lithuanian perfect, Tuttle (1986) on the BE perfects in Central Italo-Romance, and Rosemeyer (2022) on Old Spanish.

1.2 Barese – an overview

Barese is an Italo-Romance dialect spoken in the city of Bari, Apulia, in southeastern Italy, and belongs to the upper-southern (*altomeridionali*) dialect group (according to Loporcaro's (2009) terminology and classification). Data from Apulo-Barese varieties are usually taken into account in studies on Romance in general or on Italian dialects more specifically (Rohlfs 1966, Manzini & Savoia 2005, Loporcaro 1988; 2009; 2022, *inter alia*, Cennamo 2001, Štichauer 2022, Bach & Štichauer 2022); however, studies exclusively dedicated to urban Barese are scarce. Andriani's (2017) dissertation on the Barese syntax is an exception. However, apart from Andriani's (2017; 2018) and Torcolacci's (2015) work in the generative framework, there are no dedicated analyses of the Barese perfect as such.

1.2.1 The Barese perfect: semantics

In line with other Romance varieties, for past time reference Barese employs three main past tenses: the imperfect and two perfective pasts: *passato prossimo* ('recent', or com-

pound/periphrastic past, i.e. the perfect) and *passato remoto* ('remote', or synthetic perfective past).

Although no in-detail corpora or token-based studies on the semantics of the Barese perfect have been carried out yet, there are good reasons to suppose that the Barese perfect has not been strongly or definitely affected by the aorist drift. First, Andriani (2017, 155; 2018, 374) generalizes that the Barese perfect is used "to describe those past actions or events that display 'present relevance' to the moment in which they are uttered by the speaker", as in (7), where the synthetic perfective past is contrasted with the perfect:

(7) *u*   *decì*,   *ma*   *iì*   *non nge*
     3SG.M.ACC   say.PST.3SG   but   1SG.NOM   NEG DEM

     àgghie   *credùte*
     HABERE.PRS.1SG   believe.PP

     'He **said** it, but I **did not believe** [and I still don't]'

Second, studies on genealogically and areally close language varieties allow us to suppose that the Barese perfect maintains cross-linguistically typical perfect semantics as per Velupillai & Dahl (2013). In Standard Italian, the perfect has expanded up to what can be defined as Stages 3 or 4 of the 'aorist drift', i.e., in Stage 3, the perfect maintains the meaning of 'past action with present relevance' (Harris 1982), while in Stage 4, the perfect is used as a preterit, and the usage of the synthetic perfective past is restricted, especially in spoken language (Harris 1982; Squartini & Bertinetto 2000, *inter alia*). Meanwhile, it may be assumed that in the Southern varieties of Italian ('Regional Italians', i.e. varieties of Italian spoken in a certain geographical area that on separate levels of linguistic analysis and in a systemic way differ both from Standard Italian and from other Regional Italian varieties (D'Achille 2002, 26)), the distinction between the perfect and the synthetic perfective past has been maintained (Bertinetto & Squartini 1996). The regional varieties of Italian are expected in this respect to reflect structures from the local dialects. More importantly, elicited questionnaire-based data from Bertinetto & Squartini (1996) showed that speakers of Italian from the areas geographically closest to Barese[8] (Naples, Potenza, Lecce) make the least use of *passato prossimo* in aoristic contexts, comparing to the other regions of the country (North, Centre, Sicily, and Sardinia). The authors note that the spontaneous linguistic behaviour might reflect the contrast between the two perfective past tenses even more than in elicited questionnaire data (Bertinetto & Squartini 1996, 384). This can be taken as an indication that in Southern Italo-Romance dialects periphrastic pasts are less subject to the anterior-preterite shift.

---

8   Regional Italian from Bari did not make it into the sample for Bertinetto & Squartini's (1996) study.

1.2.2 The Barese perfect: Italo-Romance context and formal features

The periphrastic pasts (perfects) of the Romance languages developed from two distinct Latin constructions, and this development is relevant for the features that can synchronically be observed in Barese. The ESSE + participle construction is said to have originated in the Latin passive *perfectum*, which eventually started admitting deponent verbs (Vincent 1982, Cennamo 2008). Cennamo (2008, 121–123) explains how there were major changes happening in the passage from Latin to Romance, including the loss of the Latin case system and voice distinctions (but cfr. Adams (2013) for a different view). Once these distinctions were blurred, the original Latin passive *perfectum* (ESSE + participle) came to be used in active function. As long as the nominative-accusative case system was still in place, the verbal arguments could still be differentiated. According to Cennamo, for a certain period ESSE + participle could be used with all verbs, both transitives and intransitives. However, at some point the accusative could also mark the subject of transitive verbs (i.e. "extended accusative"), thus no longer consistently marking the object. While this did not result in ambiguity with intransitive verbs, involving only one argument, the grammatical relations became unclear with transitives. This can be related to the rise of HAVE + object + participle construction.

The resultative with HAVE was attested already in archaic Latin (Cennamo 2008, 116), but its usage was restricted. In its first attestations it is weakly grammaticalized: the construction is biclausal and is used only with transitive verbs, while the auxiliary retains its lexical meaning. The construction had a resultative value, expressing the state of the object stemming from a former event in which it was involved (Pinkster 1987, 197). In the aforementioned context of ESSE + participle uses with transitive verbs resulting in ambiguous clauses with non-clearly distinguished verbal arguments, the HAVE + participle construction took over the transitive contexts, signalling the active role of the agent-like subject. The usage of HAVE + participle with a subset of intransitive verbs, where the role of the subject is active (agentive), is a much later development (Cennamo 2008, 126).

These historical developments explain the division of labour between the two auxiliaries in perfects of those modern Romance languages (most notably, Standard Italian and Standard French) that feature split-auxiliary systems. Synchronically, these Romance perfects are considered one and the same construction that, depending on the lexical verb, requires a HAVE or a BE auxiliary. HAVE is used with all transitive verbs, while intransitive verbs feature a split – some of them are used with HAVE, and some with BE. Accounts of split intransitivity in Romance and Germanic languages include Perlmutter (1989), Shannon (1990), Sorace (2000; 2011), Aranovich (2003; 2007), *inter alia*. Verbs used with the BE auxiliary are commonly referred to as 'unaccusatives', while those that are used with HAVE are termed 'unergatives' (Perlmutter 1989). Instead of a clear-cut

distinction between these two categories of verbs, they can also be seen as belonging to certain semantic classes (Levin 1993, Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995), and unaccusative verbs can be ordered into a hierarchy from the most to the least commonly BE-selecting semantic classes of verbs (Sorace 2000). The relative generalization here is that verbs that most consistently select BE have the most patient-like subjects (Aranovich 2007) and that there is a prototype for a BE-selecting mutative clause which is a clause that features a single participant, an undergoer subject with perfective (punctual) and non-causative change-of-state predicates (Shannon 1990).

However, split intransitivity is not the only auxiliary selection system in Romance. In some varieties, one of the auxiliaries has generalized throughout the whole system (most notably the possessive auxiliaries in Ibero-Romance, but also BE in some Central Italo-Romance varieties (Tuttle 1986)). Meanwhile, a range of Italo-Romances varieties, including Barese, features person-driven auxiliary usage patterns. The Barese perfect auxiliation system has been recently described by Andriani (2017; 2018) as employing mainly a EEHEEH pattern, but also featuring two more, receding patterns HEHEEH and EEH-E/H-E/H-H, the latter one with 'free variation' of BE and HAVE auxiliaries in the 1st and 2nd person plural. According to Andriani, the auxiliary selection does not depend on the semantics of the lexical verb. Such an account is in line with Loporcaro's (2007) study on person-driven auxiliation systems, which views them as not essentially different from the situations such as in Spanish, where one of the auxiliaries has completely taken over the sphere of the other one. In Loporcaro (2007), person-based auxiliary selection is thus understood as morphological and not semantically motivated. However, the data presented in Loporcaro (2007) seems to show that if a person-based pattern occurs only with one set of verbs, it will occur with those on the breaking point of 'split intransitivity', such as reflexive verbs. Other analyses of person-based auxiliation systems include Ledgeway (1998), Manzini & Savoia (2005) and Štichauer (2022), who shows that the EEHEEH pattern may be the most common. However, it seems that there is yet no universally accepted account of the person-based auxiliation systems and of the predominance of the EEHEEH pattern in Italo-Romance.

