

Deontic periphrastic constructions and defective paradigms in Sicilian

Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro (Ca' Foscari University of Venice)

In this paper I discuss a property of a verbal periphrasis widespread in Southern Italo-Romance, namely the *Aviri a + Infinitive* construction (AICo), that has gone unnoticed so far. I do so from the point of view of some Sicilian dialects, where it has been attested since the 13th century (cf. Núñez Román 2007). The AICo can have a temporal (future) or a modal (deontic or epistemic) function (cf. Amenta 2010: 14). The paper focusses on the deontic function. The AICo features an inflected HAVE (V1) followed by the preposition *a* (from Lat. AD) and an Infinitival lexical verb (V2). In the Ind. Present, the V1 displays the same reduced inflection typically found in Sicilian auxiliary HAVE in the Present Perfect, so that the reduced forms *ammu/atu* ('we/you have') appear instead of the extended *avjimmu/aviti*. In the Ind. Present 1SG, the V1 can occur either as inflected (i.e. *haju*) or as reduced (*a/e*) (cf. (1a)). The paper highlights the following points.

I. The AICo responds positively to all the relevant monoclausality diagnostics applied by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 385-391) to another Sicilian verbal periphrasis, i.e. Pseudo-Coordination (PseCo), which features two inflected verbs (e.g. *Vaju a ppigghju u pani* 'I go and fetch the bread'). In fact, the AICo: i) does not allow for the insertion of floating quantifiers (cf. (1b)) or frequency adverbs (cf. (1c)) between V1 and V2; ii) displays obligatory clitic climbing to V1 (cf. (1d, d')); and iii) occurs with a fixed order, i.e. the lexical verb cannot precede HAVE.

- (1) a. *Haju a gghjiri / Egghjiri a la posta.* (Delia, Caltanissetta)
 have.1SG to go.INF / have+to+go.INF to the post-office
 'I have to go to the post office.'
- b. *Li carusi hannu (*tutti) a gghjiri (tutti) a la posta.*
 the boys have.3PL all to go.INF all to the post-office
 'The boys all have to go to the post office.'
- c. *Ammu (*sempri) a gghjiri (sempri) a la posta cchjù luntana.*
 have.1PL always to go.INF always to the post-office more far
 'We always have to go to the farthest post office.'
- d. *L' appigliari ora stessu.*
 it.CL have+to+take.INF now same
 d'. **Appigliarlu ora stessu.*
 have+to+take.INF+it.CL now same
 'You have to take it right now.'

II. The monoclausality of the AICo differentiates it from a very similar deontic construction, namely the 'Aviri di + Infinitive Construction', which is instead biclausal (cf. (2)).

- (2) a. *Chisti hannu sempri di diri quarcosa!* (Delia, Caltanissetta)
 these have.3PL always to say.INF something
 'They are always complaining!'

III. Unlike PseCo, the AICo generally displays a fully-fledged paradigm in the Ind. Present and Imperfect, and in the Subjunctive, cross-dialectally. But, interestingly, in the Ind. Preterite most speakers find 2SG and 2PL ungrammatical or strongly deviant (cf. (3)):

(3)	Ind. Pret. HAVE TO + GO	(Delia, Caltanissetta)
1SG	<i>Ajiri appi a gghjiri a la posta</i>	I had to go to the post office yesterday
2SG	<i>*Ajiri avisti a gghjiri a la posta</i>	You had to go to the post office yesterday
3SG	<i>Ajiri appi a gghjiri a la posta</i>	He/She had to go to the post office yesterday

1PL	<i>Ajiri àppimu a gghjiri a la posta</i>	We had to go to the post office yesterday
2PL	* <i>Ajiri avìstivu a gghjiri a la posta</i>	You had to go to the post office yesterday
3PL	<i>Ajiri àppiru a gghjiri a la posta</i>	They had to go to the post office yesterday

