Inchoativity and mirativity in Italo-Romance and Balkan Slavic verbal periphrases.
The cases of functional GO and TAKE

Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro
Università Ca' Foscari Venezia
vincenzo.dicaro@unive.it

Luca Molinari
University of Warsaw & Ca' Foscari University of Venice
l.molinari@uw.edu.pl

Abstract

This paper investigates the properties of GO and TAKE used as functional verbs to express the beginning of an action or a state (inchoativity) or a sense of surprise, wonder, astonishment, or regret (mirativity) as found in a group of multiple verb constructions, in a macro-comparative perspective. Multiple Agreement Constructions (V1+*mi*/*mu*/*da*/*če*+V2$_{[+\text{finite}]}$) and Pseudo-Coordination (V1+'and'+V2$_{[+\text{finite}]}$) are considered in Italo-Romance (Italian and Sicilian) and Balkan Slavic (Bulgarian),

together with the Italo-Romance Infinitival Construction (V1+*a*+V2$_{[-finite]}$), drawing from novel fieldwork data and online corpus data. GO and TAKE generally proved to be highly productive as both inchoative and mirative markers in all the languages considered. In particular, an analysis of cases in which these two functional verbs convey (to different degrees) both functions at once is provided, relying on the cognitive basis underlying the process of their grammaticalisation.

Keywords: inchoativity, mirativity, Multiple Agreement Constructions, Pseudo-Coordination, Southern Italo-Romance, Balkan Slavic.

1. Introduction

Functional GO and TAKE can be found in a number of two-verb periphrases all around the world (see, e.g., Ross 2021 for an overview) that can be graphically described as 'V1+V2'.[1]

    In European languages, two basic configurations are available:

(1)   Types of V1+V2 periphrases
        a.   V1 + an optional connector + a non-finite V2;
        b.   V1 + an optional connector + a finite V2.

    The syntactic status of the optional connector is not uncontroversial. However, it is agreed upon that it does not provide any semantic contribution to the periphrasis (see, e.g., the status of the connector in Serial Verb Constructions as a desemanticised linker in Aikhenvald 2006: 20).
    The configuration in (1b) can be further divided into two types, listed in (2) :[2]

(2)   Types of V1+finite V2 periphrases
        a.   Multiple Agreement Constructions (or MACs);
        b.   Pseudo-Coordination (or PseCo)

    Instances of the constructions in (2) are attested in both Italo-Romance and Balkan Slavic with different connectors, e.g., *a*, *e*, *i*, *ma*, *(m)i*, *(m)u*, *cu*, *da*, *ta*, *če*, *oti*, *deka*, and *što*. In Balkan Slavic, these constructions are favoured by a general loss of the infinitive,[3] which is widespread in all the languages of the Balkan *Sprachbund* (i.e., Albanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Modern Greek, and Romanian; cf. Sandfeld 1930; Joseph 1983; Asenova 2002; Tomic 2006, De Angelis 2016, 2017; De Angelis & Krstić 2014).
    In Italo-Romance Multiple Agreement Constructions, the finite V2 can be thought of as an infinitive in disguise (cf. Ledgeway 2003, 2006, 2007, 2013; Manzini & Savoia 2005: 698; De Angelis 2017, a.o.) and always appears in the present

---

[1]   Two-verb periphrases featuring GO and TAKE are considered by some scholars as a class of multipredicate periphrases referred to as Serial Verb Constructions (see, e.g., Déchaine 1993; Aikhenvald & Dixon 2006; Ross 2021: Ch. 4 for an overview).

[2]   See Giusti, Di Caro & Ross 2022 for an overview and for a discussion on the nomenclature.

[3]   A similar infinitival loss in some southern Italo-Romance dialects is also referred to as the 'unpopularity of the infinitive' (cf. Rohlfs 1969: §717).

indicative, since it is the V1 that carries the relevant TAM features. In the examples in (3), from some Southern Italo-Romance varieties of different areas, the V1 appears as inflected in the preterite (cf. (3a-c)) and imperfect (cf. (3d, e)) indicative, and in the conditional (cf. (3f)).[4]

(3)   a. Province of Messina; adapted from Rohlfs (1969: 103)
Iḍḍu   annau   mi   si   curca.
he   go.PST.3SG   MI   REFL   lay-down.PRS.3SG
'He went to sleep.'
    b. Sorbo San Basile (Catanzaro); adapted from Manzini & Savoia (2005: 654)
Vinni   ma   ti   viju.
come.PST.1SG   MA   you   see.PRS.1SG
'I've come to see you.'
    c. Province of Messina; adapted from Rohlfs (1969: 103)
Pinsau   mi   parti.
think.PST.3SG   MI   leave.PRS.3SG
'He thought about leaving.'
    d. Salentino; adapted from Rohlfs (1969: 103)
Vulia   cu   ssacciu.
want.IMPF.1SG   CU   know.PRS.1SG
'I wanted to know.'
    e. Crotone; adapted from Rohlfs (1969: 103)
Jívanu   u   mmáncianu.
go.IMPF.1PL   U   eat.PRS.1PL
'They went to eat.'
    f. Southern Calabrian; adapted from Rohlfs (1969: 103)
Vorria   mu   sacciu.
want. COND.1SG   MU   know.PRS.1SG
'I'd like to know.'
    g. North-eastern Sicily; adapted from De Angelis (2017: 46)
Iḍḍu   urría   mi   fujèmu   sempri.
he   want. COND.3SG   MI   run.PRS.1PL   always
'He would like us to be always running.'

In Bulgarian, too, a particular kind of MAC featuring the connector *da* displays the same behaviour, i.e., the V2 can only appear in the present tense. Krapova & Cinque (2018: 162) argue, along the lines of Progovac (1993), that the lack of alternative verb morphology on the V2 signals that present tense is the default form. The periphrasis *da*+V2 in the present tense syntactically functions as an infinitive form. Interestingly, such periphrases are found with phasal verbs, e.g., *započvam / započna* 'begin, start' or *svăršvam / svărša* 'finish', as shown in (4).[5] This kind of

---

[4]   The connectors (*m*)*u*, (*m*)*i* and *ma* are historically related to the Latin subordinator MODO 'as, since, given that', while *cu* is related to Latin QUOD 'because, that' (see Rohlfs 1969: §786–789; De Angelis 2013; Ledgeway 2016, a.o.). Following the work by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001; 2003; 2020; see also Giusti & Cardinaletti 2022; Di Caro 2017; 2019a) we do not translate these connectors into English in the glosses.
[5]   Where not explicitly specified, all the examples in Bulgarian are taken from our interviews with native speakers.

MAC instantiates only a subgroup of *da* constructions which Krapova & Cinque (2018: 158) define as 'restructuring infinitive-like constructions' and analyse as monoclausal, in opposition to the other subgroups (namely 'Romance-like subjunctives' and 'non-restructuring infinitive-like control constructions'), which are biclausal.

(4)   Bulgarian
    a.   Tja   veče   e   započnala
         she   already is   begin.PST.PRT.PFV.F.SG
         da   jade.
         DA   eat.PRS.IMPFV.3SG
         'She has already started eating.'
    b.   Svǎršix   da   rabotja
         finish.AOR.PFV.1SG   DA   work.PRS.IMPFV.1SG
         predi   dva   časa.
         before two hours
         'I finished working two hours ago.'

On the contrary, in Southern Italo-Romance Pseudo-Coordination (cf. ((2) b)) something different happens. Irrespective of the diatopically specific configurations it can display, PseCo formally appears as a coordination of two verbs but syntactically behaves as a monoclausal construction (cf. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2020 and references therein), which is always monoeventive (see, e.g., Shopen 1971: 257-258).[6] As regards the PseCo featuring V1 GO and the connecting element *a* (henceforth *a*PseCo), it is the V2 that carries the relevant TAM features. This is explained by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001, 2003, 2020) by postulating that the V1 is merged in *t*, a head immediately higher than T, where it copies the TAM features of the V2 parasitically (see Section 4.1 for details).[7] As a consequence of this parasitic copying, in some Southern Italo-Romance varieties, the V1 can surface as an invariable reduced form. Compare (5a) where the V1 GO emerges as the fully inflected *vaju* 'I go' with (5b), where the V1 GO is reduced to the invariable *Uo-,* which can be applied to all the persons of the paradigm, as shown in (5b') (cf. Di Caro & Giusti 2015; Di Caro 2019a, b):

(5)   a.   Marsala (Trapani); Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001: 373)
         Vaju   a ppigghju   u   pani.
         go.PRS.1SG a fetch.PRS.1SG the   bread
         'I go and fetch the bread.'
    b.   Acireale (Catania); adapted from Di Caro (2019b: 71)
         Uoppigghju   u   pani.
         UO+A+fetch.PRS.1SG   the   bread
         'I go and fetch the bread.'

---

[6]   But cf. Manzini & Savoia (2005), (2007) and Manzini & Lorusso (2022) for a general biclausal account of Southern Italo-Romance PseCo.

[7]   The authors extend the analysis to Germanic PseCo, by discussing data from American English and Swedish. Note, however, that in their work the relevant construction is referred to as 'Inflected Construction'.

      b'. Uoppìgghjunu   u   pani.
        UO+A+fetch.PRS.3PL   the   bread
        'They go and fetch the bread.'

The PseCo featuring V1 TAKE (henceforth V1 TAKE PseCo) is also monoeventive. However, Giusti & Cardinaletti (2022) provide a different syntactic explanation for this construction, drawing from Soto Gómez's (2021) analysis for what he calls 'speaker-oriented *y*PseCo' in Spanish.[8]

(6) a. Spanish; adapted from Soto Gómez's (2021: 110)
      Así que he   cogido y   he   llamado a la   Seat   y   para
      so that has taken and has called   to the Seat and for
      mañana   por la mañana me tienen   el   coche   preparado...
      tomorrow by the morning me have.PRS.3PL the car   prepared
      'So, I went and called Seat, and, by tomorrow morning, they have the car ready.'
  b. Spanish; adapted from Soto Gómez's (2021: 111)
      Y   coge y   la tía le   suelta sin   más: "pues aquí
      and takes and the lady to-him drops without more so   here
      en el despacho hay   más espacio por si queries   pelear   aquí."
      in the office   has   more space   for if want.2PL fight.INF here
      'To my astonishment, the lady nonchalantly says: "there is room here in the office in case you want to fight here."'

In both MACs and PseCo a high degree of variation can be found cross-linguistically regarding a number of parameters, including i) the class of predicates allowed as V1, ii) those allowed as V2, iii) the degree of grammaticalisation of the V1 both in terms of semantic bleaching and iv) in terms of phonological reduction, v) the presence or absence of the connecting element between V1 and V2 and its nature, vi) the type of Mood and Tense allowed, vii) the number of Person slots available in any paradigm. In this study we will focus on (i) and (iii).