The Barese perfect is formed from the auxiliary and the past participle. Barese, like the other Romance languages, employs a single past **participle** that was passive diachronically, but can assume an active or passive interpretation depending on the verb. Some participles, namely, the so-called 'strong' forms can exhibit metaphonetic gender and number agreement with the subject by stem vowel changes, i.e., *bənədìttə* [masculine] vs. *bənədèttə* [feminine] 'blessed', *cuèttə* [masculine] vs. *còttə* [feminine] 'cooked', but this seems to be in decline (Andriani 2017, 185–187, Loporcaro 1998, Tuttle 1986, *inter alia*). Traces of the metaphonetic gender agreement can only be observed in a few examples from the data used for this study (8, 9). Thus, metaphonetic gender/number

agreement does not seem to be systematic and cannot be related to the grammaticalization of the perfect in Barese, or rather, the Barese perfect is to be considered grammaticalized up to the point where the morphosyntactic expression of the construction is stable.

(8) *Acquànne* *u-*   *aggnìiddde* ***iè***   ***ccuètte***
    when   DEF.SG.M lamb.M   be.PRS.3PL cook.PP.M
    [*s'ammènene trè o quatt'òve sbattùte prìme iìnd'a nu piàtte*]
    'When the lamb **is ready**, [you put three or four beaten eggs into a plate]'

(9) *Acquànne* *la*   *carne* ***iè***   ***ccotte***
    when   DEF   meat.F be.PRS.3SG cook.PP.F
    [*se lève e se mètte a ttàuue.*]
    'When the meat **is ready**, you take it off and you serve it.'

The **auxiliary** paradigm in the perfect is person-based: generally, it takes the ESSE type copular auxiliary in the first and second persons, and the HABERE type possessive auxiliary in the 3rd person, with some possible variations or alternative patterns (Andriani 2017, 154–159). However, as will be shown in the presentation of the data in the following sections, Barese does not always adhere to the EEHEEH pattern, as the BE auxiliary does appear in certain contexts in the 3rd person, as well. It is thus possible that in Barese the sphere of the BE auxiliary is expanding.

In this paper, which describes a data-based study (see Section 2), the formal definition of the Barese perfect is a natural starting point. Thus, the Barese perfect is, for the purposes of this paper, defined as a construction composed of a present tense *jèsse* or *avè* auxiliary (Table 1) and a participle of a lexical verb. This also includes cases where the participle is adjectivized to some extent, as in (8, 9).

The data analysed in this paper will show that, contrary to the situation described by Andriani (2017; 2018), variation between the BE and HAVE auxiliaries in our Barese doculect occurs in all persons, apart from 2SG, which consistently employs BE. This might be due to different varieties of Barese: Andriani's data comes from "recordings of structured interviews and spontaneous conversations with native speakers of different age groups" (Andriani 2017, 1), enriched by consultations of other printed and recorded materials in Barese, but, presumably, without conducting any quantitative analysis, while the data used for this study comes from written materials exclusively and is quantitative in that the frequency of constructions and functions assumes a crucial role (Section 2). The full Barese perfect auxiliary paradigms, as extracted from the data, and including all versions of non-standardized orthography, are given in Table 1.

	jèsse auxiliaries	*avè* auxiliaries
1SG	*so, sò, ssò, zò*	*àgghie, agghie, ho, ai, aggio, àgghi'*
2SG	*si, sì, ssì, zì*	-
3SG	*è, iè, e*	*ha, av', ave, àve, èv'*
1PL	*sìme, sim, siam*	*avìme, avìm', am', amme, ame, àme, hamme, amm'*
2PL	*siete*[9]	*avìte, avìt'*
3PL	*sò, ssò*	*hanne, honne, avònne, avonne*

Table 1. Barese *jèsse* and *avè* perfect auxiliaries, as observed in the data[10]

2 Data

Barese is mainly a spoken language variety, which has a very limited written tradition and no firmly established orthography. There are not any publicly available spoken or written corpora of Barese. While the dialect is alive and well in the spoken language, sources of written language in Barese, that can be readily used to gather a sufficient amount of data for a quantitative analysis, are scarce, and mainly consist of books translated from Italian and some poetry collections written originally in the dialect. Most written texts in the dialect appear out of conscious efforts by groups of dialect speakers to promote Barese.

Thus, for the purposes of this study, two different kinds of Barese texts have been selected. The first one is the translation of *Le petit prince* by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry into Barese from Italian by Vito Signorile[11]. The second one is a monthly newspaper in Barese, *U Corrìire de BBàre*, published in the city of Bari from 2009 to 2012. In total, 32 issues of the newspaper were published, all of which are available online on the website of the association *Centro Studi Baresi* in PDF format[12]. The newspaper consists of various articles and sections, most written originally in Barese, although some are in Standard Italian as well as in regional Italian. Figure 1 shows the front page of *U Corrìire de BBàre*.

---

[9]   This Standard-Italian-sounding form appears only once in the data, in a context of a dialect speaker who is trying to speak Standard Italian. The regular Barese 2nd person plural of jèsse would be sìte (Andriani 2017; 2018), but it does not appear in the data.

[10]   As noted by one of the reviewers of this paper, some forms observed in our doculect have Standard Italian orthography (*ho*), some are similar to Neapolitan (*aggio*), and some present vowel changes characteristic only of Florentine (*siam*, *siete*), hence, are derived from Standard Italian. However, they were not excluded from the database, as the overabundance of grammatical markers is to be expected in a bilingual setting such as the one of the Barese-speaking community.

[11]   U Prengepine (The Little Prince) by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. Translated to Barese by Vito Signorile. Editor: A. M. Lomoro. Gelsorosso, 2015.

[12]   http://www.centrostudibaresi.it/corriere/ (last accessed on 19 July 2024)

Figure 1. A front page from *U Corrìire de BBàre* (3/2010)

Given the multilingual nature of the newspaper and the lack of conventionalized orthography in Barese, the data was collected manually. The same applies to the translation of *Le Petit Prince* (*U Prengepine*).

Thus, the collection of texts used a source of data for this study consists of all the texts in Barese, excluding articles in standard or regional Italian, taken from the 32 issues of *U Corrìire de BBàre*, along with the whole text of *U Prengepine*. The number of perfect tokens obtained this way is 743 (123 from *U Prengepine* and 620 from *U Corrìire de BBàre*). 71 token from *U Corrìire,* however, had to be excluded, as they were verb conjugations presented in the newspaper as pieces of the dialect grammar, and thus were not instances of natural language used in context. The final sample for Barese consists of 672 clauses with the tokens of the Barese perfect. These were manually annotated with features relevant for the study, such as the base verb, telicity, transitivity, person, number, gender, auxiliary (BE or HAVE), reflexivity, negation, and the semantic function of the perfect. The database thus created has been made available via the following link: http://linguistics.flf.vu.lt/be-perfects.

The data used for this study is here and henceforth referred to as a doculect (Wälchli & Cysouw 2012), which stands for "any documented language variety, be it as raw data (e.g., a sound file), primary data (e.g., a transcribed text or wordlist), or secondary data (e.g., a glossed text or a grammatical description) of whatever size" (Wälchli & Cysouw 2012, 673). The term serves as a "replacement for the notion of language" and is used in order to emphasize that what is studied is merely an empirical sample of language,

"rather than assume that any particular sample fully represents a language" (Wälchli & Cysouw 2012, 706).

These considerations are especially relevant in the given context of Barese, a non-standard variety under the influence of a 'big' standard language, Italian. As pointed out by one of the reviewers on an earlier version of this paper, the texts that comprise our doculect were likely written by a small group of older middle-class speakers only. It is thus possible that, apart from features characteristic of written language, quite untypical for Barese, their idiolects, likely even more so in writing, contain innovations and influences from Standard Italian. However, this is by no means exceptional, since it is the vast majority of Barese speakers that are bilingual and to a lesser or greater extent affected by contact with Standard Italian. Instead of searching (in vain, see McLaughlin & Sall (2001), Dimmendaal (2001), as well as Sagna & Hantgan (2021) and Lüpke (2021) on monolingualism as an exception rather than a rule) for the "perfect informant(s)", a monolingual speaker who could provide an "ideal" sample of Barese uninfluenced by Standard Italian, the approach adopted in this paper is the following: the author does not assume to have obtained a fully representative sample of Barese, and the analysis is instead carried out on the particular Barese doculect described above, and any and all conclusions hold for this doculect only.

3 Analysis: Auxiliary usage and the semantic functions of the Barese perfect

Each token from the database described in Section 2 has been assigned one of the semantic functions of the perfect listed and defined in Table 2, which also shows the number and the proportion of each function in the data. Statives and subject-oriented resultatives are discussed in more detail in the following sections (3.2 and 3.3), while the other semantic functions are:

- resultatives with transitive verbs (10), that convey a change-of-state that holds at the present moment and that is derived from a prior event which is backgrounded (restrictions to the modification of the event part of the meaning apply as per Mittwoch (2008));
- current relevance (CR) perfects (11), that are formed with both transitive and intransitive verbs and convey a past event with current relevance, as opposed to a direct result (change-of-state). The event part of the meaning in CR perfects is foregrounded, as opposed to the state in resultatives;
- experientials (12), that refer to a past event that is viewed from a perspective of having occurred at least once within an interval of time that ends at the moment of speech/writing and is portrayed as part of subject's experience;
- durative perfects (13), that convey a continuous event that started in the past and persists into the moment of speech (writing); and

- perfects used in narrative contexts (14), that refer to an event in a succession of events (a narrative), entirely similar to the uses of a perfective past tense.

