

The long history of a syncretism in Italo-Romance and Ladin verb morphology

Abstract

This study traces the history of a syncretism in the verb morphology of two Romance varieties. It explores the origin, in medieval Tuscan and elsewhere, of a morphomic pattern of identity between the second person singular present indicative and some cells of the present subjunctive. It shows that this syncretism was originally an accidental effect of sound change, but that subsequent morphological changes replicated that pattern with a result today familiar in the grammar of modern Italian. It then explores a peculiar morphological change which happened almost ‘overnight’ in the recent history of the Val Badia dialect of Ladin, and argues that the only plausible explanation is a ‘calque’, involving the redistribution of native inflexional material in imitation of the aforementioned morphomic pattern in standard Italian. The theoretical implications of this conclusion are briefly considered. The findings of this study suggest that speakers prefer predictability of patterning over transparent signalling of grammatical meaning and that, most surprisingly, morphomic patterns can actually be borrowed from one language into another.

Key words

syncretism, morphemes, borrowing, Italian, Ladin,

1. *A neglected syncretism and its implications*

There is an aspect of the inflexional morphology of Italian which ‘hides in plain sight’.¹ The facts are perfectly familiar, yet the pattern involved is never acknowledged. At issue is the syncretic paradigmatic distribution such that identical morphological material is uniquely shared by a set of cells comprising: 2SG present indicative, 1SG, 2SG, and 3SG present subjunctive, and 3PL present subjunctive (Table 1):

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
present indicative		■				
present subjunctive	■	■	■			■
future						
conditional						
imperfect indicative						
imperfect subjunctive						
preterite						

Table 1. A syncretism in Italian first conjugation verbs

¹ I am very grateful to the following colleagues for their helpful comments at various stages of the development of these ideas: Chiara Cappellaro, Hans-Olav Enger, Livio Gaeta, John Charles Smith, Nigel Vincent. My thanks also go to two anonymous reviewers for their insightful remarks.

This syncretism is the fortuitous result of sound change and the set of paradigm cells implicated is irreducible to any significant, distinctive, shared functional denominator. The arbitrariness of its distribution is magnified by the fact that it is restricted to the *first conjugation*. It is ignored in synchronic descriptions of Italian morphology presumably because synchronically, too, it is assumed to be a matter of chance resemblance, of ‘accidental’ not ‘systematic’ distribution (cf. Baerman 2009: 220f.; Haspelmath and Sims 2010: 174-76; Stump 2019: 293). However, a different story is told by its very early history and by its very recent history. Both historical phases show that speakers can and do detect arbitrary, historically accidental, patterns of syncretism, and that their knowledge of those patterns can guide the course of morphological change to the extent of overriding and obscuring established, transparent, mappings between form and meaning. The more recent phase also bears a novel implication for morphological theory: abstract syncretic patterns can be ‘borrowed’ from one language into another.

Syncretisms involving functionally arbitrary patterns of paradigmatic distribution are staple examples of what Aronoff (1994) called ‘morphemes’. Morphemes by definition lack synchronic phonological or functional motivation, and they are, typically, recurrent patterns of formal identity defined across sets of paradigm cells which lack any distinctive common characteristic. They are also the kind of phenomenon on which Maiden (e.g., 2018) bases most of his analyses of the role of morphomic patterns in the history of the Romance languages. Among the morphomic phenomena which Maiden discusses are, for example, cases in which if the cells of the present subjunctive have a stem allomorph (whatever its phonological nature) then that same allomorph will be shared by the first person singular present indicative, and vice versa, or in which the occurrence of an allomorph, whatever its form, in the stem of any one cell of the preterite, imperfect subjunctive (and certain other parts of the paradigm) implies the presence of that same allomorph in all the others. Despite the fact that the paradigm cells affected form a heterogeneous set, there is ample evidence from subsequent diachronic morphological changes (see Maiden 2016b; 2018: 19) that speakers are aware of these abstract, morphomic, distributional patterns, and actually prefer them over apparently more ‘natural’ form-meaning relationships. The Italo-Romance facts discussed here throw further light on such phenomena in diachrony. However, Maiden (2018) also strongly asserts the idiosyncratically ‘language-specific’ nature of individual morphomic structures, predicting that they will only be found in the languages (or their descendants) in which the historical accidents which gave rise to them occurred. The evidence presented below that morphomic structures are borrowed—or more accurately ‘calqued’—will force us re-examine that claim.

2. ‘Iotic’ syncretism in modern Italo-Romance and its origin

2.1 *The syncretism and its dialectal distribution*

In the modern Italian present tense of the first conjugation an identical form occurs—exclusively—in 2SG (indicative and subjunctive) and 1SG, 3SG, and 3PL subjunctives. The singular forms are perfectly identical, while the modern 3PL is differentiated from the singular by also having the ending -no. It is quite likely, however, that *kanti* was also originally the form of the 3PL, as well as that of the singular, the ending -no having been introduced at a later date: for some relevant arguments see, e.g., Maiden (1995: 130-

132).² Table 2 contrasts an example of the Italian first conjugation present (*cantare* ‘sing’) with a non-first-conjugation verb (*vendere* ‘sell’) where no such syncretism exists:³

1 ST CONJ	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	<i>canto</i>	<i>canti</i>	<i>canta</i>	<i>cantiamo</i>	<i>cantate</i>	<i>cantano</i>
	'kanto	'kanti	'kanta	kan'tjamo	kan'tate	'kantano
PRS.SBJV	<i>canti</i>	<i>canti</i>	<i>canti</i>	<i>cantiamo</i>	<i>cantiate</i>	<i>cantino</i>
	'kanti	'kanti	'kanti	kan'tjamo	kan'tjate	'kantino

NON-1 ST CONJ	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	<i>vendo</i>	<i>vendi</i>	<i>vende</i>	<i>vendiamo</i>	<i>vendete</i>	<i>vendono</i>
	'vendo	'vendi	'vende	ven'djamo	ven'dete	'vendono
PRS.SBJV	<i>venda</i>	<i>venda</i>	<i>venda</i>	<i>vendiamo</i>	<i>vendiate</i>	<i>vendano</i>
	'venda	'venda	'venda	ven'djamo	ven'djate	'vendano

Table 2. Present indicative and subjunctive of first conjugation and non-first conjugation verbs in modern Italian

The pattern characterized by inflexional *-i*, illustrated in Table 2, is not restricted to Italian or to Tuscany. This syncretism (henceforth, ‘iotic’ syncretism) recurs in Lazio, Umbria, and Corsica (see *AIS* map 1685; Rohlf 2021b: 248; 296; *ALEIC*;⁴ Chiodi-Tischer 1981). It further appears in fourteenth-century Abruzzese (Haumer 1934: 74) and fifteenth century Assisan (Sestito 2004: 197). It is also possible to discern the original presence of the desinence *-i* through the phenomenon of metaphony: just as in numerous Italo-Romance dialects the *-i* of the 2SG triggers metaphonic assimilatory raising of the preceding stressed vowel, the *-i* of our syncretistic present subjunctive forms appears to have had the same effect. Thus old Aquilano has metaphonized 3SG.PRS.SBJV *perduni* vs non-metaphonized 3SG.PRS.IND *perdona* (Haumer 1934). In some dialects of Romagna, final **-i* has long been deleted (and locally replaced by *-a*),⁵ but leaves a trace of its

² Vanelli (2014: 144) suggests a phonological explanation for the [i] of the third person plural. But what she invokes is a sound change peculiar to Tuscan, while the iotic third person plural subjunctive is found outside Tuscany, as mentioned below.

³ These are the only cells whose ending is a syllabic [i]. The status of the 1PL and 2PL forms (where orthographic *i* is [j]) is different, because they are common to all conjugations. Only in the first conjugation is the 2SG present indicative distinctively homophonous with forms of the present subjunctive.

⁴ Compare *ALEIC* maps 31, 34, 115, 215, 223, 338, 360, 361, 362, 371, 380, 487, 520, 598, 900, 924, 1124, 1264, 1334, 1337, 1495, 1507, 1570, 1618, 1734, 1764, 1776, 1779, 1821, 1830.