When it comes to the class of predicates allowed as V1, a preliminary distinction must be made. Whereas MACs allow for a great deal of predicates as V1 (cf., e.g., Manzini & Savoia 2005; De Angelis 2013; Ganfi 2021; Giusti & Cardinaletti 2022),[9] as they appear in languages where infinitival V2s are highly limited, in PseCo

---

[8]   Soto Gómez (2021) individuates two types of *y*PseCo with V1 TAKE and GO in Spanish: i) a monoclausal speaker-oriented one, and ii) a biclausal inceptive one.

[9]   Finite V2s introduced by *mi* can be selected also when they are the argument of a noun, an adjective, or a preposition, or when they are the subject of a sentence:

(i)   Province of Messina; adapted from Rohlfs (1969: 103)
     a. Ai   raggiuni mi   ti   lagni.
        have.2SG right   MI   you   complain.2SG
        'You are right to complain.'
     b. Passai   senza   mu ti   viu.
        come.PST.1SG without   MU you see.1SG
        'I came by without seeing you.'

only a restricted number of predicates is allowed, the most prototypical being GO, COME, STAND, SIT, LIE, and TAKE.[10]

Let us consider the examples in (7) from Italo-Romance and Bulgarian:

(7)   a. Delia (Caltanissetta); Di Caro (2019a: 133)
           Vaju   a ffazzu   la   spisa.
           go.PRS.1SG A do.PRS.1SG   the   shopping
           'I go and do the shopping.'
       b. Marsala (Trapani); Di Caro & Giusti (2015: 417)
           Vegnu   a ppigghju   u   pani.
           come.PRS.1SG   A   fetch.PRS.1SG   the   bread
           'I come and fetch the bread.'
       c. Putignano (Bari); Manzini & Savoia (2005: 689)
           u stok   a f'fattsə.
           it stay.PRS.1SG A do.PRS.1SG
           'I'm doing it.'
       d. Avetrana (Taranto); Rohlfs (1969: 167)
           Oj'   a mmangiu.
           want.PRS.1SG   A eat.PRS.1SG
           'I want to eat.'
       e. Bulgarian; Kuteva (1999: 195)
           Sedi   i   čisti   po   cjal
           sit.PRS.IMPFV.3SG   and   clean.PRS.IMPFV.3SG   along   whole
           den v kăšti.
           day in home
           'She cleans the house all day long / She habitually cleans the house all day long.'[11]
       f. Bulgarian; Kuteva (1999: 194)
           Toj leži   i   mărzeluva
           he lie.PRS.IMPFV.3SG and lie-on-one's-back. PRS.IMPFV.3SG
           cjal   godina   veče.
           whole   year   already
           'He's been lying on his back for a whole year now / He's been idling around for a whole year now.'

---

[10]   The selection of V1 is another important parameter of micro-variation. For a comprehensive overview of the possible V1s in Sicilian PseCo cf. Di Caro (2019a).

[11]   As justly pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, also the verb SIT in Bulgarian can be used to express a negative speaker's attitude (cf. (i)), which is different from the mirative reading TAKE/GO can convey, although in some cases it can overlap with the semantic import of the latter to express disappointment.

(i)   Bulgarian; Kuteva (1999: 191)
        Sedi   i   se   oplakva   vmest   da   se
        sit.PRS.IMPFV.3SG   and   REFL complain.PRS.IMPFV.3SG   instead   DA   REFL
        xvane   za   rabota.
        catches for   work
        'He/she has been complaining all the time instead of starting to work.'

g. Italian

Ora	prendo	e	me	ne	vado!
now	take.PRS.1SG	and	ME	NE	go.PRS.1SG

'I'll go right now!'

As is possible to see from the examples provided so far, the scenario is quite rich and heterogeneous. The aim of this study is to propose a preliminary macro-comparison between the MACs and PseCo found in Italo-Romance (i.e., Italian and Sicilian) and Balkan Slavic (we will focus on Bulgarian here) by providing new data taken from these varieties. The research questions that lead our investigation are: i) are there common affinities between the functions GO and TAKE can take on cross-linguistically (i.e., inchoativity and mirativity)? ii) are there recurring structures where functional GO and TAKE are found? iii) how can we explain the tendency of GO and TAKE to grammaticalise into functional verbs?

In answering these research questions, we base our work on our recent fieldwork (for Sicilian and Bulgarian) and on previous recent literature (for Italian see Masini, Mattiola & Vecchi 2019; for Italian and Sicilian see Giusti & Cardinaletti 2022; for Bulgarian see Coseriu 1966; 1977; Kanchev 2010).

The rest of this paper is organised as follows: in Section 2 the functions of V1 GO and TAKE are described; in Section 3 we summarise the results of a preliminary quantitative study on Bulgarian PseCo and MACs with V1 TAKE; in Section 4 we explore the interaction of the inchoative and mirative semantics in the relevant constructions; in Section 5 we draw the conclusions and offer some directions for future research.

2. The functions of V1 GO and TAKE

Cross-linguistically, GO and TAKE are some of the V1s with a higher tendency to grammaticalisation (cf. Hopper & Traugott 2003). These verbs can, to different degrees, retain their semantics or become markers to serve different purposes, which are listed in (8):[12]

(8)   Functions of grammaticalised V1 GO and TAKE

a. inchoativity;
b. mirativity;
c. exhortation.

Let us see in detail how inchoativity and mirativity are encoded in these double verb constructions in Italo-Romance and Balkan Slavic.

---

[12]   In this study we leave aside the use of functional TAKE and GO as exhortative markers. Note also that GO and TAKE can be used, respectively, as a temporal marker, mainly to mark the future (see Fleischman 1982; Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994; Hopper & Traugott 2003; but see Squartini 1998 and Cruschina 2022 for the past in Catalan with GO), and as a reproachative marker in the imperative (see Simeonova 2023 for Bulgarian with TAKE).

2.1. Inchoativity in Italo-Romance double verb constructions

As regards the expression of inchoativity, i.e. the marking of the process of beginning or becoming,[13] in Italian both GO and TAKE can appear in an infinitival construction featuring the connector *a*, from Lat. AD (henceforth *a*InfCo):

(9)   Italian
       a. Così, quando andiamo   a tagliare le   patate…
          so   when go.PRS.1PL   to cut.INF the   potatoes
          'So that, when we start cutting the potatoes…'
       b. Ultimamente Gianni   ha   preso   a bere.
          lately   Gianni   has   taken   to drink.INF
          'Lately, John has started drinking (alcohol).'

      Note that expressions such as the one shown in (9a) are frequently used in descriptions in informal Italian. For example, they are widespread in the Italian spoken by chefs and culinary influencers on TV shows and Social Media tutorials.[14]
      PseCo with V1 GO can also be used with the same inchoative semantics, although it is less frequent than V1 TAKE in this respect, and may retain some semantics of motion:

(10)   Italian
       Adesso vado   e   mando   tutte le   e-mail.
       now   go.PRS.1SG   and   send.PRS.1SG all   the   e-mails
       'I'll go and send all the e-mails now.'

In Sicilian, inchoativity is instantiated by an *a*PseCo with V1 GO (cf. (11)).[15]

(11)   Delia (Caltanissetta)
       Ora vaju   a mmunnu   li   patati.
       now go.PRS.1SG A peel.PRS.1SG   the   potatoes
       'I'll start peeling the potatoes now.'

---

[13]   In this paper, we use 'inchoative' in a broad sense as a synonym of 'ingressive'/ 'inceptive', to describe an element marking the beginning of a state or an action. The Romance augment deriving from the Latin derivational affix *-sc-* (as in It. *arrossisco* 'I blush' and *fiorisco* 'I come into bloom'), which was originally limited to imperfective forms and expressed an ingressive meaning (Maiden 2016: 715), has lost its semantics and can thus be found also in verbs like *capisco* 'I understand' or *preferisco* 'I prefer' that do not display any inchoative semantics (Rohlfs 1968: 242-243).
[14]   Both the authors of the paper are native speakers of Italian. All the Italian examples, where not specified otherwise, are based on our fieldwork and our intuition as native speakers. The novel data from Sicilian are also to be attributed to the interviews by one of the authors. Note also that the Italian spoken by chefs and culinary influencers on TV shows and Social Media tutorials is currently being analysed by one of the authors.
[15]   Although the data collected so far go against the possibility for functional TAKE to express inchoativity in Sicilian (or, at least, exclusively inchoativity; see Section 5), we agree with an anonymous reviewer that a more in-depth study is required in this respect.

The corresponding infinitival construction does not seem to convey the same inchoative meaning:[16]

(12)   #Ora   vaju   a mmunnari   li   patati.
          now   go.PRS.1SG   to peel.INF   the   potatoes
          (intended) 'I'll start peeling the potatoes now.'

Note that, naturally, Italo-Romance languages can also resort to an explicit lexically inchoative V1, such as START or BEGIN (as in (13)) or to adverbials such as 'to begin with' (as in (14)).[17] In this paper, however, we explore the alternative possible means to express inchoativity, namely the use of V1 GO and TAKE.

(13)   a. Italian
            Ora   (in)comincio   a sbucciare   le   patate.
            Now   start.PRS.1SG   to peel.INF   the   potatoes
            'I'll start peeling the potatoes now.'
        b. Delia (Caltanissetta)
            Ora   accuminciu   a mmunari   li   patati.
            now   start.PRS.1SG   to peel.INF   the   potatoes
            'I'll start peeling the potatoes now.'

(14)   a. Italian
            Per prima   cosa,   sbucciamo   le   patate.
            for first   thing   peel.PRS.1SG   the   potatoes
            'To begin with, let's peel the potatoes.'
        b. Delia (Caltanissetta)
            Pp' accuminciari, munnammu   li   patati.
            for start.INF   peel.PRS.1SG   the   potatoes
            'To begin with, let's peel the potatoes.'

Let us see now how inchoativity is encoded in Bulgarian by means of V1+V2 periphrases.

2.2. Inchoativity in Bulgarian double verb constructions

Bulgarian displays a MAC featuring V1 TAKE (cf. (15a-b)) and the connector *da* (henceforth, *da*MAC) to express inchoativity. This structure is analogous to the Italian *a*InfCo, in that the Bulgarian infinitive is taken over by *da* followed by a tensed V2 which can only appear in the present tense (as in (15)). Recall that Krapova & Cinque (2018: 162) analyse such instances of *da*+V2 as a syntactic infinitive, which is found with phasal verbs such as *započvam / započna* 'begin, start' (cf. (15c); see also (4)). Under this analysis, the parallelism between the Bulgarian TAKE *da*MAC and the Italo-Romance TAKE *a*InfCo is welcome.

