

Pre-final version.

Published in 2018 in *Advances in Italian Dialectology: Sketches of Italo-Romance grammars*, Roberta D'Alessandro & Diego Pescarini (eds), 292–320. Leiden: Brill.

The ‘go for’ construction in Sicilian*

SILVIO CRUSCHINA

University of Vienna

ABSTRACT

In this paper, I offer a semantic and syntactic analysis of the Sicilian periphrasis ‘*jiri pi (go for) + infinitive*’ (GFC, ‘*go for* construction’), which is used to emphasize the surprising or unexpected result of an uncompleted action. This construction conveys that the action denoted by the complement verb is interrupted and followed by a sudden and unexpected event. The informative meaning of GFC can thus be described as ‘conative’, in that the subject attempts to perform an action that is partially or fully unaccomplished. On the other hand, the effect of surprise and unexpectedness associated with this construction – but spelled out by the event expressed by the following clause – must be characterized as a conventional implicature that adds up to the propositional content of the sentence. In contrast to the lexical occurrences of the verb *go* followed by a final clause, GFC semantically and syntactically behaves as a single periphrastic unit, as confirmed by a variety of transparency effects such as clitic climbing and by other diagnostics used to test the degree of grammaticalization of the motion verb and of the construction as a whole.

KEYWORDS

motion verb, Sicilian, grammaticalization, conative aspect, surprise, conventional implicature, functional verb.

1. INTRODUCTION

Crosslinguistically, the motion verb *go* is a common lexical source of special constructions or periphrases which, as a result of different paths of grammaticalization, express various aspectual or temporal meanings (cf. Bybee et al. 1994, a.o.). In southern Italian dialects, this verb has recently attracted the attention of linguists thanks to the special morphosyntactic properties that it displays when it combines with an infinitive or with a finite form of a lexical verb. In this construction, the verb *go* behaves as a functional verb (cf. 1a-b) or, in some dialects, as an uninflected (clitic) marker expressing andative aspect (cf. 1c, 2) (Sornicola 1976, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003, Manzini & Savoia 2005, Cruschina 2013, Di Caro 2015, Ledgeway 2016, Andriani in preparation):¹

* I would like to thank Delia Bentley, Adam Ledgeway, and Nigel Vincent for helpful discussion of several aspects of this paper.

¹ This construction is not limited to the verb *go*, but can also feature other motion verbs with an andative or a venitive aspectual meaning, as well as other verbs such as *want*, *stay*,

- (1) a. *Vaju a mangiari.* (Mussomeli, Sicily)
 go.PRS.IND.1SG to eat.INF
 b. *Vaju a mangiu.*
 go.PRS.IND.1SG to eat.PRS.IND.1SG
 c. *Va a mangiu.*
 go to eat.PRS.IND.1SG
 ‘I am going to eat.’
- (2) *Lu va ffazzu.* (Mesagne, Puglia)
 it= GO do.PRS.IND.1SG
 ‘I’m going to do it.’
 (Manzini & Savoia 2005, I: 691)

As can be observed in the examples above, the verb *go* in this construction can be either directly followed by the lexical verb (cf. 2) or linked to it by means of the pseudo-coordinator *a* (cf. 1), which is homophonous with the proposition meaning ‘to’ – the (pseudo-)conjunction *e* ‘and’ is also found in some varieties (cf. Rohlfs 1969). Some dialects only exhibit one of these options, while in others the two structures co-exist, presumably as a sign of a change in progress.² Note also that in some cases it is not so easy to determine the presence vs. absence of the pseudo-coordinator *a*: the syntactic doubling of the initial consonant of the second verb (*ffazzu*) in the example (2), for instance, could be taken as evidence for the ‘hidden’ presence of an underlying linking element that is not clearly pronounced, presumably due to a phonological merger with the final vowel of the first verb (*va*).

In this paper I investigate a different construction that involves the verb *go* in southern Italian dialects, whose distinctive characteristic is the presence of the preposition equivalent to ‘for’ in the specific dialect. I will call it the ‘*go for* construction’, abbreviated to GFC. Despite being a widely used construction across the whole of Southern Italy, GFC has, with very few exceptions (e.g. Leone 1995), largely escaped the attention of the linguistic literature, most probably due to its resemblance to an ordinary complex sentence involving a lexical instance of the verb *go* followed by a final clause. In fact, morphologically, GFC does not display the same striking features as the andative construction, such as double inflection (cf. 1b) or inflectional reduction (cf. 1c, 2). More specifically, I will concentrate on GFC in Sicilian, hoping to offer a first systematic analysis that could

take, and *start* with different aspectual value (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003, Manzini & Savoia 2005, Cruschina 2013, Di Caro 2015, Ledgeway 2016, Andriani in preparation). In this paper, I will only discuss the construction with the verb *go*.

² The term pseudo-coordinator refers to fake coordinators, typically the equivalent of English *and*, which appear to actually have a subordinating function or to link two verbs that build up a complex predicate with an aspectual or idiomatic meaning (see, e.g., De Vos 2005 and references therein).

inspire and encourage further research into the possible microvariation concerning this construction in other southern Italian dialects.³

As concisely described in Leone (1995: 44), the Sicilian periphrasis ‘*jiri pi (go for) + infinitive*’ is used to emphasize the surprising or unexpected result of an action:

- (3) *Va pi tràsiri iddu, e nun trova cchiù*
 go.PRS.3SG for enter.INF he and not find.PRS.3SG more
lu beni sò.
 the good his
 ‘He ends up going in [lit. he goes to go in] only to find that his sweetheart was no longer there.’
 (Palermo, Pitrè I: 677)
- (4) *Iemmu ppi-ddàpiri a porta, e vittimu un surci*
 go.PST.1PL for-open.INF the door and see.PST.1PL a mouse
ca scappava.
 that escape.PST.3SG
 ‘We went to open the door, when we saw a mouse run away.’
 (Leone 1995: 44)
- (5) *Vàiu ppi mmuzzicari u turruni, e mi rruppi*
 go.PRS.1SG for bite.INF the nougat and me=break.PST.1SG
u renti.
 the tooth
 ‘I was about to bite into the nougat, when I broke my tooth.’
 (Leone 1995: 44)

Crucially, the surprise import is not directly associated with the sentence featuring GFC, but with the result expressed by the following sentence: the sudden realization in (3) that his sweetheart was no longer in the house where she was expected, the unexpected sight of a running mouse in (4), and the unforeseen and un hoped-for breaking of a tooth in (5). All these surprising and unexpected events immediately follow the action denoted by GFC, which is in turn presented as attempted and uncompleted. On the basis of these and similar examples, I will argue that, semantically, this construction encodes a conative aspect and displays an expressive character conveying an element of surprise and unexpectedness that is actually spelled out by the following sentence. Moreover, GFC involves a single event interpretation, and its productivity appears to be sensitive to the type of predicate involved in the construction. Syntactically, the application of several tests will prove that we are dealing with a monoclausal structure: comparison with the biclausal construction that contains *go* as a lexical verb of motion and a subordinate final clause will confirm these findings.

³ The following is a very common Sicilian saying, variants of which are found throughout the south of Italy: *jisti pi futtiri e fusti futtutu* ‘you went to swindle but you got swindled’.

