



**HAL**  
open science

## Complex event predications

Fabio Del Prete

► **To cite this version:**

Fabio Del Prete. Complex event predications. Doctoral. Universitat Pompeu Fabra (Barcelone), Spain. 2024. hal-04694238

**HAL Id: hal-04694238**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04694238v1>**

Submitted on 11 Sep 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Complex event predications

Fabio Del Prete

CLLE (CNRS, Toulouse)

**GLiF seminar, January 18 2024**

## Doubly Inflected Construction

Sicilian exhibits a **complex verbal construction** (*Doubly Inflected Construction*, DIC; Cruschina 2013):

- (1) Vaju                      a accattu                      a    cicoria.  
 go-1SG-PRS-IND a buy-1SG-PRS-IND the chicory  
 'I go to buy chicory.'

In DIC, a **motion verb V1** is followed by an **eventive verb V2**.

Previous studies have generally considered V1 restricted to *iri* 'go', *veniri* 'come', *passari* 'pass by' and *mannari* 'send' (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003; but see Di Caro 2018, 2022 for a richer picture).

## Doubly Inflected Construction

- (2) Vegnu / Passu / Mannu a  
 come-1SG-PRS-IND / pass-1SG-PRS-IND / send-1SG-PRS-IND a  
 accattu a cicoria.  
 buy-1SG-PRS-IND the chicory  
 'I come / pass / send someone to buy chicory.'

V1 and V2 are **both inflected** and must bear the **same person and TAM features** (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003).

For this reason, some scholars consider DIC a case of *Multiple Agreement Construction* (Di Caro 2018; Giusti, Di Caro & Ross 2022).

DIC has been more recently described as a *Pseudo-Coordination* (*ibidem*): it looks like a coordination (of two inflected verbs) but **behaves monoclausally** by different linguistic tests.

## DIC vs. Infinitival Construction

DIC must also be distinguished from the **Infinitival Construction (IC)** exemplified by (3), in which V1 is inflected and V2 is in the infinitival form:

- (3) Vaju                      a accattari a cicoria.  
 go-1SG-PRS-IND to buy-INF the chicory  
 'I go to buy chicory.'

DIC differs from IC in crucial respects, both morphosyntactically and semantically (more below).

## Connecting particle in DIC

A DIC has the general structure [**V1 a V2**], where **a** is a *connecting particle*.

Although the connecting particle is not discernible from the preposition *a* 'to' of the IC, it has been shown to derive from the Latin coordinating particle **ac** 'and' (Rohlf's 1969) while the latter derives from the Latin directional preposition *ad* 'to/toward'.

This may suggest that DIC is a coordinate construction. However, DIC differs from coordinations in crucial respects – as was said above, it has been categorized as a *Pseudo-Coordination*.

# The proposal in Del Prete & Todaro (2020)

- DIC as a **Serial Verb Construction** of a particular kind, i.e. an **asymmetrical SVC with concordant marking of inflectional features** (Aikhenvald 2006);
- **two lexical verbs V1, V2** (event predicates) combine to form a single predicate which is true of a **“concatenated event”**;
- the motion verb contributes a **true motion event** to the sentence meaning, **projecting thematic roles THEME and GOAL** (no grammaticalization of the motion verb as an auxiliary);
- a **compositional semantic analysis in an event-framework** is possible for this construction.

# Overview of the talk

- 1 Introduction
- 2 DIC: morphosyntax and semantics
  - Differences between DIC and coordinations
  - Differences between DIC and Infinitival Construction
- 3 DIC and Serial Verb Constructions
  - DIC as a Serial Verb Construction
  - No grammaticalization of V1 as tense/aspect marker in DIC
- 4 The analysis in Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001
- 5 Formal analysis: event concatenation
- 6 Conclusion



## Identity of the inflectional features on V1 and V2

- In DIC *person and TAM features* on V1 and V2 must be the same:

- (4) a. \*Vaju            a ppigghia            u pani.  
 Go-1SG-PRS a fetch-3SG-PRS the bread  
 (Impossible reading: 'I go (to some place) and he/she fetches the bread.')
- b. \*Ia                a ppigghiai            u pani.  
 Go-1SG-IPFV a fetch-1SG-PFV the bread  
 (Impossible reading: 'I was going (to some place) and I fetched the bread.')
- This property makes DIC a particular kind of *Multiple Agreement Construction* – besides being redundantly marked, agreement involves all the relevant features (Giusti, Di Caro & Ross 2022).