---

[16]   The sign "#" indicates that the sentence is acceptable but infelicitous in the intended sense (i.e. it is possible with V1 GO retaining its semantics of motion).
[17]   See Section 2.2 for similar examples in Bulgarian.

(15)   a. Bulgarian, TAKE *da*MAC; adapted from Kanchev (2010: 41)
            Vze   da   piše.
            take.AOR.PF.3SG   DA   write.PRS.IMPF.3SG
            '(S)he started writing.'
        b. Bulgarian, TAKE *da*MAC
            Marija vze   da   igrae   na videoigri.
            Mary   take.AOR.PF.3SG   DA   play.PRS.IMPF.3SG   at videogames
            'Mary started playing videogames.'
        c. Bulgarian, *da*MAC; adapted from Krapova & Cinque (2018: 160)
            Kosta   započva   sega da   šofira.
            Kosta   begin.PRS.IMPF.3SG now DA   drive.PRS.IMPF.3SG
            'Now Kosta begins to drive.'

The interviews with native speakers revealed the possibility (then confirmed by corpus search; cf. examples (16a-b)) of having an inchoative *da*MAC with the andative V1 *trăgvam* / *trăgna* 'leave'.[18]

(16)   a. Bulgarian; Bulgarian National Corpus, 00002357bDIE
            …neštata s   namiraneto na dobra rabota ne   izgleždaxa nikak
            things-the with   finding-the of good job   NEG   looked   at-all
            rozovi i   našite   se   primiraxa, če deteto
            rosy   and ours-the REFL   resign   ČE child-the
            trăgva   da   stava   stjuard…
            leave.AOR.IMPFV.3SG   DA   become.PRS.IMPFV.3SG steward
            '...things with the search for a good job were not rosy at all and ours had to resign themselves to the fact that the child was planning to become a steward…'
        b. Bulgarian, GO *da*MAC
            Trăgna   da   piše.
            leave.AOR.PFV.3SG   DA   write.PRS.IMPFV.3SG
            '(S)he started writing.'

The verbs TAKE and GO are both well attested in their functional use both in corpora and according to native speakers. However, there seems to be a difference in productivity between them in some contexts. For instance, in the case of the "weather" verb *valja* (lit. 'pour'),[19] V1 TAKE is easily accepted by all our consultants, while V1 GO raises some doubts among them. This intuition is confirmed by a Google search:

---

[18] The Bulgarian verb matching the English *go* is *otivam* / *otida*. However, this verb is not used as functional V1 in such periphrases but maintains its itive semantics. For our purposes, since *trăgvam* / *trăgna* is still an andative verb, we will classify the periphrases in which it appears as GO MACs.

[19]   "Weather" is given in quotes since *valja* 'pour' is not a real weather non-argumental verb like English *to rain*. In Bulgarian, this verb is a regular intransitive verb, whose subject can be expressed (cf, (ia)). If it is omitted, it is understood as 'rain pours' (cf. (ib)).

(i)   a. Vali   dăžd / snjag / graduška.   b. Vali.
            pours   rain   snow   hall   pours
            'It rains / it snows / it hails.'   'It rains.'

the query "взе да вали" in (17a) yields 4,810 results,[20] while the query "тръгна да вали" in (17b) returns only 6 results.[21] However, the reason for the lower acceptability of GO in the case of (17b) cannot be attributed either to the lack of volitionality or to the inanimacy (or non-agentivity) of the subject. *Trăgvam / trăgna* is found in many such cases (cf. (18a) and (18b) respectively).

(17)   Bulgarian
        a. Vze   da   vali.
           take.AOR.PFV.3SG   DA   pour.PRS.IMPFV.3SG
        b. ?Trăgna   da   vali.
           leave.AOR.PFV.3SG   DA   pour.PRS.IMPFV.3SG
           'It started raining.'

(18)   a. Bulgarian; bgTenTen12 (SketchEngine); token 2812071
           Kato   trăgna   da   umiram -   togava
           as   leave.AOR.PFV.3SG   DA   die.PRS.IMPFV.3SG   then
           elate   i   me   razpitvajte.
           go.IMPER and   me   question.2PL
           'When I start to die, then come and question me.'
        b. Bulgarian; https://www.24chasa.bg/bulgaria/article/10433829
           Dokato   se   dvižeše,   avtobusăt se   udari v trotoara
           while   REFL was-moving   bus-the   REFL hit   in sidewalk-the
           ot   djasnata strana, gumite se   spukaxa i   trăgna
           from right-the side   tyres-the REFL blew.3PL and leave.AOR.PFV.3SG
           da   gori   požar, imaše   mnogo dim.
           DA   burn.PRS.IMPFV.3SG   fire   there-was much   smoke
           'While moving, the bus hit the sidewalk on the right side, the tires blew and a fire started burning, there was a lot of smoke.'

As in Romance, Bulgarian can express inchoativity with the use of phasal verbs such as *započvam / započna* 'begin, start' (19) (cf. also (15c)) or with adverbials (cf. (20)).

(19)   Bulgarian
        Petăr   započna   da   piše.
        Peter   start.AOR.PFV.3SG   DA   write.PRS.IMPFV.3SG
        'Peter started writing.'

(20)   Bulgarian;   https://www.credoweb.bg/publication/105430/problemite-sas-sanya-svarzani-s-zhenskoto-bezplodie
        …lekarite   preporăčvat părvo   da   se   započne
        doctors-the suggest.3PL first   DA   REFL start.PRS.PFV.3SG
        s   kognitivna povedenčeska terapija.
        with   cognitive   behavioural   therapy
        '…the doctors suggest starting with cognitive behavioural therapy first.'

---

[20] Source (accessed 17/11/ 2023).
[21] Source (accessed 17/11/ 2023).

Since our focus is on functional TAKE and GO, we will not deal with such verbs here (however, cf. Section 4.2 for a discussion about the structure of the periphrasis featuring *započvam / započna*).

2.3. Mirativity in Italo-Romance double verb constructions

Mirativity can be defined as the speaker's expression of astonishment, wonder, regret, irritation, or scandal (cf. DeLancey 1997; 2001; see also Aikhenvald 2005 and Rett & Murray 2013, a.g.). Cross-linguistically, it can be associated with motion verbs, either itives (e.g., GO) and venitives (e.g., COME) where it gets, respectively, a negative and a positive nuance (cf. Fleischman 1982; Ross 2016), and also with TAKE (cf. Ekberg 1993).

In Italian, mirativity can be expressed by different V1+V2 configurations, namely by an *a*InfCo with V1 GO (cf. (21a, b)) or by a TAKE *e*PseCo (as in (21c, d)).

(21)   Italian
   a. [Expression of regret or irritation]
      Ecco!   È andato   a   cadere   proprio lì…
      ecco   is gone.M   to   fall.INF   exactly there
      'Here we are! He went and fell in that very place…'
   b. [Expression of surprise]
      Ma cosa   va   a   pensare?
      but what   go.PRS.3SG   to   think.INF
      'Why on Earth would he think that?'
   c. [Expression of surprise; adapted from Giusti & Cardinaletti (2022: 47)]
      Ha   preso   ed   è partita.
      has   taken   and   is left.F
      'She suddenly left.'
   d. [Expression of irritation]
      Nonè   che   uno   prende
      NEG is   that   one   take.PRS.3SG
      e   se   ne   va   così!
      and SE   NE   go.PRS.3SG like-that
      'Why would someone just up and leave like that?'

Sicilian displays an *a*PseCo with V1 GO (cf. (22a); see also Sornicola 1976; Cruschina 2013) and, like Italian, an *e*PseCo with V1 TAKE (cf. (22b)).

(22)   Delia (Caltanissetta)
   a. Cci   va   a dduna   un   pugnu!
      to-him go.PRS.3SG   A give. PRS.3SG   a   punch
   b. [Expression of surprise]
      Piglià   e   cci   detti   un   pugnu!
      take. PST.3SG and   to-him   give. PST.3SG   a   punch
      'He suddenly hit him with a punch! / He up and hit him with a punch!'

     c. [Expression of irritation]
       Piglià   e   si   nni   pintì!
       take. PST.3SG and SE   NE   regret. PST.3SG
       'Unexpectedly, he changed his mind.'

Since Sicilian GO *a*PseCo generally displays defective paradigms – another parameter subject to micro-variation – an *a*InfCo (cf. 23b') is used to fill the paradigm in the unavailable slots.[22] Compare (23a) with the *a*PseCo in (23b), which is grammatical in central Sicilian varieties, such as Deliano, but not in western Sicilian varieties such as Partannese:[23]

(23)   a. Delia (Caltanissetta); GO *a*PseCo
         Cci   ji   a ddetti   un   pugnu!
         to-him go.PST.3SG   A give. PST.3SG   a   punch
    b. Partanna (Trapani); GO *a*PseCo
         *Cci   ìu   a   ddesi   un   pugnu!
         to-him go. PST.3SG   A   give. PST.3SG   a   punch
    b'. Partanna (Trapani); GO *a*InfCo
         Cci   ìu   a   ddari   un   pugnu!
         to-him go. PST.3SG   to   give.INF a   punch
         'He suddenly hit him with a punch! / He up and hit him with a punch!'

V1 TAKE in Italo-Romance must generally share TAM and Person features with the V2 when it occurs in PseCo. Nevertheless, in Sicilian it can occur as an invariable present indicative 3SG when it is used as a mirative marker:

(24)   Delia (Caltanissetta); Di Caro (2022b: ex. 54)
       Tutta a   nna vota, piglia   e   gghjucava   jì!
       all   at   one   time take.PRS.3SG and play.IMPF.1SG   I
       'All of a sudden, (I found out) I was going to play (the match)'.

We have seen in Section 2.1 that inchoativity in Italo-Romance can also be expressed through other strategies. For mirativity, the scenario is equally (if not more) complex (see, e.g., Cruschina 2012 for mirative fronting).[24] In this study we abstract away the cases where mirativity is expressed not via functional GO and TAKE but by means of i) adverbs such as 'suddenly', 'surprisingly' or 'unexpectedly', ii) adverbials such as 'to my big surprise' iii) the 'Dativus Ethicus' *mi* 'to me' (see Masini 2012 for Italian). All these strategies, however, can to different degrees cooccur with either functional GO or TAKE.[25]

---

[22]   See Di Caro (2019b) for an overview on the parameters of microvariation on Sicilian GO *a*PseCo. See Di Caro & Giusti (2018) and Di Caro (2022a) for a discussion on the paradigmatic defectivity of present indicative *a*PseCo in Deliano.