Building on this semantic and syntactic evidence, I will propose that in the construction under investigation *go* is a functional verb encoding an aspectual value (cf. also Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003, Cinque 2006, Tellier 2015, Ledgeway 2016), while the surprise and unexpectedness meaning must be characterized as a conventional implicature.⁴

The examples presented and discussed in this paper come predominantly from the Sicilian novels by Giuseppe Pitrè ([1875] 1985). When no source is indicated, the examples are from the Sicilian dialect of Mussomeli, in the province of Caltanissetta. It should also be noted that GFC is typical of a narrative style, where either past tenses (cf. 4) or the narrative present (cf. 3, 5) are employed to refer to past events. Recent discourse-analytical studies agree that the narrative present is not only used to make the past more vivid, as traditionally claimed, but also to foreground events and to express a personal evaluation (see Brinton 1992). This explains why the narrative present, in particular, is so commonly found with GFC, insofar as it lends itself very well to the principal discourse function of GFC, namely, the expression of an internal evaluation of the events which are described as surprising or unexpected.

2. SEMANTIC ANALYSIS: ASPECTUAL FUNCTION AND EVENT INTERPRETATION

The origins of the Sicilian GFC can be found in the biclausal construction involving the lexical verb *jiri* ‘to go’ and an infinitival clause of purpose introduced by the preposition *pi* ‘for’:⁵

- (6) *Ciciruni parti e va nni sò soru pi purtalla*
 Ciciruni leave.3SG and go.3SG in his sister for take.INF=her
nni lu Re.
 in the king
 ‘Ciciruni leaves and goes to her sister’s to take her to the king.’
 (Palermo, Pitrè II: 72)

In this example, the verb *go* clearly denotes the meaning of movement and change of location, whose destination is overtly spelled out by the locative complement *nni sò soru* ‘to her sister’s (place)’. From a semantic viewpoint,

⁴ The characterization of GFC as outlined in this chapter builds on Dalrymple & Vincent’s (2015) analysis of a similar construction in English (cf. § 2.1).

⁵ It must be noted that the purpose or goal can also be expressed by a nominal constituent in Sicilian (Rohlf’s 1969: § 810), as in (ia) or by both a nominal expression and a final clause, as illustrated in (ib):

- (i) a. «*Unni vai, cavaleri?*» — «*Vaju pi lu pumu chi sona.*»
 where go.2SG knight go.1SG for the apple that ring.3SG
 ‘Where are you going, knight? – I’m going for the ringing apple.’
 (Palermo, Pitrè I: 579)
- b. *a la terza vota quannu va pi iddu pi pigghiàrisi 'nzoccu avia arristatu ...*
 to the third time when go.3SG for him for take.INF=self what had remained
 ‘the third time when he goes for him (in order) to take what had left ...’
 (Palermo, Pitrè I: 673)

it thus behaves as a full lexical verb. The infinitival clause introduced by the preposition *pi* ‘for’ is a subordinate adverbial clause expressing the purpose of the action introduced in the matrix clause. It seems natural to assume that GFC derives from a process of grammaticalization out of this biclausal structure. For ease of exposition, I will use the term BIS to refer to this biclausal structure containing a matrix clause featuring a lexical instance of the verb *go* and a final clause.

In the remainder of this section, I will describe the semantic results of this linguistic change, while in the next section (§ 3), I will discuss its morphosyntactic consequences. In the semantic and morphosyntactic characterization of GFC, the term grammaticalization will be used both in its diachronic and in its synchronic meaning. Diachronically, grammaticalization is the process that changes lexical units into grammatical units. In this sense, I have already mentioned that historically GFC is a functional construction that has emerged out of BIS. Synchronically, grammaticalization offers a set of principles and diagnostics to describe the degree of grammaticality of an element, according to a scalar approach to grammaticalization (Lehmann 1985, 1995, Bertinetto 1990, Heine 1993, Hopper & Traugott [1993] 2003, Giacalone Ramat 1995, 2000, Amenta & Strudsholm 2002, Amenta 2010, Vincent 2011, Cruschina 2013, a.o.). I will compare and contrast GFC and BIS to examine the degree of grammaticality or auxiliarity of the verb *go* in GFC as opposed to the lexical occurrence of the same verb in BIS.

2.1 *The conative component*

Semantically, the construction under examination here has lost, partially or completely, its movement meaning and has acquired a conative function. In the example in (3) above, the subject of the sentence enters the house and discovers something unexpected. In this case, GFC preserves a displacement meaning. It must be noted, however, that the same construction simultaneously denotes that the sudden realization occurs before the entering action is completed or, put another way, that the attempt to enter the house is unexpectedly interrupted because of the discovery that causes surprise and upset. In (4) a movement meaning might be implied, but is by no means necessarily entailed, and may well be attributed to the infinitival verb. In (5), by contrast, the attempted action clearly does not involve any physical displacement of the subject.

Despite the variation regarding whether an idea of movement is still present, what GFC consistently expresses in all the examples is that the subject of the sentence attempts to direct an action on to an object (or simply to perform an action), but, crucially, does not succeed or does not conclude the action. This function can be described as conative, insofar as it matches the definitions of conativity or conative aspect found in the literature. As discussed in Vincent (2013), the term conative is traditionally used to indicate an attempt to do something. GFC, then, involves a conative aspect in that the subject attempts an action that is partially or fully unaccomplished.

Dalrymple & Vincent (2015) examine an English construction which is very similar to Sicilian GFC. Consider the following examples reported and discussed in their article ((7a) is from the web, while (7b-c) are from the British National Corpus) (cf. also the English translations of the Sicilian examples in this chapter):

- (7) a. I slept all day today and when I awoke I thought the pain was gone but I **went to sit up** and my God it felt like I had just been pushed down 12 flights of stairs.
 b. Swiftly, she **went to change the subject** – but he beat her to it.
 c. He **went to answer her**, but she shook her head dismissively.

The English and the Sicilian constructions are almost identical: the verb *go* is followed by an infinitive verb introduced by a preposition. The preposition is *to* in English and *pi* ‘for’ in Sicilian, a marginal difference which is entirely expected given that they correspond to the preposition that is typically used to introduce final clauses in the respective language. The conative meaning contributed by the English *go-to* construction is defined as follows (where X is the subject of the sentence, while P is the complement predicate):

- (8) *X go to P* means that X intended to P, and made some effort to P.
 (Dalrymple & Vincent 2015: 9)

Exactly the same meaning characterizes the Sicilian construction, the conative aspect of which can then be described by minimally adapting Dalrymple & Vincent’s definition:

- (9) *X go for P* means that X intended to P, and made some effort to P.

As mentioned in Section 1, the construction additionally conveys the idea that the action denoted by the complement verb is interrupted and followed by a sudden and unexpected event. I will return to the surprise import of GFC in Section 4.

2.2 *Single event interpretation*

GFC involves a single event interpretation. This becomes evident if we consider the contrast in (10). The event described in the first sentence (10a) would under any other interpretation prove incompatible with the continuation (10b), in contrast to genuine cases of subordination such as (11) which clearly involves two events (cf. Shopen 1971, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003, Manzini & Savoia 2005: 698f., Cruschina 2013, Tellier 2015, for similar tests used in relation to constructions involving motion verbs):

- (10) a. [*Jivu pi mi susiri*]_{e1} e ...
 go.PST.1SG for me= get-up.INF and

- ‘I went to get up and ...’
- b. *mi detti cuntu ca un putiva caminari*
 me=give.PST.1SG account that not could.1SG walk.INF
 ‘I realized I couldn’t walk.’
- (11) a. [[*Jivu (ddrà dintra)*]_{e1} *pi* [*pigliari na birra*]_{e2}] *e ...*
 go.PST.1SG there inside for take.INF a beer and
 ‘I went (in there) to get a beer and ...’
- b. #*mi detti cuntu ca un putiva caminari*
 me=give.PST.1SG account that not could.1SG walk.INF
 ‘I realized I couldn’t walk.’

