

Verbal periphrases with functional TAKE in Bulgarian. A syntactic and semantic account.

Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro¹

Luca Molinari^{1,2}

¹Ca' Foscari University of Venice, ²University of Warsaw

The verb TAKE is used in a number of periphrastic constructions where it can serve different purposes, cross-linguistically. In many European languages, it is found in different configurations that can be either biclausal or monoclausal. Bulgarian is one of the languages featuring those “TAKE constructions”, although the available literature is rather scarce and unsystematic (cf. Wagner 1955; Coseriu 1966).

In this paper **we aim at filling a gap in the literature** by providing new insights into these constructions which, to the best of our knowledge, are not discussed elsewhere. We will identify three different configurations, shown in (1), provide their structure, and describe what functions TAKE can take on in them. In doing so, we will consider the results of our recent fieldwork and of an online questionnaire based on an acceptability judgement task we have created and submitted to native speakers.

Following Giusti and Cardinaletti (2022), we distinguish Multiple Agreement Constructions (henceforth MACs) from Pseudo-Coordination (henceforth PseCo) and propose to call (1a) TAKE *da*MAC and (1b-b') TAKE *če*MAC, according to the linker that appears between V1 (TAKE) and V2. On the other hand, we call the construction in (1c-c') *i*PseCo, since it formally appears as a coordination (featuring the coordinator *i* ‘and’) but syntactically behaves as a monoclausal construction (cf. Giusti et al. 2022).

The properties of the TAKE *da/če*MAC suggest these are all monoclausal structures (i.e., not involving the projection of a CP layer selected by V1). In fact, these constructions pattern along with other monoclausal structures attested in Bulgarian featuring the connector *da* (cf. Krapova and Cinque 2018), but **differently from** the biclausal structures with an embedded clause introduced by the complementiser *če* (cf. Tomić 2006). The TAKE *da/če*MAC are characterised by anaphoric present Tense on V2 and impossibility of disjoint reference between V1 and V2, as there is a unique subject.

Moreover, the constructions in (1a) and (1b-b') operate a division of labour from a semantic point of view. (1a) only encodes inchoativity, while (1b-b') express different shades of mirativity (in the sense of DeLancey 1997), namely (i) the speaker's surprise (1b), and (ii) the speaker's disapproval (1b') for the content of the event. Interestingly, while (1a) displays the features of monoclausal *da*MACs, (1b-b') show a different behaviour than canonical *če*MACs and share the same features of (1a).

The *i*PseCo displays obligatory TAM feature sharing between V1 and V2, which may inflect for all tenses. Moreover, V1 and V2 cannot have independent reference, which is in line with our monoclausal analysis. The *i*PseCo has a mirative semantics, which is expected as PseCos are associated with mirativity cross-linguistically.

The structural representation of the constructions discussed above is given in (2). Since the TAKE *če*MAC is not biclausal - differently from other canonical *če*MACs -, in (2d) we can hypothesise that the connector *če* is not a real complementiser but acts as *da* in the monoclausal *da*MACs. In the TAKE MACs, V1 selects a defective complement with the connector being merged in a functional projection inside the embedded TP domain (cf. Cinque 2006) triggering the relevant reading of the construction: we propose it to be Asp[inceptive] in *da*MAC and Asp[terminative] for the *če*MAC. This allows to account for the Tense restriction on the V2.

For the *iPseCo* we follow Soto Gómez's (2021) analysis of the Spanish *yPseCo*, in which the features of V2, which sits in T, are transferred through C to V1, which is base generated in the Left Periphery. Soto Gómez (2021) proposes that V1 in Spanish *yPseCo* encodes contrastive focus as it introduces the information which constitutes the locus the speaker wants the hearer to direct the attention to. Moreover, as focus contrasts a constituent against a set of possible alternatives, the speaker-oriented *y/iPseCo* contrasts the actual event with the set of the speaker's expectations.

- 1) a. Vze **da** piše. (TAKE *da*MAC)
 take.PERF.AOR.3SG *da* write.IMPF.PRS.3SG
 'He started writing.'
- b. Vze **če** napisa. (TAKE *če*MAC)
 take.PERF.AOR.3SG *če* write.PERF.PRES.3SG
 'He unexpectedly wrote.' [Kanchev (2010: 41-2)]
- b'. Boris vze **če** go udari.
 Boris take.PERF.AOR.3SG *če* him.CL.ACC
 hit.PERF.PRS.3SG
 'Boris went and hit him.' (context: Boris, known for his bad temper, was arguing with a friend of his).
- c. ... vze **i** pātuvej. (*iPseCo*)
 take.IMPF.IMPER.2SG and travel.IMPF.IMPER.2SG
 '... take and travel!' [SketchEngine, "Bulgarian Web 2012"; token 250037609]
- c'. ... vze **i** gledajte koj raboti tam na černo.
 take.IMPF.IMPER.2PL and look.IMPF.IMPER.2PL who works there in black
 '... look who is working under the table!' ["Bulgarian Web 2012"; token 408037284]
- 2) a. [TP *započna* [_{VP} ~~*započna*~~ [TP *da piše* [_{VP} *piše*]]]] (*da*MAC);
 b. [TP *vze* [_{VP} ~~*vze*~~ [TP *da piše* [_{VP} ~~*piše*~~]]]] (TAKE *da*MAC);
 c. [TP *kaza* [_{VP} ~~*kaza*~~ [CP *če* [TP *e* [_{VP} *pristignal*]]]]] 'He said he arrived.' (*če*MAC);
 d. [TP *vze* [_{VP} ~~*vze*~~ [TP *če napisa* [_{VP} ~~*napisa*~~]]]] (TAKE *če*MAC);
 e. [_{FocP} *vzimate* [CP *i* [TP *gledate* [_{VP} ~~*gledate*~~]]]] (*iPseCo*).

Selected references

- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2006. Restructuring and Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, vol. 4. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coseriu, E. 1966. "Tomo y me voy": ein Problem vergleichender europäischer Syntax. *Vox Romanica*, 25, 13-55.
- DeLancey, S. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1, 33-52.
- Giusti, G. & Cardinaletti, A. 2022. Theory-driven approaches and empirical advances: A protocol for Pseudo-Coordinations and Multiple Agreement Constructions in Italo-Romance. In Giusti, G., Di Caro, V. N. & Ross, D. (eds), *Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions*. 35-64 Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Giusti, G., Di Caro, V. N. & Ross, D. 2022. Pseudo-Coordinations and Multiple Agreement Constructions: An overview. In Giusti, G., Di Caro, V. N. & Ross, D. (eds), *Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions*. 1-34. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kanchev, I. 2010. On the semantics, typology and origin of the construction *vzемам/взема че* (*ma, u*) + perfective aspect verb. *Contrastive Linguistics*, 35(3). 40-44.

- Krapova, I. & Cinque, G. 2021. Universal Constraints on Balkanisms. A Case Study: The Absence of Clitic Climbing. In Krapova, I. & Joseph, B. (eds), *Balkan Syntax and (Universal) Principles of Grammar*, 151-191. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Soto Gómez, J. F. 2021. *Pseudocoordination in Spanish. A two construction analysis*. MA thesis, Ca' Foscari University of Venice.
- Tomić, O. M. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund morpho-syntactic features*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Wagner, M. L. 1955. Expletive Verbalformen in den Sprachen des Mittelmeeres. *Romanische Forschungen*, 67(1/2), 1-8.