[23]   Note, however, that, in this context, the Partannese speakers prefer the infinitival V2 *sunari* 'play, sound' (i.e. *sunari un pugnu* lit. 'to play a punch') instead of the basic *dari* 'give'.

[24]   *Mutatis mutandis*, the same disclaimer holds for Bulgarian as well.

[25]   Note also that Italian has a further strategy to express mirativity, namely the 'Surprise negative sentences' (or Snegs; cf. Greco 2020), which features the use of the modal negation

2.4. Mirativity in Bulgarian double verb constructions

To express mirativity, Bulgarian displays two different constructions, although only V1 TAKE is allowed. One of the available constructions is a MAC featuring two possible complementiser-like elements:[26] (i) *če* 'that' (*če*MAC) (cf. (25a-a')), which is frequently found, and (ii) *ta* 'that' (*ta*MAC) (cf. (25b-b')), whose use is more sporadic. As regards these elements, a quick search on the Bulgarian National Corpus (BNC, available at http://search.dcl.bas.bg/) provides a picture of the state of affairs. The search of all the possible inflected forms of *vzemam če* + V2 (using the query <вземам/F/ че *{POS=V}>) returns 57 results, while *vzemam ta* + V2 (<вземам/F/ та *{POS=V}>) returns only 8 results.[27]

The other available construction for expressing mirativity is a PseCo with the connecting element *i* 'and' (*i*PseCo) (cf. (25c)), analogous to the Italian and Sicilian *e*PseCo (see Section 2.3) and to Spanish *y*PseCo (see Soto Gómez 2021). Interestingly, the connector *i* can be omitted when the two verbs appear in the imperative form, as in (25c') (cf. Simeonova 2023).

(25)   a.   Bulgarian, TAKE *če*MAC; adapted from Kanchev (2010: 42)
             Vze,   če   napisa.
             take.AOR.PF.3SG   ČE   write. AOR.PF.3SG
             '(S)he unexpectedly wrote.'
       a'. Bulgarian, TAKE *če*MAC; Di Caro & Molinari (2022: 28)
             Ivan   vze,   če   se   razplaka.
             Ivan   take.AOR.PF.3SG   ČE   REFL   cry.AOR.PF.3SG
             'Ivan unexpectedly cried.'

(here glossed as NEG) as a mirative marker. Compare the Sneg in (ia) with the mirative TAKE *e*PseCo in (ib) and the GO *a*InfCo in (ic):

i)   Italian
       a. Non gli   dà   un pugno?
          NEG to-him   give.PRS.3SG   a punch
       b. Prende   e   gli   dà   un pugno!
          take.PRS.3SG and   to-him   give.PRS.3SG   a punch
       c. Gli va   a dare   un   pugno…
          to-him go.PRS.3SG to give.INF   a   punch
          'He suddenly hit him with a punch! / He up and hit him with a punch!'

Interestingly, mirative GO and TAKE can cooccur with Snegs, as in (ii), giving rise to different configurations. The mirative contribution of each marker, however, is still to be thoroughly investigated.

ii)   Italian
       Non gli   va   a dare   un pungo?
       NEG to-him   go.PRS.3SG   to give.INF a punch
       'He suddenly hit him with a punch! / He up and hit him with a punch!'

[26]   Although *če* has been classified as a fully-fledged complementiser (cf., e.g., Rudin 1986, Krapova 2002, 2021, a.o.), it is not clear whether this element can be assigned the categorial status of complementiser when it appears in such constructions which syntactically behave like PseCo.
[27]   Accessed 18/11/2023.

 b. Bulgarian, TAKE *ta*MAC

Vze	ta	zavalja	dăžd.
take. AOR.PF.3SG	TA	pour. AOR.PF.3SG	rain

  'It unexpectedly rained.'

 b'. Bulgarian, TAKE *ta*MAC; bgTenTen12, token 171285346

Tăkmo	naučix	magareto	da	ne	jade,
just	I-taught	donkey-the	DA	NEG	eats

to	vze	ta	umrja.
it	take. AOR.PF.3SG	ta	die. AOR.PF.3SG

  'I had just taught my donkey not to eat, when it died unexpectedly.'

 c. Bulgarian, TAKE *i*PseCo; *The serial killer* (*Серийният убиец*) by C. Marinov

…tja	vze	i	trăgna	s	men
she	take. AOR.PF.3SG	and	leave. AOR.PF.3SG	with	me

kato	opaška.
as	tail

  '...she took off with me as a tail.'

 c'. Bulgarian, *i*PseCo; adapted from Simeonova (2023: 2)

Alex	vze	/	*započna	i	si	trăgna.
Alex	take. AOR.PF.3SG	/	*started	and	REFL	leave.AOR.PF.3SG

  'Alex suddenly left.'

The formative *ta* can function as a complementiser on a par with *če* (although the former can only introduce a final embedded clause, as in (26)), but in present day standard Bulgarian it has only a quite limited use and displays a residual presence in such periphrases.

(26) Bulgarian; BNC, L00200049tDKE

I	go	otvori,	ta	vsički	da	piem	po	edno.
and	it	open.IMPR	TA	all	DA	drink.1PL	on	one

  'And open it, so that we all can drink one.'

According to our informants, *ta* is still used as a complementiser in some local dialects. Further data are needed to confirm this claim.

3. A preliminary quantitative study on Bulgarian TAKE constructions

The documentation of the relevant TAKE-constructions in Bulgarian in the present literature is rather scarce and non-systematic. To the best of our knowledge, only a few examples are reported in the literature. Coseriu (1977: 21) reports from Sandfeld (1900) the following three examples (our translation), which, however, are not from standard Bulgarian: (i) hvanăla se i igrala '(she) held on and danced', (ii) fatila ta utseakla darvotu '(she) took and cut down the tree', (iii) zele ta skrili pak stokata 'they hid the goods again'. The other available examples in the literature are reported above from Kanchev (2010) (cf. (15a) and (25a)).

  In order to collect and provide new data on these constructions in Bulgarian, and as a preliminary study to tackle the question of the coexistence of MACs and

PseCo in this language, Di Caro & Molinari (2022) administered a fully anonymous online questionnaire based on acceptability judgments to 157 Bulgarian native speakers (age range = 18-75; M = 43.63; SD = 13.92) living in different parts of Bulgaria.

The sample was recruited mainly adopting the strategy of 'snowballing sampling' (Buchstaller & Khattab 2013), i.e., asking some informants to spread the questionnaire among their acquaintances. A part of the sample was also collected by advertising the study among Bulgarian communities that have their Facebook groups.

The questionnaire contained:

(i)   39 items consisting of sentences featuring either TAKE *da*MAC, TAKE *če*MAC or *i*PseCo to be rated through a 5-point scale (1 = totally unacceptable, 5 = totally acceptable);

(ii)   3 forced-choice tasks that presented a context and three sentences (corresponding to the three relevant constructions) to the participants, who had to choose the one which better suited the described situation.[28]

The 39 items were equally divided for all the three constructions (13 items containing a *če*MAC, 13 with a *da*MAC, and 13 with an *i*PseCo) and investigated all the persons of the paradigm. The 13 items for each construction were divided as follows: 5 sentences featured a past tense (in particular, we used perfective verbs in the aorist), while the remaining 8 were in the present (with an imperfective verb instead). The stimuli investigated different kinds of verbs: simple transitive (e.g., 'throw' (27a)) and transitive requiring an oblique object (e.g., 'apologise' (27b)), unaccusative (e.g., 'go' (27c)), unergative (e.g., 'stay' (27d)), and stative (e.g., 'look' (27e)). The following examples are all taken from the questionnaire.

(27)   a. Vseki   păt, kogato risuva   nešto   i   ne   ì   xaresva,
            each   time when   draws   something   and NEG   to.her likes
            vzema   i   go   xvărlja.
            take.PRS.IMPF.3SG   and it   thow-away.PRS.IMPF.3SG
            'Every time she's painting and she doesn't like what she's painting, she goes and throws it away.'

        b. Tja beše na   srešta   s   šefa   si.   Văpreki če šefăt
            she was   on   meeting with boss.the SELF   despite   boss.the
            ì   ništo   ne   ja   popita,   tja   vze
            to-her   nothing NEG her   asked.3SG she   take.AOR.PF.SG
            da   mu   se   izvinjava.
            DA   to-him SELF   apologise.PRS.IMPF.3SG
            'She was at a meeting with her boss. Even though he didn't ask her anything, she took and apologized with him.'

---

[28]   We agree with an anonymous reviewer's observation that one limitation of our methodology is the absence of fillers. This study was conceived as a pilot study that is a necessary first step towards the documentation and investigation of this understudied phenomenon. The design of the questionnaire was thus the result of a trade-off between the need of collecting some first organised data, and the necessity of having a wide pool of informants. Although we are aware of the weaknesses of this methodology, cutting the fillers out allowed us to have a shorter questionnaire, thus preventing participant from abandoning the study before completion.

c. ?Vzex,   če   trăgnax,   tolkova   beše lesno!
take.AOR.PF.1SG ČE leave.AOR.PF.1SG so-much was   easy
'I took and went, it was so easy!'

d. *Ako pak   ste   zakăsneli,   sledvaštija pāt
if   again are.2SG be-late.PRT.PF.PL next-the   time
vzemame,   če   ostavame   vkăšti   napravo.
take.PRS.IMPF.1PL ČE   stay.PRS.IMPF.1PL   at-home directly
(Intended) 'If you're late again, next time we'll take and stay at home directly.'

e. Ivan se   spravjaše   dobre   s   izpita   si,   kogato
Ivan REFL managed.3SG well   with exam-the SELF when
izvednǎž vze   da   izgležda   pritesnen.
suddenly take.AOR.PF.3SG DA look.AOR.PF.3SG worried
'Ivan was writing his exam well, when suddenly he went and looked worried.'

The results of this preliminary study show that the rate of acceptability of these constructions is relatively low overall (see Table 1). This can be explained considering different factors. First, the percentages displayed in the tables below are calculated only considering the two highest rates of the Likert scale used (i.e., 4 and 5) to obtain stronger judgements of acceptability (cf. Di Caro & Molinari 2022). The intermediate rating (i.e., 3) are calculated together with the lower ones (i.e., 1 and 2), which are taken to indicate unacceptability of the constructions presented. Second, the unexpected finding that the two TAKE MACs are almost exclusively accepted when the V1 is in the past tense contribute to the low acceptability, as half of the sentences are in the present tense. The *i*PseCo instead displays a similar acceptability rate in both the present and in the past (see Table 2). Third, the lack of fillers may have skewed the results towards the unacceptability of less typical examples.[29] Fourth, such constructions belong to the colloquial register (cf. also Simeonova 2023), which also plays a role in lowering the threshold of their acceptability when they are presented in written form.