Functions of the perfect	Definition	Tokens	Proportion
Statives	Denote a current state of the subject	40	6%
Subject-oriented resultatives	Denote a change-of-state of the subject (with intransitive verbs), resulting from a backgrounded prior event	152	23%
Transitive resultatives	Denote a change-of-state of both the object and the subject (with transitive verbs), resulting from a backgrounded prior event	202	30%
Current relevance perfects	Denote a foregrounded prior event with current relevance	86	13%
Experientials	Denote a prior event that has occurred at least once during an interval of time ending at the present	53	8%
Duratives	Denote a continuous event that started in the past and persists into the present	25	4%
Narratives	Uses of the perfect in narrative contexts (perfective past)	110	16%
(other values)[13]		4	0%
Total		672	100%

Table 2. The proportions of the semantic values of the Barese perfect

(10) *Parle   come   t'   **ha**   **ffatte**   màmmete*
     speak.IMP.2SG how   2SG.OBJ HABERE.PRS.3SG make.PP   mother.POSS.2SG
     'Speak like your mother **has** you **made** [i.e. in your native vernacular]'

(11) *Iàneme   sènza   core,   **sì**   **ffàtte***
     soul   without   heart   be.PRS.2SG   make.PP

     u   dessciùn' a   ssanda   Necòle?
     DEF.SG.M   fast   PREP   saint   Nicholas
     'Soul without a heart, **have** you **fasted** for Saint Nicholas?'

---

[13]   The four tokens that have not been assigned to any of the values discussed in this paper are impersonal *si* constructions with passive semantics (Cennamo 2014):
     *non   **ze**   **so**   **vvìste**   le   vìggele   rubbàne,   addò   stònne?*
     NEG   RFL   be.PRS.3PL   see.PP   DEF   warden   urban   where   stay.PRS.3PL
     'The traffic policemen **are** nowhere to be **seen**, where are they?'

(12) *Non* **ha** **velute** *mà* *bène* *a* *nesciune.*
NEG   HABERE.PRS.3SG   want.PP   never   well   PREP   nobody
'S/he **has** never **loved** anyone.'

(13) *Le* *candedàte* *e* *cchìdde* *de* *l'* *ambiende* *lore*
DEF   candidates   and   those   PREP   DEF   surroundings   3PL

honne **sciute** *spennènne* *e* *spennènne* *terrìse*
HABERE.PRS.3PL   go.PP   spend.GER   and   spend.GER   money

a *cchiù* *nom* *bbozze*
PREP   more   NEG   can.PRS.1SG

'The candidates and those close to them **have been** continuously **spending** all the money without stopping.'

(14) *Apprime* **sì** **remanute** *sorprèse* *ma* *po'* *de*
at_first   be.PRS.2SG   remain.PP   surprised   but   then   2SG.ACC

sì **misse** *a* *rite* *e* *me* **sì** **ditte***: […]*
be.PRS.2SG   put.PP   PREP   laugh.INF   and   1SG.ACC   be.PRS.2SG   say.PP

'At first you **were surprised**, but then you **started** to laugh and **said** to me: […]'

The analysis of the data shows that the Barese perfect encompasses a wide range of semantic functions from statives to narratives (Table 2). The most frequent values are resultatives – both with transitive and intransitive verbs. The more grammaticalized and cross-linguistically typical perfect values, i.e. CR perfects, experientials, and durative perfects, are also used in the doculect. As the Barese perfect can be used in narrative contexts, it is to be considered affected by the aorist drift. Although a more detailed discussion of each semantic value of the Barese perfect is outside the scope of this paper, the analysis summarized in Table 2 confirms the intuition by Bertinetto & Squartini (1996) that the use of the Italian *passato prossimo* in regional Italian reflects the competition between the perfect and the synthetic perfective past in the vernaculars proper, as the Barese perfect in our data is used mainly with the functions characteristic of perfects cross-linguistically, and in line with Regional Italian varieties geographically closest to Barese (Potenza, Naples, and Lecce) from Bertinetto & Squartini's (1996) sample. Indeed, the use of the perfect in narrative contexts in our doculect is limited (16%), and the perfect is mainly employed in contexts that reflect the semantics of the cross-linguistic Perfect category: its meaning includes a past event along with its direct result or a more general consequence.

From the perspective of the auxiliary usage, the analysis showed that the Barese perfect does not always attain to the person-based pattern. Rather, there is auxiliary variation

with all semantic functions of the perfect, and with all persons except for 2SG which consistently employs the BE auxiliary. As per Andriani (2017), auxiliary variation is foreseen by the two receding patterns in 1SG, 1PL, and 2PL, but none of the three person-based patterns allows the BE auxiliary in 3SG or 3PL. Table 3 shows the proportions of the auxiliaries in 3rd person with each semantic function of the perfect from the data used for this study.

Semantic function	BE in 3rd person	HAVE in 3rd person
Statives	34 (97%)	1 (3%)
Subject-oriented resultatives	32 (27%)	85 (73%)
Transitive resultatives	2 (2%)	96 (98%)
CR perfects	11 (26%)	31 (74%)
Experientials	2 (13%)	13 (87%)
Duratives	2 (15%)	11 (85%)
Narratives	9 (16%)	47 (84%)

Table 3. HAVE and BE auxiliaries with each semantic value of the Barese perfect

The data in the table 2 shows that the semantic functions of the perfect which feature the largest proportions of BE in the 3rd person are statives and subject-oriented resultatives. Sections 3.2 and 3.3 offer a closer look at these contexts.

3.1 Statives

The stative perfects are defined as instances of the HAVE/BE auxiliary and the past participle that denote a current state of the subject. The reference to a prior event, conveyed by the participle, with statives is vague, as the event that gave rise to the state is strongly backgrounded. Differently from subject-oriented resultatives (Section 3.3), statives convey a state, but not a change-of-state. They do not convey anything about whether there existed a preceding state of the world were the state of the subject was different. Example (15) does not provide us with any information on a possible preceding state of the subject (the danger of the baobabs) that might or might not have been known before. In (16), the adverbial *ssèmbe* 'always' excludes the change-of-state. Thus, statives rather ascribe a property to the subject which either does not stem from any prior event (16), or the prior event is backgrounded, and the focus is on the current state of the subject (17) which may or may not be temporary. The participles used in stative contexts are limited lexically – not every verb can form a stative. They can also appear in an attributive position inside a noun phrase, and some may be adjectivized (16).

(15) *Ma   u   periggue de   le   baobab*
but   DEF.SG.M danger PREP DEF baobabs

*iè   acchesì **scanesciute**,*
be.PRS.3SG   so   not_know.PP

[*e le uà che avèssa passà ciunghe se perdèsse sop'a n'asteroide, iè acchesì forte, ca na volda tande sò fatte n'eccezione.*]

'But the danger of the baobabs **is** so **unknown**, [and the troubles that one would have to go through if they got lost on the asteroid are so considerable, that for once I made an exception.]'

(16) ***So**   ssèmbe tutte **aunìte**, felìsce e **chendìinde***
BE.PRS.3PL always all   unite.PP   happy   and satisfied

[*e cce fàscene na cose la fàscene tutte nzìime*]

'They **are** always **united**, happy, and **content**, [and if they are doing something, they are doing it all together'].

(17) *So   capessciùte, non **zò**   mìche*
be.PRS.1SG understand.PP NEG be.PRS.1SG   NEG

***rembambbìte**   com' a   ttè!!*
become_senile.PP   as   PREP   2SG

'I understand, I**'m** not **out of my mind** like you are!!'

Rosemeyer (2022), while discussing anteriors and resultatives in Old Spanish that employed both auxiliaries, before HAVE took over the contexts of BE, refers to the concept of 'event-result metonymy'. In order to differentiate Old Spanish anteriors (perfects) from resultatives, he suggests that certain predicates semantically entail not only an event, but also a resultant state, and that speakers can exploit it to foreground or background either the event or the state (2022, 151). This distinction applies not only to resultatives, but also to statives: with statives, the predicate itself (in any form) may entail both an event and a state, but in its uses in the perfect construction (auxiliary + participle) the event is backgrounded to the point where it is no longer clear if it is implied at all. The participles used in stative contexts function semantically as adjectives. An equivalent value, termed 'copula and predicative adjective construction', has been distinguished for Old Spanish by Pountain (1985) as one of the four functions of *ser* 'be' + participle construction, with the following example (18):

(18) *Si màs   non la   onrrase,*
if   more   NEG 3SG.F.ACC   honour.PST.SBJ

***seriè**   desmesurado*[14].
be.COND.3SG   become_immoderate.PP

'If he did not do her more honour, he **would be lacking in respect**'

---

[14]   The auxiliary in this example is in the conditional, so it does not correspond to our definition of the perfect, but the example still shows the possibility of participles used adjectivally, with strongly backgrounded or not presupposed prior events.