In other words, (10a) does not entail two independent events – one related to movement and lexicalized by the verb *go*, the other expressing a getting-up action. If two separate events were at play in this sentence, it would not be possible, contrary to fact, to continue (10a) with sentence (10b), which excludes that any movement event could have taken place. By contrast, in a BIS construction (cf. 11a) the lexical verb *go* is the predicate of the matrix clause and, as such, it can be followed by its locative argument (i.e. *ddrà dintra* ‘in there’): here the interpretation necessarily entails two consecutive but distinct events: a first event of going (the matrix clause) and a second event denoted by the final clause (i.e. to get a beer). In this case, the movement event cannot be denied and a continuation like (11b) would prove pragmatically infelicitous (as indicated by the symbol #).

In sum, in GFC there is no independent event of going; rather, the first verb simply contributes a conative aspectual meaning to the single event denoted by the complement verb. In some circumstances an idea of movement and physical displacement may still be present (see § 1), which might suggest that, in addition to conativity, the motion verb may also express an andative aspect signalling that a distance has to be covered for the action to be realized or executed. The element of movement and physical displacement may also be viewed as the ‘persistence’ typical of grammaticalization processes, whereby the grammaticalized form or construction may still reflect the lexical origin or development (see Hopper & Traugott [1993] 2003). From a semantic viewpoint, we can therefore conclude that GFC is a periphrastic structure comprising a functional verb that contributes aspectual grammatical information and a main lexical verb that retains its lexical meaning.

2.3 Restrictions on the subject and type of predicate

As already discussed in Section 2.1, conativity implies an attempt to perform an action that emphasizes the mental process or the behaviour directed towards that action on the part of the subject. This means that the semantic properties of GFC impose specific requirements on the subject and on the types of predicate that can enter the construction:

“Conative situations are situations of mere attempt, that means, a telic, and, in most cases, non-durative controlled action is presented in the preparatory stage and the achievement is explicitly or implicitly negated.” (Zeisler 2004: 205, cited in Dalrymple & Vincent 2015)

First of all, only controlled actions can be presented as conative. As a consequence, only intentional agents are allowed (12a), while inanimate subjects (12b) or subjects of unintentional events (12c) are not admitted:

- (12) a. *Jì pi abbuccari u vinu, e s’u jittà*
 go.PST.3SG for pour.INF the wine and self=it=throw
tuttu d’incùaddru.
 all down
 ‘He went to pour the wine and spilt it all over himself.’
- b. **U vinu (si) jì pi abbuccari e...*
 the wine itself= go.PST.3SG for pour/spill.INF and
- c. **Jì pi cadiri n’terra e...*
 go.PST.3SG for fall.INF in-floor and

As for the type of predicate denoted by the complement verb, namely, the verb spelling out the attempted action, telic events, whether punctual (*achievements*, cf. (5)) or not (*accomplishments*, cf. (12a)), are typically found in GFC, while states (cf. 13a) and (atelic) activities (cf. 13b) are not possible. Verbs expressing inceptive (cf. 13c) and terminative (cf. 13d) aspect are also excluded, presumably because of an independent incompatibility with conative aspect, at least in that precise order (see, e.g., Cinque 2006: 90, cf. fn. 12):⁶

- (13) a. **Maria jì pi cridiri ca aviva a*
 Mary go.PST.3SG for believe.INF that have.PST.3SG to

⁶ The reverse order (inceptive/terminative > conative) is also infelicitous. Note that the verb *jiri* in this construction cannot combine with any other modal or aspectual periphrasis such as the deontic verbal periphrasis with *aviri a* ‘have to’:

- (i) a. *Aju a gghiri nni Peppi, ppi pigliari l’ ova.*
 have.1SG to go in Peppi for fetch.INF the eggs
 ‘I have to go to Peppi’s to fetch the eggs.’
- b. **Aju a gghiri pì pigliari l’ ova e...*
 have.1SG to go for fetch.INF the eggs and

Although I could not find any attestations in Pitre’s works, it seems that the ‘go for’ construction is possible with progressive *stari* ‘stay’ (+ gerund), although limited to the imperfect past:

- (ii) *Stava jìannu pi pigliari l’ova, quannu tutt’a na vota si misi*
 stay.PST.3SG go.GER for take.INF the eggs when all to a time IMP=put.PST.3SG
a chioviri e mi mossi dintra.
 to rain.INF and REFL=remain.PST.1SG inside
 ‘I was about to go and fetch the eggs, when it suddenly started to rain and I stayed home.’

The tense restriction could simply be due to the unsuitability of the progressive aspect in the narrative present, i.e. when combined with a narrative style that employs a (morphologically) present tense (cf. § 1).

- chioviri e ...*
rain.INF and
- b. **Jiru pi curriri pi tri uri e ...*
go.PST.3PL for run.INF for three hours and
- c. **Giuvanni jì pi accuminciari a abbuccari*
John go.PST.3SG for start.INF to pour.INF
u vinu e ...
the wine and
- d. **Giuvanni jì pi finiri di costruiri*
John go.PST.3SG for finish.INF of build.INF
na casa nova e ...
the house new and

Exceptions to this generalization, however, are not infrequent. The verbs ‘see’ and ‘look (at)’, despite expressing activity and state, respectively, are frequently found in GFC (for the special word order in (14a), see fn. 10 below):

- (14) a. *Va lu Re pi vidi stu ritrattu e*
go.PRS.3SG the king for see.INF this portrait and
trova 'na giuvina bedda, bedda ca l'aguali
find.PRS.3SG a lady beautiful beautiful that the same
'un s'ha vistu mai.
not IMP=have.PRS.3SG seen never
‘The King goes to see this portrait and finds a most beautiful lady, as beautiful as he had ever seen.’
(Palermo, Pitrè II: 186)
- b. *quantu senti un scrùsciu chi cchiù chi*
as hear.PRS.3SG a noise that more that
java, cchiù forti si facia,
go.IMF.PST.3SG more strong self= make.IMF.PST.3SG
va pi guardari e vidi un sbardu di palummi.
go.PRS.3SG for look.INF and sees a flock of doves
‘as soon as he hears a noise that was getting louder and louder, he goes to have a look and sees a flock of doves.’
(Palermo, Pitrè I: 675)
- c. «*E ccà cu' cci stà?*» *E risposta 'un cci nni*
and here who there= stays and answer not him= of.it=
dava nuddu. Va pi vidi poi e
give.IMF.PST.3SG nobody go.PRS.3SG for see.INF then and
vidi sti tri picciotti.
see.PRS.3SG these three young-men
“‘Who lives here?’” And he received no answer. He goes to see/have a look then and sees these three young men.’
(Palermo, Pitrè I: 584)

These apparent exceptions can be explained by the following proposal: an explicit (14a) or implicit (14b,c) object contributes a telic interpretation to the event, roughly equivalent to ‘check x (out)’ or ‘have a look at x ’ (e.g. *what the noise is* in (14b), and *who lives there* in (14c)). In this interpretation, the predicate could be either an achievement or an accomplishment, depending on the durativity, but in either case it denotes a telic event. This would amount to saying that verbs that normally encode states or activities receive a telic interpretation in this construction, according to a mechanism that is known in the literature as aspect shift or event coercion (see Dowty 1979, Bach 1981, Pulman 1997, de Swart 1998, Fernald 1999, Rothstein 2004, among many others). In these cases what is attempted (and then suddenly interrupted) is not the action denoted by the complement verb alone, but the action together with some contextually salient or intended purpose. Further exceptions are possible and seem to be related to an advanced degree of grammaticalization of the functional verb: the case of weather predicates will be discussed in Section 3.3.