Table 1. Percentage of acceptability for each construction

Construction	% of acceptablity
*če*MAC	35%
*da*MAC	24%
*i*PseCo	34.1%

Source: Di Caro & Molinari (2022: 30)

---

[29]   We thank an anonymous reviewer for this observation.

Table 2. Percentage of acceptability of the constructions according to the tense

Construction	Present	Past
*če*MAC	19.7%	65.6%
*da*MAC	15.9%	40.3%
*i*PseCo	34%	34.4%

Source: Di Caro & Molinari (2022: 30)

The obtained results highlight the productivity of the two MACs (mainly in the past), which contrasts with the *i*PseCo, which is the least common. This observation is also confirmed by Simeonova (2023: 2).

As for the semantic specialisation, the questionnaire contained three different contexts corresponding to different semantics: inchoative (cf. (28)), mirative with a surprise effect (cf. (29)), and mirative with a disapproval nuance (cf. (30)). The informants had to choose which of the three constructions better suited the description of the given context.

(28)   [Marija beše vkăšti i skučaeše. Za da se zabavljava, započna da igrae na videoigri. Posočete koe ot sledvaštite izrečenija po-dobre opisva tazi situacija.]
[Mary was at home and she was bored. In order to have fun, he started playing videogames. Indicate which of the following sentences best describes this situation.]

a. Marija   vze   da   igrae   na   videoigri.
   Maria   take.AOR.PF.3SG   DA   play.PRS.IMPF.3SG   at   videogames

b. Marija   vze,   če   poigra   na   videoigri.
   Maria   take.AOR.PF.3SG   ČE   play.AOR.PF.3SG   at   videogames

c. Marija   vze   i   poigra   na   videoigri.
   Maria   take.AOR.PF.3SG   and   play.AOR.PF.3SG   at   videogames
   'Mary went and played videogames.'

(29)   [Včera Ivan beše v dobro nastroenie. Izvednăž započna da plače. Posočete koe ot sledvaštite izrečenija po-dobre opisva tazi situacija.]
[Yesterday Ivan was in a good mood. Suddenly he started crying. Indicate which of the following sentences best describes this situation.]

a. Ivan   vze   da   plače.
   Ivan   take.AOR.PF.3SG   DA   cry.PRS.IMPF.3SG

b. Ivan   vze,   če   se   razplaka.
   Ivan   take.AOR.PF.3SG   ČE   SELF   cry.AOR.PF.3SG

c. Ivan   vze   i   se   razplaka.
   Ivan   take.AOR.PF.3SG   and   SELF   cry.AOR.PF.3SG
   'Ivan went and cried.'

(30)   [Boris vinagi e bil izbuxliv. Minalata večer, dokato spореše s edin ot
        prijatelite si, Boris go udari. Posočete koe ot sledvaštite izrečenija po-dobre
        opisva tazi situacija.]
        [Boris has always had a bad attitude. Yesterday evening, while discussing
        with a friend, he hit him. Indicate which of the following sentences best
        describes this situation]

a.	Boris	vze	da	go	udrja.
	Boris	take.AOR.PF.3SG	DA	him	beat.PRS.IMPF.3SG
b.	Boris	vze,	če	go	udari.
	Boris	take.AOR.PF.3SG	ČE	him	beat.AOR.PF.3SG
c.	Boris	vze	i	go	udari.
	Boris	take.AOR.PF.3SG	and	him	beat.AOR.PF.3SG

        'Boris went and hit him.'

The forced-choice tasks reveal the existence of a neat division of labour of the considered constructions, at least between the TAKE *če*MAC and the TAKE *da*MAC (see Table 3).[30]

Table 3. Percentage of acceptability of the constructions according to the action type

Construction	Inchoative	Mirative (disapproval)	Mirative (surprise)
*če*MAC	19.9%	79.8%	63.7%
*da*MAC	69.6%	11.9%	31.9%
*i*PseCo	10.5%	8.3%	4.4%

Source: Di Caro & Molinari (2022: 31)

The obtained results clearly demonstrate the inchoative semantics of the TAKE *da*MAC, which sharply contrasts with the mirative semantics of the TAKE *če*MAC. The *i*PseCo is instead the least preferred, probably because all the contexts were in the past tense, and the two TAKE MACs are the preferred choice in that context (and prevail over the *i*PseCo). The existence of this latter construction could instead be justified by its broader versatility, in that it makes the inchoative/mirative semantics available with verbal tenses that are not accessible to the TAKE MACs.

The *i*PseCo seems to be very productive in imperatives, which results in a construction expressing the speaker's negative attitude towards the addressee. This PseCo conveys a meaning of reproach, reprimand, and/or scolding (Simeonova 2023).

(31)   Bulgarian, *i*PseCo; Simeonova (2023: 6)
        Vzemi   i   napiši   nešto!
        take.IMPR.PFV.2SG and   write.IMPR.PFV.2SG something
        'Write something already!'

Such an interpretation will be dealt with in more detail in Section 5.

---

[30]   The relatively high acceptability of the TAKE *da*MAC in the mirative context with a neutral surprise effect (a third of the informants) is likely to be due to the way the action is described in the context, *viz.* using the verb *započna* 'begin'. This could have skewed the participants towards the inchoative *da*MAC.

4. The structure of the periphrases with functional TAKE and GO

After presenting the array of available structures to express inchoativity and mirativity, we will now focus on their syntactic properties and provide their structural analysis.

4.1. Italo-Romance

Italo-Romance PseCo and MACs have recently been the object of some renewed interest (see Giusti, Di Caro & Ross 2022 for an overview; see also Di Caro 2019a). We base our syntactic analysis of these constructions on the work by Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) and following refinements (2003; 2020) for the GO *a*PseCo, and on Giusti & Cardinaletti (2022) for TAKE *e*PseCO and the *mu*MAC.

As anticipated in Section 1, Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) propose that the V1 in Sicilian GO *a*PseCo is a lexical verb merged as a functional head in a dedicated position immediately higher than T, namely *t* (cf. (32a)).[31] There, it can either copy the TAM features of the V2 or remain invariant (e.g. *va-* or, in some eastern Sicilian varieties also *vo-*, *uo-* and *o-*, as in (32b, b'); see Di Caro & Giusti 2015; Di Caro 2019a).

As regards the Italo-Romance TAKE *e*PseCo, Giusti & Cardinaletti (2022), following Soto Gómez's (2021) analysis of the Spanish counterpart, propose that V1 TAKE is a functional head that first merges in Foc, in the Left Periphery of the sentence (Rizzi 1997). The position of TAKE in Foc is justified by the fact that this verb functions as a contrastive Focus, i.e., contrasting the speaker's expectation with the (surprising) event. The Foc head is projected by the pseudo-coordinator *e* in CP, while the rest of the clause is a full TP where the lexical verb V2 canonically remerges to TP (as shown in (32b)).

As for the Southern Italo-Romance MACs, Cardinaletti & Giusti (2020) provide a structure (cf. (32c)) where the V1 projects an independent *v*P and takes a FinP as its complement, where FinP is to be considered as a reduced clausal projection, with the same properties as the non-finite Fin that is found in control and raising infinitives (cf. Rizzi 1997).

Finally, we draw on Cinque (2006) to provide the structures of the mirative GO *a*InfCo in (32d) and the inchoative GO/TAKE *a*InfCo in (32e), where the two verbs are merged as functional heads in the TP spine: mirative GO in AndativeP (from where it raises to FocP, in the Left Periphery of the sentence) and both inchoative GO and TAKE in Asp$_{inceptive}$P.

(32)   a. [$_t$P V1 [$_t$P (*a*) [TP V2 [$_v$P ~~V2~~ …   [GO *a*PseCo]
       b. [FocP V1 [CP *e* [TP V2 [$_v$P ~~V2~~ …   [TAKE *e*PseCo]
       c. [TP V1 [$_v$P V1 [FinP (*mu/mi/ma/cu*) [TP V2 [$_v$P ~~V2~~ …   [*mu*MAC]
       d. [FocP V1 [AndativeP ~~V1~~ [$_v$P *a* V2 [VP ~~V2~~ …   [mirative GO *a*InfCo]
       e. [Asp$_{inceptive}$P V1 [$_v$P *a* V2 [VP ~~V2~~ …   [inchoative GO/TAKE *a*InfCo]

---

[31]   In their analysis, Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001; 2003; 2020) also consider V1 COME, COME BY and SEND. Since all of these V1s display the same syntactic behaviour, in this paper we refer to them as GO *a*PseCo.

We contend that inchoative TAKE and GO can occupy the Asp$_{inceptive}$P head in (32e) in virtue of their bleached semantics (more on that in Section 5). Being found in the inceptive head, they acquire that particular reading.

4.2. Bulgarian

The case of the periphrasis with V1 *započvam / započna* is interesting as its similarities with the TAKE/GO *da*MAC go beyond the inchoative semantics. These constructions share the same monoclausal behaviour (recall that Krapova & Cinque 2018 classify *započvam*-like periphrases as monoclausal, in contrast to other periphrases featuring *da* which are biclausal). In particular, there is a unique clausal subject (hence the impossibility of having an expressed subject for the V2, as in (33a)), and the V2 must appear in the "default form" (i.e., the present tense), while other forms are not admitted, cf. (33b)).

(33)   a. Boris   vze / trăgna / započna   (*Marija)
          Boris   take leave   start.AOR.PFV.3SG   Mary
          da   piše.
          DA   write.PRS.IMPFV.3SG
          'Boris started writing.'
       b. *Vzex / trăgnax / započnax   da   napisax.
            take   leave   start.AOR.PFV.1SG   DA   write.AOR.PFV.1SG

The parallelism in this case is noteworthy: the inchoative semantics can be expressed by the same syntactically monoclausal *da*MAC with three different V1s,[32] i.e., *vzema(m)* 'take', *trăgvam/trăgna* 'leave', and *započvam/započna* 'begin/start'. The only difference is that the former two V1s do not lexically encode inchoativity (we will return on this in Section 5). The syntactic identity of the structures above suggests that we are dealing with the same structure, where only the V1 changes.

For this purpose, we adopt Krapova & Cinque's (2018: 162) analysis of *započvam*-like periphrases, which is based on Cinque's (2006) split-TP. The idea is that the V1 *započvam/započna* is inserted in a functional Asp$_{inceptive}$ head which selects a verbal complement introduced by the particle *da*. This particle belongs to the functional field of the same clause. The analysis represented in (34) refers to the example (33a).