Rosemeyer (2022) also concludes that the Old Spanish BE auxiliary did not undergo a grammaticalization process comparable to that of HAVE, and thus the uses of Old Spanish *ser* 'be' + participle (statives and intransitive resultatives) should be considered weakly grammaticalized. This aligns with Kapkan's (2021) analysis of the Lithuanian perfect, which is a weakly grammaticalized exclusively BE perfect, formed with an active participle. In the data from Kapkan (2021), statives, in the paper referred to as 'copular constructions with adjectival participles' (19), are the most frequent semantic function of the Lithuanian perfect, also considered the least grammaticalized.

(19) *Veganai*   **yra**   **issziuv-e,**   **perbal-e**,
vegan.PL.M   be.PRS.3   dry_out-PST.PA.PL.M   become_pale-PPA.PL.M
[*pajuodusiais paakiaia ir pavandenijusiomis akimis*][15]
'Vegans **are skinny**, **pale**, [with dark under-eye circles and watery eyes.]'

Another function of the Old Spanish *ser* + participle construction, distinguished by Pountain (1985) and relevant also for Barese, is the 'resultant state passive'. As discussed in the preceding section, the ESSE + participle construction was once a passive (of *perfectum*, i.e., perfective past, as opposed to synthetic present passive in *-r*) in Latin, before its use expanded to deponent verbs (Flobert 1975, Vincent 1982), and then to all verbs (Cennamo 2008). Still, it can be observed in our Barese data (and, likely, in a range of other Romance varieties), how in perfects with the stative value and with the BE auxiliary, the participle, if derived from a transitive verb, carries traces of its origin and can sometimes be ambiguous with the passive or perceived as a passive. This depends on event-result metonymy and on how strongly the event implied by the verb is backgrounded.

For example, in (20), the participle *lauriàte* 'graduated' is derived from Lat. *laureare* 'to crown with laurels, to honour', but Latin reference dictionaries (such as Shorrock & Butterfield 2007, Lewis 2000, Niermeyer & Van de Kieft 2002) do not list it as verb, only as a participle *laureate-us/-a/-um*, indicated as an adjective, while the verb *laureare* is only to be found in the most comprehensive Latin dictionaries (such as Howlett 1997), with examples provided mainly of its usage as an adjectival participle. This testifies that the participle was lexicalized already in Latin, and the passive meaning is only derivational. Synchronically in Barese *lauriàte* merely means 'with a university degree' and morphologically it would be derived from the transitive verb *laurià* 'to graduate [somebody]', but the latter verb is not in use, while its reflexive counterpart *laurià-sse* functions as the usual intransitive verb meaning 'to graduate [from university]'.

(20) *Felìsce*   *Ggiòvene,*   *u*   *figghie*   *d'*   *Alfrète,*   *iè*
PN   PN   DEF.SG.M   son   PREP   PN   BE.PRS.3SG

nnàte   *a*   *Bbàre*   *u*   *1947,*   *iè*   *Acquàrie,*
be_born.PP   PREP   Bari   DEF.SG.M   1947   BE.PRS.3SG   Aquarius

---

[15]   Since the data in Kapkan (2021) comes from Facebook comments, the orthography might not correspond to Standard Lithuanian. Typos have not been corrected either.

iè	*lauriàte,*	*iè*	*nzràte,*
BE.PRS.3SG	graduate.PP	BE.PRS.3SG	marry.PP

e	*ttène*	*du*	*figghie.*
and	have.PRS.3SG	two	children

'F.G., son of A., was born in Bari in 1947, he is an Acquarius, he **has a university degree**, he is married, and he has two children.'

In (21), the ambiguity with the passive is stronger: the subject *la carne* 'meat' is clearly the patient, and thus the stative can be ambiguous with the passive, depending on the interpretation of the participle: 'cooked [by someone]' or 'ready'. In the given context, the second translation is more appropriate.

(21)
E	*oggn'e*	*ttande*	*s'*	*attèndene*	*e*	*s'*	*assàbbrene*	*pe*
and	each	many	RFL	check.PRS.3PL	and	RFL	taste.PRS.3PL	PREP

vedè	*ce*	*ssò*	*ccuètte*.
see.INF	if	be.PRS.3SG	cook.PP.M

'And once in a while you check them and taste them to see if they **are ready**.'

Here, a parallel can be drawn between statives in Barese and Lithuanian. In Lithuanian, the interpretation of the active value participles, derived from intransitive verbs, may be vague between the stative and the subject-oriented resultative, depending on whether a prior event and thus a change-of-state is implied (22).

(22)
Šiuolaikiniai	*tėvai*	*visai*	*išprotėję,*
modern.NOM.PL.M	parent.NOM.PL.M	totally	go_crazy.PST.PA.PL.M

[*duoda vaikams tokius vardus*]

'Modern parents **are** totally **crazy**, [they give such names to their children.]'

In Barese, despite the different diathesis/voice of the participle, an equivalent vagueness can be observed in examples such as (21) – does it refer to a current state of the food being ready to eat, or to its change-of-state from raw to cooked (by someone, with demoted agent)? There are certain contextual features (but not definitive criteria) that draw a given token closer to a stative interpretation, such as adverbs indicating gradability, such as *acchesì* 'so [much]' (15).

The passive interpretation is excluded with those participles that are derived from synchronically intransitive verbs that already in Latin had both transitive and intransitive meanings, such as in (23).

(23)
[*Tocche o nnon docche,*]	*hanne*	*matràte*	*le*	*vremecòcche*
	HABERE.PRS.3PL	mature.PP	DEF	apricots

'Touching or not touching, the apricots **are ripe**'

The same holds for statives such as *chendìinde* 'content, satisfied' in (16), where the lexical verb is used only as a participle, other forms of the lexical verb not being available. In general, statives formed with participles derived from intransitive verbs are not frequent in our Barese data: out of 40 statives, only 9 are intransitive. Included in this number are also such participles that are lexicalized with a particular meaning, absent from other forms of the transitive source verb, such as in (24).

(24)   *Ma*   *nonn-*   **è**   **ddìtte**   *ca*
      but   NEG   be.PRS.3SG   say.PP   COMP
      [*non z'àv'a petè parlà com'a totte l'àlde cose c'avònne seccìsse ddò.*]
      'But **it's not a sure thing** that [you're not supposed to talk about it the same way [you talk] about anything else'

The passive or active interpretation of the construction requires an implication of a change-of-state which with statives is optional. Thus, although the Baltic and Romance participles originate from opposite voice forms (active versus passive), since with statives the vague prior event is irrelevant, i.e., it is irrelevant if 'the subject has done something' or 'something has been done to the subject', the focus being on the subject's state, Barese statives can be said to have the same semantic function as the Lithuanian ones.

Similarly, they can be considered the least grammaticalized value of the BE + participle construction also in Barese. BE perfects are modelled on the 'X is Y' Equation schema (Anderson 1973, 32–33, Heine 1993, 35–36) in the context of copula auxiliarization. Formally the BE + participle perfect constructions both in Barese and in Lithuanian are identical to copular ascriptive constructions with adjectival participles. The default post-copular position in the construction is not exclusive to participles – this is where other nominal parts of the predicate appear, among them – adjectives. The Y position is typical of property-ascribing elements. A prototypical property-ascribing element is an adjective, but an adjectival participle is a good fit here, too. This is why adjectival participles are especially fit to appear in this context and to build a bridge between the source construction and the first stage of a BE perfect grammaticalization: semantically they are adjectives, but formally – participles, derived from verbs. Stative perfects show the intermediate stage of a BE perfect grammaticalization from the source ascriptive copular construction to a resultative, when a participle can be inserted into the adjective's position and assign a property or state to the subject.

Except for (23)[16], all statives in all persons in the data are used with the BE auxiliary. The almost exclusive usage of the BE auxiliary, instead of the auxiliaries per the person-

---

[16]   Although the object of this study is the construction formed with BE/HAVE auxiliaries only, excluding other possible auxiliaries in Barese, it is worth noting that there were 4 tokens in the data with *sta'* 'stand/be/stay' and a participle: all participles were formed from transitive verbs, and semantically these occurrences are quite similar to statives with the BE auxiliary.