⁵ In the examples given here, the present subjunctive ends in *-a*. Apparently, the original first conjugation subjunctive marker *-i* was replaced, after triggering metaphony, by the non-first conjugation present subjunctive marker *-a*. This sequence of events was first mooted by Mussafia (1871: 67f.). He was worried, however, that a scenario in which *-i* was first extended (causing metaphony) then ousted by *-a* (leaving the effects of metaphony behind), was too contrived (‘zu künstlich’). I think that this explanation is simply the only one available. First, *-i* was generalized as a subjunctive marker in all conjugations, with metaphonizing effects, but later surviving, more archaic, remnants of the original non-first conjugation desinence *-a* returned to prevail over *-i*. Haumer (1934: 74) also reveals an apparent tussle between subjunctive *-i* and *-a* in old Aquilano. See Wendriner (1889: 71) for rivalry between first and non-first conjugation subjunctive markers in sixteenth-century Paduan.

former presence in a metaphonic vowel—not only in 2SG, as expected, but also in 1SG, 3SG, and 3PL present subjunctive.⁶ Schürr (1974: 54f.) gives the following from Forlì (Table 3):⁷

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	kāt 'sing'	kēt	'kāta	kan'tē	kan'tej	'kāta
PRS.SBJV	'kēta	'kēta	'kēta	kan'teja	kan'tiva	'kēta

Table 3. Distribution of metaphony in the Forlivese present tense

For Lugo, Pelliciardi (1977: 115-21) gives the forms in Table (4):⁸

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	lev ⁹ 'wash'	lev	'leva	la'vën	la'vi	'leva
PRS.SBJV	'leva	'leva	'leva	la'veja	la'viva	'leva

Table 4. Distribution of metaphony in the present tense in Lugo

Schürr (1918: 57f.; 60f.; 63; 65f.) provides older Romagnolo examples from texts such as the sixteenth century *Pulon Matt*, for the singular and third person forms of the present subjunctive. For example, metaphonic *e* for historically underlying *[a] in 1SG.PRS.SBJV *fezza* 'do', 3SG.PRS.SBJV *tretta* 'treat', 3PL.PRS.SBJV *bella* 'dance'. Compare *fezza* with modern dialectal Tuscan *facci*, and the last two forms with Italian *tratti*, *balli(no)*. In sum, the iotic syncretism familiar from Italian exists, or once existed, both south and north of the Apennines. *How* did that syncretism originate?

2.2 Origins of iotic syncretism

The Latin antecedents of the (modern Italian) forms given in Table (2) are in Table (5):

	FIRST CONJUGATION					
	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	CANTO	CANTAS	CANTAT	CANTAMUS	CANTATIS	CANTANT
PRS.SBJV	CANTEM	CANTES	CANTET	CANTEMUS	CANTETIS	CANTENT

	NON-FIRST CONJUGATION					
	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	UENDO	UENDIS	UENDIT	UENDIMUS	UENDITIS	UENDUNT
PRS.SBJV	UENDAM	UENDAS	UENDAT	UENDAMUS	UENDATIS	UENDANT

Table 5. Present indicative and subjunctive of Latin first and non-first conjugation verbs

⁶ In these dialects this pattern is found in all conjugations. Extension of the -i of the present subjunctive from the first conjugation to other conjugations is widely attested in central Italo-Romance (see, e.g., Rohlf's 2021b: 298f.).

⁷ See also Schürr (1919: 133; 140; 146; 151).

⁸ I offer an IPA approximation of Pelliciardi's transcription: the more closed vowels are metaphonic outcomes.

⁹ In this dialect the form of the 1SG present indicative tends to become identical to that of the 2SG.

One cannot arrive at the first conjugation forms in Table (2) from the Latin first conjugation forms in Table (5) entirely by regular sound change; in particular, the ending -i cannot be explained phonologically. The expected changes would be:¹⁰

(i) word-final nasals and dentals fall

(ii) word final -s after a vowel becomes *-i

(iii) the diphthongs arising from (ii) become raised monophthongs, so that:

-as	>	*-ai	>	*-e
-es	>	*-ei	>	*-i
-is	>	*-ii	>	*-i

The predicted results of these sound changes appear in Table (6):

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	'kanto	'kante	'kanta	kan'tamu	kan'tati	'kanta(n)
PRS.SBJV	'kante	'kanti	'kante	kan'temu	kan'teti	'kante(n)

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	'vendo	'vendi	'vende	ven'demu	ven'deti	'vendo(n)
PRS.SBJV	'venda	'vende	'venda	ven'damu	ven'dati	'venda(n)

Table 6. Phonologically predicted outcomes of Latin verb forms in early Italo-Romance

The predicted forms in Table (6) already involve a syncretism almost identical in its distribution (not yet in form) to that of modern Italian: as an accidental result of sound change, the 2SG present indicative of the first conjugation has become identical to the 1SG, 3SG, and 3PL present subjunctive. The 2SG present subjunctive is slightly different, in that it already ends in -i by (iii) above. The pattern of syncretism characterized by final -e illustrated in Tables (6) and (7) still survived in old Tuscan (Rohlf's 2021b:248;296), although the modern pattern of syncretism in -i was already well established alongside it.

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
present indicative						
present subjunctive						
future						
conditional						
imperfect indicative						
imperfect subjunctive						
preterite						

Table 7. Early Italo-Romance syncretism in the present tense of the first conjugation

¹⁰ For more detailed arguments in support of (ii) and (iii) see Maiden (1996).

Somehow, the syncretic set of forms in -e has been replaced by a set of forms in -i (making them identical to the established 2SG present subjunctive form in -i). How did this come about? There is simply no phonological mechanism relevant here¹¹ by which final unstressed [e] raises to [i]. Nor can the change we observe be a reanalysis such that speakers simply replace the verb ending -e with -i ‘across-the-board’. In medieval Tuscan final -e was also found in the 3SG present indicative of non-first conjugation verbs and of rhizotonic preterite forms, the 1SG and 3SG forms of all imperfect subjunctives, all 2PL forms, and the infinitive. Yet, within the present-tense, the replacement of forms in -e by those in -i occurs *only* in the 1SG, 3SG, and 3SG.

There have been divers attempts to explain this replacement. Meyer-Lübke (1895: §145) invokes analogical generalization of the already existing 2SG present subjunctive ending -i to other present subjunctive forms, but this explanation is completely unmotivated, and spread of the 2SG form is otherwise unparalleled in the system. Tekavčić (1980: 288) curiously claims that it is a change principally motivated by a need to distinguish the first conjugation subjunctive forms from the 2SG imperative in -a, but this explanation ignores the fact that these forms were already perfectly distinguished, and that no differentiation was ever necessary. It is Rohlfs (2021b: 296) who discerns what seems to me the only plausible explanation, namely that what happens in the present subjunctive is connected with the replacement of -e by -i in the 2SG present indicative:¹² ‘È chiaro che quest’i è di origine analogica, e si dovrà riportare agli stessi motivi che hanno causato la desinenza -i nella seconda persona dell’indicativo’.

Rohlfs does not explain further, but what he seems to be invoking as the motivation of our change is the so-called ‘Humboldt’s Universal’, formulated by Vennemann (1978: 259), which states that ‘[s]uppletion is undesirable, uniformity of linguistic symbolization is desirable: both roots and grammatical markers should be unique and constant’. The ending -i was already¹³ the inflexional marker of 2SG in the present indicative of non-first conjugation verbs (e.g. *vedi* ‘see’, *vendi* ‘sell’, *dormi* ‘sleep’), in the present subjunctive of first conjugation verbs (e.g., *canti*), in fourth conjugation¹⁴ imperatives (e.g., *dormi*), in imperfect subjunctives of all conjugations (e.g., *vedessi*), and in the preterite and conditional of all conjugations (e.g., *vedesti*; *vedresti*). In Italian, in fact, all 2SG verbs forms have come to end in -i, except for the first conjugation 2SG imperative. It is therefore unsurprising that a minority 2SG ending -e was replaced by the far more widespread 2SG ending -i. It should be added, by the way, that replacement of -e by -i was not limited to the 2SG present indicative of the first conjugation: -e was also the regular ending of 2SG non-first conjugation present subjunctives and of all imperfect indicatives,¹⁵ and here too it was eventually replaced by -i.¹⁶

¹¹ Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 294-302) shows that Latin *long* final -e could yield -i, but the -e at issue was short. See also Vanelli (2013: 465f.) for arguments against a phonological explanation.