(34)   [TP pro [Asp$_{inceptive}$P {*započna/vze/trăgna*} [*da* [VP *piše*]]]]

As we proposed in Section 4.1, we claim that in Bulgarian as well inchoative GO and TAKE can occupy Asp$_{inceptive}$P (cf. (34)) (just like *započna*) as a consequence of their semantic bleaching. This quite simple move accounts for the structural identity between the constructions and derives their monoclausal syntactic behaviour.

The mirative TAKE *če/ta*MACs are instead very different from canonical periphrases with the complementiser *če/ta.* The example (26) featuring *ta* and (35)

---

[32]   With "monoclausal" we mean the absence of a CP layer sandwiched between two independent TPs.

featuring *če* show that such canonical constructions are trivially biclausal (as the complementiser introduces a full subordinate clause).

(35)   Bulgarian; adapted from Tomić (2006: 463)
Mislja,   če   tova zdanie   stoi   i   sega.
think.1SG ČE   this building   stands and now
'I think that that building is there even now.'

The biclausal status of the canonical periphrases featuring *če/ta* allows the two verbs to have independent reference and does not force them to share TAM features. This sharply contrasts with the properties of the TAKE *če/ta*MAC (and *i*PseCo), in which V1 and V2 must be coreferent and must share TAM features (cf. (36) with (25)).

(36)   Bulgarian
a. Boris vze,   če / ta   (*Marija) udari
   Boris take.AOR.PF.3SG   ČE   TA   Mary   hit.AOR.PF.3SG
   priatelja   si.
   friend-the   self's
   'Boris suddenly/unexpectedly hit his own friend.'
b. *Vzex,   če / ta   udrjam   priatelja si.
   take.AOR.PF.1SG   ČE   TA   hit.PRS.IMPF.1SG friend-the self's

This can be best characterized as a monoclausal behaviour, as postulated for the TAKE/GO *da*MACs. However, the difference in the case of the TAKE *če/ta*MACs is the obligatory TAM sharing between V1 and V2. The TAKE *i*PseCo features exactly the same properties as the TAKE *če/ta*MACs (37). It differs from canonical coordinations in that V1 and V2 are not interpreted as two consequential actions, but rather as a single one (expressed by the V2).

(37)   a. Tja   vze   i   (*toj)   trăgna.
           she   take.AOR.PF.3SG and he   leave.AOR.PF.3SG
           'She took off.'
        b. *Vzemi   i   šte napišeš   nešto!
           take.IMPR.PFV.2SG and FUT write.PRS.PFV.2SG something

Such structures have the same properties (both from a syntactic and a semantic perspective) of the Italo-Romance *e*PseCo: for this reason, we argue that they can be accounted for by Soto Gómez's (2021) proposal, replicated for Bulgarian in (38).

(38)   [FocP [Foc *vze*] [CP [C {*če/ta/i*}] [TP [T *umrja*] [vP ~~umrja~~]]]]

For the time being, we maintain that C is the position of the connectors, including the (pseudo-)coordinator *i* (along the lines of Soto Gómez 2021).[33] As will be argued for in Section 5, these structural proposals are perfectly in line with the process of grammaticalisation TAKE and GO undergo.

---

[33]   Further research is needed to clarify the role of *če* and *ta* in such MACs.

5. The intersection of inchoative and mirative functions

In the previous sections we have dealt with inchoativity and mirativity in Italo-Romance and Bulgarian separately. In this section we will discuss some cases in which the distinction between the two functions is not clear-cut, in the sense that the multiple verb constructions featuring GO and TAKE seem to display both inchoative and mirative nuances. Consider the following examples:

(39)   a. Italian, GO *e*PseCo
        Adesso   vado   e   gliene   dico   quattro!
        now   go.PRS.1SG   and   to-him+NE   say.PRS.1SG   four
     b. Italian, GO *a*InfCo
        Adesso   vado   a   dirgliene   quattro!
        now   go.PRS.1SG   to say.INF+to-him+NE   four
        'Enough. I'll go and give him a talking-to!'

(40)   a. Bulgarian, TAKE *da*MAC; Simeonova (2023: 6)
        Vzemi   da   napišeš   nešto!
        take.IMPER.PFV.2SG   DA   write.PRS.PFV.2SG   something
     b. Bulgarian, TAKE *če*MAC; *ibid.*
        Vzemi,   če   napiši   nešto!
        take.IMPER.PFV.2SG   and   write.IMPER.PFV.2SG something
     c. Bulgarian, TAKE *i*PseCo; *ibid.*
        Vzemi   (i)   napiši   nešto!
        take.IMPER.PFV.2SG   and   write.IMPER.PFV.2SG something
        ≈'Write something already!'

In the examples in (39) the functional GO still retains its semantics of motion, in the sense that the speaker is threatening to leave their position in order to reach the person that has made them angry or annoyed. Nevertheless, at the same time (or for that very reason) the periphrasis gives the whole sentence a flavour of disappointment, on the one hand, and signals the initiation of an event, on the other. A similar semantic intersection can be observed in (40).[34] The interpretation of these sentences is well rendered by Simeonova (2023: 12) as "you didn't do it […], I'm telling you to do it (preference + performative), and I am expecting you to not do it (mirative)". As a result, mirativity (given by the speaker's expectation that the interlocutor will not perform the action they are supposed to do) intersects with inchoativity (i.e., the request to start performing the action).

We might wonder why we obtain this intersection between different semantics. A principled answer could be that, since both TAKE and GO can convey (to different degrees) both inchoativity and mirativity, it is expected that both semantics can arise in one and the same periphrasis. This probably has to do with the cognitive basis grounding the path that leads these lexical verbs to becoming functional ones. The reason why TAKE is eligible for conveying both inchoative and mirative semantics

---

[34]   Note that these sentences are in the imperative mood, which contributes part of the semantic complexity. Nevertheless, the compatibility of TAKE in such contexts suggests that this V1 can accommodate for the intersection of inchoative and mirative semantics.

was explored by Ekberg (1993). The idea is that the action of taking is conceptualised as consisting of three different stages (see Ekberg 1993: 25ff.):

  i)   the *initiation* of the event, which is volitional and momentaneous as the 'taker' (defined as 'trajector' by Ekberg) is prototypically human;

  ii) the *transfer*, in which the 'takee' ('landmark' in Ekberg's terms) is transferred to the taker;

  iii) the *possession*, i.e., the resulting state in which the takee already belongs to the taker.

The inchoativity of functional TAKE is strictly connected with the *initiation* stage and arises, according to Ekberg, when the verb is combined with a V2 denoting an unbounded event (e.g., *swim*). In this case, the conceptualisation of the action of taking is reduced to the first stage, providing the reading of a volitional and momentaneous beginning of the action.[35]

The mirative function is instead linked to the resultative stage and arises when the V2 denotes a bounded event (e.g., *win*). In this case, the event has a more complex internal structure, and the periphrastic construction both indicates the beginning and the completeness of the action. Although Ekberg (1993) does not explicitly mention the surprise effect,[36] her work contains all the ingredients to justify this semantics. Mirativity is likely to arise as an interplay between the momentaneous nature of the action (as conceptualised in the initiation) and the resultative state (which is fundamental, as the speaker expresses surprise for the outcome of the action, not for the action itself).[37] From this perspective, the mirative function entails the inchoative

---

[35]   Ekberg uses the volitionality of the prototypical human subject to justify the ungrammaticality of Swedish examples like (i) involving a non-volitional subject.

(i)   Swedish; Ekberg (1993: 34)
       *Bollen tog   och   rullade   nerfor   backen.
       the-ball took   and   rolled   down   the-hill

She argues that the subject should either be [+volitional] or underspecified for volitionality. However, there are problematic cases: in Italian, Sicilian, and Bulgarian, inchoative TAKE is admitted with a weather verb as V2 (e.g., (17a)), which is supposed to lack a logical subject. Moreover, in languages like Russian, non-volitional subjects are also admitted (ii). This is not possible in a language like Italian.

(ii)   Russian; Weiss (2022: 50)
       Ved' Taras Ermilyč byl   ogoročen: ugoščal-ugoščal   dorogogo   gostja, a
       PRT Taras Ermilyč was   upset   offered-offered   dear   guest   and
       tot   v   nagradu   vzjal da   i   umer …
       that in   reward   took   DA   and died
       'Taras Ermilyč was upset: he had treated the dear guest so carefully, and now the guest took and died as a reward.'

The possibility to co-occur with non-volitional subjects in some Slavic languages can indicate that TAKE is (slightly) more grammaticalised in comparison with, e.g., Italian, in that in the former languages the aspect of non-volitionality has been bleached.

[36]   For the surprise effect in Swedish periphrases with functional GO see Wiklund (2009) and Josefsson (2014).

[37]   This naturally accounts for the strong preference of these constructions for past events. Furthermore, the fact that the result is a key element in the emerging of mirative semantics justifies the use of the perfective aspect in Bulgarian (see Section 3).

one. Hence, what we observe is that in certain contexts both functions of the action (its beginning and its result) emerge as prominent, giving a mixed pattern.

The conceptualisation of TAKE in different stages is crucial to justify its grammaticalisation into an inchoative and mirative marker. Moreover, the fact that conceptualisation is rooted in the human cognition justifies the great productivity of TAKE as functional verbs in different languages. This is well explained by Ekberg:

> "Is the cross linguistic use of *take* in the periphrastic *take and V*-construction arbitrary, or is it linguistically conceptually motivated? Bybee & Pagliuca (1985: 75) suggest that human language users have 'a natural propensity for making metaphorical extensions that lead to the increased use of certain items.' They further state that these metaphorical extensions are 'cognitively based, and are similar across languages'. […] It is a reasonable hypothesis that an item which denotes a basic, human pattern of movement – such as *take* – is well fitted for an extended use as, e.g., a marker of *aktionsart* or pragmatic meaning."
>
> [Ekberg (1993: 37)]

As far as the verb GO is concerned, Ross (2016), capitalising on Stefanowitsch (1999), derives the mirative semantics of functional itive verbs building on their motion away from the deictic centre (i.e., the speaker). In the same fashion, mirative GO can be thought of as "motion away from expectation" (Ross 2016: 10), where the speaker's expectation represents the "deictic center" in the distribution of possible outcomes of an event.

As for the inchoative function of GO, the same mechanism proposed by Ekberg (1993) for TAKE could be extended to cover this case as well. In fact, the conceptualisation of motion conveyed by itive verbs straightforwardly shares with the action conveyed by TAKE at least the component of *initiation* and *transfer* (although the transfer happens in the same direction as the initiation, i.e., the opposite direction with respect to the transfer with TAKE). The focus on the *initiation* is likely to be the source for the inchoative semantics of GO. This semantics is strictly connected with the intentionality shade that emerged from some of the above cited examples (e.g., (16a) and (39)). An important role in explaining this inference is played by the inference of futurity triggered by the purposive construction with GO (in analogy with the case of *be going to* in English; cf. Traugott 1995: 35; Hopper & Traugott 2003: 87ff.). Let us briefly consider the case of Bulgarian which is the most understudied (if compared to Italo-Romance). The verb *trăgvam / trăgna* is generally found in periphrases where it maintains its itive semantics, and the *da*-clause expresses the goal of the motion (cf. 41).