  Tu   *st'*   *attrassàte*
  2SG   stay.PRS.2SG   be_late.PP
  'You'**re late**'

based pattern can be related to the grammaticalization tendencies of BE perfects. The BE auxiliary is thus used with the least grammaticalized function of the BE perfect.

3.2 Subject-oriented resultatives

Subject-oriented resultatives are defined as resultative perfects with intransitive verbs expressing a change-of-state of the subject, derived from a prior event, as per Nedjalkov & Jaxontov's (1988, 9) definition. In Kapkan (2021), subject-oriented resultatives are considered the following step of the Lithuanian BE perfect grammaticalization after statives (ascriptive copular constructions with adjectival participles). This semantic function is weakly grammaticalized and almost compositional for BE perfects, involving a subject, a BE auxiliary, and a participle as a property ascribing element. For HAVE perfects instead, they are a highly grammaticalized value, only possible when the possessive auxiliary has already lost its lexical meaning. Subject-oriented resultatives also correspond to the prototypical BE-selecting clause: they have patient-like subjects (Aranovich 2007) and are mutative clauses which feature a single participant, an undergoer subject with perfective (punctual) and non-causative change-of-state predicates (Shannon 1990).

The tokens with a semantic function that here is described as subject-oriented resultative in analyses of Romance perfects are normally assigned to a broader group of resultative (or CR) perfects, that hosts tokens with both transitive and intransitive verbs. In order to define subject-oriented resultatives as separate from both resultatives with transitive verbs and CR perfects, it is useful here again to refer to Rosemeyer's (2022) notion of event-result metonymy.

With intransitive (subject-oriented) and transitive resultatives, both a prior event and a resulting subject's state are implied, but the event is backgrounded, and the focus is still on subject's state, as opposed to CR perfects (or 'anteriors' in Rosemeyer 2022). Differently from statives, resultatives denote not a single state, but necessarily a change-of-state, i.e., they presuppose a state of the world that differs from the current one by the state of the subject. Differently from resultatives with transitive verbs, subject-oriented resultatives convey a change-of-state of the subject, not the object, via their intransitive lexical input.

Mittwoch (2008, 329–330) offers certain restrictions that apply to resultatives, which also help for the resultative and CR perfect distinction. These restrictions derive precisely from the fact that with resultatives, the event, as opposed to the state, is backgrounded. Consequently, "semantic material that belongs only to the event component of the verb cannot be focused" (Mittwoch 2008, 328). For instance, the resultative interpretation is incompatible with manner adverbials that modify the event part of the meaning (25, 26, see also the English examples in Mittwoch 2008, 328–330). Essentially, since the event

is backgrounded, it cannot be modified, as this would draw the focus to the event at the expense of the state, yielding a different function of the perfect.

(25) *A*   *bbuène*   *a*   *bbuène,*   *Colìne*   **ha**   **gneuessciùte**.
PREP   well.ADV   PREP   well.ADV   PN   HABERE.PRS.3SG   faint.PP

'All of a sudden, Colìne **fainted**.'

(26) *Colìne*   **ha**   **gneuessciùte**[17]
PN   HABERE.PRS.3SG   faint.PP

'Colìne **has fainted** [and is still unconscious]'

Verbs used in subject-oriented resultatives ('unaccusatives') can also be seen as belonging to specific semantic classes (Levin & Rappaport 1995). According to Sorace's (2000) Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy (ASH), 'inherently telic verbs' of change-of-location and change-of-state verbs (other than change-of-location) cross-linguistically in split-auxiliary systems most consistently select BE auxiliaries. Sorace describes change-of-location verbs as "expressing a change of location, which involves a concrete displacement from one point in space to another" and having "the highest degree of dynamicity and telicity" (Sorace 2000, 863). In our Barese data, subject-oriented resultatives with change-of-location verbs, which include *sscì* 'to go', *arrevà* 'to arrive', *cadè* 'to fall', *ternà* 'to return', *menì* 'to come' or *assì* 'to come out/go out', can be used with the BE auxiliary in the 3rd person (27, 28).

(27) *Chèdda*   *giacchètte,*   *addò*   ***è***   ***sciùte?***   *A*   *la*   *uèrre?*
DIST.SG.F   jacket   where   be.PRS.3SG   go.PP   PREP   DEF   war

'Where **has** this jacket **been**? To war?'

(28) *Acquànne*   *le*   *maccarùne*   *e*   *le*   *cime*   *de*   *rape*
when   DEF   pasta   and   DEF   peak   PREP   turnip

so   ***arrevàt'***   *a*   *la*   *ggiùsta*   *chettùre,* […]
be.PRS.3PL   arrive.PP   PREP   DEF   right   cooking.N

'Once the pasta and the turnip greens **have reached** the right cooking point, […]'

The next step of the ASH is change-of-state verbs, other than those of change-of-location, such as *devendà* 'to become', *cangià* 'to change' or *fernessce* 'to end', which "express a change in a particular direction without specifying a telic endpoint" (Sorace 2000, 864). Inherently telic verbs *merì* 'to die' and *nassce* 'to be born', along with *crepà* 'to die [pejorative]' and *resescetà* 'resurrect' are also assigned to this group. These verbs can also include the BE auxiliary in the 3rd person (29, 30).

---

[17]   Constructed.

(29) *Mò?...   Mò   tutt'   e   cangiàte*.
      now   now   all   be.PRS.3SG   change.PP
      'Now?... Now everything **has changed**.'

(30) *Quann'   è   fernùte   chèssa   bbrutta   pèste* […]
      when   be.PRS.3SG   finish.PP   PROX.SG.F   ugly.SG.F   plague.F
      'When this awful plague **is finished** […]'

Cennamo (2008) slightly redefines the ASH steps based on data from Campanian dialects, in which the expansion of the BE auxiliary can be observed. The case of these Campanian dialects is quite equivalent to that of Barese. Cennamo explains that while in Neapolitan the generalization of HAVE in all persons and with all verbs was nearly complete by the end of the 15th century (Cennamo 2008, 130, but cfr. Ledgeway 2009 for a different timeline), the surrounding dialects of Pompei, Sorrento, and Portici kept the BE auxiliary in 1st and 2nd person, as well as, in certain contexts, in 3rd person. Currently, an expansion of BE at the expense of HAVE can be traced in different speaker class and age varieties of the dialects. Pompei, Sorrento, and Portici dialects all follow the same person-based auxiliary pattern as Barese: namely, EEHEEH. However, Cennamo shows that the BE auxiliary can also appear in the 3rd person with verbs which essentially coincide with the Sorace's first steps of ASH. The order that Cennamo observes for the BE expansion, which the author assigns to the Italian influence (Cennamo 2008, 133), in Pompei, Sorrento, and Portici is slightly different, though: BE auxiliaries start appearing first with change-of-state verbs, only then with change-of-location verbs.

As can be seen from the frequency data given in Table 3, out of the total of 117 3rd person subject-oriented resultatives 32 appear with the BE auxiliary. In 3PL, this proportion is lower (6 out of 33) than in 3SG (26 out of 84). The classes of verbs used with HAVE are not essentially different from those used with BE: they can all be subsumed under the labels of change-of-state, change-of-location, and inhibited change-of-state or location verbs. It seems that there might be a range of factors that influence the usage of the auxiliary in the 3rd person, and it is not easy to pinpoint the most important one. Morphosyntactic factors seem to influence the choice between the different available forms on singular 3rd person HAVE (participles with initial consonants with *ha* vs. participles with initial vowels with *av'*), but not between HAVE and BE.

Reflexive verbs do not seem to attract BE – among reflexive subject-oriented resultatives, only 2 out of the total of 24 3rd persons appear with BE. It seems then that there is indeed free variation between the auxiliaries, as subject-oriented resultatives accept both BE and HAVE in the 3rd person, although BE is more likely to replace HAVE in the singular.

The two most frequent verbs in our sample are *ffà(sse)* 'to become' (21 occurrences) and *sscì* 'to go, to leave' (10 occurrences). *Sscì* is predominantly used with BE in the 3rd person singular (27), while the plural constantly retains HAVE (31).

(31) *La   sòlete,   chèdde   da   tènene   prenotàte   (manghe*
     DEF   usual   DIST.SG.F   there   have.PRS.3PL   book.PP   lack.PRS.3SG

     fòsse   u   palche   o   Pedrezzìille)   iìdde   e
     be.SUBJ.3SG   DEF.SG.M   stage   PREP   PN   3SG.M   and

     Iàngeue,   chembbàgne   de   gevendù, […]   nzìime,   pure   mò
     PN   friend   PREP   youth   together   even   now

     c'   **avònne**   **sciùte**   m-   *benziòne.*
     COMPL   HABERE.PRS.3PL   go.PP   PREP   retirement

     'The usual [bench], that one there, they've got it booked (as if it were Petruzzelli [theatre] stage), him and Angelo, friends from youth […], together even now that they **are retired**.'