## Non-identity of the inflectional features in coordinations

Needless to say, in coordinations person and TAM features on V1 and V2 can vary independently from one another:

- (5) a. io vaiu a casa e iddru pigghia u pani.  
 I go-1SG to home and he fetch-3SG the bread  
 'I'm going home and he's fetching the bread.'
- b. Ia a casa e pigghiai u pani.  
 go-1SG-IPFV a home and fetch-1SG-PFV the bread  
 'I was going home and I fetched the bread.'

# Placement of clitics in Sicilian

## Rules of clitic placement in Sicilian (same as in Italian)

- **RCP1** Clitics must appear to the immediate left of the finite verb ((6-a))<sup>1</sup>
- **RCP2** Clitics must appear to the immediate right of the non-finite verb ((6-b))

- (6) a. Il pane, (lo) compro (\*lo) domani.  
 the bread it-CL buy-1SG-PRS it-CL tomorrow  
 'The bread, I'll buy it tomorrow.'
- b. Vado a (\*lo) comprar(lo) domani.  
 go-1SG-PRS to it-CL buy-INF.it-CL tomorrow  
 'I'll go to buy it tomorrow.'

<sup>1</sup>An exception to this rule is given by imperatives, which we ignore here.

## Obligatory clitic climbing in DIC

In DIC a clitic pronoun realizing the object of V2 cannot appear to the immediate left of V2 (contrary to what one would expect on the basis of **RCP1**). In (7) the clitic *u* 'it', corresponding to the object of *mangiu* 'eat', must appear to the immediate left of V1 (clitic climbing is obligatory; Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001):

- (7) (U) vaju a (\*u) mangiu ddrà.  
 It-CL go-1SG a it-CL eat-1SG there  
 'I go eat it there.'

In the coordination (8) the same clitic must appear to the immediate left of V2 (clitic climbing is not possible):

- (8) (\*U) vaju ddrà e (u) mangiu.  
 It-CL go-1SG there and it-CL eat-1SG  
 'I go there and I eat it.'

## Wh-extraction facts

Unlike coordinations, DIC is not subject to the *Coordinate Structure Constraint* (Ross 1967):

- (9) a. Soccu vai a mmangi ddrà?  
 What go-2SG a eat-2SG there  
 'What<sub>i</sub> do you go eat *t<sub>i</sub>* there?'
- b. \*Soccu vai ddrà e mmangi?  
 What go-2SG and eat-2SG  
 'What<sub>i</sub> do you go there and do you eat *t<sub>i</sub>*?'

## No intervening adverbs

In DIC, unlike in IC, neither temporal adverbs nor spatial adverbs can appear between V1 and V2:

- (10) a. Vaju (\*sempre) a mmangiu (sempre) pisci. (DIC)  
 go-1SG always a eat-1SG always fish  
 'I always go eat fish.'
- b. Vaju (sempre) a mmangiari (sempre) pisci. (IC)  
 go-1SG always to eat-INF always fish  
 'I always go to eat fish.'
- (11) a. Vaju (\*a casa) a mmangiu (a casa). (DIC)  
 go-1SG to house a eat-1SG at house  
 'I go eat at home.'
- b. Vaju (a casa) a mmangiari (a casa). (IC)  
 go-1SG to house to eat-INF at house  
 'I go to eat at home.'

## No intervening quantifiers in DICs

In DIC, unlike in IC, floating quantifiers cannot appear between V1 and V2, either:

- (12) a. I picciotti vannu (\*tutti) a ppigghianu (tutti) u pani na  
 The boys go-3PL all a fetch-3PL all the bread in  
 'sta butìa. (DIC)  
 this shop  
 'The boys all go buy bread in this shop.'
- b. I picciotti vannu (tutti) a ppigghiari (tutti) u pani na 'sta  
 The boys go-3PL all to fetch-INF all the bread in this  
 butìa. (IC)  
 shop  
 'The boys all go to buy bread in this shop.'

## “Single-event” interpretation

The contrast in (13-a)-(13-b) has been taken to show that DIC has a “single event” interpretation while IC refers to two independent events (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001).

