Paolo Lorusso (IUSS, Pavia), Ludovico Franco (Università di Firenze)

Pseudo-coordinate constructions with *'take'* in Apulian varieties.

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 'pɛɣiə   ɛ   '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 2015, Cardinaletti & Giusti 2020) 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) 'Pɛɣiə   ɛ   'vannə.
     take 2sg$_{PRES/IMP}$ and   go.3pl.prs
     'They could go'

(4) 'Pɛɣiə   ɛ   ma'ndʒɛmə   la   'mɛlə?
     take 2sg$_{PRES/IMP}$ 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   ɛ   də'ʃerənə na prɛɣir
          listened 3pl   and   said3pl a prayer
          'They listened to and said a prayer'

     B: No, sən'derənə la 'predəkə   e   də'ʃerənə   na prɛ'ɣir
          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   ɛ   də'ʃerənə   na prɛ'ɣir
          took 3pl   and   said.3pl   a prayer
          'They said a prayer'

     B: a.   *#No, pə'ɣierənə   na 'mɛlə   e   də'ʃerənə   na prɛ'ɣir
               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'ɣir
               yes,   took.3pl   a prayer
               'Yes, they took a prayer.'

          c.   'Sənə, də'ʃerənə na prɛ'ɣir
               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 Vendler's (1967) classification, as in (7), like the progressive inflected construction (stay+to+V2) in the same varieties in (8).

(7) a.   *'Pɛɣiənə e   'sapənə *State*   b.   *'pɛɣiənə   e   ca'nəʃənə *Achievement*
            take3pl n and   know3pl   take3pl   and   meet3pl

(8) a.   *stek   a   'satʧə *State*   b.   *stek   a ca'nəskə   *Achievement*
            stay1sg to   know1sg   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 (se 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 appear un the full paradigm of inflections (contrary to what happen 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 2nd person inflected *take* V1 and an inflected V2. These constructions, contrary to what 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   'pɛɣɣiə   ɛ   vɛ
            now   take 2sg$_{PRES/IMP}$ and   come2sg$_{PRES/IMP}$
            'Go now!'

(12)   'Pɛɣɣiə   ɛ   'sapənə u nom
            take 2sg$_{PRES/IMP}$ and   know3pl   the name
             'They could/probably know the name '

(13)   'Pɛɣɣiə   ɛ   ma'ndʒemə   la   'mɛlə?   =(4)
            take 2sg$_{PRES/IMP}$ 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 (2015) we take ɛ to encode a C head, like the item *a* (=AC) of aspectual inflected constructions. We assume that while 2nd 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 pɛɣiə … [CP ɛ [TP *pro* vannə…]]]   *mood* take *pseudo-coordinate structure*

(15) [TP *pro* pə'ɣierənə… [CP ɛ [TP *pro* scerənə…]]]]   *aspect* take *pseudo-coordinate structure*

Selected References. Cardinaletti; A., Giusti, G; (2020), Multiple Agreement in Southern Italian Dialects. , Linguistic Variation: Structure and Interpretation., Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, vol. 132, pp. 125-148Ledgeway, A. (2015). From Coordination to Subordination: the Grammaticalisation of Progressive and Andative Aspect in the Dialects of Salento. In: Cardoso, A.; Martins, A. M.; Pereira, S.; Pinto, C.; Pratas, F. (eds.), Coordination and Subordination. Oxford: Oxford University Press./ Manzini M.R., Lorusso P. & L.M. Savoia (2017) "A/bare finite complements in Southern Italian varieties: Monoclausal or bi-clausal syntax?" Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali (QULSO) 3: 11–59. Florence: Florence University Press.