Ffà(*sse*) 'to become' appears exclusively with HAVE (32). The verb *ffà* in Barese normally functions as a transitive verb meaning 'to do, to make', while its reflexive counterpart *ffà*(*sse*) 'to become' can acquire the meaning 'to become'. However, the reflexive is not strictly necessary for the intransitivization with this verb, as it can also be used without the reflexive marker with the meaning 'to become', as in (32).

(32) *Se   mètte   sop'   o   ffuèche,   appène   le   cepòdde*
     RFL   put.PRS.3SG   above   PREP   fire   as_soon_as   DEF   onion

     ha   **ffatte**   *bbiònde,*
     HABERE.PRS.3SG   make.PP   blonde

     [*s'ammène nu pìcche de carne mascenàte e se fasce sfrìsce.*]

     'You put it on the heat, as soon as the onions **have become** yellow, [you add a bit of minced meat, and you let it fry.]'

The only two verbs that are used with BE consistently in the 3rd person are the definite change-of-state verbs *merì* 'to die' (33) and *nassce* 'to be born' (34). Although the data from subject-oriented resultatives is not yet sufficient to make any sound conclusions, it seems that an influential factor in the choice of the auxiliary in the 3rd person is the lexical verb itself: namely, some frequent verbs may tend to favour one auxiliary over the other. Similar conclusions were obtained by Digesto (2022) for the usage of the Italian subjunctive.

(33) *è   vvìv'   u   nùuste,*
     be.PRS.3SG   alive   DEF.SG.M   POSS.1PL

     è   **mmùurt**   *u*   *vùuste!*
     be.PRS.3SG   die.PP   DEF.SG.M   POSS.2PL

     'Ours is alive, yours **is dead**' [fish sellers about the fish]

(34) *Ind'*   *a*   *la*   *pagghie*   *è*   ***nnate***   *stu*
      PREP   PREP   DEF   hay   be.PRS.SG.F   be_born.PP   PROX.SG.M

      nìnne   *bèlle bèlle*
      baby   beautiful.SUP

      'This most beautiful baby **is born** in the hay'

If the schema on which the BE perfect is modelled is the Equation schema 'X is Y'
(Heine 1993), then statives are the intermediate value conceptually between ascriptive
copular constructions with adjectives and subject-oriented resultatives, as they include
verbal morphology in the 'Y' position, but no (or very little) verbal semantics. Subject-
oriented resultatives then appear as soon as a verbal participle expressing change-of-
state is used instead of the adjectival one. The meaning of subject-oriented resultatives is
closely related to their perfective and intransitive lexical input – it can be paraphrased as
'X is having-done-Y'. Thus, the usage of the BE auxiliary with subject-oriented resulta-
tives in the Barese perfect can again be related to the grammaticalization tendencies for
BE perfects. Although less so than with statives, the BE auxiliary can be used also with
this second step of BE-perfect grammaticalization cline.

3.3 Other values

Table 2 showed that there are some occurrences of BE in the 3rd person also with other
functions of the perfect, such as CR perfects, duratives, or in aoristic contexts. These
tend to occur with certain verbs that prefer the BE auxiliary despite the person and also
despite the semantic function of the perfect. They are mainly frequent intransitive verbs
that express a definite change-of-state or a change-of-location of the subject, such as
merì 'to die' (9 tokens, all with BE), *nassce* 'to be born' (9 tokens, all with BE) or *scì*
'to go' (25 with BE, 12 with HAVE). Some of the uses of these verbs were discussed in
Section 3.3 as instances of subject-oriented resultatives, however, the same verbs can
be used in different contexts. For example, in (35) *merì* 'to die' is used in a CR perfect
context, and in (36) *scì* 'to go' is used in an experiential context.

(35) *Ci-*   *è*   ***mmuèrte?***   *Cudde*   *ca*   *non*   *velève*
      who   be.PRS.3SG   die.PP.M   DIST.SG.M   COMPL   NEG   want.IMPF.3SG

      cambà   *cchiù.*   *Ah*   *sì?*   *E*   *a*   *cce-*   *iòre*   *è*   ***mmuèrte?***
      live.INF   more   ah   yes   and   PREP   what   hour   be.PRS.3SG   die.PP.M

      A ll'   *òre*   *d'*   *aiìre*   *a*   *chèss'*   *òre.*
      PREP   DEF   hour   PREP   yesterday PREP   PROX.SG.F   hour

      'Who **died**? The one that didn't want to live any longer. Really? And at what time
      did he **die**? At yesterday's time at this hour [nonsensical reply].'

(36) | *Ci-* | *iè* | *ssciùte* | *mà!!!* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| who | be.PRS.3SG | go.PP | never |

    'Nobody **has** ever **been** there!!!'

The stative verb *jèsse* 'to be' also attracts the BE auxiliary (23 tokens with BE, 3 tokens with HAVE). The expansion of BE based on lexical input is in line with findings by Cennamo (2008) on Campanian Italo-Romance varieties. Cennamo (2008) related this to the influence of Standard Italian, as these verbs occur in the Italian periphrastic past with the BE auxiliary. Meanwhile, there are no transitive verbs in our Barese data that demonstrate the same tendency to prefer HAVE in violation of the person-based pattern per Standard Italian model, i.e., transitive verbs such as *mettè* 'to put' or *chiamà* 'to call' in 2SG always appear with the BE auxiliary, both in resultative (37) and more grammaticalized narrative contexts (38).

(37) | *Na* | *volde* | *ca* | *le* | ***si*** | ***mettùte*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| INDEF.SG.F | time.SG.F | COMPL | 3PL.F.ACC | be.PRS.2SG | put.PP |

iìnd'a	*nu*	*piàtte* […]
into	INDEF.SG.M	plate.SG.M

    'Once you **have put** them into a plate […]'

(38) | *Na* | *dì* | *me* | ***sì*** | ***chiamàte*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| INDEF.SG.F | day.SG.F | 1SG.ACC | be.PRS.2SG | call.PP |

    [*percè avìve ffatte lite che attàneme.*]

    'One day **you called** me [because you had argued with my father.]'

This might be related to the fact that *avè* (deriving from Latin *habēre* 'to have') in Barese has lost its possessive verb semantics – Barese uses *avè* mainly as an auxiliary to form the perfect and the deontic future, or as a lexical verb meaning 'to receive', while the regular possessive verb is *tenè* (deriving from Latin *tenēre* 'to hold'), as in other Southern Italo-Romance varieties and Ibero-Romance languages. It has even been proposed (Lois 1990) that the loss of possessive meaning in HABERE-derived verbs is a necessary prerequisite for its generalization throughout the perfect paradigm as the only auxiliary, though there are notable exceptions, such as Romanian. Thus, the expansion of BE in the 3rd person in Barese can be regarded as contact-induced grammaticalization of the BE perfect.

3.4 BE auxiliary in 3rd person tokens: a summary

The Barese perfect can be seen as a conflation of two different constructions (the Latin ESSE and HABERE periphrases), and this conflation can be observed on two different

levels. First, it is manifested in the person-based auxiliation system EEHEEH, whose formation is a topic for future studies. Second, it can be seen in the competition of HAVE and BE auxiliaries, when the BE auxiliary appears in the 3rd person. BE + participle construction originates from the Latin passive *perfectum* and continues to be almost exclusively used with the value of the perfect closest to the source construction: the statives, that do not necessarily presuppose a past event and a change-of-state, or where the past event is strongly backgrounded, and the passive or active interpretation of the participle becomes irrelevant. With statives, person-based auxiliary usage patterns do not have any effect. Meanwhile, the HAVE periphrasis came into the Barese system (as well as into all other early Romance varieties) via resultative constructions with transitive verbs, in which synchronically there is no expansion of BE into the sphere of HAVE (3rd person). The BE tokens with transitive resultatives occur regularly with 1SG and 2SG, as per the person-based pattern.

The expansion of the BE-sphere can be further observed following the unexpected uses of BE with the 3rd person tokens with intransitive verbs in resultative contexts. Cennamo (2008) describes an equivalent process in Campanian dialects, attributing the expansion of BE to classes of lexical verbs. However, an approach based on the development of a BE perfect, parallel to that in Lithuanian (Kapkan 2021), can account for the presence of BE not only with subject-oriented resultatives, but also with statives. Thus, with statives and subject-oriented resultatives, the expansion of BE related to the grammaticalization of the BE perfect supersedes the person-based pattern. Meanwhile, the uses of 3rd person BE + participle in Barese do not seem to follow further steps of BE perfect grammaticalization observed for Lithuanian in Kapkan (2021) (i.e., experientials or transitive resultatives).