- (13) a. ??Vaju a accattu a cicoria gnignornu, ma unn’a  
 go-1SG a buy-1SG the chicory everyday but not.it-CL  
 ttrovu mai. (DIC)  
 find-1SG never  
 ‘I go and buy chicory every day but I never find it.’
- b. Vaju a accattari a cicoria gnignornu, ma unn’a  
 go-1SG to buy-INF the chicory everyday but not.it-CL  
 ttrovu mai. (IC)  
 find-1SG never  
 ‘I go to buy chicory every day but I never find it.’



## (Non-)veridicality

(13-a) might still refer to *two* event components  $e_1$ ,  $e_2$  and the contrast between (13-a) and (13-b) might have to do with **modality**: (13-a) requires that *both*  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  occur in the real world, (13-b) does not.

Consider the coordination (14):

(14) ??I go there and I buy chicory every day, but I never find it.

From the unacceptability of (14) it would be incorrect to infer that (14) refers to a single event.

Del Prete & Todaro (2020): The contrast between (13-a) and (13-b) shows that the IC *vaju a accattari* 'I go to buy' does not entail *accattu* 'I buy' (IC is **non-veridical w.r.t. V2**), while the DIC *vaju a accattu* does entail *accattu* (DIC is **veridical w.r.t. V2**).

## Negation of DIC

Negation must precede the whole complex [V1 a V2]. However, it need not take semantic scope over both components V1 and V2, but it can selectively associate with one or the other via **focus marking**.

- (15) Un vaju a [<sub>F</sub>accattu a cicoria], vaju a accattu u pani.  
 not go-1SG a buy-1SG the chicory go-1SG a buy-1SG the bread  
 'I'm not going to buy chicory, I'm going to buy bread.'

The event component which is negated in (15) is the V2-event (this part is unproblematic, since V2 is generally recognized to be a lexical verb).

## Negation of DIC

- (16) a. Un [<sub>F</sub>vaju] a mmanciu a casa, manciu cca ni Peppe.  
 not go-1SG a eat-1SG at home eat-1SG here by Peppe  
 'I'm not going to eat at home, I eat here at Peppe's.'
- b. Un [<sub>F</sub>vene] a ppigghia u pane iddru stessu, u  
 not come-3SG a fetch-1SG the bread he self it-CL  
 manna a ppigghia.  
 send-3SG a fetch-3SG  
 'He's not coming to fetch the bread himself, he's sending  
 someone to fetch it.'

The event component which is negated in (16-a)-(16-b) is the motion event, not the V2-event! — for (16-a)-(16-b) to make sense, **V1 has to be interpreted as a lexical (motion) verb.**

## To sum up

- DIC behaves differently from IC and coordinations, both morphosyntactically and semantically
- the evidence suggests that DIC is a **monoclausal structure** (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003), with one single **complex predicate** referring to a single **complex event**
- the complex event has **two event components**: a **motion component**  $e_1$  followed by an **event component**  $e_2$
- **veridicality**: event components  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  must **occur in the same world** (unlike in IC)

## Definition of Serial Verb Construction

“The serial verb construction [...] is a syntactic phenomenon in which two or more verbs or verb phrases are strung together in a single clause. [...] Serial verb constructions are often described as coding a single event; they can also be used to indicate concurrent or causally-related events.” (from the Wikipedia’s entry “Serial verb construction”)

- (17) a. Bólá sè ẹran tà. [*“consecutive” SVC, Yoruba*]  
 Bola cook meat sell  
 ‘Bola cooked some meat and sold it.’
- b. Ó mú ìwé wá. [*“venitive” SVC, Yoruba*]  
 he take book come  
 ‘He brought the book.’
- c. Kofi naki Amba kiri. [*“resultative” SVC, Sranan*]  
 Kofi hit Amba kill  
 ‘Kofi struck Amba dead.’

# Properties of Serial Verb Constructions

Characteristic properties of SVCs:

- they are constructions containing **no marker of syntactic dependency** (either coordination or subordination) between the verb components;
- they display **argument sharing** between their verb components;
- they describe what is conceptualized as **one integrated situation (single event)** – semantically, such an event may be composed of a **series of sub-events**.

