

Motion verb constructions and parameters of grammaticalization



PSECOMAC
2019

Pseudo-Coordination and
Multiple Agreement Constructions

The Second Meeting

Silvio Cruschina
(*University of Helsinki*)

&

Fabio Del Prete
(*CNRS & University of Toulouse*)

Outline

Motion verb constructions (MVCs) and parameters of grammaticalization

1. Introduction
2. Sicilian DIC
3. French *venir de* (+ infinitive)
4. Italian MVCs
5. Spanish MVCs (*ir + a + infinitive*)
6. Conclusions and final remarks

1.1. Two types of motion verb constructions (MVCs)

We compare the grammaticalization status of two types of MVCs:

- (i) pseudo-coordination MVCs (PC-MVCs)
- (ii) canonical MVCs

- Type (i) = *Doubly Inflected Construction* (DIC) in Sicilian → (1a)
- Type (ii) = *Infinitival Construction* (IC) in Sicilian/Romance → (1b)

- (1) a. *Vaju a pigghiu u pani.*
go.PRS.1SG to take.PRS.1SG the bread
- b. *Vaju a pigghiari u pani.*
go.PRS.1SG to take.INF the bread
'I go to fetch the bread.'

(*Marsala, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 373*)

1.2. Goal of the paper

- to assess the relative degree of grammaticalization of the two types of MVCs

Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003) compare DIC with IC and, on the basis of syntactic and semantics tests, show that DIC is monoclausal:

- the V1 motion verbs in DIC are “lexical categories merged as functional heads” in the extended projection of the V2.
 - these verbs are “semi-lexical” – even if it is true that they lack or have lost their lexical properties, they still retain a motion meaning (see also Cardinaletti & Giusti 2019, Di Caro 2019).
- ☞ DIC seems to have undergone syntactic but not semantic grammaticalization.

1.3 Parameters of grammaticalization

We investigate these aspects in more detail by comparing the parameters of grammaticalization (a)-(d) (see Heine 1993, Hopper & Traugott 2003, Eckardt 2006, a.o.) and examine their interplay in MVCs:

- (a) (morpho-)phonological erosion;
- (b) syntactic restructuring;
- (c) decategorialization and argument restructuring;
- (d) semantic and functional change.

1.4. Our proposal

By comparing the two types of MVCs above, we show that these parameters do not necessarily operate hand in hand, but may apply independently from one another. In some cases, the simultaneous application of the parameters may depend on the specific lexical item, as in the case of the verb GO in PC-MVCs.

Outline

Motion verb constructions (MVCs) and parameters of grammaticalization

1. Introduction
2. Sicilian DIC
3. French *venir de* (+ infinitive)
4. Italian MVCs
5. Spanish MVCs (*ir + a + infinitive*)
6. Conclusions and final remarks

2.1. Syntactic restructuring

In DIC, syntactic restructuring (*i.e.*, monoclausality; cf. clitic climbing) has taken place (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001: 388):

(2) = obligatory clitic climbing with DIC

(3) = optional with IC (preferences depend on the dialect)

- (2) a. *U vaju a pigghiu.*
 it= go.PRS.1SG to take.PRS.1SG
- b. **Vaju a pigghiulu.*
 go.PRS.1SG to take.PRS.1SG =it
 ‘I go to fetch it.’

syntactic and semantic
 ‘concatenation’ between V1 & V2

- (3) a. *U vaju a pigghiari.*
 it= go.PRS.1SG to take.INF
- b. *Vaj u a pigghiallu.*
 go.PRS.1SG to take.INF =it
 ‘I go to fetch it.’