Transitive resultatives are a clear sphere of the HAVE perfect, which has grammaticalized further in Italo-Romance and in Barese, than in Lithuanian. The development of the Barese BE + participle construction is thus peculiar: it takes place within a perfect construction which, thanks to the HAVE periphrasis, is already strongly grammaticalized and affected by the aorist drift. A suggested schematic representation of the fusion and development of HAVE and BE perfects in Barese is given in Table 4. The two constructions should have fused at Stage 2 (resultatives), where the person-based systems come about, and from there on developed as a single gram. However, the BE auxiliary maintained its copular semantics, which lead to the expansion of the BE-sphere into the functions that are common to exclusively BE perfects, such as in Lithuanian.

Stage	Value	Paraphrase	Stage	Value	Paraphrase
Stage 0	HAVE + O + PP	S has O. O is V-ed	Stage 0	ESSE + PP (perfectum)	S was/is V-ed
Stage 1	HAVE + O + PP	S has O. S V-ed O.	Stage 1	Stative (Copular ascriptive construction with a participle)	S has a verbal property V
Stage 2A	Transitive resultative	S has V done to O	Stage 2A	Subject-oriented resultative	S is having-done-V
Stage	*Value*	*Paraphrase*			
Stage 2B	Resultative	S is having-done-V (to O)			
Stage 3	Current relevance	S has done V (to O)			
Stage 4	Experiential	S has experience of V			
Stage 5	Durative	S began V, and V still lasts			
Stage 6	Narrative	S did V (to O)			

Table 4. The development of the Barese perfect

4 Conclusions

The goal of this paper was to conduct a data-based analysis of the occurrences of the Barese perfect with the BE auxiliary in the 3rd person, where it is not foreseen by the person-based auxiliary usage pattern, which was in previous research described as featuring BE in 1st and 2nd person, and HAVE in the 3rd person. The present analysis was conducted on the sample of 672 tokens of the Barese perfect, extracted from a collection of written texts in Barese.

The analysis showed that the Barese perfect in our data most frequently features the BE auxiliary in the 3rd person with those two semantic functions that correspond to the first two steps of the grammaticalization cline proposed for an exclusively copular Lithuanian perfect in Kapkan (2021). These two values are termed statives, defined as instances of the perfect denoting a current state of the subject without an obligatory implication of a change-of-state, and subject-oriented resultatives, defined as perfects with intransitive verbs expressing a change-of-state of the subject, derived from a prior event. With statives, the BE auxiliary is used almost exclusively, and with subject-oriented resultatives, it is used in variation with HAVE in the 3rd person. Additionally, the BE auxiliary is used in all persons with certain frequent verbs despite the semantic function of the perfect. The lexical classes of these verbs correspond to the first three steps of Sorace's (2000) auxiliary selection hierarchy, as already discussed by Cennamo (2008) for Italo-Romance Campanian varieties: they are intransitive change-of-state and change-of-location verbs. These are essentially the verbs that are used in subject-oriented resultative contexts. However, the analysis presented in this paper took into account the develop-

ment tendencies of the cross-linguistic Perfect category, thus being able to capture not only the 3rd person BE auxiliary uses with subject-oriented resultatives, but also the almost exclusive usage of BE with statives. It was proposed that statives are the first step in the BE perfect grammaticalization cline, which is closest to the source construction of a BE perfect, i.e., an ascriptive copular construction 'X is Y' (Equation schema; Heine 1993). Subject-oriented resultatives represent the second step in this cline, where the subject is assigned a verbal property of having participated in some prior event. Instances of the BE auxiliary with the same verbs in contexts that were under the present semantic analysis of the Barese perfect assigned to CR perfects, experientials and uses of the perfect in narratives can be regarded as further expansion of the BE-sphere into other functions of the perfect, already available thanks to the HAVE periphrasis, which has grammaticalized further than the BE periphrasis. As all the uses of the BE auxiliary in the 3rd person identified in the data and discussed in this paper draw the Barese system closer to Standard Italian, these developments can be regarded as contact-induced grammaticalization under the influence of a more prestigious variety upon the local dialect.

The main perspective for further research that can be outlined at this point is the formation of the EEHEEH person-based auxiliary usage pattern in Italo-Romance dialects in relation to the cross-linguistic grammaticalization tendencies of copular and possessive perfects. In previous research on the person-based patterns, HAVE and BE auxiliary variation was regarded as morphological, as it is part of the same paradigm (Loporcaro 2007, Štichauer 2022), but the present analysis showed that the BE + participle construction in the Barese doculect still exhibits a development specific to BE perfects. This means that semantic motivations in the formation and further development of the Barese person-based pattern cannot be excluded.

Abbreviations

1	1st person	DIM	diminutive
2	2nd person	DIST	distal
3	3rd person	F	feminine
ACC	accusative	GEN	genitive
ADJ	adjective	ILL	illative
ADV	adverb	IMP	imperative
AOR	aorist	IMPF	imperfect
ASH	Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy	INSTR	instrumental
COMPL	complementizer	IPF	imperfective
CONJ	conjunction	LOC	locative
CR	current relevance	M	masculine
DAT	dative	N	neuter
DEF	definite	NEG	negation
DEM	demonstrative	NOM	nominative

OCS	Old Church Slavonic	PRS	present tense
PFV	perfective	PST	past tense
PL	plural	PTC	particle
POSS	possessive pronoun	PVB	preverb
PAP	past active participle	REL	relative pronoun
PP	past participle	RFL	reflexive
PQ	polar question particle	SUP	superlative
PREP	preposition	SG	singular
PRN	pronominal	VOC	vocative
PROX	proximal	WH	wh-pronoun

References

Adams, James Noel. 2013. *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. 1st edn. New York: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511843433

Anderson, John. 1973. *An Essay Concerning Aspect: Some Considerations of a General Character Arising from the Abbé Darrigol's Analysis of the Basque Verb*. The Hague & Paris: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110876666

Andriani, Luigi. 2017. *The syntax of the dialect of Bari*. Homerton College, University of Cambridge PhD dissertation. Accessed 27 October 2022. https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.15625

Andriani, Luigi. 2018. Instability and Change: A Parametric Approach to Barese Auxiliary Selection. *Comparative and Diachronic Perspectives on Romance Syntax*. Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Adina Dragomirescu, Irina Nicula, Alexandru Nicolae, ed. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 361–400.

Aranovich, Raúl. 2003. The semantics of auxiliary selection in Old Spanish. *Studies in Language* 27 (1), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.27.1.02ara

Aranovich, Raúl, ed. 2007. *Split Auxiliary Systems: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/books/9789027292568

Arkadiev, Peter M. & Björn Wiemer. 2020. Chapter 5. Perfects in Baltic and Slavic. *Perfects in Indo-European Languages and Beyond*. Robert Crellin & Thomas Jügel, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 124–214. (*Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 352) https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.352.05ark

Bach, Xavier & Pavel Štichauer. 2022. Auxiliary selection in Italo-Romance and inflexional classes. *Periphrasis and Inflexion in Diachrony*. Adam Ledgeway, John Charles Smith & Nigel Vincent. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 193–212. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198870807.003.0008

Bertinetto, Pier Marco & Mario Squartini. 1996. La distribuzione del Perfetto Semplice e del Perfetto Composto nelle diverse varietà di italiano. *Romance Philology* 49, 383–419.

Bybee, Joan L. & Östen Dahl. 1989. The Creation of Tense and Aspect Systems in the Languages of the World. *Studies in Language* 13 (1), 51–103. https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.13.1.03byb

Bybee, Joan L., Revere D. Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cennamo, Michela. 2001. L'innacusatività in alcune varietà campane: teorie e dati a confronto. *Dati empirici e teorie linguistiche. Atti del XXXIII Congresso Internazionale della Società di Linguistica Italiana*. Federico Albano Leoni et al., eds. Rome: Bulzoni. 427–453.

Cennamo, Michela. 2008. The rise and development of analytic perfects in Italo-Romance. *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*, vol. 113. Thórhallur Eythórsson, ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 115–142. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.113.05cen

Cennamo, Michela. 2014. Passive and impersonal reflexives in the Italian dialects: Synchronic and diachronic aspects. *Diachrony and Dialects*. Paola Benincà, Adam Ledgeway & Nigel Vincent, eds. 1st edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 71–95. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198701781.003.0004

D'Achille, Paolo. 2002. L'italiano regionale. *I dialetti italiani: storia, struttura, uso*. Torino: UTET. 26–42.

Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford [Oxfordshire] & New York, NY: B. Blackwell.