¹² Lausberg (1966: 277) invokes analogical spread of the first conjugation 2SG subjunctive ending, but fails to motivate such a change.

¹³ Rohlfs (2021b: 248) appeals implausibly (cf. Haase 1999: 171) to the analogical influence of the fourth conjugation 2SG present indicative ending -i. Haase’s own appeal to what he calls an ‘Alteritätsanalogie’ involving a reversal in the first conjugation of the alternation pattern characteristic of the fourth conjugation (indicative *i* vs subjunctive *a*), seems equally problematic.

¹⁴ Possibly also in second conjugation imperatives such as *vedi*; for a different, phonological, explanation, see Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 294-302).

¹⁵ For further phonological evidence of original 2SG -e in southern Italy, see Maiden (2016: 220).

In many Italo-Romance dialects, replacement of -e by -i indeed stops in the 2SG. Table (8) shows a typical pattern for a dialect of Liguria (Azaretti 1982: 200),¹⁷ while Table (9) illustrates the same pattern for the first conjugation in Ascrea in Lazio (Fanti 1939):

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	'kantu 'sing'	'kanti	'kanta	kan'tamu	kan'te	'kanta
PRS.SBJV	'kante	'kanti	'kante	'kantimu	'kanti	'kante

Table 8. Replacement of -e by -i just in the 2SG in Ventimiglia (Liguria)

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	'manno 'send'	'manni	'manna	man'nemo	man'nete	'mannanu
PRS.SBJV	'manne	'manni	'manne	man'nemo	man'nete	'mannenu

Table 9. Replacement of -e by -i limited to the 2SG in Ascrea (Lazio)

Dialects such as those illustrated in Table (8) and (9) have something close to a 'superstable' marker of 2SG: almost all 2SG forms end in -i, and -i expresses almost exclusively 2SG. For instance, in Ascrea (Fanti 1939)—with a few exceptions in some very high frequency verbs with vowel-final roots in the present indicative, and with the systematic exception of the 2SG imperative in the first conjugation—all 2SG forms end in -i, but almost no¹⁸ non-2SG form does so.

In Italian an 'ideal', i.e. maximally transparent, near-biunique matching between the 2SG and its desinential marker could also have been installed. What actually happens looks rather like a 'misreading of the instructions': the replacement of -e with -i in the 2SG seems to have been reanalysed as a rule replacing -e with -i *wherever in the paradigm there are forms identical to the second person singular*. In short, the innovation is sensitive not to a person-number specification, but to a pattern of syncretism which had accidentally arisen in the early Italo-Romance first conjugation present indicative. It replicates that pattern and, in so doing, gives rise to the slightly different pattern familiar from modern Italian and re-presented in Table (10), one which includes the 2SG present subjunctive, already in -i:

	1SG	2SG	3SG	3PL
PRS.IND	<i>canto</i>	<i>canti</i>	<i>canta</i>	<i>cantano</i>
PRS.SBJV	<i>canti</i>	<i>canti</i>	<i>canti</i>	<i>cantino</i>

Table 10. Modern Italian first conjugation syncretism

I come back to the theoretical significance of the emergence of this pattern later. I first turn to a much later development of the Italian iotic syncretism. This development is remarkable in that it does not actually occur in Italian at all, or even within Italo-

¹⁶ Modern Italian 2SG present subjunctive (*tu*) *venda* is a recent innovation: see, e.g., Rohlfs (2021b: 296f.; 299-301); Maiden (1995: 129; 2007: 161; to appear).

¹⁷ The 1PL and 2PL forms in this dialect are later formations, irrelevant here.

¹⁸ The exception is the preterite, which has 1SG -i, a form inherited from Latin.

Romance as usually defined, but in the recent history of the Ladin dialects of the Val Badia. Yet I shall argue that what we observe there is a direct consequence of the Italian syncretism.

3. The Badiot Ladin ‘sigmatic’ syncretism

3.1 The nature of the Badiot syncretism

The modern Ladin of the Val Badia shows a pattern of syncretism which is that of modern Italian, albeit quite different in phonological content. It is unlike its Italian counterpart¹⁹ in that it is ‘sigmatic’, the inflexional ending involved being -(e)s,²⁰ not -i.

In the Val Badia,²¹ the sigmatic pattern occurs at San Martin de Tor, La Valle, S. Leonardo, S. Cassiano, Corvara, Colfosco (*ALD* points 83, 84, 85, 91, 90, 89). Table (12) presents examples from S. Martin de Tor and Corvara (gaps reflect lack of information for specific forms). For further extensive illustration of this pattern, see the ‘schemi verbali’ provided in Moling (2016).

San Martin de Tor²²

	1SG	2SG	3SG	3PL
PRS.IND	'ma:ndʒi 'eat'	'ma:ndʒes	'ma:ndʒa	'ma:ndʒa
PRS.SBJV	'ma:ndʒes	'ma:ndʒes	'ma:ndʒes	'ma:ndʒes
PRS.IND	krɛj 'believe'	'krɛjes	krɛj	krɛj
PRS.SBJV	'krɛjes	'krɛjes	'krɛjes	'krɛjes
PRS.IND	o:j 'want'	'o:s(te)	o:(l)	o:(i)
PRS.SBJV	o:js	o:js		
PRS.IND	pɔ 'can'	pɔ:s	pɔ	pɔ
PRS.SBJV	'pɔ:js		'pɔ:js	'pɔ:js
PRS.IND	do:rmi 'sleep'	'do:rmes	do:rm	do:rm
PRS.SBJV	'do:rmes	'do:rmes	'do:rmes	'do:rmes
PRS.IND	suŋ 'am'	ɛs	ɛ	ɛ

¹⁹ It is also unlike Italian in not necessarily involving whole-word syncretism. In Italian, first conjugation verbs do not normally show root allomorphy, but in Ladin (for reasons explained later) the phenomenon is not restricted to the first conjugation and affects many verbs with already existing root allomorphy.

²⁰ As examples in Table (12) show, Ladin -es sometimes manifests as -əs, or as -js (-is) postvocally. This is a matter of phonetic variation.

²¹ There is one, isolated, case outside the Val Badia. This is si:bəs, the present subjunctive forms of the verb ‘be’ in the Gardnese dialect of S. Cristina (*ALD* point 87; *ALD-II* maps 114, 117). Its historical status is unclear: I find nothing like it in nineteenth century descriptions of Gardnese, although data from *TALL* confirm it for modern Gardnese. It is unclear whether the Gardnese form is influenced by Badiot, or whether the presence of the sigmatic subjunctive in Gardnese indicates that somehow the phenomenon *originated* in the verb ‘be’, in both varieties. This seems unlikely, because it is precisely ‘be’ which in the Val Badia sometimes lacks the sigmatic form (cf. note 28).

²² Data from: *ALD-I* maps 52, 201, 257, 258, 259, 627, 628; *ALD-II* maps 114, 117, 372, 378, 380, 482, 483, 488, 491, 492, 493, 497, 596, 597, 598, 604, 606, 722, 723, 727, 728, 925 929, 930, 998, 999, 1000.