## Sub-kinds of SVCs

- SVCs fall into two broad groups: *asymmetrical* and *symmetrical* (Aikhenvald 2006).
- **Asymmetrical SVCs** consist of a “**minor**” verb (= **V1**) from a **closed class**, and a “**major**” verb (= **V2**) from an **open class** (which determines the transitivity of the whole construction).
- Symmetrical SVCs consist of verb components chosen from major lexical classes.

# DIC as a SVC

Del Prete & Todaro (2020) propose to regard DIC as a particular kind of SVC: **1. contiguous, 2. asymmetrical, 3. with concordant marking of inflectional features.**

- **Contiguous:** V1 and V2 are only separated by a “dummy” particle (see the possibility of contracted forms, e.g. *vaffazzu* ‘(I) go make’).
- **Asymmetrical:** V1 comes from a closed class of motion verbs.
- **With concordant marking of infl. features:** V1 and V2 are both inflected and bear the same infl. features.



## DIC and argument sharing

Baker (1989) took **object-sharing** as fundamental for the status of SVC (he was mainly looking at examples of verb serialization from West African languages, which do have this feature).

Subsequent typological studies have highlighted that object-sharing is only one possibility among others for SVCs; the most common form of argument sharing is **subject-sharing** (Aikhenvald 2006).

DIC systematically displays argument sharing: this is most of the time subject-sharing and never object-sharing. The only transitive verb V1 that can appear in DIC is the causative motion verb *mannari* 'send', which strictly speaking doesn't give rise to object-sharing.

## DIC and argument sharing

- (18) a. *Peppe va a ppigghia u pani.*  
 Peppe go-3SG a fetch-3SG the bread  
 ‘Peppe goes to fetch the bread.’
- b. *Peppe manna a ppigghia u pani.*  
 Peppe send-3SG a fetch-3SG the bread  
 ‘Peppe sends (someone) to fetch the bread.’

In (18-a) the subject of *va* and the subject of *ppigghia* are the same individual – Peppe is the agent of both the motion event and the fetching-the-bread event.

In (18-b) the (underlying) object of *manna* is the same individual as the subject of *ppigghia* – the person who is sent by Peppe is the agent of the fetching-the-bread event.

## DIC and argument sharing

The pattern of argument sharing displayed by (18-a)-(18-b) is related to the **control properties** of *mannari* 'send' and *iri* 'go', as they are shown in lexical uses (beyond DIC): *mannari* is **object control**, cf. (19-a); *iri* is **subject control**, cf. (19-b).

- (19) a. I send you to buy the bread. ( $\Rightarrow$  **You** buy the bread)  
b. I go to buy the bread. ( $\Rightarrow$  **I** buy the bread)

## Motion verbs as tense/aspect markers

Observation1: The minor verbs in asymmetrical SVCs tend to grammaticalize into markers of direction and aspect.

Observation2: More generally, the verbs *go* and *come* are known to have auxiliary uses as TAM markers across languages.

A *prima facie* expectation: DIC (in particular, DIC with the high-frequency V1 *go*) might involve **grammaticalization of the motion verb** as a TAM auxiliary.

- (20)
- a. Je vais manger chez moi.  
'I'm going to eat at home.'
  - b. Je viens d'acheter ce livre.  
'I've just bought this book.'

## Motion verbs as tense/aspect markers

When motion verbs are grammaticalized as **TAM markers**, they no longer put restrictions on the actional type of their verb complements (in particular, **purely stative complements are acceptable**):

- (21) a. Je vais le savoir/être malade.  
'I'm going to know it/to be sick.'
- b. Je viens de le savoir/d'avoir la fièvre.  
'I've just come to know it/had fever.'

## Motion verbs are no tense/aspect markers in DIC

In DIC, purely stative verbs V2 are out (Accattoli & Todaro 2016):

- (22) a. \*Vaju a ssugnu malatu.  
 go-1SG a be-1SG sick  
 'I'm going to be sick.'
- b. \*Vègnu a aiu la freve.  
 come-1SG a have-1SG the fever  
 'I've just had fever.'

Only stative verbs like *stari* 'stay' are acceptable as V2 (cf. the discussion of the "sit-stand-lie" class in Dowty 1979: 173–180):

- (23) Va a sta ni so soro picchè un avi casa.  
 go-3SG a stay-3SG in his sister because NEG have-3SG house  
 'He's going to stay at his sister's because he has no home.'