2.2. (Morpho-)phonological erosion

The V1s in DIC display the expected phonological forms and inflectional endings, they show no (morpho-)phonological erosion (except for GO, cf. *infra*).

| Dialect of Mussomeli | <i>jiri</i> 'go' | <i>viniri</i> 'come' | <i>passari</i> 'come by' | <i>mannari</i> 'send' |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1SG | 'vajʊ | 'viəŋŋʊ | 'passʊ | 'mannʊ |
| 2SG | 'va(ɪ) | 'viəŋɪ | 'passɪ | 'mannɪ |
| 3SG | 'va | 'vɛŋɪ | 'passa | 'manna |
| 1PL | 'jamʊ | vi'niəmʊ | pas'samʊ | man'nam ʊ |
| 2PL | 'jɪɪ | vi'nɪɪ | pas'satɪ | man'natɪ |
| 3PL | 'vannʊ | 'viənnʊ | 'passanʊ | 'mannanʊ |
| 2SG.IMP | 'va | 'viəŋɪ | 'passa | 'manna |

2.3. Decategorialization and argument restructuring

The motion verbs behave as functional verbs with respect to syntactic properties and their argument structure

(4) a. * *Peppe va a mancia agghiri a casa.*
 Peppe go.3SG a eat.3SG towards home
 (*Intended reading: ‘Peppe goes home to eat.’*)

b. * *Peppe va a mancia c’ a machina.*
 Peppe go.3SG a eat.3SG with the car
 (*Intended reading: ‘Peppe goes to eat by car.’*)

Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001, 2003) take the unacceptability of these sentences as evidence that *va* does not project either a goal or an instrumental role in DIC.

2.3. Decategorialization and argument restructuring

- It is plausible that the argument structure of these verbs has been subject to an overall readjustment, in the construction of a complex predicate, while their thematic properties are preserved (see Del Prete & Todaro 2019):

Full Compatibility: *A locative or instrumental adverbial in a DIC is acceptable only if it is compatible with both V1 and V2.*

(4) a. * *Peppe va a mancia agghiri a casa.*
 Peppe go.3SG a eat.3SG towards home

b. * *Peppe va a mancia c' a machina.*
 Peppe go.3SG a eat.3SG with the car

☞ *agghiri a casa* and *c' a machina* are bad in (4a) and (4b) because they are (semantically or pragmatically) only compatible with either V1 or V2, but not with both.

2.3. Decategorialization and argument restructuring

Full Compatibility: *A locative or instrumental adverbial in a DIC is acceptable only if it is compatible with both V1 and V2.*

(5) a. *Peppe va a mancia a casa.*
 Peppe go.3SG a eat.3SG at home
 ‘Peppe goes to eat at home.’

b. *Peppe u va a pigghia c' a machina.*
 Peppe him=go.3SG a take.3SG with the car
 ‘Peppe goes to picks him up by car.’

☞ *a casa* is the GOAL of V1 and the LOCATION of V2 in (5a), while *c'a machina* is compatible with both V1 and V2 as INSTRUMENT in (5b).

2.4. Semantic and functional change

The global meaning of DIC is similar to the global meaning of IC in that both contain a motion event subcomponent, which could be captured in aspectual terms (*andative* and *venitive* aspects), at least for COME/GO as V1 (cf. e.g. Sebba 1987, Givón 1991, Aikhenvald 2006, Cruschina 2013).

- (1') a. *Vaju a pigghiu u pani.*
 go.PRS.1SG to take.PRS.1SG the bread
- b. *Vaju a pigghiari u pani.*
 go.PRS.1SG to take.INF the bread
 ‘I go to fetch the bread.’

2.5. Parameters of grammaticalization: Summing up

| Parameters | Sicilian DIC |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| (morpho-)phonological erosion | - |
| syntactic restructuring | + |
| decategorialization and argument restructuring | + |
| semantic and functional change | - |

2.6. The verb GO: erosion and semantic/functional change

The only verb that shows both (morpho-)phonological erosion and semantic/functional change in DIC is GO:

- (i) the inflected forms of this verb compete in an invariable form (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001) and, in some dialects, procliticize onto V2 (Di Caro 2015: 62-68, 2018, 2019);
- (ii) this verb may be used as an emphatic tense marker expressing surprise or unexpectedness (Sornicola 1976: 68, Cruschina 2013: 298, *forthcoming*).