3. MORPHOSYNTACTIC PROPERTIES AND SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS

GFC does not display any visible peculiar morphosyntactic features that may overtly distinguish it from BIS (cf. (6) above, as well as the contrast with the structures in (1) and (2)). Upon closer scrutiny, however, it is possible to identify morphosyntactic properties that firmly support the hypothesis that GFC and BIS have different underlying syntactic structures. In particular, several pieces of evidence show that GFC should be analysed as a monoclausal structure, a syntactic analysis that goes hand in hand with the characteristic single event interpretation discussed in the previous section from a semantic viewpoint.

3.1 Monoclausal structure

The monoclausal nature of GFC clearly emerges when this construction is directly contrasted with the lexical occurrences of the verb *go* followed by a final clause headed by *pi* ‘for’, i.e. with the biclausal structure BIS. In GFC, the behaviour of *jiri* ‘go’ as a functional verb gives rise to a set of interrelated differences with respect to BIS:⁷

- a) Incompatibility with locative arguments and verbal adjuncts;
- b) Incompatibility with negation;
- c) Clitic climbing.

First of all, GFC cannot include the locative arguments or the adjuncts that typically occur with motion verbs. The presence of such constituents

⁷ These syntactic properties have been independently discussed in the literature as evidence or tests in support of a monoclausal analysis (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003, Cruschina 2013, Tellier 2015, Ledgeway 2016; see also Wurmbrand 2001, 2004 for German).

undermines the periphrastic interpretation of the construction as GFC, leaving BIS as the only possible structure. This is illustrated in (15). The BIS in (15a) contains two locative arguments of the lexical verb *go* ('in the same village' and 'to the same dealer'). In (15b), it is shown that, in addition to a locative argument ('in there', 'in the other room'), BIS can host a manner adverb (*lestu* 'quickly') or an adverbial expression of frequency (*du voti* 'twice'). By contrast, neither a locative argument, be it pronominal, adverbial or a full PP, nor a frequency or manner adverb referring to an event of going can occur in GFC, see (15c):

- (15) a. *si nni ji' a lu stissu paisi, e*
 self=there.from= go.PST.3SG to the same village and
nni lu stessu mircanti, pi vinnirci lu sidduni.
 to the same dealer for sell.INF=him the saddle
 'he went to the same village, and to the same dealer, to sell
 him the saddle.'
 (Cianciana, AG, Pitrè I: 244)
- b. *Jì (lestu) ddrà (dintra) (du voti) pi pigliari na*
 go.PST.3SG fast there in(side) two times for take.INF a
buttiglia di vinu.
 bottle of wine
 'He (quickly) went (in) there (twice) to get a bottle of wine.'
- c. *(*Ci) jì (*ddrà/*lestu/*du voti) pi pigliari na*
 there= go.PST.3SG there fast two times for take.INF a
buttiglia di vinu e si taglià c' u vitru.
 bottle of wine and self= cut.PST3SG with the glass
 'He went to get a bottle of wine and cut himself with the
 glass.'

The presence of locative specifications or of modifying adverbs forces a lexical reading of the motion verb and presupposes an actual physical displacement: a periphrastic status cannot thus be attributed to this type of structure, which must thus inevitably be identified as an instance of BIS. That we are not dealing with an occurrence of GFC is also confirmed by the pragmatic oddity that results from inserting a construction with a locative argument or a manner/frequency adverb in a context where GFC would be usually employed, namely, when a following sentence expresses the unexpected result of the immediately preceding event (cf. 15c).

The incompatibility between GFC and locative arguments or manner and frequency adjuncts is a direct consequence of the functional status of *go* in GFC: it has lost the lexical meaning of movement and has therefore no thematic grid and no argument structure of its own; nor can it be modified by those adverbs or adverbial expressions that generally co-occur with the lexical verb to specify the manner, the frequency or the intensity of a going event. As a matter of fact, a locative constituent is required by the argument

structure of lexical *go* as a core participant in the eventuality denoted by this verb: its absence is only acceptable when *go* acts as a functional verb, rather than as a lexical one.

Functional *go* in GFC is also incompatible with negation (cf. 16b), whereas the two events denoted in BIS can be individually negated (cf. 16a).

- (16) a. *Un ci jì pi un' a offenniri.*
 not there= go.PST.3SG for not her= offend
 'He didn't go there (in order) to not offend her.'
- b. (**Un*) *jì pi (*un) pigliari na buttiglia di vinu e ...*
 not go.PST.3SG for not take.INF a bottle of wine and

In combination with a lexical verb, the grammaticalized verb *go* in GFC loses the possibility of being negated separately. This witnesses the unitary interpretation of GFC as a single event in a monoclausal structure. The verb *go* can therefore be negated only when it entails movement in space and expresses no aspectual meanings. In periphrastic constructions, however, the whole construction made up of a functional verb and a main lexical verb can normally be negated. This is not the case in GFC, where no negation can occur at all. The fact that in (16b) the infinitive cannot bear sentential negation can be explained by assuming that the complement of the functional verb is a bare VP, thus lacking an independent TP and NegP. The incompatibility of GFC with a higher negation (i.e. with negation scoping over the overall construction) must instead be explained differently. The key aspect seems to be the surprise meaning component of GFC. A possible solution to this problem is offered in Tellier's (2015: 160-161) analysis of expressive *aller* and *venir* in French, which also convey an idea of unexpectedness and surprise: expressives (cf. Cruse 1986, Potts 2005, 2007) are generally incompatible with true negation, since "the speaker's discontent or surprise at the event [...] cannot be simultaneously asserted and denied".⁸

Since Rizzi (1982), clitic climbing has been viewed as a diagnostic for restructuring, namely, a phenomenon of clause union (cf. Aissen & Perlmutter 1983) where an apparently biclausal structure involving two verbal elements behaves as a single clause. A pronominal clitic originally dependent on a complement verb can thus climb up and attach to the higher verb. In Romance, motion verbs, together with other aspectual and modal verbs, belong to the class of verbs that are typically involved in restructuring phenomena. Restructuring motion verbs are followed either directly by the infinitive (e.g. in French) or by the preposition *a* before the infinitive (e.g. in Spanish and in Italian). What is interesting about the Sicilian GFC is the possibility of also finding monoclausal effects in the presence of the

⁸ See also Elliott (1974) for expressive predicates, and Portner & Zanuttini (2000), Zanuttini & Portner (2003), who attribute the unacceptability of negation in exclamatives expressing surprise to their scalar implicature property.

proposition *pi* ‘for’. In Standard Italian, clitic climbing is optional with restructuring verbs: the clitic can either climb to the left of the finite (functional) verb or stay lower, attached to the infinitive. In Sicilian, it actually depends on the specific dialect: clitic climbing with GFC seems to be optional in the dialect of Palermo (see the contrast between (17a) and (17b)); it is possible in the dialect of Mussomeli (18a), but the placement of the clitic before the infinitive is preferred (18b):⁹

- (17) a. *Va pi vutàrisi, e vidi a un omu.*
 go.3SG for turn.INF=self and see.PRS.3SG ACC a man
 ‘He goes to turn around and sees a man.’
 (Palermo, Pitrè I: 469)
- b. *Si va pi vutari e trova la vurza,*
 self= go.PRS.3SG for turn.INF and find.PRS.3SG the bag
la tuvagghia e lu viulinu.
 the towel and the violin
 ‘He goes to turn around and finds the bag, the towel and the violin.’
 (Palermo, Pitrè I: 483)
- (18) a. *U jì pi spingiri e cadì n’ terra.*
 it= go.PST.3SG for lift.INF and fall.PST.3SG in floor
- b. *Jì p’ u spingiri e cadì n’ terra.*
 go.PST.3SG for it= lift.INF and fall.PST.3SG in floor
 ‘He went to lift it up and fell on the floor.’

