

Contact-related and input-related factors in auxiliary selection

Evidence from Italo-Romance varieties

Margherita Di Salvo¹, Eugenio Gorla²

¹University of Naples, Federico II, Department of Humanities

²University of Turin, Department of Humanities

margherita.disalvo@unina.it, eugenio.gorla@unito.it

In this paper we provide a comparative account of auxiliary selection in two heritage language (HL) communities of Italian origin, in Argentina and in the UK. We use the term Italo-Romance heritage languages (IRHLs) as a cover term to refer to both standard Italian and primary dialects spoken in Italy.

Most Italo-Romance varieties are characterized by split intransitivity in the selection of the perfective auxiliary: intransitive verbs select ‘be’ or ‘have’ in the formation of the analytical past tense according to syntactic and semantic properties (Cennamo 2001, Sorace 2000). As a general rule, inergative verbs select ‘have’; unaccusative, passive and reflexive verbs select ‘be’; see standard Italian in ex. (1)-(2):

(1) Maria è caduta
Maria be:AUX.3SG fallen
‘Maria has fallen/fell’

(2) Maria ha dormito
Maria have:AUX.3SG slept
‘Maria has slept/slept’

Split intransitivity is hardly maintained as it is in IRHL communities: several HL settings show a greater variation in auxiliary selection with respect to homeland varieties. To gain a deeper understanding of this phenomenon we compare data from two different HL settings: Piedmontese communities in Argentina and the Campanian community in Bedford (UK). The two settings allow us to compare Piedmontese and Campanian Italo-Romance dialects, in contact respectively with Spanish and English, two languages that do not have auxiliary selection.

In the Piedmontese HL variety, split intransitivity tends to be lost, as ‘have’ is generalized as a perfective auxiliary with verbs of any class; see ex. (3)

(3) l’ha stait lì l’ha fait la cosecha e tut.
have.3SG been there have.3SG done the harvest and all

dòpo l’ha andait an là
afterwards have.3SG gone in there
‘he has been there, I has done the harvest and afterwards he went there’

However, variation is still present in the data, and will be described in relation with social and acquisitional features of the speakers.

A different picture is offered by the data from the UK: here, the analysis shows that ‘be’ may be selected instead of ‘have’ with inergative verbs and with specific persons, namely 1pl, 1sg, and 3sg. The selection of ‘be’ is also sensitive of the language used by the speakers: it is higher when they speak dialect and but absent if they speak Italian. When migrants speak Italian, they select ‘have’ with this kind of verbs as in Standard Italian.

Based on the framework by Benmamoun et al. (2013), Polinsky & Scontras (2020), we provide a comparison between the two case studies, aimed at highlighting the dynamics to which IRHL varieties are subject. We make a distinction between contact-related innovations, depending on grammatical features of the dominant language, and input-related innovations, depending on acquisitional factors characterizing specific HL scenarios, as well as on inherent patterns of variation in the input.

References

- Benmamoun E., Montrul, S. & Polinsky, M. (2013). Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities and challenges for linguistics. *Theoretical Linguistics* 39, 129-81.
- Cennamo M. (2001). L'Inaccusativita` in alcune variet` campane: teorie e dati a confronto. In R. Sornicola, E. Stenta Krosbakken, and C. Stromboli (Eds.), *Dati empirici e teorie linguistiche: Atti del XXXIII Congresso della Societa` di Linguistica Italiana*, Napoli, 28-30 ottobre 1999, 427-453. Rome: Bulzoni.
- Polinsky M. & Scontras G. (2020). Understanding heritage languages. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 23, 4-20.
- Sorace, A. (2000). Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs. *Language* 76, 859-890.