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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/mul/da/èe+V2[_finite]) and Pseudo-Coordination (V1+’and’+V2[_finite]) are considered in Italo-Romance (Italian and Sicilian) and Balkan Slavic (Bulgarian),
together with the Italo-Romance Infinitival Construction \((V1+a+V2_{-\text{finite}})\), 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.
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---

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 ‘\(V1+V2\).’

In European languages, two basic configurations are available:

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

   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. Types of \(V1+\text{finite} \ V2\) 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., \(a, e, i, ma, (m)i, (m)u, cu, da, ta, \text{če}, \text{otí, déka, and što}\). In Balkan Slavic, these constructions are favoured by a general loss of the infinitive, 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)).

(3) a. Province of Messina; adapted from Rohlfs (1969: 103)
   Iɖɖu annau mi si curca.
   ‘He went to sleep.’

b. Sorbo San Basile (Catanzaro); adapted from Manzini & Savoia (2005: 654)
   Vinni ma ti viju.
   ‘I’ve come to see you.’

c. Province of Messina; adapted from Rohlfs (1969: 103)
   Pinsau mi parti.
   ‘He thought about leaving.’

d. Salentino; adapted from Rohlfs (1969: 103)
   Vulia cu ssacciu.
   ‘I wanted to know.’

e. Crotone; adapted from Rohlfs (1969: 103)
   Jívanu u mmáncianu.
   ‘They went to eat.’

f. Southern Calabrian; adapted from Rohlfs (1969: 103)
   Vorria mu sacci.u.
   ‘I’d like to know.’

g. North-eastern Sicily; adapted from De Angelis (2017: 46)
   Iɖɖu urrá mi fujèmu sempri.
   ‘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). 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. Svâršix 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 ppighjju 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)
   Uoppighjju 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 ypseco’ 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 para 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 ypseco 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.\(^\text{10}\)

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

\[(7)\]

a. Delia (Caltanissetta); Di Caro (2019a: 133)

\begin{verbatim}
Vaju a ffaxzu la spisa.
go.PRS.1SG A do.PRS.1SG the shopping
'I go and do the shopping.'
\end{verbatim}

b. Marsala (Trapani); Di Caro & Giusti (2015: 417)

\begin{verbatim}
Vegnu a ppiighju u pani.
come.PRS.1SG A fetch.PRS.1SG the bread
'I come and fetch the bread.'
\end{verbatim}

c. Putignano (Bari); Manzini & Savoia (2005: 689)

\begin{verbatim}
ustok a f'fattsǝ.
itstay.PRS.1SG A do.PRS.1SG
'I’m doing it.'
\end{verbatim}

d. Avetrana (Taranto); Rohlfs (1969: 167)

\begin{verbatim}
Oj’ a mmangiu.
want.PRS.1SG A eat.PRS.1SG
'I want to eat.'
\end{verbatim}

e. Bulgarian; Kuteva (1999: 195)

\begin{verbatim}
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.’\(^\text{11}\)
\end{verbatim}

f. Bulgarian; Kuteva (1999: 194)

\begin{verbatim}
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.’
\end{verbatim}

---

\(^\text{10}\) 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).

\(^\text{11}\) 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)

\begin{verbatim}
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.’
\end{verbatim}
Inchoativity and mirativity in Italo-Romance and Balkan Slavic

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. 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):

(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.
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,\(^\text{13}\) in Italian both GO and TAKE can appear in an infinitival construction featuring the connector \(a\), from Lat. AD (henceforth \(a\text{InfCo}\)):

(9) Italian

a. Così, quando andiamo a tagliare le patate... so when \(\text{go.PRS.IPL} \to \text{cut-INF}\) 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.\(^\text{14}\)

\(a\text{PseCo}\) 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 \(\text{go.PRS.ISG} \& \text{send.PRS.ISG}\) all the e-mails
‘I’ll go and send all the e-mails now.’