Clitic climbing clearly shows that in these examples the infinitival clauses are not clausally complex in the same way as standard embedded clauses, but are rather part of a complex periphrastic predicate comprising a functional verb that contributes an aspectual meaning and a complement lexical verb that denotes an action or an event. More evidence for the special status of the infinitive occurring in GFC is discussed in the next section.

3.2 Fixed order and lack of infinitival autonomy

Unlike BIS, which involves a final clause (cf. (19)-(21)), the elements of the sequence ‘*jiri + pi + infinitive*’ in GFC must occur in a fixed order and must be adjacent to one another. In (19), the final clause precedes the verb *go*,

⁹ The behaviour of the Palermo dialect is somewhat unexpected in light of the fact that proclisis, and hence clitic climbing, with restructuring verbs is the most common pattern in Old Sicilian and in southern Italian dialects more generally (cf. Maiden 1998: 182, Amenta & Strudsholm 2002: 18). Note also that, unlike in most Sicilian dialects, in the dialect of Mussomeli clitics generally precede the infinitive (cf. 18b): this is a typical property of central-southern dialects of Sicily (in the provinces of Caltanissetta and Agrigento).

while in (20), we see that a constituent can be inserted between *go* and the final clause:¹⁰

- (FINAL CLAUSE > JIRI)
- (19) *Ogni jornu s' accattava 'na pagnotta cauda, e pi*
 every day self= buy.PST.3SG a loaf hot and for
cunzarisilla java nna la Chiesa.
 fill=self=it go.PST.3SG to the church
 'He bought a hot loaf every day and went to the church to fill it.'
 (Palermo, Pitrè I: 257)

- (INTERVENING CONSTITUENT)
- (20) *Ciciruni parti e va nni sò soru pi purtalla*
 Ciciruni leave.3SG and go.3SG in his sister for take.INF=her
nni lu Re.
 in the king
 'Ciciruni leaves and goes to her sister to take her to the king.'
 (Palermo, Pitrè II: 72)

A different order of elements, as well as the presence of intervening material, block a periphrastic interpretation of the construction and unequivocally yield a BIS reading.

Unlike in Italian, Sicilian embedded infinitives may display an overt subject in the so-called personal infinitives (cf. Bentley 2014). If a personal infinitive follows the motion verb, that is, if the infinitive is either preceded or followed by an overt subject, we are certainly dealing with BIS:

- (PERSONAL INFINITIVE)
- (21) *Ni nni iemu pi ttu arristari sulu.*
 we.self= there.from= go.PST.1PL for you remain.INF alone
 'We left in order for you to be left alone.'
 (La Fauci 1984: 122, cited in Bentley 2014: 110)

So far in this section I have not provided any examples of GFC not only because they are not attested, but also because the lack of adjacency between its components, the insertion of a constituent, and the presence of a personal infinitive would not make the sentence ungrammatical, but would simply force a biclausal interpretation. However, if we take an attested GFC example where no spatial movement is entailed and with the typical

¹⁰ In (14a) above we find a postverbal subject intervening between the verb *go* and the infinitival clause. This may indicate that in this example the biclausal structure has not yet been fully grammaticalized to the monoclausal conative construction. Interestingly, this is one of the examples where, to a certain extent, the movement meaning persists. At any rate, it must also be noted that this order seems to belong to a specific narrative style, and is judged as ungrammatical or at least as marginal by all native speakers when presented with this sentence in a colloquial register. An alternative explanation could be that in this very specific narrative (and almost archaic) register, the verb moves to a higher position, as independently argued for Romance medieval varieties (cf. Benincà 2006, Poletto 2014).

juxtaposition of a second sentence expressing surprise and unexpectedness, as for instance the example in (5), repeated here below, we can observe that none of the operations discussed above would be possible without rendering the sentence unacceptable or at least pragmatically infelicitous (cf. also § 3.1.):

- (5') *Vàiu ppi mmuzzicari u turruni, e mi rruppi*
 go.PRS.1SG for bite.INF the nougat and me=break.PST.1SG
u renti.
 the tooth
 'I went to bite into the nougat, when I broke my tooth.'
 (Leone 1995: 44)

- (22) #*Ppi mmuzzicari u turruni, v àiu (nn' a cucina)*
 for bite.INF the nougat go.PRS.1SG in the kitchen
e mi rruppi u renti.
 and me=break.PST.1ST the tooth
 (PREPOSITION + INFINITIVE > JIRI)

- (23) #*V àiu nn' a cucina ppi mmuzzicari u turruni,*
 go.PRS.1SG in the kitchen for bite.INF the nougat
e mi rruppi u renti.
 and me=break.PST.1ST the tooth
 (INTERVENING CONSTITUENT)

- (24) **V àiu ppi iu muzzicari u turruni, e mi rruppi*
 go.1SG for I bite.INF the nougat and me=break.PST.1ST
u renti.
 the tooth
 (PERSONAL INFINITIVE)

The infelicity or the grammatical unacceptability of these sentences results from the attempt to force the interpretation typically associated with a biclausal structure onto a construction that is used for different purposes and in different contexts, namely, the grammaticalized GFC.

3.3 A further stage of grammaticalization: The case of weather predicates

The semantic and syntactic properties discussed so far lead to the conclusion that GFC derives from a process of grammaticalization out of BIS. The construction shows neither morphological reduction nor phonological erosion, but this is not expected in each and every instance of grammaticalization. The semantic bleaching from a content or lexical category to a functional item is nonetheless evident when the meaning and the syntactic properties of the construction as a whole are taken into consideration, showing that this phenomenon is a fully-fledged instance of grammaticalization. One further piece of evidence confirms that *go* in GFC

is a functional verb that contributes an aspectual meaning: the use of the construction with weather predicates. Before illustrating this use, two clarifications are in order. Firstly, as already mentioned in Section 1, GFC is widespread in the whole of Southern Italy; the possibility for weather predicates to enter this construction, however, appears to be limited to certain dialects and is certainly much more constrained in terms of frequency and with respect to the contextual licensing conditions. Secondly, weather predicates select for no arguments – in fact, their valency is zero – and can surely not be used in constructions involving a lexical verb of movement.¹¹ Consider the following examples from the dialect of Mussomeli:

- (25) a. *Jì pi chioviri e vonsi trasiri*
 go.PST.3SG for rain.INF and want.PST.1SG enter.INF
i robbi.
 the cloths
 ‘It seemed it was going to rain and I had to take the laundry in.’
- b. *Jì pi nivicari, mmeci chioppi.*
 go.PST.3SG for snow.INF instead rain.PRS.3SG
 ‘It seemed it was going to snow, but it was actually raining.’

On the one hand, these sentences may seem in apparent contradiction with the generalizations discussed in Section 2 on the specific requirements imposed by the conative aspect on the subject and on the types of predicate. On the other, they clearly reflect a more advanced stage of grammaticalization, whereby the motion verb has undergone a complete process of decategorialization, has lost its lexical properties, and now serves a purely functional purpose, namely, the expression of a conative aspect highlighting the abrupt interruption of an event (an activity in this case) right after its start or even before. Sentence (25a), for instance, implies either that the rain did not last long (the activity is then being described as having an endpoint) or that it looked like it was going to rain, but it could well be that in fact it never did. Similarly, (25b) can be uttered upon realizing that what at first sight seemed to be snow, perhaps because some snowflakes fell, was in fact (or ended up being) rain.