PRS.SBJV	'si:dəs	'si:dəs	'si:dəs	'si:dəs
PRS.IND	a 'have'		a	a
PRS.SBJV	a:js	a:js	a:js	a:js
Corvara				
	1SG	2SG	3SG	3PL
PRS.IND	'ma:ndʒe 'eat'	'ma:ndʒes	'ma:ndʒa	'ma:ndʒa
PRS.SBJV	'ma:ndʒes	'ma:ndʒes	'ma:ndʒes	'ma:ndʒes
PRS.IND	'kraje 'believe'	krajs	kraj	kraj
PRS.SBJV	'krajəs	'krajəs	'krajəs	
PRS.IND	o:i 'want'	'o:s(te)	o:(l)	o:(i)
PRS.SBJV	'o:jes	'o:jes		
PRS.IND	pə 'can'	pə:s	pə	pə
PRS.SBJV	'pə:jes		'pə:jes	'pə:jes
PRS.IND	do:rm 'sleep'	do:rmes	do:rm	do:rm
PRS.SBJV	'do:rmes		'do:rmes	'do:rmes
PRS.IND	suŋ 'am'	es	eḷ	eḷ
PRS.SBJV	'si:dəs	'si:dəs	'si:dəs	'si:dəs
PRS.IND	a 'have'		a	a
PRS.SBJV	'a:jes	'a:jes	'a:jes	'a:jes

Table 12. Sigmatic syncretism in dialects of the Val Badia.

3.2 Origins of the Badiot syncretism

The sigmatic syncretism is very recent. Final -s in the 2SG is inherited from Latin, but its presence elsewhere is novel. There is absolutely no sign of it in the detailed morphological descriptions produced in the late nineteenth century (e.g., Alton 1879; Gartner 1883; also Mair 1978: 138f.),²³ and no examples in nineteenth century Ladin prose texts.²⁴ Yet by the 1960s it is firmly established.²⁵ Indeed its presence is perhaps the most remarkable difference in Vittur's reworking and expansion (Alton-Vittur 1968) of Alton (1879). Alton was mainly describing his native dialect of Colfosco (cf. Kramer 1989: 757), yet gave no indication of our syncretism. In Colfosco today, however, the

²³ The *AIS* data, gathered in 1921, provide scant information on the present subjunctive, but Colfosco (point 314, map 1639) has 'mani ('I send'), with no -s.

²⁴ See for example the nineteenth century material in 'grafia antica' for the Val Badia in the *TALL* database. It should be noted that material provided there in 'grafia moderna' introduces into the writings of Alton sigmatic subjunctives which are certainly not there in the original texts.

²⁵ See further Mair (1973), Kramer (1976), Moling (2016).

sigmatic subjunctive is firmly established, and Alton-Vittur (1968: 36; 41; 43f.; 49; 51-55) lists only sigmatic subjunctive forms for upper Val Badia.²⁶ How and when did this happen?

Kramer (1976: 78) assumes that the sigmatic endings of the first and third persons of the present subjunctive originate in 2SG forms in -s (see also Salvi 2020: 81). In fact there is no other plausible origin for this ending. It is also significant that present subjunctive -(e)s and 2SG present indicative -(e)s are mutually exclusive: we have only 2SG.PRS.SBJV 'ma:ndʒes, never **'ma:ndʒeses. All other tenses and moods (except singular imperatives), in almost all other Badiot varieties, show sigmatic 2SG forms.²⁷ The fact that the sigmatic subjunctive ending cannot itself be combined with a 2SG desinence clearly suggests that the sigmatic subjunctive was itself originally a 2SG form. Kramer (1976: 78) derives subjunctive -es specifically from historically underlying *-as, the ending of the 2SG present subjunctive of non-first conjugation verbs. In most Ladin varieties the distinction between conjugation classes has been neutralized in the present subjunctive, and the prevailing forms always originate in the *first* conjugation (see, e.g., Mair 1978: 138), so it seems doubtful that the sigmatic subjunctive would originate in non-first conjugation verbs. Actually, there is another source for -es, namely the 2SG present *indicative* of first conjugation verbs, also historically in *-as (cf. *'mand(u)kas > 'ma:ndʒes), and this is a point to whose significance I return later.

There are no good explanations of *why* this has happened. Kramer (1976: 78) merely indicates that what we observe is *plausible* because similar things happen elsewhere: he claims that there are parallels in French for 2SG desinences being extended into the 1SG. Yet this happens in the French *indicative* not in the subjunctive (e.g., UENDO UENDIS UENDIT > *vend vend* *vend* > *vends vend* *vend* but UENDAM UENDAS UENDAT > *vende vendes vende*). The French facts also have a specific motivation, namely that in certain verbs, by sound change, both 1SG and 2SG came to end in -s (cf. Pope 1952: §899). As for the extension of 2SG -es into the third person as well as into the 1SG present subjunctive, Kramer invokes a parallel with an assumed generalization of -i from the 2SG of the first conjugation present subjunctive in Italian, as proposed for Italian by Lausberg (1966: 277).²⁸ Mair (1978: 142) does not really explore the cause of the sigmatic subjunctive, but focuses interestingly on its paradigmatic distribution, noting that the distribution of -s in Val Badia is exactly the same as that of a present subjunctive ending -i in the dialect of Marebbe. I suggest later that this parallel with Marebbano, and the parallel with the Italian iotic present subjunctive mentioned by Kramer, have real significance for understanding the phenomenon.

What kind of inflexional pattern existed in Badiot present indicatives and subjunctives before the emergence of the sigmatic present subjunctive? Broadly, the endings of the present subjunctive had in some localities the (originally first conjugation) marker -e, and elsewhere -i. Alton (1879: 102; 105; 107; 113) illustrates the following (Table 13) pattern from first conjugation verb 'love'. There is complete neutralization of inflexion class

²⁶ Although the 1968 reworking 'stützt sich [...] auf das Badiot und zwar des Oberlandes, St. Kassian-Stern-Abtei [...]', rather than Colfosco (Alton-Vittur 1968: 8).

²⁷ Cf. *ALD-II* maps 118, 375, 484, 485, 491.

²⁸ Kramer additionally invokes the influence of the imperfect subjunctive, in whose singular and third person 'ein -s im Auslaut steht'. But the -s of the imperfect subjunctive does not stand 'im Auslaut' in the 2SG, while the -s of the imperfect subjunctive is present in 1PL and 2PL as well (Kramer 1976:84f.). These are clearly two different kinds of -s.

distinctions in the Ladin present subjunctive, in favour of originally first conjugation forms, so that present subjunctive endings are generally²⁹ identical for all conjugations.

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	<i>ame</i>	<i>ames</i>	<i>ama</i>	<i>amon</i>	<i>amès</i>	<i>ama</i>
PRS.SBJV	<i>ame</i>	<i>ames</i>	<i>ame</i>	<i>amonse</i>	<i>amèse</i>	<i>ame</i>

Table 13. Present tense first conjugation morphology in late nineteenth century upper Val Badia

What Alton transcribes as final *-e* (apparently a weakly articulated schwa: see also see also Alton-Vittur 1968: 39) is a reflex of the first conjugation subjunctive marker **-e*. The modern dialect of Rina (*ALD* pt 82), illustrated in Table (14) has a clear *-e* (*ALD-II* maps 482, 483, 488, 491, 492, 493, 497):

	1SG	2SG	3SG	3PL
PRS.IND	'mandʒi 'eat'	'mandʒes	'mandʒa	'mandʒa
PRS.SBJV	'mandʒe	'mandʒes	'mandʒe	'mandʒe

Table 14. Present tense morphology in modern Rina

Elsewhere, we find *-i*. Gartner (1883: 131) records in the first conjugation in San Leonardo an ending *-i* that appears in the 1SG, 3SG and 3PL present subjunctive (Table 15):

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	'po:rte 'carry'	po:rts	'po:rta	pur'tuŋ	pur'taj̥s	'po:rta
PRS.SBJV	'po:rti	po:rts	'po:rti	pur'tuŋze	pur'taj̥ze	'po:rti

Table 15. Present tense morphology in late nineteenth century San Leonardo

That the marker *-i* was characteristic of present subjunctive is also indicated in Gartner's data from Marebbe and S. Vigilio (see also Mair 1973: 90), presented in Table (16):

Marebbe

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.SBJV	'pwarti 'carry'	pwartis	'pwarti	pur'tiŋ	pur'taj̥s	'pwarti

S. Vigilio

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
PRS.IND	'po:rte 'carry'	'po:rtəs	'po:rta	por'tuŋ	por'tej̥s	'po:rta
PRS.SBJV	'po:rti	'po:rti	'po:rti	por'tuŋze	por'tej̥ze	'po:rti

Table 16. Present tense morphology in late nineteenth century Marebbe and San Vigilio

²⁹ Exceptions are the present subjunctive of the verbs 'be' (1SG *si*: 2SG *si:s*: 3SG *si*: 3PL *si:*), and 'give' (specified as having an optional set of forms 1SG *di*: 2SG *di:s*: 3SG *di*: 3PL *di:*).