(41)   Bulgarian; bgTenTen12, token 1321477
Xristofor   Kolumb   trăgva   da   tărsi
Christopher Columbus   leave.PRS.IMPFR.3SG   DA   look-for.PRS.IMPFR.3SG
păt   kăm Dalečnija iztok   prez   Atlantičeskija   okean…
way   to   Far   East   through Atlantic   ocean
'Christopher Columbus sets out to find a route to the Far East across the Atlantic Ocean…'

As proposed for *be going to*, the flavour of futurity is likely to arise when the futurity entailed by the purposive construction is foregrounded. This implies that this

semantic change involves the grammaticalisation of the whole complex *trăgvam/trăgna da* and not of the verb itself. This is supported by the data found in the corpus bgTenTen12. A collocation search for the lemma *trăgna* (query [lemma="тръгна"]; 99,002 results) reveals that the most frequent lemma occurring right after the verb is *da* (14,221 occurrences). If this is the case, it would be a welcome result given that such a development would straightforwardly explain why the inchoative use of *trăgvam/trăgna* is expressed via a *da*MAC. As a consequence, we have a clue to explain why inchoative structures with either GO or TAKE in Bulgarian are *da*MACs, while mirative TAKE MACs and PseCo feature a different connector. What remains to be clarified is the role of the (pseudo-)complementisers *če/ta* and the (pseudo-)coordinator *i*.

Functional TAKE and GO undergo a process of subjectification, just like what happens with *be going to* (Traugott 1982, 1986, 1988, 1995; Hopper & Traugott 2003). This consists in a shift of perspective that these items lexicalise, from an 'objective' one (describing a situation as it appears) to a 'subjective' one (looking at the event from the speaker's perspective, coming to lexicalise the speaker's attitude). Ekberg (1993: 36f.) states that "[t]he use of *take and V* signals that the speaker has established 'mental contact' with the *trajector* - or that the speaker has taken the view of the *trajector* - and thus is able to assert that the *trajector* is performing the action volitionally". This is particularly evident in the mirative semantics, which highlight the speaker's surprise, regret or disappointment.

Before concluding, it is important to point out the relevance of the syntactic account proposed in Section 4.1 and 4.2 for the subjectification account of functional GO and TAKE. The idea that the Left Periphery relates to the speaker's attitude is widely acknowledged (cf. Krifka 2020 for a recent detailed proposal). The structural proposal presented above naturally accounts for this fact, as mirative GO and TAKE raise to the Left Periphery. Moreover, even in the case in which these V1s have an inchoative interpretation, we suppose a shift upwards in the TP spine. This causes GO and TAKE to find themselves closer to the CP layer.

6. Conclusions

With the macro-comparison of some verbal periphrases with functional GO and TAKE in Italian, Sicilian and Bulgarian proposed in this paper, we have tried to fill a gap in the literature, where data from Sicilian and Bulgarian are either scarce or difficult to retrieve, given the colloquial nature of some of these periphrases. In particular, we have shown that both GO and TAKE are very productive as inchoative and mirative markers (and sometimes as both, as discussed in Section 5) in all the languages considered. The cross-linguistic consistency of these verbs to grammaticalise can be accounted for by the way the action they denote is conceptualised. Moreover, we have proposed a consistent structural explanation for the features shared by these constructions. The structural similarity of the relevant PseCo and MACs can be seen as the by-product of the subjectification process GO and TAKE undergo, which causes them to shift upwards in the functional hierarchy.

Furthermore, interestingly, Bulgarian and Italian seem to be closer than Sicilian and Italian from a structural perspective: the former share the functional use of GO and TAKE with inchoative semantics, and display analogous constructions (i.e., Italian

*a*InfCo corresponds to Bulgarian *da*MAC, and Italian *e*PseCo is equivalent to Bulgarian *i*PseCo). All these facts are summarised in Table 4.

Table 4. An overview of the verbal periphrases with functional GO and TAKE

	Inchoativity	**Mirativity**
Italian		
a. TAKE *e*PseCo	+	+
b. TAKE *a*InfCo	+	-
c. GO *a*InfCo	+	+
d. GO *e*PseCo	+	+
Sicilian		
e. GO *a*InfCo	?	+
f. GO *a*PseCo	+	+
g. TAKE *e*PseCo	?	+
Bulgarian		
h. TAKE *da*MAC	+	- (+ with imperative)
i. GO *da*MAC	+	-
j. TAKE *če*MAC	- (+ with imperative)	+
k. TAKE *ta*MAC	-	+
l. TAKE *i*PseCo	(+)	+

The study conducted and the data collected for the varieties under investigation allow us to answer the research questions laid out at the end of Section 1. In particular, we have highlighted that i) TAKE have the tendency to grammaticalise both as an inchoative and a mirative marker in the three languages under investigation, while GO seems to specialise only for inchoativity in Bulgarian (but not in Italian and Sicilian). Moreover, ii) the PseCo is a widespread structure, found in all the three varieties. Note that Bulgarian TAKE *če/ta*MAC formally behave like PseCo. Furthermore, the Bulgarian *da*MAC is the analogous of the Italo-Romance InfCo. Finally, iii) we can reconcile the functions with the structures by recognising that GO and TAKE undergo subjectification (due to the way the action they express is conceptualised). This causes the verb to shift upwards (to the Left Periphery or to a higher position in the TP).

Considering the preliminary nature of this contribution and the complexity of the functions under analysis, we think that further research can be done that basically goes in at least two directions: i) a wider data collection extended to the whole Balkan area (e.g., in Albanian, Romanian, Macedonian and Modern Greek) to assess the extent to which the encoding of inchoativity and mirativity via GO and TAKE are expressed by the same periphrases; ii) more fine-grained dedicated qualitative and quantitative studies to capture the parameters of micro-variation in the GO and TAKE multi verb constructions considered in the present study. Both directions can be developed using the protocol methodology (in the sense of Giusti 2011), which provides a track that guides the process of data collection and data query. This tool would be extremely useful already in the phase of organisation of fieldwork, as it would allow researchers to focus on specific properties of interest during the data collection. This would facilitate the subsequent analysis and highlight the points in which the languages overlap and those in which they differ.

Acknowledgments

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2005. *Evidentiality*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199263882.001.0001

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial verb constructions in typological perspective. In A. Y. Aikhenvald, & R. M. W. Dixon (eds), *Serial Verb Constructions: A cross-linguistic typology*, 1–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199279159.003.0001

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds). 2006. *Serial Verb Constructions: A cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199279159.001.0001

Asenova, Petya. 2002. *Balkansko ezikosnanie. Osnovni problemi na balkanskija ezikov săjuz* [Balkan linguistics. Fundamental problems of the Balkan Linguistic Union]. Veliko Tărnovo: Faber.

Buchstaller, Isabelle, & Ghada Khattab. 2013. Population samples. In R. J. Podesva, & D. Sharma (eds), *Research methods in linguistics*, 74–95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139013734

Bybee, Joan L., & William Pagliuca. 1985. Cross-linguistic comparison and the development of grammatical meaning. In J. Fisiak (ed.), *Historical Semantics – Historical word-formation*, 59–83. Berlin: Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110850178.59

Bybee, Joan L., Perkins, Revere, & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cardinaletti, Anna, & Giuliana Giusti. 2001 Semi-lexical motion verbs in Romance and Germanic. In N. Corver, & H. Van Riemsdijk (eds), *Semi-lexical categories*, 371–414. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110874006.371

Cardinaletti, Anna, & Giuliana Giusti. 2003. Motion verbs as functional heads. In C. Tortora (ed.), *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, 31–49. New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195136456.003.0002

Cardinaletti, Anna, & Giuliana Giusti. 2020. Multiple agreement in southern Italian dialects. In L. Franco, & P. Lorusso (eds), *Linguistic variation: Structure and interpretation*, 125–148. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501505201-008

Cinque, Guglielmo 2006. *Restructuring and Functional Heads*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Coseriu, Eugenio. 1966. "Tomo y me voy": ein Problem vergleichender europäischer Syntax. *Vox Romanica* 25: 13–55.

Coseriu, Eugenio. 1977. "Tomo y me voy": Un problema de sintaxis comparada europea. *Estudios de lingüística románica*: 79–151.

Cruschina, Silvio. 2012. *Discourse-related features and functional projections*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199759613.001.0001

Cruschina, Silvio 2013. Beyond the stem and inflectional morphology: an irregular pattern at the level of periphrasis. In S. Cruschina, M. Maiden, & J. C. Smith (eds), *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology*, 262–283. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199678860.003.0014

Cruschina, Silvio. 2022. Gone unexpectedly. Pseudo-coordination and the expression of surprise. In G. Giusti, V. N. Di Caro, & D. Ross (eds), *Pseudo-coordination and multiple agreement constructions,* 129–148. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.05cru

De Angelis, Alessandro. 2013. *Strategie di complementazione frasale nell'estremo Meridione italiano*. Messina: SGB Edizioni.

De Angelis, Alessandro. 2016. Origini formali e funzionali della particella *(m)i*, *(m)u*, *ma* nell'area messinese e calabrese centro-meridionale. In P. Del Puente (ed.), *Dialetti: per parlare e parlarne. Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Dialettologia. Progetto A.L.Ba. (Potenza, Castelmezzano, Lagopesole, 6–8 novembre 2014)*, 75–95. Venosa: Osanna Edizioni.

De Angelis, Alessandro. 2017. Between Greek and Romance: Competing complementation systems in Southern Italy. In P. Molinelli (ed.), *Language and identity in multilingual Mediterranean settings. Challenges for historical*

sociolinguistics, 135–156. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110554274-008

De Angelis, Alessandro & Milena Krstić. 2014. Perdita dell'infinito e *obviation effect* in alcune varietà slave e italo-romanze: Per un'analisi contrastiva. In I. Pesa Matracki, M. Ljubicic, N. Z. Filipin, & V. Kovacic (eds), *Atti del Convegno internazionale in onore del Prof. Zarko Muljacic (1922–2009)*, 249–260. Zagreb: FF-press.

Déchaine, Rose Marie. 1993. Serial Verb Constructions. In K. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Sternefeld, & T. Venneman (eds), *Syntax: An international handbook of contemporary research,* vol. 1, 799–825. Berlin / New York: Walter De Gruyter.