In Sicilian, inchoativity is instantiated by an \(a\text{PseCo}\) with V1 GO (cf. (11)).\(^\text{15}\)

(11) Delia (Caltanissetta)

Ora vaju a mmunnu li patati.
now \(\text{go.PRS.ISG} \& \text{A peel.PRS.ISG}\) 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. \textit{arrossisco} ‘I blush’ and \textit{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 \textit{capisco} ‘I understand’ or \textit{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:

(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)). 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 accuminci 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, munnamu 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, daMAC) to express inchoativity. This structure is analogous to the Italian aInfCo, 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 daMAC and the Italo-Romance TAKE aInfCo 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 daMAC; adapted from Kanchev (2010: 41)

Vze da piše.  
\(\text{take.AOR.PF.3SG DA write.PRS.IMPF.3SG} \)

‘(S)he started writing.’

b. Bulgarian, TAKE daMAC

Marija vze na videoigri.  
\(\text{Mary take.AOR.PF.3SG DA play.PRS.IMPF.3SG at videogames} \)

‘Mary started playing videogames.’

c. Bulgarian, daMAC; adapted from Krapova & Cinque (2018: 160)

Kosta započva da šofira.  
\(\text{Kosta begin.PRS.IMPF.3SG now DA drive.PRS.IMPF.3SG} \)

‘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 daMAC with the andative V1 trăgva / trăgna ‘leave’.\(^\text{18}\)

(16)  

a. Bulgarian: Bulgarian National Corpus, 00002357bDIE

...neštata s namiraneto na dobra rabota ne izgleđdaxa 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 resignČE child-the trăgva 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 daMAC

Trăgna da piše.  
\(\text{leave.AOR.PFV.3SG DA write.PRS.IMPFV.3SG} \)

‘(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’),\(^\text{19}\) 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:

---

\(^\text{18}\) 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 trăgva / trăgna is still an andative verb, we will classify the periphrases in which it appears as GO MACs.

\(^\text{19}\) “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. (i)). If it is omitted, it is understood as ‘rain pours’ (cf. (ib)).

(i)  

a. Vali dăžd / snjag / graduška.  

pours rain snow hail  

‘It rains / it snows / it hails.’

b. Vali.  

pours  

‘It rains.’
the query “взе да вали” in (17a) yields 4,810 results,\textsuperscript{20} while the query “тръгна да вали” in (17b) returns only 6 results.\textsuperscript{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. Trăgva / trăgna is found in many such cases (cf. (18a) and (18b)) respectively.

(17) Bulgarian
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Vze da vali.
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{take.AOR.PFV.3SG} & DA \\
\text{pour.PRS.IMPVFV.3SG} &
\end{tabular}
\item b. ?Trăgna da vali.
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{leave.AOR.PFV.3SG} & DA \\
\text{pour.PRS.IMPVFV.3SG} &
\end{tabular}
\end{enumerate}
‘It started raining.’

(18) a. Bulgarian; bgTenTen12 (SketchEngine); token 2812071
\begin{verbatim}
Kato trăgna da umiram - togava as leave.AOR.PFV.3SG DA die.PRS.IMPVFV.3SG then elate i me razpitvajte. go.IMPER and me question.2PL
‘When I start to die, then come and question me.’
\end{verbatim}

b. Bulgarian; https://www.24chasa.bg/bulgaria/article/10433829
\begin{verbatim}
Dokato se dviżeše, autobusăt se udari v trotoara while REFLEX was-moving bus-reflex hit in sidewalk-the ot djasnata strana, gumite se spukaxa i trăgna from right-side tires-reflex blew.3PL and leave.AOR.PFV.3SG da gori požar, imaše mnogo dim. DA burn.PRS.IMPVFV.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.’
\end{verbatim}

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
\begin{verbatim}
Petăr započna da piše. Peter start.AOR.PFV.3SG DA write.PRS.IMPVFV.3SG
‘Peter started writing.’
\end{verbatim}

(20) Bulgarian; https://www.credoweb.bg/publication/105430/problemite-sas-sanya-svarzani-s-zhenskoto-bezplodie
\begin{verbatim}
…lekarite preporaćat pârvo da se započne doctors-the suggest.3PL first DA REFLEX start.PRS.PFV.3SG s kognitivna povedenčeska terapija. with cognitive behavioural therapy
‘…the doctors suggest starting with cognitive behavioural therapy first.’
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{20}Source (accessed 17/11/ 2023).
\textsuperscript{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 *aInfCo* with V1 GO (cf. (21a, b)) or by a TAKE *ePseCo* (as in (21c, d)).