The present subjunctive pattern with -i reported by Gartner for S. Vigilio is repeated in modern data (*ALD-II* maps 488, 491, 492, 493, 497) for Pieve di Marebbe (point 81), presented in Table (17):

	1SG	2SG	3SG	3PL
PRS.IND	'manji 'eat'	'manjes	'manja	'manja
PRS.SBJV	'manji	'manji	'manji	'manji

Table 17. Present tense morphology in modern Pieve di Marebbe

Overall, then, it seems that much of the Val Badia once had a present subjunctive characterized, in the singular and 3PL, by inflexional -i (or -ə or -e). Now, the fact is that the singular and 3PL forms of the present subjunctive of first conjugation verbs should not have any kind of final vowel at all. The regular and predictable fate of final unstressed -e in Ladin (as extensively found in northern Italo-Romance varieties as well: cf. Rohlfs 2021a: 180f.) is for it to be deleted, the only unstressed final vowel that regularly survives in these varieties being -a. Nonetheless, Romance languages for which one would predict on historical phonological grounds a zero ending in the present subjunctive rarely actually show this predicted result; rather, a final inflexional vowel of some kind is usually present, usually -e or -i in the Ladin area (see, e.g., *AIS* maps 1685, 1686; *ALD-II* maps 491-493, 497; Rohlfs 2021b: 299f.). Mair (1978: 138f.) is probably right in suggesting that -i is a local reflex of unstressed final -e.³⁰ It is more difficult to say where this latter vowel comes from. One possibility is that it was analogically extended from a subset of first conjugation verbs in which final -e was widely preserved after clusters /Cr/ or /Cl/ (cf. Rohlfs 2021a: 181f.; Lausberg 1965: 299).³¹ A further problematic detail is that the 2SG ending of the present subjunctive is reported by Gartner as -i, rather than -is, for S. Vigilio, a pattern which seems to have spread in the modern dialects of Marebbe and the lower Val Badia. The cause of this resemblance with Italian is unclear. It is true that in these dialects -s is often lost for phonological reasons after a stem-final sibilant, and notably in the imperfect subjunctive/conditional (Mair 1973: 90f.; 143), but that particular phonological environment is not systematically encountered in the present subjunctive. Gartner (1883: 151) shows that in the 1880s -s was still retained in the 2SG present subjunctive forms of the verbs 'be' and 'have', even though -i appeared in other verbs. The disappearance of -s, then, is a detail which seems to have a non-phonological motivation, and one wonders whether this might already be the imitation of the modern Italian (first conjugation) present subjunctive. However we seek to explain these facts, the crucial point is this: that -i is, or was, the prevalent present subjunctive marker in Badiot by the nineteenth century, and that this present subjunctive ending, of native

³⁰ Mair is discussing Marebbano, but raising of final unstressed -e to -i is more widespread (cf. reflexes of **sẽmpre* 'always' in *AIS* map 1534; *ALD-I* map 722; *ALD-II* map 208). It is, however, difficult to identify other clear examples of this development specifically for the Val Badia. Kramer (1976: 78) attributes -i to the influence of the fourth conjugation thematic vowel [i], but this is implausible both on historical phonological grounds (final unstressed *-i is regularly deleted) and on morphological grounds (-i is not a marker of present subjunctive in the fourth conjugation).

³¹ This phenomenon similarly affects the 1SG present indicative, originally in -o. See further Lausberg (1966: 273; 277); Rohlfs (2021b: 246f.); Elwert (1972: 283); Salvi (2020: 80). Also Kramer (1976: 71; 79).

origin, will have been homophonous with the standard Italian present subjunctive ending (especially so in those Badiot varieties where even the 2SG present subjunctive ended in -i, as in Italian). How, though, did Badiot get from this situation to the modern sigmatic present subjunctive?

The sigmatic present subjunctive ending in the Val Badia has a paradigmatic distribution (2SG present indicative + 1SG present subjunctive + 3SG present subjunctive + 3PL present subjunctive) of a kind for which there is—so far as I can detect—no parallel anywhere else in the the Val Badia dialects or in any other Ladin variety. It therefore cannot be analogically modelled on any indigenous distributional pattern. However, it displays exactly the pattern of syncretism found in Italian first conjugation verbs, where the relevant desinence is ‘iotic’ (2SG.PRS.IND *canti* ~ 1SG.PRS.SBJV *canti* ~ 2SG.PRS.SBJV *canti* ~ 3SG.PRS.SBJV *canti* ~ 3SG.PRS.SBJV *canti(no)*). We have seen that by the late nineteenth century the singular and 3PL present subjunctive forms of all verbs had -i in the Val Badia, thereby also presenting an accidental resemblance with the desinences found in the Italian first conjugation. My claim is that the Italian iotic syncretism is the model for the Badiot sigmatic syncretism.³²

The situation in the Val Badia in the nineteenth century was that Italian was taught in elementary schools, and had been so since the seventeenth century the language favoured in preaching, confession, and liturgy (for the ideological motives for this preference see, e.g., Palla 2020: 255; 258; Fiorentini 2020: 456). That the inhabitants of the Val Badia knew at least some Italian is confirmed by Alton and by Gartner (see Alton 1879: 3; Gartner 1882: 9; 11; also Belardi 1994: 68). Alton states that Ladin speakers esteemed Italian and actively sought to learn it (as well as German).³³ Until the early 1870s, priority tended to be given to Italian in schools, but thereafter the Austrian authorities sought to exclude it in favour of German (Palla 2020: 254f.), and teaching in Italian in schools was suppressed during the First World War (Salvioni 1917: 28; Coletti, Cordin, and Zamboni 1992: 208; Goebel 2020: 49). After incorporation of the South Tyrol into the Italian state, Italian was reintroduced, and introduced into public administration (Coletti, Cordin, and Zamboni 1992: 208f.). During the Fascist period Italian became the sole language used in schools. Belardi (2003: 35) identifies the twentieth century as the period when Ladin monoglossism disappeared and all Ladin-speakers came to master at least one other language (German or Italian), with interference effects both by and on Ladin.

It is perilous to try to motivate a change in a detail of verb morphology by appeal to Ladin-speakers’ attitudes towards Italian, but we should not ignore the import of Palla’s observation (2020: 259) that ‘[i] ladini, nonostante la vicinanza linguistica all’italiano, percepirono l’annessione al nuovo Stato come qualcosa che andava contro la loro storia, cultura, tradizione, come qualcosa di così diverso da sé da cui la comunità doveva tutelarsi per poter sopravvivere, e di conseguenza la coscienza ladina crebbe, si diffuse, si radicò tra la gente molto di più che nel secolo precedente.’ Might this have been a context in which ‘Ladinization’ of a fundamentally ‘Italian’ morphological phenomenon was favoured? Where Italian was becoming increasingly influential but a sense of distinctive ‘Ladinity’ was also growing, might the ‘compromise solution’ have been that speakers of Badiot sought to ‘Ladinize’ an Italian inflexional pattern by replacing -i (predominantly

³² From what I can observe, the contexts in which the (present) subjunctive in Badiot is *used* are not fundamentally different from those of Italian.

³³ To the best of my knowledge, there is no parallel phenomenon in German (or Bavarian dialects).

the marker of 2SG) with the native 2SG marker *-(e)s*?³⁴ What they did, I suggest, was to implement an Italian *pattern* of paradigmatic distribution, but one that uses native Ladin morphological *matter*.³⁵ This is a *calque* of the Italian pattern of syncretism.