3.4 TAM and sentence types

Grammaticalized verbs are generally subject to morphosyntactic restrictions with respect to the TAM (tense, aspect, and mood) system, as well as to the types of sentence in which they can occur. The actual distributional restrictions of a specific grammatical verb (e.g. an auxiliary or another functional verb) depend on the degree of grammaticalization and on the conditions of use of the construction in which it occurs: the wider the

¹¹ In the literature, it has often been argued that weather predicates are not totally argumentless, but have quasi-argumental subjects, i.e. non referential or semi-referential, but nevertheless θ -role-bearing subjects (cf. Bolinger 1973, 1977, Chomsky 1982, Cardinaletti 1990, Vikner 1995, Sheehan 2006: Ch.5).

restrictions are, the greater the degree of decategorialization that characterizes a grammaticalized verb. At the end of Section 1, I observed that GFC is typical of a narrative style. This explains why GFC is generally found either in the preterite (i.e. with the perfective past) or in the present tense used as a historic present, that is, to refer to past events. The imperfective past tense – making reference to a durative, continuing or repeated event or state in the past – is therefore uncommon in GFC (cf. § 2.3 for other aspectual restrictions). It would only be possible if both the attempted action described in GFC and the result expressed by the following sentence are characterized by a continual repetition, as in (26):

- (26) *Jiva p' addrumari u muturi e*
 go.IMF.PST.3SG for turn-on.INF the engine and
si ci astutava.
 self= him= turn.off.IMF.3SG
 ‘He kept turning on the engine but it kept dying (on him)’

Unlike other periphrastic constructions with motion verbs (cf. (1) and (2) above, and see Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, 2003, Cruschina 2013, Di Caro 2015 for discussion of the paradigm restrictions concerning the functional motion verbs in those constructions), GFC can be used for all grammatical persons, but cannot occur in the imperative. The exclusion of the imperative mood from GFC’s paradigm is a further difference with respect to BIS and is evidently due to the semantic incompatibility between the conative aspect of GFC and the carrying out of the action requested by the imperative.

Because of a similar semantic incompatibility, GFC cannot be used in interrogative sentences.¹² The incompatibility between GFC and the imperative mood and the interrogative sentence type may additionally be attributed to the fact that they are not particularly well suited to the typical narrative style of GFC. Declaratives are thus the most common sentence type in which GFC occurs; however, other sentence types such as temporal (cf. 27, 28) and conditional (cf. 29) clauses are also possible:

- (27) *La sira quannu iju pi pigghiari la pupa, e*
 the evening when go.PST.3SG for take.INF the doll and
nun la truvau cchiui, si misi a chianciri.
 not her= find.PST.3SG more REFL=put.PST.3SG to cry.INF
 ‘In the evening, when she went to fetch the doll, and couldn’t find it,
 she started crying.’
 (Palermo, Pitre I: 267)

¹² A possible context in which GFC can occur within an interrogative sentence, though still marginally, is that of an echo-question which repeats part of what the speaker has just heard but not fully understood (e.g. *Chi jisti pi pigghiari e ti cadi n'terra?* ‘What did you go to take and fell on the floor?’). In this case, however, the meaning of surprise or unexpectedness most probably associated with the original assertion is not repeated together with the question, and the construction is presumably used metalinguistically.

(28) *comu va pi asciògghiri lu saccu, s' adduna*
 as go.PRS.3SG pi untie.INF the sack sefl= notice.PRS.3SG
di la picciotta ch' era ddà dintra attaccata
 of the young-woman that was there inside tied-up
 'as he goes to untie the sack, he notices the young woman who was
 tied up in there.'
 (Marsala, Pitrè III: 111)

(29) *Sutta u lettu c'è na munachedda, cummigliata cu*
 under the bed there=is a little-nun covered with
dudici mantedda, si a vaju pi tuccari
 twelve mantels if her= GO.PRS.1ST for touch.INF
s'appizza all' occhiu e mi fa lacrimari
 sefl=stick.PRS.3SG to-the eye and me= make.3SG weep.INF
 'Under the bed is a little nun, covered with twelve mantels, if I go to
 touch her, she sticks to my eye and makes me weep.'

Example (29) is a traditional Sicilian riddle, whose solution is 'an onion'.¹³ In this conditional sentence, the conative aspect of the GFC is evident: the main coordinated clauses express the consequences of any attempt to accomplish the conditional action expressed by the dependent if-clause.

3.5 Morphosyntactic and semantic properties: A summary

The following table summarizes the morphosyntactic and semantic properties discussed in the previous sections, contrasting the behaviour of the verb *jiri* 'go' in its lexical usage within the biclausal structure featuring a final clause (i.e. BIS) and the same verb in its functional use expressing conative aspect (i.e. GFC). I use the abbreviations V1 and V2 to indicate the verb *go* and the following infinitival verb form, respectively:

(30) Table 1: Morphosyntactic and semantic properties of GFC

	BIS	GFC
arguments and adjuncts	✓	✗
sentential negation with V1	✓	✗
sentential negation with V2	✓	✗
clitic climbing	✗	✓
fixed order	✗	✓
adjacency requirement	✗	✓
distributional restrictions	✗	✓
single event interpretation	✗	✓

¹³ This variant of the riddle is taken from the following collection of popular sayings, riddles, proverbs, prayers, tongue twisters and folklore songs in the dialect of Palazzo Adriano, in the province of Palermo: *Detti popolari – Indovinelli – Proverbi – Preghiere dialettali – Scioglilingua – Canzoni tradizionali*, Comune di Palazzo Adriano – Prologo "Palazzo Adriano", available at: <<http://www.dimarcomezzojuso.it/autore.php?id=71>>.

While BIS shows all the properties typical of a complex biclausal structure comprising a matrix and a subordinate clause, functional *go* in GFC behaves as a restructuring aspectual verb which has lost its lexical spatial meaning. As a consequence, the arguments and adjuncts which are typically dependent on a lexical motion verb are not possible with functional *go*, which cannot even be modified by negation. Sentential negation can normally modify the complement infinitival verb in the biclausal structure, but not in the presence of functional *go*. We attributed the general ban on negation not to the morphosyntactic properties of the construction as such – periphrastic constructions normally admit negation with scope on the whole construction –, but to the surprise meaning associated with GFC (cf. § 3.1; see also § 4.2). In the conative GFC, the two verbs act as a single unit with respect to syntactic (i.e. clitic climbing, fixed order, and required adjacency) and semantic properties (i.e. single event interpretation). In contrast, the two verbs in BIS are two independent verbs which, semantically, denote two separate events and, syntactically, allow for greater order flexibility but not for the structural transparency necessary for clitic climbing.

4. FURTHER STRUCTURAL AND INTERPRETIVE ISSUES

On the basis of the previous discussion, the analysis I propose for the Sicilian GFC should be clear: as a result of a process of grammaticalization from a biclausal structure (BIS), the restructuring verb *go* in GFC must now be analysed as a functional verb which has lost its lexical content and has developed a merely aspectual meaning.¹⁴ This kind of functional verb encodes tense, person, and conative aspect features, but it is the complement infinitival verb that contributes the lexical meaning to the construction. If the role of the two verbs and their division of labour within the construction is rather transparent, the status of the preposition connecting them is more difficult to capture. This issue will be addressed in the next section (§ 4.1), while Section 4.2 will be devoted to an account of the surprise and unexpected meaning typically associated with GFC.