**(21)** **Italian**

a. [Expression of regret or irritation]
   
   Eccò! È andato a cadere proprio li…
   
   *eccò* 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.*
   
   ‘She suddenly left.’

d. [Expression of irritation]
   
   Non' è 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 *aPseCo* with V1 GO (cf. (22a); see also Sornicola 1976; Cruschina 2013) and, like Italian, an *ePseCo* 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 aPseCo generally displays defective paradigms – another parameter subject to micro-variation – an aInfCo (cf. 23b’) is used to fill the paradigm in the unavailable slots.\(^\text{22}\) Compare (23a) with the aPseCo in (23b), which is grammatical in central Sicilian varieties, such as Deliano, but not in western Sicilian varieties such as Partannese.\(^\text{23}\)

\[(23)\]

a. Delia (Caltanissetta); GO aPseCo

Cci ji a ddetti un pugnu!
to-him go. PST.3SG A give. PST.3SG a punch

b. Partanna (Trapani); GO aPseCo

\(^\text{a}\)Cci iu a ddesi un pugnu!
to-him go. PST.3SG A give. PST.3SG a punch

b’. Partanna (Trapani); GO aInfCo

Cci iu 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 ji!
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).\(^\text{24}\) 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’ \(\text{mi ‘to me’}\) (see Masini 2012 for Italian). All these strategies, however, can to different degrees cooccur with either functional GO or TAKE.\(^\text{25}\)

\^\text{22}\) See Di Caro (2019b) for an overview on the parameters of microvariation on Sicilian GO aPseCo. See Di Caro & Giusti (2018) and Di Caro (2022a) for a discussion on the paradigmatic defectivity of present indicative aPseCo in Deliano.

\^\text{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’.

\^\text{24}\) Mutatis mutandis, the same disclaimer holds for Bulgarian as well.

\^\text{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’ (čeMAC) (cf. (25a’-a’)), which is frequently found, and (ii) ta ‘that’ (taMAC) (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 <vzemam/F/ če *{POS=V}>) returns 57 results, while vzemam ta + V2 (<vzemam/F/ ta *{POS=V}>) returns only 8 results. 27

The other available construction for expressing mirativity is a PseCo with the connecting element i ‘and’ (iPseCo) (cf. (25c)), analogous to the Italian and Sicilian ePseCo (see Section 2.3) and to Spanish yPseCo (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 čeMAC; adapted from Kanchev (2010: 42)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Vze,} & \quad \text{če} \quad \text{nepisa.} \\
\text{take.AOR.PF.3SG} & \quad \text{ČE} \quad \text{write. AOR.PF.3SG} \\
\text{‘(S)he unexpectedly wrote.’}
\end{align*}
\]

a’. Bulgarian, TAKE čeMAC; Di Caro & Molinari (2022: 28)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ivan} & \quad \text{vze,} \quad \text{če} \quad \text{se} \quad \text{razplaka.} \\
\text{Ivan take.AOR.PF.3SG} & \quad \text{ČE} \quad \text{REFL cry. AOR.PF.3SG} \\
\text{‘Ivan unexpectedly cried.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(here glossed as NEG) as a mirative marker. Compare the Sneg in (ia) with the mirative TAKE ePseCo in (ib) and the GO aInfCo in (ic):

i) Italian

\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Non gli} \quad \text{dà} \quad \text{un pugno?} \\
& \quad \text{NEG to-him give.PRS.3SG} \quad \text{a punch} \\
b. & \quad \text{Prende} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{gli} \quad \text{dà} \quad \text{un pugno!} \\
& \quad \text{take.PRS.3SG} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{to-him give.PRS.3SG} \quad \text{a punch} \\
c. & \quad \text{Gli va} \quad \text{a dare} \quad \text{un pugno…} \\
& \quad \text{to-him go.PRS.3SG} \quad \text{go. INF} \quad \text{a punch} \\
\quad \text{‘He suddenly hit him with a punch! / He up and hit him with a punch!’}
\end{align*}
\]