▪ Invariable forms

| | | | | | | |
|--------|-----|--------------|--------------------|---|-----------|--------------------|
| (6) | 1SG | <i>vaju</i> | <i>a pigghiu</i> | / | <i>va</i> | <i>a pigghiu</i> |
| | 2SG | <i>vai</i> | <i>a pigghi</i> | / | <i>va</i> | <i>a pigghi</i> |
| | 3SG | <i>va</i> | <i>a pigghia</i> | / | <i>va</i> | <i>a pigghia</i> |
| | 3PL | <i>vannu</i> | <i>a pigghianu</i> | / | <i>va</i> | <i>a pigghianu</i> |
| IMPER. | 2SG | <i>va</i> | <i>pigghia</i> | / | <i>va</i> | <i>pigghia</i> |

2.6. The verb GO: erosion and semantic/functional change

▪ Cliticization/affixation

- (7) a. *Voppigghju u pani.* 1SG (Marina di Ragusa, Sicily)
 go+fetch.1SG the bread
 b. *Voppigghi u pani.* 2SG
 c. *Vopigghja u pani.* 3SG [full paradigm] ...
 d. *Voppigghjamu u pani.* 1PL
 e. *Voppigghjati u pani.* 2PL
 c. *Voppigghjanu u pani.* 3PL

- (8) a. *Occattu u giunnali.* 1SG (Acireale, Sicily)
 go+buy.1SG the newspaper
 b. *Occatti u giunnali.* 2SG
 c. *Occattunu u giunnali.* 3PL
 ... [full paradigm] (Di Caro 2015: 62-68, 2018, 2019)

2.6. The verb GO: erosion and semantic/functional change

▪ Surprise and unexpectedness

(9) *Vaiu a ssientu ca iddu ci fici stu tuortu a sso mughieri.*
 go.PRS.1SG a hear.PRS.1SG that he her=do.PST.3SG this wrong to his wife
 ‘I heard that he did such a wrong to his wife.’
 (Sornicola 1976: 68)

(10) *Cuannu u vittu ca sunava nna banna, vaju*
 when him=see.PST.1SG that play.PST.3SG in-the band go.PRS.1SG
a pruvu na gioia!
 a feel.PRS.1SG a joy
 ‘When I saw him play in the band, I felt such a joy!’
 (Cruschina 2013: 298)

2.6. The verb GO: erosion and semantic/functional change

- **Surprise and unexpectedness**

☞ The infinitival construction (IC) is not possible with this meaning/in this context in Sicilian:

(10') **Cuannu u vitti ca sunava nna banna,*
 when him=see.PST.1SG that play.IMRF.PST.3SG in-the band
vaju a pruvari na gioia!
 go.PRS.1SG to feel.INF a joy

2.6. The verb GO: erosion and semantic/functional change

However, these two parameters do not necessarily apply simultaneously and are independent from each other.

☞ Uses of GO as emphasis or ‘mirative’ marker are independent from phonological erosion and are also possible with IC in Romance (cf. (11)-(12)) and in other MVCs in other languages:

(11) *Esther est allée s’ imaginer que tu l’aimais.* (French)

Esther is gone REFL imagine that you her=love

‘Esther had this crazy idea that you were in love with her.’ (Tellier 2015:159)

(Italian)

(12) *Avevo appena pulito per terra e mi va a cadere la teiera.*

had.1SG just cleaned for floor and on-me=goes to fell.INF the teapot

‘I had just cleaned the floor when the teapot fell down.’