4.1 *The role of the preposition*

In BIS, the role of the Sicilian preposition *pi* is rather obvious: it introduces a final clause. This is indeed one of the general functions of this preposition in Sicilian as well as in other Romance varieties. In combination with a motion verb such as *go*, the preposition thus introduces a subordinate clause that indicates the purpose or goal towards which the movement is directed.

¹⁴ In generative grammar, and in particular, within the cartographic approach to syntactic structures, functional or light verbs are treated as functional heads occupying the relevant positions within a single fixed-ordered hierarchy of functional projections (cf. Cinque 1999, 2006). The position of the conative aspectual verb is illustrated here below, where only the surrounding aspectual projections are considered (from Cinque 2006: 90):

(i) . . . Asp_{habitual} > Asp_{prepositional} > Asp_{repetitive(I)} > Asp_{terminative} > Asp_{continuative} > . . .
 Asp_{retrospective} > Asp_{progressive} > Asp_{prospective} > Asp_{inceptive} > Asp_{frustrative/success} >
Asp_{conative} > Asp_{completive(I)} > Voice > . . . Asp_{completive(II)} > Asp_{repetitive(II)}

The obvious question to address is now: What happens in GFC? Since it is a monoclausal construction, the preposition *pi* clearly does not mark any sort of dependency between clauses in this case. We could then assume that it is simply a residual of the source construction from which GFC originates. In this sense, its function is essentially equal to that of the desemanticized linker typically found in serial verb constructions (Aikhenvald 2006: 20).¹⁵ If synchronically the preposition *pi* does not serve any specific function within the construction, diachronically it must have played a crucial role in the development of the conative aspect and of the characteristic semantic and morphosyntactic properties that distinguish GFC from other periphrases that also involve a reanalysed motion verb, but a different preposition (cf. (1), (2) above and the references cited in the discussion of these examples). I leave this diachronic question open for future research.

4.2 *The surprise and unexpectedness import as a conventional implicature*

While the conative import is part of the informative meaning of the construction, expressing the main point of the utterance, the effect of surprise and unexpectedness associated with this construction – but spelled out by the event expressed by the following clause – can be characterized as a conventional implicature (in the sense of Potts 2005, 2007) that adds up to the propositional content of the sentence (cf. Dalrymple & Vincent 2015).¹⁶ Consider the following examples:

- (31) a. *va pi nesciri e nun pò, ca lu pirtusu*
 go.PRS.3SG for go-out.INF and not can.3SG that the hole
si trova chiusu.
 self= find.PRS.3SG closed
 ‘he goes to go out and cannot, as the hole is blocked’
 (*Camporeale, PA, Pitrè IV: 92*)
- b. *Iju pi tastari, e vitti ca era vinu spuntu.*
 go.PST.3SG for taste.INF and see.PST.3SG that was wine acid
 ‘He went to taste it and saw/realized it was almost vinegar.’
 (*Palermo, Pitrè III: 60*)
- c. *va pi sarvari lu còcciu di la càlia,*
 go.PRS.3SG for save.INF the grain of the roasted-chickpea
e s’ adduna chi lu gaddu si l’ avia manciatu.
 and self= notice that the rooster self= it = had eaten

¹⁵ According to Cinque (2006: 45), in restructuring constructions, prepositions which originally had a complementizer function have now been reanalysed “as introducers of smaller portions of the extended projection of the lexical VP, namely, as introducers of the complement of one of the functional heads that make up that extended projection”:

(i) ... F ... [PP [INFP [FP F ... [VP]]]]

With regard to the role of the preposition, Ledgeway (2015) proposes that in similar structures prepositions can realize different phase heads.

¹⁶ The use of the verb *go* in constructions expressing surprise and unexpectedness is not uncommon (cf. Wiklund 2009, Josefsson 2014, Dalrymple & Vincent 2015, Tellier 2015, and references therein).

‘she went to save the roasted chickpea, and realized that the rooster had eaten it.’

(*Marsala*, Pitrè III: 108)

First of all, the information that is presented as surprising is not already part of the background, and this is a property that distinguishes conventional implicatures from presuppositions. In these examples, moreover, it would not be possible for the speaker to cancel or deny the import of surprise and unexpectedness associated with the second clause, as typical of conventional implicatures and contrary to conversational implicatures. Indeed, continuations like the following would prove pragmatically infelicitous:

- (32) a. #*ma già u sapiva.*
but already it=know.PST.1/3SG
‘but I/he already knew it.’
b. #*propia chidru ca pinsava.*
exactly what that think.PST.1/3SG
‘exactly as I/he thought.’

In addition, the addressee can challenge either the at-issue meaning or the conventional implicature, showing that the two meanings are independent from one another. Let us consider sentence (31b), for instance; here repeated as (33A). Upon hearing this sentence, the addressee B can object to A’s statement about the quality of the wine, asserting that the wine was actually good (33B). The addressee thus contests the at-issue meaning ‘the wine was almost vinegar’, providing his different opinion. The addressee’s reaction could alternatively be directed not to the at-issue content of A’s statement, but to the conventional implicature of surprise or unexpectedness: in (33B’), the addressee contests that A’s statement should be evaluated as surprising or unexpected:

- (33) A: *Iju pi tastari, e vitti ca era vinu spuntu.*
go.PST.3SG for taste.INF and see.PST.3SG that was wine acid
‘He went to taste it and saw/realized it was almost vinegar.’
B: *Ugn’ è veru, u vinu jera bùanu.*
not be.PRS.3SG true the wine be.PST.3SG good
‘That’s not true, the wine was good.’
B’: *Chi c’è di stranu!? A ssu priazzu, chi*
what there=is of strange at that price what
t’ aspittavi?!
you= expect.PST.2SG
‘What’s so odd about that!? At that price, what would you expect?!’

We can therefore describe the overall meaning of GFC by making reference to its multidimensional content: on the one hand, the informative at-issue meaning provided by the conative proposition (p1) and by the following resultative proposition (p2) (cf. 34a); on the other, the non-at-issue meaning, to be characterized as a conventional implicature, expressing that, in some sense, p2 is surprising or unexpected (cf. 34b):

- (34) a. Informative/descriptive (at-issue) content:
p1 = X intends/makes efforts to P, where P = ‘taste the wine’
p2 = the wine was (almost) vinegar
- b. Conventional Implicature:
p2 (i.e. the result of p1) is surprising and/or unexpected

Crucially, even if in the narrow sense the second clause expressing the surprising or unexpected result of the attempted action is not part of the conative GFC, it is still necessary for the construction to work: if this consequence or result of the conative proposition is missing, the construction would be felt to be incomplete and hence pragmatically odd.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, I have examined the semantic and the morphosyntactic properties of the ‘go for’ construction (GFC) in Sicilian. On the basis of the traditional diagnostics for the reflexes of grammaticalization, I showed that in this construction the motion verb *go* behaves as a functional verb expressing conative aspect and that the sentence following GFC denotes the result or the consequence of the action denoted by GFC and is associated with a conventional implicature of surprise and unexpectedness. Diachronically, GFC derives from BIS, namely, from a biclausal structure that comprises a matrix clause with a lexical occurrence of the motion verb and a final clause. In this paper, however, I did not look at the GFC in diachrony, but rather at its synchronic characteristics. BIS still exists in modern Sicilian, thereby allowing a direct synchronic analysis contrasted with GFC which enables us to capture the semantic and morphosyntactic consequences of the grammaticalization of the motion verb *go* both with respect to the individual verb and at the level of the construction as a whole.