# Motion verbs are no tense/aspect markers in DIC

## Hypothesis:

- the motion verb in V1 projects a  $\theta$ -role GOAL, and the verb in V2 predicates that an event of the relevant type occurs at the location which receives the GOAL role
- pure statives (*know the answer/be sick*) do not take a locative argument (e.g. \**he was sick/knew the answer in Rome*)
- *stare* is a stative, but not a pure stative, since it takes a locative argument (e.g. *he stayed in Rome for a week*)

This explains why *stare* is good as V2 in DIC, whereas *essere malato* is out.

## Failure of V1 to project arguments

Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001): in DIC V1 has been desemantized since its argument structure is reduced – *iri* ‘go’ takes a directional PP complement (projects a  $\theta$ -role GOAL) in lexical uses but not in DIC:

- (24) a. Vaju a mmangiari agghiri a casa. (IC)  
 go-1SG to eat-INF toward at home  
 ‘I go to eat toward home.’
- b. \*Vaju a mmangiu agghiri a casa. (DIC)  
 go-1SG a eat-1SG toward at home  
 ‘I go eat toward home.’
- (25) Vaju a mmangiu a casa.  
 go-1SG a eat-1SG at home  
 ‘I go eat at home.’



## Failure of V1 to project arguments

- (26) Ti mannu a ppigghiu u pani. (DIC)  
 you-CL send-1SG a fetch-1SG the bread  
 'I send (someone) to fetch the bread *for you*.'  
 (Impossible reading: 'I send *you* to fetch the bread.')

Semantically, in (26) *mannu* 'send' has a theme (the person who is sent), which is the same individual as the agent of *ppigghiu* 'fetch'.

Syntactically, this theme does not seem to be present – the clitic *ti* cannot refer to it!

This is in contrast with what is found in IC:

- (27) Ti mannu a ppigghiari u pani. (IC)  
 you-CL send-1SG to fetch-INF the bread  
 'I send you to fetch the bread.'

## Failure of V1 to take adjuncts

In DIC the motion verb does not take adjuncts (unlike in lexical uses):

- (28) a. **Vaju** a mmangiari **c'a machina**.  
 go-1SG to eat-INF with.the car  
 'I go to eat by car.'
- b. ??Vaju a mmangiu c'a machina.  
 go-1SG a eat-1SG with.the car  
 'I go eat by car.'

Although (29) is fine! (Cruschina 2013)

- (29) U **vaju** a **ppigghiu** **c'a machina**.  
 him-CL go-1SG a pick.up-1SG with.the car  
 'I go pick him up by car.'

- (29) U        **vaju**    a **ppigghiu**    **c'a machina.**  
 him-CL go-1SG a pick.up-1SG with.the        car  
 'I go pick him up by car.'

- **Full Compatibility** — Del Prete & Todaro (2020: 18)  
*A locative or instrumental adverbial in a DIC is acceptable only if it is compatible with both verb components V1 and V2.*

## Problematic person features in DIC with *mannari*

Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001): (a) V1 is desemanticized and auxiliary-like and V2 is the lexical head of DIC; (b) the inflectional features on V2 are semantically interpreted while those on V1 are just a copy of the inflectional features on V2.

DIC with *mannari* is problematic for this theory:

- (30) Mannu a ppigghiu u pani.  
 send-1SG a fetch-1SG the bread  
 'I send someone to fetch the bread.'

By Feature-Matching, the person feature on *mannu* is the same as on *pigghiu* but is interpreted only on *mannu*: the agent of *pigghiu* is not the speaker but some other person who the speaker sends to fetch the bread.

## Informal preliminaries

Del Prete & Todaro (2020):

- (a) **no desemanticization of the motion verb;**
- (b) a **syntax / semantics mismatch** in DIC:
  - (b1) **semantically**, *mannari* does project a THEME argument in *ti mannu a pigghiu u pani* 'I send (someone) to fetch the bread for you' and *iri* does project a GOAL argument in *vaju a mangiu* 'I go eat',
  - (b2) **syntactically**, however, those arguments are non-visible.
- (c) The motion verb V1 combines with an event verb V2 according to a **concatenation operation**; the semantic correlate of this operation determines that only some of the  $\theta$ -roles of V1 project to the argument structure of the complex predicate [V1-a-V2], whereas others are "closed off" in the course of the semantic composition.