2.6. The verb GO: erosion and semantic/functional change

- (13) *Ramón fue y se cayó.*
 Ramon went and REFL fell
 ‘Ramon unexpectedly fell.’
 (Spanish: Arnaiz & Camacho 1999: 318, cited in Ross 2016: 3)
- (11) *Hon har gått och gift sig.* (Swedish)
 she have.PRS go.SUP and marry.SUP REFL
 ‘It so happens that she got married.’ (Josefsson 2014: 27)
- (12) a. *He went and hit me.* (English)
 (Carden & Pesetsky 1977: 89, cited in De Vos 2005: 47)
 b. *Look at what he went and did this time!* (Ross 2016: 2)

2.6. The verb GO: parameters of grammaticalization

| Parameters | Sicilian DIC with GO |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| (morpho-)phonological erosion | (+) |
| syntactic restructuring | + |
| decategorialization and argument restructuring | + |
| semantic and functional change | (+) |

(+) → possible, but not obligatory!

Outline

Motion verb constructions (MVCs) and parameters of grammaticalization

1. Introduction
2. Sicilian DIC
3. French *venir de* (+ infinitive)
4. Italian MVCs
5. Spanish MVCs (*ir + a + infinitive*)
6. Conclusions and final remarks

3. French *venir de* (+ infinitive)

Syntactic restructuring is generally absent in French (cf. (13a), which shows the agrammaticality of clitic climbing), and the infinitival MVC *venir de* (+ infinitive) used to express recent past is no exception to this generalization. The construction, however, has clearly undergone semantic/functional change, as shown in (13b), where the motion verb COME cannot select a locative argument:

- (13) a. *Je* (**le*) *viens de (le) faire.*
 I it= come of it do.INF
- b. *Je* *viens (*ici) de le faire.*
 I come there of it do.INF
 ‘I just did it.’

3. French *venir de* (+ infinitive)

| Parameters | French <i>venir de</i> |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| (morpho-)phonological erosion | - |
| syntactic restructuring | - |
| decategorialization and argument restructuring | + |
| semantic and functional change | + |

Outline

Motion verb constructions (MVCs) and parameters of grammaticalization

1. Introduction
2. Sicilian DIC
3. French *venir de* (+ infinitive)
4. Italian MVCs
5. Spanish MVCs (*ir + a + infinitive*)
6. Conclusions and final remarks

4. Italian MVCs

Italian MVCs are typical restructuring contexts (syntactically), though only optionally (Rizzi 1982, but see Cinque 2006 for a different claim), but display the expected argument structure. This implies that an instrumental complement compatible with the motion verb can only interpose between the motion verb and the preposition in the absence of clitic climbing (and hence restructuring) (cf. (14a) vs (14b)):

- (14)a. *Vado (con la macchina) a prenderlo (con la macchina).*
 go.1SG with the car to take=him with the car
- b. *Lo vado (*con la macchina) a prendere (con la macchina).*
 him=go.1SG with the car to take=him with the car
 ‘I go (and) take him by car.’

- ☞ Neither ((morpho-)phonological erosion nor semantic/functional change characterize Italian MVCs.

4. Italian MVCs

| Parameters | Italian IC |
|------------------------------------------------|------------|
| (morpho-)phonological erosion | - |
| syntactic restructuring | + |
| decategorialization and argument restructuring | - |
| semantic and functional change | - |

☞ same for IC in Sicilian!

Outline

Motion verb constructions (MVCs) and parameters of grammaticalization

1. Introduction
2. Sicilian DIC
3. French *venir de* (+ infinitive)
4. Italian MVCs
5. Spanish MVCs (*ir + a + infinitive*)
6. Conclusions and final remarks

5. Spanish *ir + a + infinitive*

Spanish MVCs are syntactically very similar to Italian ones, but, at least when featuring the verb GO, have undergone semantic/functional change acquiring a prospective future function (see also French *aller + infinitive*).