PRIMARY SOURCE

Pitrè, Giuseppe [1875] (1985). *Fiabe novelle e racconti popolari siciliani*, 4 Voll. Sala Bolognese: Forni. Digital edition (2010): LiberLiber, Progetto Manuzio.

REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2006). Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–68.
- Aissen, Judith & David Perlmutter (1983). Clause reduction in Spanish. In David Perlmutter (ed.), *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 360–403.
- Amenta, Luisa (2010). Perifrasi verbali in siciliano. In Jacopo Garzonio (ed.), *Studi sui dialetti della Sicilia. Quaderni di lavoro ASIt 11*. Padua: Unipress, 1–18.
- Amenta, Luisa & Erling Strudsholm (2002). «Andare a + infinito» in italiano. Parametri di variazione sincronici e diacronici. *Cuadernos de Filología Italiana* 9: 11–29.
- Andriani, Luigi (in preparation). Aspects of the morpho-syntax of Barese. PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Bach, Emmon (1981). On time, tense, and aspect: an essay in English metaphysics. In Peter Cole (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, 62–81.
- Benincà, Paola (2006). A detailed map of the left periphery of Medieval Romance. In Raffaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger & Paul Portner (eds.), *Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture: Cross-linguistic Investigations*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 53–86.
- Bentley, Delia (2014). On the personal infinitive in Sicilian. In Paola Benincà, Adam Ledgeway & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Diachrony and Dialects: Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 96–135.
- Bertinetto, Pier Marco (1990). Perifrasi verbali italiane: criteri di identificazione e gerarchia di perifrasticità. In Giuliano Bernini & Anna Giacalone Ramat (eds.), *La temporalità nell'acquisizione di lingue seconde*. Milan: Angeli, 331–350.
- Bolinger, Dwight (1973). Ambient *it* is meaningful too. *Journal of Linguistics* 9 (2): 261–270.
- Bolinger, Dwight (1977). *Meaning and Form*. London: Longman.
- Brinton, Laurel (1992). The historical present in Charlotte Brontë's novels: Some discourse functions. *Style* 26 (2): 221–244.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca (1994). *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (1990). *Impersonal Constructions and Sentential Arguments in German*. Padua: Unipress.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti (2001). 'Semi-lexical' motion verbs in Romance and Germanic. In Norbert Corver & Henk C. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Semi-lexical Categories. On the Function of Content Words and the Content of Function Words*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 371–414.

- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti (2003). Motion verbs as functional heads. In Cristina Tortora (ed.), *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 31–49.
- Chomsky, Noam (1982). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (2006). *Restructuring and Functional Heads*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2013). Beyond the stem and inflectional morphology: An irregular pattern at the level of periphrasis. In Silvio Cruschina, Martin Maiden and John Charles Smith (eds.), *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology: Diachronic and Synchronic Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 262–283.
- Cruse, D. Alan (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalrymple, Mary & Nigel Vincent (2015). The *go to* construction. Ms., University of Oxford and University of Manchester.
- De Swart, Henriëtte (1998). Aspect shift and coercion. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 16: 347–385.
- De Vos, Mark. 2005. *The Syntax of Pseudo-Coordination in English and Afrikaans*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Leiden Centre for Linguistics. LOT/Igitur Publishing.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo N. (2015). Syntactic constructions with motion verbs in some Sicilian dialects: a comparative analysis. Master's Thesis, Ca' Foscari University of Venice.
- Dowty, David (1979). *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar. The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Elliott, Dale E. (1974). Toward a grammar of exclamatives. *Foundations of Language* 11 (2): 231–246.
- Fernald, Theodore (1999). Evidential coercion. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 29(1): 43–63.
- Giacalone Ramat, Anna (1995). Sulla grammaticalizzazione dei verbi di movimento: andare e venire + gerundio. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 80: 168–203.
- Giacalone Ramat, Anna (2000). On some grammaticalization patterns for auxiliaries. In John Charles Smith & Delia Bentley (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 1995. Selected Papers from the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 1995*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 125–154.
- Heine, Bernd (1993). *Auxiliaries. Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott [1993] (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Josefsson, Gunlög (2014). Pseudocoordination in Swedish with *gå* ‘go’ and the “surprise effect”. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 93: 26–50.
- La Fauci, Nunzio (1984). La formazione del siciliano nel Medioevo: uno sguardo oltre la storia della linguistica e la linguistica della storia. In Adriana Quattordio Moreschini (ed.), *Tre millenni di storia linguistica della Sicilia*. Pisa: Giardini, 105–138.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2015). Reconstructing complementizer-drop in the dialects of the Salento: A syntactic or phonological phenomenon?. In Theresa Biberauer & George Walkden (eds.), *Syntax Over Time: Lexical, Morphological, and Information-structural Interactions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 146–162.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2016). From coordination to subordination: the grammaticalisation of progressive and andative aspect in the dialects of Salento. In Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira & Clara Pinto (eds.), *Coordination and Subordination. Form and Meaning. Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*. Newcastle: Cambridge Publishing Scholars, 157–184.
- Lehmann, Christian (1985). Grammaticalization: Synchronic variation and diachronic change. *Lingua e stile* 20: 303–318.
- Lehmann, Christian (1995). *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Munich: LINCOM Europa.
- Leone, Alfonso (1995). *Profilo di sintassi siciliana*. Palermo: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.
- Maiden, Martin (1998). *Storia linguistica dell’italiano*. Bologna: Il Mulino [Italian translation of *A Linguistic History of Italian*. London/New York: Longman, 1995].
- Manzini, Maria Rita & Leonardo Savoia (2005). *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- Poletto, Cecilia (2014). *Word Order in Old Italian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Portner, Paul & Raffaella Zanuttini (2000). The force of negation in WH exclamatives and interrogatives. In Laurence R. Horn & Yasuhiko Kato (eds.), *Studies in Negation and Polarity: Syntactic and semantic perspectives*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 201–239.
- Potts, Christopher (2005). *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Potts, Christopher (2007). The expressive dimension. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33: 165–198.
- Pulman, Stephen G. (1997). Aspectual shift as type coercion. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 95 (2): 279–317.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1982). *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rohlf, Gerhard (1969). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti, Vol. 3: Sintassi e Formazione delle Parole*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Rothstein, Susan (2004). *Structuring Events: A Study in the Semantics of Aspect*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Sheehan, Michelle (2006). *The EPP and Null Subjects in Romance*. PhD thesis, Newcastle University.
- Shopen, Timothy (1971). Caught in the act. *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 254–263.
- Sornicola, Rosanna (1976). Vado a dire, vaiu a ddicu: problema sintattico o problema semantico?. *Lingua Nostra* 37: 65–74.
- Tellier, Christine (2015). French expressive motion verbs as functional heads. *Probus* 27: 157–192.
- Vikner, Sten (1995). *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vincent, Nigel (2011). Non-finite forms, periphrases, and autonomous morphology in Latin and Romance. In Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith, Maria Goldbach & Marc-Olivier Hinzelin (eds.), *Morphological Autonomy: Perspectives from Romance Inflectional Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 417–435.
- Vincent, Nigel (2013). Conative. *Linguistic Typology* 17 (2): 269–289.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena (2009). The syntax of surprise: Unexpected event readings in complex predication. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 84: 181–224.
- Wurmbrand, Susi (2001). *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Wurmbrand, Susi (2004). Two types of restructuring: Lexical vs. functional. *Lingua* 114: 991–1014.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella & Paul Portner (2003). Exclamative clauses: At the syntax-semantics interface. *Language* 79 (1): 39–81.
- Zeisler, Bettina (2004). *Relative Tense and Aspectual Values in Tibetan Languages: A Comparative Study*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.