Dahl, Östen, ed. 2000. *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197099

Dahl, Östen. 2022. Perfects Across Languages. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 8 (1), 279–297. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-031120-123428

Dahl, Östen & Eva Hedin. 2000. Current relevance and event reference. *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Östen Dahl, ed. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton. 385–402. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197099.3.385

Daugavet, Anna & Peter Arkadiev. 2021. The perfects in Latvian and Lithuanian: A comparative study based on questionnaire and corpus data. *Baltic Linguistics* 12 (12), 73–165. https://doi.org/10.32798/bl.922

Digesto, Salvio. 2022. Lexicalization and Social Meaning of the Italian Subjunctive. *Cadernos de Linguística* 2 (3), e609. https://doi.org/10.25189/2675-4916.2021.v2.n3.id609

Dimmendaal, Gerrit J. 2001. Places and people: field sites and informants. *Linguistic Fieldwork*. Paul Newman & Martha Ratliff, eds. 1st edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 55–75. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511810206.004

Drinka, Bridget. 2017. *Language Contact in Europe: The Periphrastic Perfect through History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139027694

Flobert, Pierre. 1975. *Les Verbes Déponents Latins des Origines à Charlemagne*. Paris: Société D'édition Les Belles Leitres.

Harris, Martin. 1982. The "past simple" and the "present perfect" in Romance. *Studies in Romance verb*. Vincent Nigel & Martin Harris, eds. London & Canberra: CROOM HELM. 42–70.

Heine, Bernd. 1993. *Auxiliaries: cognitive forces and grammaticalization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2006. *The Changing Languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199297337.001.0001

Howlett, David R. 1997. *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. Vol. Fascicule V I-J-K-L. Oxford: The British Academy, Oxford University Press.

Hristov, Bozhil. 2019. *Grammaticalising the Perfect and Explanations of Language Change: Have- and Be-Perfects in the History and Structure of English and Bulgarian*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004414051

Kapkan, Danguolė Kotryna. 2021. Perfect in Lithuanian: A case study based on data from Facebook comments. *Baltic Linguistics* 12 (12), 21–71. https://doi.org/10.32798/bl.921

Kuteva, Tania. 2004. *Auxiliation: An Enquiry Into the Nature of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam. 1998. *Ave´*(*re*) and *esse*(*re*) alternation in Neapolitan. *Studies on the Syntax of Central Romance Languages: Proceedings of the III Symposium on the Syntax of Central Romance Languages*. Olga Fullana & Francesc Roca, eds. Girona: Universitat de Girona. 123–147.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2009. *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano*. Tubingen: Walter de Gruyter – Max Niemeyer Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783484971288

Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change* (Oxford Studies in Diachronic and Historical Linguistics). Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Levin, Beth. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1995. *Unaccusativity: at the syntax-lexical semantics interface*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press. https://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb08443.0001.001

Lewis, Charlton T. 2000. *Elementary Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lindstedt, Jouko. 2000. The perfect – aspectual, temporal and evidential. *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Östen Dahl, ed. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton. 365–384. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197099.3.365

Lois, Ximena. 1990. Auxiliary Selection and Past Participle Agreement in Romance. *Probus* 2 (2), 235–255. https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.1990.2.2.233

Loporcaro, Michele. 1988. *Grammatica storica del dialetto di Altamura*. Pisa: Giardini editori e stampatori. (*Orientamenti linguistici* 21)

Loporcaro, Michele. 1998. *Sintassi comparata dell'accordo participiale romanzo*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Loporcaro, Michele. 2007. On triple auxiliation in Romance. *Linguistics* 45 (1), 173–222. https://doi.org/10.1515/LING.2007.005

Loporcaro, Michele. 2009. *Profilo linguistico dei dialetti italiani*. Roma, Bari: Laterza. (*Manuali Laterza* 275)

Loporcaro, Michele. 2022. The morphological nature of person-driven auxiliation: Evidence from shape conditions. *Periphrasis and Inflexion in Diachrony*. Adam Ledgeway, John Charles Smith & Nigel Vincent, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 213–238. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198870807.003.0009

Lüpke, Friederike. 2021. Patterns and perspectives shape perceptions: Epistemological and methodological reflections on the study of small-scale multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 25 (4), 878–900. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069211023145

Manzini, Maria Rita & Leonardo Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci: Morfosintassi generativa*. Alessandria: dell'Orso.

McLaughlin, Fiona & Thierno Seydou Sall. 2001. The give and take of fieldwork: Noun classes and other concerns in Fatick, Senegal. *Linguistic fieldwork*. Paul Newman & Martha Ratliff, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 189–210.

Mittwoch, Anita. 2008. The English Resultative perfect and its relationship to the Experiential perfect and the simple past tense. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31 (3), 323–351. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-008-9037-y

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Sergej Je. Jaxontov. 1988. *The Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Vladimir P. Nedjalkov & Bernard Comrie, ed. Vol. 12. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.12.06ned

Niermeyer, Jan Frederik & Christopher Van de Kieft. 2002. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. Vol. A-L. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Perlmutter, David M. 1989. Multiattachment and the unaccusative hypothesis: the perfect auxiliary in Italian. *Probus* 1 (1), 63–120. https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.1989.1.1.63

Pinkster, Harm. 1987. The Strategy and Chronology of the Development of Future and Perfect Tense Auxiliaries in Latin. *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*. Martin Harris & Paolo Ramat, eds. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton. 193–224. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110856910.193

Plungian, Vladimir A. & Anna Yu. Urmanchieva. 2017. Perfekt v staroslavjanskom: byl li on rezultativnym? [The Perfect in Old Church Slavonic: Was It Resultative?]. *Slavistična revija* 2, 13–56.

Plungian, Vladimir A. & Anna Yu. Urmanchieva. 2018. K tipologii nerezultativnogo perfekta (na materiale staroslavjanskogo jazyka). [Towards the typology of non-resultative perfect (based on Old Church Slavonic material)]. *Slovene* (letnik 66/2018), 421–440.

Pountain, Christopher J. 1985. Copulas, Verbs of Possession and Auxiliaries in Old Spanish: The Evidence for Structurally Interdependent Changes. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 62 (4), 337–355. https://doi.org/10.1080/1475382852000362337

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1966. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. 3 vols. Turin: Einaudi.

Rosemeyer, Malte. 2022. Anteriors and resultatives in Old Spanish. *IVITRA Research in Linguistics and Literature*, vol. 31. Mar Garachana Camarero, Sandra Montserrat Buendia & Claus Dieter Pusch, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 149–170. https://doi.org/10.1075/ivitra.31.08ros

Sagna, Serge & Abbie Hantgan. 2021. African multilingualism viewed from another angle: Challenging the Casamance exception. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 25 (4), 939–958. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069211023146

Shannon, Thomas F. 1990. The unaccusative hypothesis and the history of the perfect auxiliary in Germanic and Romance. *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, vol. 66. Henning Andersen & Ernst F. K. Koerner, eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 461–488. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.66.32sha

Shorrock, Robert & David Butterfield. 2007. *The Penguin Latin Dictionary*. London: Penguin.

Sorace, Antonella. 2000. Gradients in Auxiliary Selection with Intransitive Verbs. *Language. Linguistic Society of America* 76 (4), 859–890. https://doi.org/10.2307/417202

Sorace, Antonella. 2011. Gradience in Split Intransitivity: The End of the Unaccusative Hypothesis? *Archivio glottologico italiano* XCVI (1), 67–86. https://doi.org/10.1400/179059

Squartini, Mario & Pier Marco Bertinetto. 2000. The Simple and Compound Past in Romance languages. *Tense and Aspect Systems in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton. 403–440. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197099

Štichauer, Pavel. 2022. Grammaticalization of auxiliary verb constructions. *Linguistica Pragensia* 32 (1), 59–84.

Thieroff, Rolf. 2000. On the areal distribution of tense-aspect categories in Europe. *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Östen Dahl, ed. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 265–308. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197099.1.265

Torcolacci, Giuseppe. 2015. *Marking the Default: Auxiliary selection in Southern Italian dialects*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Leiden university. Accessed 23 November 2024. https://www.lotpublications.nl/marking-the-default-auxiliary-selection-in-southern-italian-dialects

Tuttle, Edward F. 1986. The Spread of ESSE as Universal Auxiliary in Central Italo-Romance. *Medioevo romanzo* 11, 229–287.

Velupillai, Viveka & Östen Dahl. 2013. The Perfect. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath, eds. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Accessed 10 March, 2021. http://wals.info/chapter/68

Vincent, Nigel. 1982. The development of auxiliaries *habere* and *esse* in Romance. *Studies in the Romance verb*. Nigel Vincent & Martin Harris, eds. London & Canberra: CROOM HELM. 71–96.

Wälchli, Bernhard & Michael Cysouw. 2012. Lexical typology through similarity semantics: Toward a semantic map of motion verbs. *Linguistics* 50 (3), 671–710. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2012-0021