DeLancey, Scott. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1: 33–52. https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.1997.1.1.33

DeLancey, Scott. 2001. The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 369–382. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)80001-1

Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2017. Multiple Agreement Constructions: A macro-comparative analysis of pseudo-coordination with the motion verb *go* in the Arabic and Sicilian dialects. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 19(2): 71–91.

Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2019a. *Multiple Agreement Constructions in Southern Italo-Romance. The syntax of Sicilian pseudo-coordination*. Ph.D. thesis, Ca' Foscari University of Venice.

Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2019b. The inflected construction in the dialects of Sicily: Parameters of micro-variation. In S. Cruschina, A. Ledgeway, & E. Remberger (eds), *Italian Dialectology at the Interface*, 63–78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.251.03dic

Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2022a. Preterite indicative pseudo-coordination and morphomic patterns. In G. Giusti, V. N. Di Caro, & D. Ross (eds), *Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions*, 99–128. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110554274-008

Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2022b. *Il bilinguismo italiano-dialetto in Sicilia. Profilo socio-linguistico, nuove realtà comunicative e prospettive didattiche*. Venezia: Edizioni Ca' Foscari. http://doi.org/10.30687/978-88-6969-649-7

Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò & Giuliana Giusti. 2015. A protocol for the inflected construction in Sicilian dialects. *Annali di Ca' Foscari, Serie Occidentale* 49: 393–422. http://doi.org/10.14277/2385-3034/AnnOc-49-15-20

Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò & Luca Molinari. 2022. Competing verbal constructions with functional TAKE in Bulgarian. In B. Hamp, T. Joyce, L. Orfila &, V. S. Govindarajan (eds), *Online proceedings of the Texas Linguistic Society Twenty First Conference*, 16–40. University of Texas at Austin.

Ekberg, Lena. 1993. The Cognitive Basis of the Meaning and Function of Cross-Linguistic TAKE and V. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 8: 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.8.03ekb

Fleischman, Suzanne. 1982. *The future in thought and language: Diachronic evidence from Romance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ganfi, Vittorio. 2021. *Diacronia e sincronia del complementatore* mi *in siciliano*. Munich: LINCOM.

Giusti, Giuliana. 2011. *Structural protocols for linguistic awareness enhancing language identity* [Available at http://www.crassh.cam.ac.uk/people/profile/giulianagiusti].

Giusti, Giuliana, & Anna Cardinaletti. 2022. Theory-driven approaches and empirical advances: A protocol for Pseudo-Coordinations and Multiple Agreement Constructions in Italo-Romance. In G. Giusti, V. N. Di Caro, & D. Ross (eds), *Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions*, 35–64. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.02giu

Giusti, Giuliana, Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro, & Daniel Ross. 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. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.01giu

Greco, Matteo. 2020. *The Syntax of Surprise: Expletive negation and the left periphery*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.

Hopper, Paul J., & Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization.* 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139165525

Josefsson, Günlog. 2014. Pseudo-coordination in Swedish with *gå* 'go' and the 'surprise effect'. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 93: 26–50. Lund University.

Joseph, Brian D. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kanchev, Ivan. 2010. Семантика, типология и произход на конструкцията вземам/взема че (та, и) + глагол от свършен вид [On the semantics, typology and origin of the construction вземам/взема че (та, и) + perfective aspect verb]. *Съпоставително езикознание* [*Contrastive Linguistics*] 35(3): 40–44. http://www.slav.uni-sofia.bg/index.php/nova-knizhka/611-3-2010

Krapova, Iliyana. 2002. On the left periphery of the Bulgarian sentence. *University of Venice Working Papers* 12: 107–128. Ca' Foscari University of Venice.

Krapova, Iliyana. 2021. Complementizers and particles inside and outside of the left periphery: The case of Bulgarian revisited. In B. Wiemer, & B. Sonnenhauser (eds), *Clausal Complementation in South Slavic*, V–VI. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110725858-202

Krapova, Iliyana, & Guglielmo Cinque. 2018. Universal Constraints on Balkanisms. A Case Study: The absence of clitic climbing. In I. Krapova, & B. Joseph (eds), *Balkan Syntax and (Universal) Principles of Grammar*, 151-191. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.01giu

Krifka, Manfred. 2020. Layers of assertive clauses: Propositions, judgements, commitments, acts. In J. Hartmann, & A. Wöllstein (eds), *Propositionale Argumente im Sprachvergleich: Theorie und Empirie*, 1-46. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Kuteva, Tania A. 1999. On 'sit'/'stand'/'lie' auxiliation. *Linguistics* 37(2): 191–213. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.37.2.191

Ledgeway, Adam. 2003. Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: La doppia serie di complementatori. *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 27: 89–147. https://doi.org/10.1400/90246

Ledgeway, Adam. 2006. The dual complementizer system in southern Italy: Spirito greco, materia romanza? In A. L. Lepschy, G. Lepschy, & A. Tosi (eds), *Rethinking languages in contact: The case of Italian. Essays in memory of Joseph Cremona*, 112–126. Oxford: Legenda.

Ledgeway, Adam 2007. Diachrony of finiteness: Subordination in the dialects of southern Italy. In I. A. Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 335–365. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam 2013. Greek Disguised as Romance? The Case of Southern Italy. In M. Janse, B. Joseph, A. Ralli, & M. Bağrıaçık (eds), *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory.* Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects, University of Patras, 184–228 (available at https://pasithee.library.upatras.gr/mgdlt/article/view/2596/2833).

Ledgeway, Adam. 2016. Clausal complementation. In A. Ledgeway, & M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 1013–1028. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0063

Maiden, Martin. 2016. Morphomes. In A. Ledgeway & M. Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 708–721. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0043

Manzini, M. Rita, & Paolo Lorusso. 2022. A bisentential syntax for *a*/bare finite complements in South Italian varieties: Motion verbs and the progressive. In G. Giusti, V. N. Di Caro, & D. Ross (eds), *Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions*. 65–98. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.03man

Manzini, M. Rita, & Leonardo M. Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi Generativa*, vol. I: *Introduzione - Il soggetto - La struttura del complementatore, frasi interrogative, relative e aspetti della subordinazione*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Manzini, M. Rita, & Leonardo M. Savoia. 2007. *A Unification of Morphology and Syntax: Investigations into Romance and Albanian dialects*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203968154

Masini, Francesca. 2012. Costruzioni verbo-pronominali "intensive" in italiano. In V. Bambini, I. Ricci, & P. M. Bertinetto (eds), *Linguaggio e cervello – Semantica / Language and the brain – Semantics. Atti del XLII Congresso Internazionale di Studi della Società di Linguistica Italiana (SLI), Pisa, 25–27 settembre 2008*, 1–22. Roma: Bulzoni.

Masini, Francesca, Mattiola, Simone, & Greta Vecchi. 2019. La costruzione "prendere e V" nell'italiano contemporaneo. In B. Moretti, A. Kunz, S. Natale, & E. Krakenberger (eds), *Le tendenze dell'italiano contemporaneo rivisitate: Atti del LII Congresso Internazionale di Studi della Società di Linguistica Italiana (Berna, 6–8 settembre 2018)*, 115–137. Milano: Società di Linguistica Italiana.

Picchio, Riccardo. 1991. *Letteratura della Slavia ortodossa* (IX-XVIII sec.). Bari: Dedalo.

Progovac, Ljiljana. 1993. Locality and Subjunctive-like Complements in Serbo-Croatian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 1: 116–144. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24599042

Rett, Jessica, & Murray, Sarah E. 2013. A semantic account of mirative evidentials. In T. Sneider (ed.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 23*, 453–472. University of California, Santa Cruz. https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v23i0.2687

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. On the fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, 147–161. Dordrecht: Kluwer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1968. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti, vol. 2: Morfologia*. Torino: Einaudi.

Rohlfs, Gerhard. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti, vol. 3: Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Torino: Einaudi.

Ross, Daniel. 2016. Going to Surprise: the grammaticalization of *itive* as mirative. In J. Woźny (ed.), *Online Proceedings of Cognitive Linguistics in Wrocław Web Conference*. Wrocław: Polish Cognitive Linguistics Association and University of Wrocław.

Ross, Daniel 2021. *Pseudocoordination, serial verb constructions and multi-verb predicates: The relationship between form and structure*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5546425

Rudin, Catherine. 1986. *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax: Complementizers and* wh *constructions*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers.

Sandfeld, Kristian. 1900. *Rumaenske Studier I. Infimtiv og udtrykkene derfor i Rumaensk og Balkansprogene, en sammenlignende undersøgelse.* Copenhagen.

Sandfeld, Kristian. 1930. *Linguistique balkanique: Problèmes et resultats*. Paris: Champion.

Shopen, Timothy. 1971. Caught in the Act. *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 254–263. Chicago Linguistic Society.

Simeonova, Vesela. 2023. Bulgarian *take*-reproachative imperatives and mirativity. (Handout). Oral presentation delivered at FASL 32 on 20/05/2023.

Sornicola, Rosanna. 1976. *Vado a dire*, *vaiu a ddico*: Problema sintattico o problema semantico? *Lingua Nostra* 37 (3/4): 65–74.

Squartini, Mario. 1998. *Verbal Periphrases in Romance: Aspect, actionality, and grammaticalization*. Berlin: de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110805291

Soto Gómez, Juan Francisco. 2021. *Pseudocoordination in Spanish. A two-construction analysis*. MA thesis, Ca' Foscari University of Venice.

Tomić, Olga M. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund morpho-syntactic features*. Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4488-7

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1982. From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: Some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In W. P. Lehmann, & Y. Malkiel (eds), *Perspectives on historical linguistics (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 24)*, 245–271. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.24.09clo

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1986. On the origins of "and" and "but" connectives in English. *Studies in Language* 10: 137–150. https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.10.1.08clo

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1988. Pragmatic strengthening and grammaticalization. In S. Axmaker, A. Jaisser, & H. Singmaster (eds), *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of*

the Berkeley Linguistics Society 14, 406–416. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v14i0.1784

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1995. Subjectification in grammaticalization. In D. Stein, & S. Wright (eds), *Subjectivity and subjectivisation: Linguistic perspectives*, 31–54. Cambridge: Cambridge   University   Press. https://doi.org.10.1017/CBO9780511554469.003

Weiss, Daniel. 2022. Russian constructions with 'take' expressing an unexpected event: Their historical origin and development in the 19th century. In A. Andrason, & A. Y. Aikhenvald (eds), *The rise and fall of Serial Verb Constructions*, 37–54. Stellenbosch: Universiteit Stellenbosch. Department of General Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.5842/65-1-968

Wiklund, Anna Lena. 2009. The syntax of surprise: Unexpected event readings in complex predication. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 84: 181–224. Lund University.