- (15) *Le voy a regalar un libro.*
to-her=go.1SG to give a book
'I'm going to give her a book (as a present)'

5. Spanish *ir + a + infinitive*

| Parameters | Spanish IC |
|------------------------------------------------|------------|
| (morpho-)phonological erosion | - |
| syntactic restructuring | + |
| decategorialization and argument restructuring | + |
| semantic and functional change | + |

5. Spanish *ir* + *a* + infinitive

In some Central American dialects a process of affixation similar to DIC has been reported (Fleischman 1982: 116), attesting the application of morpho-phonological erosion, which is however independent from the already established semantic change to future-tense marker:

| | STANDARD SPANISH | SELECTED AMERICAN DIALECTS |
|-----|------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1SG | voy a dormir | yo v(w)adormiri |
| 2SG | vas a dormir | tu va:dormiri |
| 3SG | va a dormir | el va:dormiri |
| 1PL | vamos a dormir | nosotros vamos a dormir |
| 2PL | van a dormir | Uds. va ⁿ a dormir |
| 3PL | van a dormir | ellos va ⁿ a dormir |

5. Spanish *ir + a + infinitive* in some Central American dialects

| Parameters | Spanish IC |
|------------------------------------------------|------------|
| (morpho-)phonological erosion | (+) |
| syntactic restructuring | + |
| decategorialization and argument restructuring | + |
| semantic and functional change | + |

(+) → possible, but not obligatory!

Outline

Motion verb constructions (MVCs) and parameters of grammaticalization

1. Introduction
2. Sicilian DIC
3. French *venir de* (+ infinitive)
4. Italian MVCs
5. Spanish MVCs (*ir + a + infinitive*)
6. Conclusions and final remarks

- I. The comparison of the PC-MVCs and the canonical MVCs (i.e. IC) helps us understand that DIC and similar constructions should not be generally analysed as the ‘more’ grammaticalized version or counterpart of the canonical MVCs, and that the PC-MVCs may have undergone some degree of grammaticalization, but only limited to some parameters.

- II. When compared at a crosslinguistic level, the parameters of grammaticalization do not entertain any implicational relations and enjoy a certain degree of independence. It appears, however, that:
 - the ‘trigger’ of grammaticalization is not always semantic reanalysis or a pragmatic inference at the level of the meaning;
 - morpho-phonological erosion seems to depend on semantic change.

- III. Among the motion verbs, GO and COME are those more amenable to semantic and functional change, but interestingly, only GO further reduces morpho-phonologically.
- IV. The special status of these verbs has (presumably) to do with their *deictic nature*: when a deictic movement verb is used, the event being described is subjectively construed. The verb GO, in particular, expresses movement away from the deictic centre (i.e. the speaker), or that the event is viewed as occurring at a distance from the deictic centre.
- ☞ This verb thus lends itself more easily to the ‘**subjectification**’ of the event, and hence to grammaticalization of the construction (presumably, GO is *lighter* than COME, i.e. semantically more simple).

Thank you!

- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti (2001). Semi-lexical motion verbs in Romance and Germanic. In N. Corver & H. van Riemsdijk (eds), *Semi-lexical categories*. De Gruyter.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti (2003). Motion verbs as functional heads. In Cristina Tortora (ed.), *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, 31-49. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti (2019). Multiple Agreement in Southern Italian Dialects. To appear in L. Franco & P. Lorusso (eds), *Linguistic Variations: Structure and Interpretation*. . *Studies in Honor of M. Rita Manzini*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (2006). *Restructuring and Functional Heads*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2013). Beyond the stem and inflectional morphology: An irregular pattern at the level of periphrasis. In S. Cruschina et al. (eds), *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Del Prete, Fabio & Giuseppina Todaro (2019). Building complex events. The case of Sicilian Doubly Inflected Construction. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*.

- Di Caro, V. N. (2019). *Multiple agreement constructions in southern in Italo-Romance. The syntax of Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination*. Ca' Foscari University of Venice, PhD dissertation.
- Eckhardt, Regine (2006). *Meaning Change in Grammaticalization. An Enquiry into Semantic Reanalysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fleischman, Suzanne (1982). *The Future in Thought and Language. Diachronic Evidence from Romance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd (1993). *Auxiliaries. Cognitive forces and grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth C. Traugott (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2nd Edition.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1982). *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.