

## Pseudo-coordinate constructions with ‘take’ in Apulian varieties.

Paolo Lorusso & Ludovico Franco

*Università degli Studi di Firenze*

1. **Introduction.** In some Apulian varieties a pseudo-coordinate structure involving an inflected V1 *take* + *and* + an inflected lexical V2 is found as a periphrasis of the inflected V2, as in (1)-(2), taken from the variety of Conversano.

(1) Maria 'pɛyɪə            ε            'mandʒə            la            'mɛlə  
M.    take.3sg.prs    and    eat3sg.prs    the    apple  
‘Maria eats the apple’.

(2) P ə'ɣierənə    e            'scerənə            a            la            'kɛsə  
Take.3pl.pst    and    went.3pl.pst    to            the            house  
‘They went home’

*Conversano (Bari)*

The meaning of this periphrasis seems to be equivalent to the meaning encoded by the (bare) inflected V2. These constructions share some similarities with other Apulian constructions, like aspectual inflected constructions (cf. Manzini & Savoia 2005, Ledgeway 2016, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2019) or doubly inflected constructions in the terms of Cruschina (2013), involving an inflected aspectual light verb/auxiliary (*stay, go, come, want*) + an optional preposition + an inflected embedded verb.

2. **Take pseudo-coordination as an aspectual or modal construction.** The overt morpho-syntactic characteristics (double inflection) and the lexical restriction on the selection of V2 allow us to interpret the *take* pseudo-coordination illustrated in (1) and (2) as an aspectual periphrasis encoding a kind of *punctual* speaker’s perspective on the event denoted by V2. We will propose a bi-clausal analysis for these structures, along the lines of Manzini et al. 2017’s account for Apulian aspectual inflected constructions. Interestingly, within the same variety, a construction involving V1 *take* (inflected for 2ps singular) + *and* + inflected V2 (full paradigm) implies a different reading, mainly linked to modality, as a future/irrealis reading in (3) or an exhortative reading in (4).

(3) 'Pɛyɪə            ε            'vannə.  
take 2sgPRES/IMP    and    go.3pl.prs  
‘They could go’

(4) 'Pɛyɪə            ε            ma'ndʒɛmə    la            'mɛlə?  
take 2sgPRES/IMP    and    eat.1pl.prs    the            apple  
‘Why don’t we eat an apple?’

*Conversano (Bari)*

Both constructions, (1)-(2) and (3)-(4), can be analysed as biclausal. In particular, the different overt morphosyntactic inflectional patterns imply different structural representation and different interpretation at the syntax-semantic interface: we assume that the V1 in (1)-(2) has a full-fledged TP and implies an aspectual ‘punctual’ reading, while the V1 in (3-4) implies a CP with lack of temporal head, encoding the future/exhortative mood. In the pseudo-coordinate structures of Conversano, the full fledged V1 does not assign any thematic role, as illustrated by the contrast in (5)-(6). With the *take* periphrasis, only V2 is responsible of the theta assignment.

(5) A: Sən'derənə    ε            də'ferənə na prɛ'yir  
listened 3pl    and    said3pl    a prayer  
‘They listened to and said a prayer’

B: No, sən'derənə            la 'predəkə    e            də'ferənə            na prɛ'yir  
No, listened 3pl            the sermon    and    said3pl            a prayer  
No, they listened to the sermon and said a prayer. *Conversano (Bari)*

(6) A: P ə'ɣierənə    ε            də'ferənə            na prɛ'yir  
took 3pl            and    said.3pl            a prayer  
‘They said a prayer’

B: a. \*#No, pə'ɣierənə            na 'mɛlə            e            də'ferənə            na prɛ'yir  
No, took.3pl            an apple            and    said.3pl            a prayer  
‘no, they took an apple and they said a prayer’

b. \*#Sənə, pə'ɣierənə            na prɛ'yir  
yes, took.3pl            a prayer  
‘Yes, they took a prayer.’

c. 'Sənə, də'ferənə            na prɛ'yir

yes, said3pl a prayer  
 ‘Yes, they said a prayer. *Conversano (Bari)*

**3. Take pseudo-coordination and lexical aspect.** This pseudo-coordinate structure cannot be found with state and achievement V2, according to Vendler’s (1967) classification, as in (7), like the progressive inflected construction (stay+to+V2) in the same varieties in (8).