# Main assumptions

- V1 and V2 are both lexical verbs which combine to form a complex predicate true of “concatenated events”
- event-semantics in the style of Parsons (1990) and Champollion (2015): verbs denote *basic* event predicates, i.e., properties of events
- $\theta$ -role functions apply to entities to yield functions that apply to basic event predicates to yield complex event predicates – where the latter contain conditions on event-participants

# Analysis of “mannu a ppigghiu u pani”

- V1 and V2 combine to form a **complex verb predicate** [V1 a V2]
- **Arguments** are linked to their predicate via **thematic ( $\theta$ ) roles**. For instance, the silent subject *pro* and the object *u pani* in (1) are linked to the predicate [mannu a pigghiu] via the  $\theta$ -roles **agent** and **theme**, respectively, and are thus represented as the  **$\theta$ -participants** (2a) and (2b), respectively:

(1) Mannu            a    ppigghiu            u    pani.  
 send-PRS.1SG    a    fetch-PRS.1SG    the    bread  
 'I send / am sending (someone) to fetch the bread.'

- (2) a. [agent(*pro*)]            ( $\Rightarrow$  *pro*'s value is the agent of the complex predicate)  
 b. [theme(*u pani*)]        ( $\Rightarrow$  the bread is the theme of the complex predicate)



- The **person inflection** on a verb predicate  $V$  (essentially) requires that the  $\theta$ -participant corresponding to the external argument of  $V$  be suitably related to the **speech roles** in the context of utterance.

The person inflection on  $[V1 \text{ a } V2]$  is realized on each of the verb components  $V1, V2$  by a mechanism of **feature spread**. (Such mechanisms are known to operate in other complex predicate constructions.)

- Ex.: the **1SG inflection** on the complex predicate in (1) requires that the  $\theta$ -participant [agent(*pro*)] (corresponding to the subject) be identical to **the speaker**.

1SG is analysed as a **modifier of the thematic role *agent*** at Logical Form, as shown in (3):

(3) [1SG(agent)(*pro*)]

( $\Rightarrow$  *pro*'s value is the agent of the complex predicate *and it is required to coincide with the speaker*)

- The  $\theta$ -participants [1sg(agent)(pro)] and [theme(u pani)] sequentially combine with the complex predicate [mannari a pigghiari], as shown in the Logical Form (4) (tense is ignored to avoid complications):

(4) [1sg(agent)(pro)] ([theme(u pani)] [mannari a pigghiari])

- The combination of the  $\theta$ -participants with their verb predicate yields an increasingly complex event property:

the structure in (4) expresses a complex property which is true of an event  $e_3$  when (i)  $e_3$  is an event of “sending to fetch”, (ii) the theme of  $e_3$  is some relevant bread, (iii) the agent of  $e_3$  is the speaker.

## Semantics

- The meaning of V1 and the meaning of V2 are **properties of events**: for V1 = *mannari*, the meaning of V1 is the property of events which is true of an event  $e_1$  exactly when  $e_1$  is an event of sending; for V2 = *pigghiari*, the meaning of V2 is the property of events which is true of an event  $e_2$  exactly when  $e_2$  is an event of fetching
- The meaning of [V1 a V2] is a **property of (complex) events**: for [V1 ac V2] = [mannari a pigghiari], the meaning of [V1 ac V2] is the property of events which is true of an event  $e_3$  exactly when  $e_3$  is obtained by concatenating an event  $e_1$  of sending and an event  $e_2$  of fetching. The **concatenation of two events**  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  is defined as follows:

- **Definition.** Let  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  be events satisfying the following conditions:  
( $\alpha$ )  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are **spatio-temporally contiguous** (hence, their temporal and spatial traces are adjacent); ( $\beta$ ) **the goal of  $e_1$  is identical with the location of  $e_2$  and the theme of  $e_1$  is identical with the agent of  $e_2$ .**  
Then:

➤ the **Event Concatenation** ( $e_1 \bullet e_2$ ) is that event  $e_3$  whose temporal trace  $\tau_T(e_3)$  is the time interval obtained by summing the temporal traces of  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  and whose spatial trace  $\tau_S(e_3)$  is the spatial region obtained by summing the spatial traces of  $e_1$  and  $e_2$

- By the definition of Event Concatenation, the meaning of [mannari pigghiari] is the property of events which is true of an event  $e_3$  exactly when  $e_3$  is obtained by concatenating an event  $e_1$  of sending and an event  $e_2$  of fetching, where  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are:

(a) temporally consecutive, (b) spatially contiguous and (c) they share participants, i.e.  $\text{theme}(e_1)=\text{agent}(e_2)$  and  $\text{goal}(e_1)=\text{location}(e_2)$

- Let's go back to *Mannu a ppigghiu u pani*:

(1) Mannu a ppigghiu u pani.