The ungrammatical cells of the paradigm can be filled in different ways: i) in the dialects of Delia, Sommatino, Mussomeli (in the province of Caltanissetta) and Palermo another deontic periphrasis, namely *mi/ti/cci/nni/vi tuccà* (lit. ‘it touched me/you/him, her or them/us’) + Infinitival V2, is used to fill the gap (e.g. *Ajiri ti/vi tuccà jiri a la posta* ‘You had to go to the post office yesterday’); ii) the ‘*Aviri di* + Infinitive Construction’, although less frequent, can be used with the same purpose (*Ajiri avisti di jiri a la posta* ‘You had to go to the post office yesterday’); (iii) in the dialect of Modica (Ragusa), the AICo 2SG and 2PL cells feature *àppitu* and *àppivu* respectively, which are crucially built on the 1SG/3SG form. On the other hand, in the dialect of Sinagra (Messina), the Preterite forms of the modal verb *duviri* ‘have to’ are used instead (e.g. *Ajiri duvisti/duvìstivu jiri a la posta* ‘You had to go to the post office yesterday’). This latter fact is noteworthy because *duviri* as a modal verb is very unpopular in Sicilian. This proves how the ungrammaticality of the second persons in the relevant construction is particularly strong among native speakers, to the point that a verb like *duviri*, which is not productive elsewhere (e.g. in the Ind. Present), is used.

IV. The resulting combination of grammatical and ungrammatical cells of the paradigm of the AICo shown in (3) is reminiscent of the W-Pattern that Di Caro & Giusti (2015) report for the Ind. Preterite PseCo in some varieties of central Sicily, where the ungrammatical 2SG and 2PL cells of the paradigm are replaced by the infinitival counterparts, as in (4):

- (4) a. **Jisti* *a* *ffacisti* *la* *spisa.* (Delia, Caltanissetta)
 go.PAST.2SG *a* do.PAST.2SG the shopping
- b. *Jisti* *a* *ffari* *la* *spisa.*
 go.PAST.2SG to do.INF the shopping
 ‘You went to do the shopping.’

The aim of this paper is to show that what prevents speakers from producing the 2SG and the 2PL of the Ind. Preterite of both AICo and PseCo in some dialects depends on the same phenomenon, namely the Ind. Preterite paradigmatic allomorphy in the Italo-Romance verb system, which traces back to Latin (cf. Magni 2001, Maiden 2018). This allomorphic paradigm features the alternation of perfective (and rhizotonic) and imperfective (and arhizotonic) forms in certain verbs, traditionally referred to as ‘irregular’ (see the alternation of the perfective *app-* and the imperfective *av-* in (3)). In a monoclausal environment, such that of AICo and PseCo, the imperfective arhizotonic forms are unavailable to the paradigm in some dialects. A thorough analysis of the Preterite AICo could thus be of great help in shedding some light on a phenomenon such as the W-Pattern that still needs further research.

Selected references: Amenta, L. 2010. “Perifrasi verbali in siciliano”. In: Garzonio, Jacopo (ed), Quaderni di lavoro ASIt, 11. Studi sui dialetti della Sicilia. Padova: Unipress. 1-18. Cardinaletti, A. & Giusti, G. 2001. “Semi-lexical motion verbs in Romance and Germanic”. In Corver, N. and H. Van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Semi-lexical categories*, 371-414. Berlin: De Gruyters. Di Caro, V. N. & Giusti, G. 2015. “A Protocol for the Inflected Construction in Sicilian Dialects”. *Annali di Ca’ Foscari, Serie Occidentale*, vol. 49: 393-422. Magni, E. 2001. “Paradigm organization and lexical connections in the development of the Italian passato remoto”. In Booij, Geert & van Marle, Jaap (eds), *Yearbook of Morphology 1999*. 75-96. Dordrecht: Springer. Maiden, M. 2018. “New thoughts on an old puzzle. The Italian alternation type *dissi, dicesti; feci facesti*”. In *Revue Romane* 53:2. 217-260. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Núñez Román, F. 2007. “Le perifrasi modali in siciliano antico”. *Philologia Hispalensis* 21. 173-190.