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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 ‘peγiɔ̃ e ‘mandɔ̃ la ‘melô
M. take.3sg.prs and eat3sg.prs the apple
‘Maria eats the apple’.

(2) P ʾyierɔ̃ e ʾscrenɔ a la ʾkesɔ
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) ʾPeγiɔ̃ e ʾvannɔ̃
Take 2sgPRES/IMP and go.3pl.prs
‘They could go’

(4) ʾPeγiɔ̃ e maʾndɛmɔ la ’melô?
Take 2sgPRES/IMP and eat1.pl.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: ʾson đerɔ̃ e đeʃerɔ̃ na preγiɔ̃
  listened 3pl and said3pl a prayer
‘They listened to and said a prayer’

B: No, ʾson đerɔ̃ la ’predɔ̃ e đeʃerɔ̃ na preγiɔ̃
  No, listened 3pl the sermon and said3pl a prayer
‘No, they listened to the sermon and said a prayer’ Conversano (Bari)

(6) A: P ʾyierɔ̃ e đeʃerɔ̃ na preγiɔ̃
  took 3pl and said3pl a prayer
‘They said a prayer’

B: a. ʾ#No, pʾyierɔ̃ na ’melô e đeʃerɔ̃ na preγiɔ̃
  No, took.3pl an apple and said3pl a prayer
‘no, they took an apple and they said a prayer’

b. ʾ#Sɔ̃n, pʾyierɔ̃ na preγiɔ̃
  Yes, took.3pl a prayer
‘Yes, they took a prayer.’

c. ʾSɔ̃n, đeʃerɔ̃ na preγiɔ̃
yes, said3pl a prayer  

Yes, they said a prayer.  

Conversano (Bari)

3. Take pseudo-coordination and lexical aspect. This pseudo-coordination 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. *Pe'yiŋə e sapəŋə State b. *Pe'yiŋə e ca'nəʃəŋə Achievement take3pl and know3pl take3pl and meet3pl

(8) a. *stek a 'satfə 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 an 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) 'mandʒəŋə  
it stay3pl to (*it) eat3pl  
‘they are eating it’

(10) (*u) pə'yiərəʃə e u man'dʒəŋə  
It take and it eat3pl  
‘they eat it’

Furthermore take constructions have full inflectional 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 'pe'yiŋə  
now take 2sgPRES/IMP and come2sgPRES/IMP  
‘Go now!’

(12) 'Pe'yiŋə  
ε 'sapəŋə u nom  
take 2sgPRES/IMP and know3pl the name  
‘They could/probably know the name’

(13) 'Pe'yiŋə  
ε ma'nədʒəŋə la 'mels? =(*u)  
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 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 pe'yiŋ ... [CP ε [TP pro vannə...]]]  
mood take pseudo-coordinate structure

(15) [TP pro pə'yiərəʃə... [CP ε [TP pro scerəŋə...]]]  
aspect take pseudo-coordinate structure