- According to the analysis presented above, (1) expresses the complex event property which is true of an event  $e_3$  at the following conditions:

1.  $e_3$  is obtained by concatenating an event  $e_1$  of sending and an event  $e_2$  of fetching,
2. the person who is sent is the same as the person who fetches and the place where this person is sent is the same as the place where the fetching occurs,
3. the agent of  $e_3$  is the speaker and the theme of  $e_3$  is the contextually relevant bread

[NOTE: the analysis predicts that the agent of the complex event (the person who sends to fetch the bread) is to be kept distinct from the agent of the V2 event (the person who fetches the bread), in spite of the person agreement.]



## Partial grammaticalization?

Di Caro (2022): “V1 in the *a*-PseCo can **keep its motion semantics** or **become an inchoative or mirative marker** (used to express surprise, wonder, but also regret and irritation; cf. Sornicola 1976, Cruschina 2018, (33))”

- (33) Vaiu            a ssientu            ca iddu ci            fici  
 go-1SG.PRS a hear-1SG.PRS that he    DAT.CL.3SG do-3SG.PST  
 stu tuortu a sso mughieri!  
 this wrong to his wife  
 ‘I ended up hearing that he did such a wrong to his wife!’

In any case, not specific to DIC but a general tendency for certain motion verbs – cf. standard Italian IC “Vado [go-1SG.PRS] a sapere [know-INF] che lui le ha fatto un torto così grave!” = (33).

## Conclusions and open issues

- Contribution to the study of complex event descriptions both at the level of morphosyntax and semantics; compositional semantic analysis of a verb construction.
- A perspective on DIC as Serial Verbs; this raises the question whether other instances of verb serialization can be found in Southern Italian dialects.
- Serial Verbs express a variety of modal/temporal relations between events (cause-effect relations, consecutiveness, simultaneity, result states, etc). DIC is a way to express spatio-temporal succession between contiguous events  $e_1$ ,  $e_2$ , and to build a complex event out of those.
- Possibility to extend the concatenation-based analysis of Del Prete & Todaro (2020) to the apparently non-motion DICs seen in (31) and (32)?



**Thank you!**

## References

- Accattoli, M. & G. Todaro** (2016). Verbes de mouvement et grammaticalisation: le cas du sicilien *vaffazzu*. In *Actes du Colloque "Normes et grammaticalisation"*, 2015, Sofia, Bulgary.
- Aikhenvald, A. Y.** (2006). Serial Verb Constructions in a Typological Perspective. In A. Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial verb constructions: a cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1-87.
- Baker, M. C.** (1989). Object Sharing and Projection in Serial Verb Constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20 (4), 513-553.
- Cardinaletti, A. & G. Giusti** (2001). 'Semi-lexical' motion verbs in Romance and Germanic. In N. Corver and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Semi-lexical Categories: the function of content words and the content of function words*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 371-414.
- Champollion, L.** (2015). The interaction of compositional semantics and event semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 38, 31-66.
- Cruschina, S.** (2013). Beyond the stem and inflectional morphology: An irregular pattern at the level of periphrasis. In S. Cruschina, M. Maiden and J. C. Smith (eds.), *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology: Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 262-283.

# References

**Di Caro, V.** (2022). *Il bilinguismo italiano-dialetto in Sicilia*. Venice University Press, Venezia.

**Giusti, G., V. Di Caro & D. Ross** (2022). Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions: An Overview. In G. Giusti, V. Di Caro & D. Ross (eds.), *Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1-32.

**Landman, F.** (2008). N-place relations in natural language. Handout of an invited talk at the Workshop PEPS-relations, Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Université Paris Nord.

**Rohlf, G.** (1969). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti: Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Einaudi, Torino.

**Ross, J. R.** (1967). *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.