- (7) a. \*Pɛyɪənə e 'sapənə State take3pln and know3pl  
 b. \*pɛyɪənə e ca'nəʃənə Achievement take3pl and meet3pl
- (8) a. \*stek a 'satʃə State stay1sg to know1sg  
 b. \*stek a ca'nəskə Achievement stay1sg to meet1sg *Conversano (Bari)*

The fact that the lexical aspect of the V2 interacts with the availability of *take* pseudo-coordination confirms that we are dealing with an aspectual periphrasis. The meaning of these structures can be linked to the speaker’s perspective on the event: they literally mean that the speaker describes the event as happening as a unique moment with no internal articulation (similarly to the progressive which is used to identify a stage within the eventive structure, cf. Landman 1992).

**4. Differences between inflected progressive construction with stay and take pseudo-coordination.** A syntactic difference between *take* and *stay* aspectual inflected construction is clitic climbing, as illustrated in (9)-(10). The unavailability of clitic climbing onto *take* V1 militates against a mono-clausal analysis along the lines of Cardinaletti & Giusti (2019) for this kind of structures. Notice that the fact that *take* verbs can be employed as aspectual devices in complex predicate constructions is widely attested on cross-linguistic grounds (see e.g. Butt 2010).

- (9) U 'stannə a (\*u) 'mandʒənə  
 it stay3pl to (\*it) eat.3pl  
 ‘they are eating it’
- (10) (\*u) pə'ɣierənə e u man'dʒerənə  
 It take and it eat3pl  
 ‘they eat it’

Furthermore *take* constructions have full inflectional paradigm of inflections (contrary to what happens for periphrastic progressives which do not show with 1st and 2nd plural person, Lorusso, 2019). As we have already pointed out in (3)-(4), we also find a construction which involves pseudo-coordination between a 2<sup>nd</sup> person inflected *take* V1 and an inflected V2. These constructions, contrary to what is illustrated in (7) and (8), do not interact with the lexical class of the embedded verb. This fact indicates we are not dealing with aspect, but with a mood operator in C. Consider the imperative (11), conditional (12) or interrogative (13) reading of *take* pseudo-coordination, when we have a 2sg inflected *take* V1 (which notably shares the morphology of imperative in the variety of *Conversano*).

- (11) Mo 'pɛyɪə ε vɛ  
 now take 2sgPRES/IMP and come2sgPRES/IMP  
 ‘Go now!’
- (12) 'Pɛyɪə ε 'sapənə u nom  
 take 2sgPRES/IMP and know3pl the name  
 ‘They could/probably know the name’
- (13) 'Pɛyɪə ε ma'ndʒemə la 'mɛlə? =(4)  
 take 2sgPRES/IMP and eat.1pl.prs the apple  
 ‘Why don’t we eat an apple?’

**5. Analysis.** We assume a bi-clausal structure for *take* pseudo-coordinates, following Ledgeway (2017), Manzini et al. (2017). Following Ledgeway (2016) we take ε to encode a C head, like the item *a* (=AC) of aspectual inflected constructions. We assume that while 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular *take* V1 is a modal operator in C and a defective V (i.e. we are possibly dealing with a grammaticalized form of *take*) selecting for a fully fledged TP, as in (14), the inflected *take* is a kind of auxiliary which instantiates a full TP, which in turn selects for a full TP: the double inflections imply an aspectual reading which is linked to a punctual interpretation of the embedded event, as in (15).

- (14) [CP pɛyɪə ... [CP ε [TP *pro* vannə...]] mood take pseudo-coordinate structure  
 (15) [TP *pro* pə'ɣierənə... [CP ε [TP *pro* scerənə...]]] aspect take pseudo-coordinate structure