4. Some theoretical implications. Syncretism, ‘naturalness’, and ‘morphomic calquing’

4.1 ‘Naturalness’

My claim is that a pattern of syncretism which arose in early Italo-Romance as an accidental consequence of sound change, has been replicated at least³⁶ twice, in different ways and independently, in the Romance languages of Italy. In central Italy, including Tuscan, an analogical change originally affecting just one member of the relevant syncretic set of cells (the 2SG) comes to affect the whole of that set, thereby preserving (but also slightly modifying) an existing syncretic pattern in the first conjugation. Perhaps a millennium later, dialects of the Val Badia replicate the Italian syncretism, using native morphological material.

It is striking that more than once, and centuries apart, the ‘price’ of replicating the syncretism has been the blurring of a previously sharply defined correlation between form and meaning. In Tuscan and elsewhere in central Italy, a change whose very motivation appears to have been the generalization of *-i* as sole marker of 2SG ‘overshoots’, so to speak, so that the newly created form also appears in specific non-second-person cells of the present subjunctive. In Badiot, the calquing of the Italian pattern has meant that *-s*, formerly a desinence uniquely associated with 2SG, now also systematically occurs in some non-second-person cells of the present subjunctive. The ‘natural’ relationship such that *-i*, or *-s*, is sole exponent of 2SG is not in fact compromised: almost³⁷ all 2SG forms came to end in *-i*, in Tuscan, and continued to end in *-s*, in Badiot. What changes is that the innovatory syncretisms undermine the *biuniqueness* of the form-meaning relationship: the meaning ‘second person singular’ is still solely expressed by *-i* or *-s*, but *-i* or *-s* no longer solely expresses the meaning ‘second person singular’. This chimes with the observation of Maiden (2018: 312f.), who

³⁴ There is at least one other respect in which Badiot morphology shows a ‘nativizing’ reaction to Italian morphological influence. Alton (1879: 106f.), for Colfosco, gives imperfect indicative forms in *-v-* (a'mava, ba'tova, al'diva; cf. Italian *amava, batteva, udiva*) but also alternatives without *-v-*. Yet corresponding forms in the late twentieth century lack *-v-* (e.g., 3SG.IPF.IND man'dža:, doŋ'mi:; cf. Alton-Vittur 1968: 40; *ALD-II* maps 484-86, 601, 725, for point 89, Colfosco). For Pieve di Marebbe (Pfarre), Gartner (1883: 132; 139; 144) gives imperfect indicative forms in *-v-*, yet the *ALD* data from the 1990s only show forms without *-v-*. In these cases morphological material shared with Italian seems to have been rejected in favour of more locally distinctive forms. For some other Italian influences on Ladin morphosyntax, see Videsott (2006: 1749).

³⁵ Cf. Sakel (2007).

³⁶ Badiot is not, in fact, the only case of a sigmatic present subjunctive. A similar phenomenon appears in certain north-eastern Lombard dialects, where there is *-s* in the 1SG, 3SG and 3PL present subjunctive, in all conjugations. More rarely, *-s* also appears in the 2SG present subjunctive. The phenomenon is described with great clarity by Rührlinger (2015), principally on the basis of material from *ALD*. Space will not allow me to offer a properly detailed analysis of the facts here (for which see Maiden 2022). I do not believe that this sigmatic subjunctive is *directly* connected with what we see in the Val Badia, but I believe that it does reflect contact with the same pattern of syncretism, in a different Italo-Romance dialect. As argued in Maiden (2022), while in Badiot the change is motivated by contact with Italian, in the north-eastern Lombard dialects it is probably due to contact with northern Italo-Romance dialects which had inherited the same pattern of syncretism as that found in early Tuscan.

³⁷ Some Tuscan, and nearly all Badiot, imperatives are exceptions.

suggests, broadly, that the diachronic replication of morphomic patterns resolves what might be described as the ‘paradigm distribution problem’, the problem of knowing where in the paradigm to distribute alternative variant forms when they arise in a language. Faced with variation in morphological exponents, speakers favour stable and predictable patterns for distributing them within inflexional paradigms.³⁸ In early Tuscan a situation arose (and endured over some time) in which, for example, *cante* coexisted with *canti* in the 2SG, as a consequence of the analogical generalization of -i as 2SG marker. In this situation, not only did two forms correspond to one meaning, but an existing syncretic pattern was disrupted (that between 2SG.PRS.IND *cante*, 1SG.PRS.SBJV *cante*, 3PRS.SBJV *cante(no)*). The ultimate outcome allowed the language producer to have the ‘best of both worlds’: -i was generalized as a 2SG marker, but the existing syncretic pattern was also ‘saved’ by generalization of -i to all relevant cells. The same appears to be true for Badiot: here speakers have kept -s as their stable and recurrent 2SG marker, but have also stably and predictably redistributed that marker according to a syncretic model acquired from Italian (and possibly favoured by some internal factors, as we have seen). From the point of view of the hearer, the result is ‘unnatural’ to the extent that the relevant forms become ambiguous with regard to person, number, and mood. In practical terms, the effects are probably negligible. In both Tuscan and Badiot, mood—and specifically selection of the subjunctive—is often independently predictable from the broader syntactic and semantic context, as more generally in Romance (see, e.g., Quer 2016: 957-965). As for the person and number of the subject, the linguistic context frequently serves to remove ambiguity,³⁹ and in any case the ‘problem’ in Tuscan is (originally) limited to the first conjugation. In Badiot the person and number of the subject tend to be distinguished by clitic subject forms (see, e.g., Salvi 2016: 159; 165) so that, in effect, the inflexional ending is functionally redundant and the communicative disruption caused by the syncretism therefore minimal. In short, the morphomic changes addressed in the present study reflect a maximalization by speakers of predictability of distribution in which violation of ‘naturalness’ is actually minimal and which apparently comports a minimal increase in cognitive effort for hearers.

4.2 *Morphomic calquing and the language-specificity of morphomic patterns*

While it is widely acknowledged that morphomic patterns in inflexional paradigms are able to be replicated in diachrony from generation to generation (see, e.g., Esher 2014; O’Neill 2014; Maiden 2018), it seems *a priori* unlikely that morphomic patterns could ever be ‘borrowed’ from one language into another one. After all, morphomic patterns are the diametrical opposite of the most common (or most detectable?) type of linguistic borrowing, that involving loanwords. With these, a form denoting a clearly defined, and often culturally novel, referent is taken from one language into another: one thinks, for example, of the borrowing into English from Spanish, and there from Nahuatl, of *tomato* or *chocolate*. Quite unlike loanwords, morphomic patterns exist independently of the phonological forms which manifest them, and may be assigned no referential or functional meaning. They therefore seem the most improbable candidates for any kind of ‘borrowing’, and the general assumption in the literature seems to be that they are not

³⁸ An anonymous reviewer suggests that one might speak of a (paradigmatic) ‘template’.

³⁹ Indeed, in Tuscan the the 2SG subjunctive is generally accompanied by a disambiguatory explicit 2SG subject pronoun. See also Vanelli (2014: 143n16).

borrowed (cf. Kossman 2015; Gardani 2018).⁴⁰ Good evidence for the borrowing of morphomic patterns under contact conditions has certainly hitherto been lacking. It is true that Elson (2017) gives an example of an alleged morphological borrowing from middle Bulgarian into Romanian verb morphology, and his labelling of the relevant phenomena as ‘realizational’ seems to correspond very closely to the notion ‘morphomic’. If Elson’s analysis of the facts were correct, we would indeed have a case of morphomic borrowing. However, Maiden (2021b) demonstrates that the relevant facts are unlikely to have anything to do with language contact, because—among other reasons—exactly the same paradigmatic pattern is found in numerous other Romance varieties which were never in contact with any Slavonic language. The developments we have seen in Badiot perhaps, at last, really do provide evidence that borrowing of a morphomic pattern is possible.

