

Review of *Microvariation in the second form the  
infinitive in Campania: the case of the  
Valle Caudina*

Title : I have the impression that « of » is missing in the title of the contribution

p.2 : given the syntactic independence of the Imperative, isn't it strange that the Imperative be introduced by a preposition ? I can understand that a (directional) preposition introduces an infinitive, but not an Imperative. Hence the hypothesis put forth by Ascoli, who saw in this « complementizer » the Latin conjunction AC

p.2 : the title of the section is misleading : rather than SFI in imperatives, I imagine the author means SFI in imperative constructions

p.2 : an SFI or a SFI ?

p.2 : it is essential to read and mention the seminal works of Ascoli and the reply offered by De Gregorio :

Ascoli, I. G. (1898), « Un problema di sintassi dialettale comparata », in *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 14. pp.453-468

De Gregorio, G. (1899), « Sopra un problema di sintassi dialettale comparata », in *Studi Glottologici Italiani* pp.239-244

<https://archive.org/details/studiglottologi02greggoog/page/n9/mode/2up>

You will find as well a synthesis of the works dedicated to this question in the following paper of R. Sornicola :

<http://wpage.unina.it/sornicol/Articoli/VadoaDire.pdf>

p.2 : do you have relevant data to say that the SFI is a « recent innovation » ?

p.3, ex (4) : do you mean that « ppô » is a clitic ? What are the arguments that justify this analysis ? More crucially, why should the clitic form of the auxiliary (i.e a monosyllabic form) cause a stress retraction on the infinitive ?

p.3 : « the SFI is homophonous with the second singular imperative form, the SFI was reanalysed as imperative when occurring with *va* 'go' » : couldn't it be the other way round ?

p.4 : when you say that « these are not invariably grammatical », do you mean « the metaphonic forms » ?

p.4, ex (12) : there is no underlying –i in the first conjugation Imperative *cocca*. It is thus understandable that there is no metaphony here

p.4 : and is an interesting case > and it is an interesting case ?

p.4, (ex (13)) : I don't see the form [bbestirete] in Ledgeway's work : it is [bbestìrete], with stress on the antepenultimate

p.4 : the finite status of Imperatives is far from being clear

p.6, ex. (15) : Issə should be glossed « he », not « you »

p.6 : Whilst in Neapolitan possessive clitics > Whilst in Neapolitan, possessive clitics

p.6 : (Ledgeway 2009: 252); > (Ledgeway 2009: 252),

p.6, ex (16) : is it normal that no stress indication is given ? (idem for the examples given on p.7)

p.7 : for the readers who are not familiar with these varieties, it would be relevant to indicate the value of 'o, 'a, 'e/i and 'i/u , 'a, al, gl'

p.7 : « In alto Sannio, forms with 'be', surfacing as like *ino arrivatə* 'they have arrived' » : check the English formulation

p.9 : in the table, is it normal that servì/servire is given as equivalent of [ka'pi] ?

p.9, ex. (22) : wouldn't it be relevant to gloss me-ACC=take-INF instead of take-INF=me-ACC ? The same observation holds for the other examples in (22)

p.10, §5.2. : the use of the SFI in imperatives > the use of the SFI in imperative constructions

p.10 : are the forms given in (26) presented with the API ? Given that the schwa is given in some forms, it would be more coherent to use the API more systematically

p.10 : on fixed expressions, cf. the other seminal paper by I. Ascoli (1901) on *Vattelapesca*, which is directly relevant in the discussion :  
<https://ia902609.us.archive.org/11/items/archivioglottolo15fireuoft/archivioglottolo15fireuoft.pdf>

p.10 : A reading... seem > A reading... seems...

p.11 : « that negative imperatives contain a null auxiliary/head which selects the infinitive as its complement » only is one of the possible accounts of negative imperatives. But of course, other types of analysis are possible

p.11 : a complement to functional verbs > a complement of functional verbs ? Please check

p.12 : monoclausality > monoclausality ?

p.12 : ....but it is also semantically also very odd.... : delete one of the occurrences of « also »

p.12 : the fact that the initial [t] is doubled is not per se a proof for enclisis, given that enclisis is attested without consonant doubling, as in *vieneme* in (29)

p.13 : (i..e functional) > (i.e functional),

p.13. When you say that « Unlike its Neapolitan counterpart, SFI was never fully reanalysed as an imperatival form », you mean in VC, right ?

p.13 : When the history of VC is mentioned, which medieval texts / evidence have been taken into account ? Therefore, on which grounds can we say that « in the history of VC there has not been a shift in finiteness » ?

p.13 : The SFI is thus fully dependent on higher verb (imperative) > The SFI is thus fully dependent on the higher verb (imperative) ?

p.14 : there seem... > there seems ?

p.14 : concerning the origin and spread of the construction, cf. the references mentioned above

p.14 : this form is not considered more prestigious than the canonical form and that is generally perceived > ... it is generally...

p.15 : the references should probably mention the forgotten works dedicated to the problem discussed in the paper