If this is true, it tends to contradict a criterion developed to test, cross-linguistically, whether some assumed morphomic phenomenon really is ‘morphomic’—i.e., whether it is a matter of ‘morphology by itself’, and is not synchronically determined by any functional or phonological factor. Maiden (2018: 2; 22) proposes language-specific ‘uniqueness’ as a negative test of ‘morphomicity’: if some putative morphomic pattern exists in some language, it is unlikely to be genuinely morphomic if that same pattern can be shown also to exist in some other language (and shared inheritance can be excluded). The types of morphomic structure in Romance languages surveyed by Maiden (2018) are by and large the fortuitous, idiosyncratic, result of accumulated changes in the history of the relevant languages which are inherently unlikely to have occurred in the same manner and order in other languages. The same morpheme, it is argued, is therefore highly unlikely to recur in other languages. If some putatively morphomic pattern turns out not to be ‘unique’ in this way, that should prompt the suspicion that the phenomenon is not morphomic at all, but motivated by some universally available extramorphological factor which the investigator has simply failed to detect. Maiden’s ‘uniqueness’ criterion has been criticized by Herce (2019: 130) who believes that it is an unnecessary and unwelcome deterrent to typological and comparative research on morphomic structures. While Herce’s objection is overstated (see Maiden 2021a: 94f. for discussion), and the uniqueness criterion can be defended as a handy general negative diagnostic of morphomhood, the evidence from Badiot that morphomic patterns actually can be ‘calqued’ from one language into another (albeit into a closely cognate language with a very similar overall morphological structure) weakens that criterion and adds to arguments that morphomic patterns can indeed appear in languages which are unrelated to each other in any relevant sense, due to borrowing. Maiden (2021a: 95n7) also considers some other possible cases of ‘non-unique’ morphemes.

5. Conclusion

This study of the ‘long’ history of a syncretism has made some surprising connexions and reached some surprising conclusions. An aspect of the morphological structure of modern Italian which had seemed so trivial as to have passed basically unnoticed by linguists, turns out to have a complex history shared with many other Italo-Romance varieties, and one which suggests a significant disregard on the part of speakers for transparent signalling of grammatical categories in favour of robust predictability of paradigmatic

⁴⁰ Gardani (2018: 4f.; 10-12) does identify ‘abstract’ morphological patterning in borrowing, but what is principally involved is the ordering of constituents in compounds.

patterning. And a puzzling, recent and abrupt, change in the morphology of some Ladin dialects appears to have been triggered by exposure to that very same phenomenon in the morphology of a different language, Italian. It thereby flies in the face of what may seem to be common-sense assumptions about what can be ‘borrowed’ between languages, and invites a more nuanced appreciation of the value of ‘uniqueness’ in typological studies of morphomic structures.

References

- AIS = JABERG, K. and JUD, J. (1928-1940.), *Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz*. Zofingen: Ringier
- ALD-I = GOEBL, H., BAUER, R. AND HAIMERL, E. (1998), *Atlant linguistisch dl ladin dolomitich y di dialec vejins, 1a pert / Atlante linguistico del ladino dolomitico e dei dialetti limifrofi, 1a parte / Sprachatlas des Dolomitenladinischen und angrenzender Dialekte*, 1. Teil, 7 vol., Wiesbaden, Reichert.
- ALD-II = GOEBL, H. (2012), *Atlant linguistisch dl ladin dolomitich y di dialec vejins, 2a pert / Atlante linguistico del ladino dolomitico e dei dialetti limitrofi, 2a parte / Sprachatlas des Dolomitenladinischen und angrenzender Dialekte*, 2. Teil, 7 vol., Strasbourg, Éditions de Linguistique et de Philologie.
- ALEIC = BOTTIGLIONI, G. (1933-42). *Atlante linguistico-etnografico italiano della Corsica*. Pisa
- ALTON, J. (1879), *Die ladinische Idiome in Ladinien, Gröden, Fassa, Buchenstein, Ampezzo*, Innsbruck, Verlag de Wagner’schen Universitaets-Buchhandlung
- ALTON, J. and VITTUR, F. (1968). *L ladin dla Val Badia. Beitrag zu einer Grammatik des Dolomitenladinischen neu bearbeitet und ergänzt von Franz Vittur unter Mitarbeit von Guntram Plangg mit Anmerkungen für das Marebanische von Alex Balsissera*, Brixen, Weger.
- ARONOFF, M. (1994), *Morphology By Itself*, Cambridge MA, MIT Press.
- AZARETTI, E. (1982), *L’evoluzione dei dialetti liguri esaminata attraverso la grammatica storica del ventimigliese*, Sanremo, Casablanca.
- BAERMAN, M. (2009). *Case Syncretism*, in MALCHUKOV, A. and SPENCER, A. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 219-30.
- BAUER, R. and CASALICCHIO, J. (2017). *Morphologie und Syntax im Projekt ALD-DM*, in «Ladinia 41», pp. 81-108.
- BELARDI, W. (1994). *Profilo storico della lingua e della letteratura ladina*. Rome: il Calamo
- BELARDI, W. (2003). *Breve storia della lingua e della letteratura ladina*. San Martin de Tor: Istitut Ladin ‘Micurà de Rü’
- BERMÚDEZ-OTERO, R. and LUÍS, A. (2016). *A view of the morphome debate*. In Luís, A. & Bermúdez-Otero, R. (eds) *The Morphome Debate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 309-340
- CHIODI TISCHER, U. (1981). *Die Mundart von Sisco (Korsika)*. Frankfurt: Lang
- COLETTI, V., CORDIN, P., ZAMBONI, A. (1992). *Il Trentino e l’Alto Adige*. In Bruni, Francesco (ed.), *L’italiano nelle regioni. Lingua nazionale e identità regionali*. Turin: UTET, 178-219.
- DALBERA-STEFANAGGI, M.-J. (1983), *La flexion verbale et sa dynamique: un des traits de différenciation verbale en corse*, «Études corses», 20/21, pp. 353-83.

- ELSON, M. (2017), *On the history of radical-final palatalization in Romanian conjugation: the interaction of phonetic phenomena with non-phonetic*. «Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie», 133, pp. 844-92.
- ELWERT, W. (1972), *Die Mundart des Fassa-Tals*, Wiesbaden, Steiner.
- ESHER, L. (2014). *Autonomous morphology and extramorphological coherence*. «Morphology», 24, pp. 325-350.
- FANTI, R. (1939), *Note fonetiche e morfologiche sul dialetto di Ascrea*, «L'Italia dialettale», 15, pp. 101-133.
- FIorentini, I. (2020), *Il plurilinguismo dei ladini e le languages in contact nell'area ladina*, in VIDESOTT, Paul, VIDESOTT, Ruth, and CASALICCHIO, Jan (eds) *Manuale di linguistica ladina*, Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, pp. 452-469.
- GARDANI, F. (2018). *On morphological borrowing*. «Language and Linguistics Compass» 12, <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12302>.
- GARTNER, T. (1882), *Viaggi ladini*, Linz, Wimmer.
- GARTNER, T. (1883), *Raetoromanische Grammatik*, Heilbronn, Henninger.
- GOEBL, H. (2020), *Il ladino e i ladini: glotto- e etnogenesi*, in VIDESOTT, Paul, VIDESOTT, Ruth, and CASALICCHIO, Jan (eds) *Manuale di linguistica ladina*, Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, pp. 35-66.
- HAASE, M. (1999), *Dialektynamik in Mittelitalien. Sprachveränderungsprozesse im umbrischen Appenineräum*, Tübingen, Stauffenburg.
- HASPELMATH, M. and SIMS, A. (2010), *Understanding Morphology*, London, Hodder.
- HAUMER, H. (1934). *Syntax und Flexion des Verbums in den aquilanischen Chroniken*, Jena, Gronau.
- HENRI, F. (2021), *Morphomic structure in Mauritian Kreol: on change, complexity and creolization*, «Morphology», 31, 447-489.
- HERCE, B. (2019), *Morpheme interactions*, «Morphology», 29, 109-132.
- KOSSMANN, M. (2015), *Contact-induced change*, in BAERMAN, M. (ed), *The Oxford Handbook of Inflection*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 251-271.
- KRAMER, J., (1976), *Historische Grammatik des Dolomitenladinischen: Formenlehre*, Gebrunn bei Würzburg, Lehmann.
- KRAMER, J. (1989), *Ladinisch: Grammatikographie und Lexikographie*, in HOLTUS, G., METZELTIN, M., and SCHMITT, C. (eds), *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik III Die einzelnen romanischen Sprachen und Sprachgebiete von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart. Rumänisch, Dalmatisch/Istroromanisch, Friaulisch, Ladinisch, Bündnerromanisch*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, pp. 757-763.
- LAUSBERG, H. (1965), *Lingüística románica I: Fonética*, Madrid, Gredos.
- LAUSBERG, H. (1966), *Lingüística románica II: Morfología*, Madrid, Gredos.
- MAIDEN, M. (1995), *A Linguistic History of Italian*, London, Longman.
- MAIDEN, M. (1996), *On the Romance inflectional endings -i and -e*, «Romance Philology», 50, pp. 147-82
- MAIDEN, M. (2007), *On the morphology of Italo-Romance imperatives*, in BENTLEY, D. and LEDGEWAY, A. (eds), *Sui dialetti italo-romanzi: saggi in onore di Nigel B. Vincent*, Norfolk, Biddles, pp. 148-64.
- MAIDEN, M. (2016a), *Italo-Romance metaphony and the Tuscan diphthongs*. «Transactions of the Philological Society», 114, pp. 198-232.

- MAIDEN, M. (2016b), *Some lessons from history. Morphemes in diachrony*, in LUÍS, A. and BERMÚDEZ-OTERO, R. (eds), *The Morpheme Debate*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 33-63.
- MAIDEN, M. (2018), *The Romance Verb. Morphomic Structure in Diachrony*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- MAIDEN, M. (2021a), *The morpheme*, «Annual Review of Linguistics», 7, pp. 89-108.
- MAIDEN, M. (2021b), *Establishing contact. Slavonic influence on Romanian morphology?*, «Journal of Language Contact», 14, pp. 24-52.
- MAIDEN, M. (2022), *The sigmatic subjunctive in north-eastern Lombard dialects: an explanation?*, <https://www.academia.edu/91654452>
- MAIDEN, M. (to appear), *Historical morphology*, in LEDGEWAY, A. and MAIDEN, M. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Italian Language*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- MAIR, W. (1973), *Ennebergische Morphologie. Analyse eines dolomitenladinischen Flexion-systems*, Innsbruck, Institut für romanische Philologie.
- MAIR, W. (1978), *Eine typologische Untersuchung zur dolomitenladinischen Verba-flexion*, «Mondo ladino», 2, pp. 101-157
- MEYER-LÜBKE, W. (1895), *Grammaire des langues romanes II. Morphologie*, Paris, Welter.
- MOLING, S. (2016), *Dizionario italiano-ladino Val Badia. Dizionar ladin Val badia – italian*, S. Martin de Tor, Istitut ladin Micurà de Rü. <https://itavalbadia.ladinternet.it/>.
- MUSSAFIA, A. (1871), *Darstellung der romagnolischen Mundart*, Vienna, Gerold's Sohn.
- NIELSEN WHITEHEAD, B. (2012), *On Italian, Ibero-Romance and Romanian imperatives in -i and the fate of Latin final -e*, «Revue romane», 47, pp. 283-304.
- O'NEILL, P. (2014), *The morpheme in constructive and abstractive models of morphology*, «Morphology», 24, pp. 25-70.
- PALLA, L. (2020), *Coscienza linguistica e identità ladina*, in VIDESOTT, Paul, VIDESOTT, Ruth, and CASALICCHIO, Jan (eds) *Manuale di linguistica ladina*, Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, pp. 243-279.
- PELLICIARDI, F. (1977), *Grammatica della lingua romagnola: la lèngva dla mi tèra*, Imola, Galeati.
- POPE, M. (1952), *From Latin to Modern French*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- QUER, J. (2016), *Mood*, in LEDGEWAY, A. and MAIDEN, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 954-966
- ROHLFS, G. (2021a), *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti: fonetica*, Bologna, il Mulino.
- ROHLFS, G. (2021b), *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti: morfologia*, Bologna, il Mulino.
- ROUND, E. (2015), *Rhizomorphemes, meromorphemes, and metamorphemes*, in BAERMAN, M., BROWN, D., and CORBETT, G. (eds), *Understanding and Measuring Morphological Complexity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 29-52.
- RÜHRLINGER, B. (2015), *Morfologia verbale dei dialetti lombardi nord-orientali nel loro contesto geolinguistico*, Strasbourg, EliPhi.
- SAKEL, J. (2007), *Types of loan: matter and pattern*, in MATRAS, Y. and SAKEL, J. (eds), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Berlin-New-York, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 15-29.

- SALVI, G. (2016). *Ladin* in LEDGEWAY, A. and MAIDEN, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 154-168.
- SALVI, G. (2020), *Il ladino e le sue caratteristiche*, in VIDESOTT, Paul, VIDESOTT, Ruth, and CASALICCHIO, Jan (eds) *Manuale di linguistica ladina*, Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter, pp. 67-108.
- SALVIONI, C. (1917), *Ladinia e Italia*, Pavia, Fusi.
- SCHÜRR, F. (1918), *Romagnolische dialektstudien. Lautlehre alter Texte*, Vienna, Hölder.
- SCHÜRR, F. (1919), *Romagnolische dialektstudien. Lautlehre lebender Mundarten*, Vienna, Hölder.
- SCHÜRR, F. (1974), *La voce della Romagna*, Ravenna, Girasole.
- SESTITO, F. (2004), *Aspetti linguistici di un documento inedito dell'assisano quattrocentesco: lo statuto di Radicofani (1441)*, «Studi di linguistica italiana», 30, pp. 161-203.
- SMITH, J. C. (2020), *Old, Middle, and Modern: temporality and typology*, in ALLAN, K. (ed.), *Dynamic Language Changes: looking in and across languages*, Singapore, Springer Nature, pp. 183-200.
- STUMP, G. (2019), *Paradigm Function Morphology*, in AUDRING, J. and MASINI, F. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Morphological Theory*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 219-230.
- TALL = *Tratament automatic dl lingaz ladin. corpuslad. corpuslad.ladintal.it*
- TEKAVČIĆ, P. (1980), *Grammatica storica dell'italiano II: Morfosintassi*, Bologna, il Mulino.
- VALENTINI, E. (ed) (2001), *Gramatica dl ladin standard*, Vich/SanMartin de Tor/Bolzano, Union Generela di Ladins dles Dolomites/Istitut Cultural Ladin 'Majon di fascegn'/ Istitut Cultural Ladin 'Micurà de Rù'/Istitut Pedagogich Ladin.
- VANELLI, L., (2013), *Variazione desinenziale nella flessione verbale dell'italiano antico*, in CASANOVA HERRERO, E., and CALVO RIGUAL, C. (eds), *Actas del XXVIé Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y de Filología Románicas*, II, Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter, pp. 459-471.
- VANELLI, L. (2014), *Person endings in the old Italian verb system*, in BENINCÀ, P., LEDGEWAY, A., and VINCENT, N. (eds), *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 131-151.
- VENNEMANN, T. (1978), *Phonetic and conceptual analogy*, in BALDI, P. and WERTH, R. (eds), *Readings in Historical Phonology*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 258-274.
- VIDESOTT, P. (2006), *Innerromanische Sprachkontakte: Italienisch und Dolomitenladinisch. Contacts linguistiques intraromans: italien et ladin Romanische*, in ERNST, G., GLEBGEN, M.-D., SCHMITT, C., & SCHWEICKARD, W. (eds) *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Histoire linguistique de la Romania. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen. Manuel international d'histoire linguistique de la Romania II*, Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, pp. 1743-1751.
- WENDRINER, R. (1889), *Die paduanische Mundart bei Ruzante*, Breslau, Koebner.