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Non gli} & \quad \text{va} \quad \text{a dare} \quad \text{un pungo?} \\
& \quad \text{NEG to-him go.PRS.3SG} \quad \text{to give.INF} \quad \text{a punch} \\
\quad \text{‘He suddenly hit him with a punch! / He up and hit him with a punch!’}
\end{align*}
\]

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.


26

27
b. Bulgarian, TAKE taMAC
Vze ta zavalja dâžd.
take. AOR.PF.3SG TA pour. AOR.PF.3SG rain
‘It unexpectedly rained.’

b’. Bulgarian, TAKE taMAC; bgTenTen12, token 171285346
Tâkmo 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 iPseCo; The serial killer (Серийният убиец) by C. Marinov
…tja vze i trâgna 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, iPseCo; adapted from Simeonova (2023: 2)
Alex vze / *započna i si trâgna.
Alex take. AOR.PF.3SG / *started and REFLECT 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) hvanâla 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 daMAC, TAKE čeMAC or iPseCo 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.  

The 39 items were equally divided for all the three constructions (13 items containing a čeMAC, 13 with a daMAC, and 13 with an iPseCo) 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 i xaresva, each time when draws something and NEG to.her likes vzema i go xvărļja. take.PRS.IMPF.3SG and it throw-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 i 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.
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 iPseCo 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. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>% of acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>čeMAC</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daMAC</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPseCo</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Di Caro & Molinari (2022: 30)
Table 2. Percentage of acceptability of the constructions according to the tense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>čeMAC</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daMAC</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPseCo</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Di Caro & Molinari (2022: 30)

The obtained results highlight the productivity of the two MACs (mainly in the past), which contrasts with the iPseCo, 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.’
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(30) [Boris vinagi e bil izbuxliv. Minalata večer, dokato sporešte 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 čeMAC and the TAKE daMAC (see Table 3).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Inchoative</th>
<th>Mirative (disapproval)</th>
<th>Mirative (surprise)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>čeMAC</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daMAC</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPseCo</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Di Caro & Molinari (2022: 31)

The obtained results clearly demonstrate the inchoative semantics of the TAKE daMAC, which sharply contrasts with the mirative semantics of the TAKE čeMAC. The iPseCo 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 iPseCo). 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 iPseCo 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).

Bulgarian, iPseCo; 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 daMAC 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 daMAC.
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 aPseCo, and on Giusti & Cardinaletti (2022) for TAKE ePseCO and the muMAC.

As anticipated in Section 1, Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) propose that the V1 in Sicilian GO aPseCo is a lexical verb merged as a functional head in a dedicated position immediately higher than T, namely t (cf. (32a)). 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 ePseCo, 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 vP 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 aInfCo in (32d) and the inchoative GO/TAKE aInfCo 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\textsubscript{inceptive}P.

(32) a. [tP V1 [tP (a) [TP V2 [vP V2 … [GO aPseCo]
   b. [FocP V1 [CP e [TP V2 [vP V2 … [TAKE ePseCo]
   c. [TP V1 [vP V1 [FinP (mu/mi/ma/cu) [TP V2 [vP V2 … [muMAC]
   d. [FocP V1 [AndativeP [vP a V2 [VP V2 … [mirative GO aInfCo]
   e. [Asp\textsubscript{inceptive}P V1 [vP a V2 [VP V2 … [inchoative GO/TAKE aInfCo]

\footnote{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 aPseCo.}
We contend that inchoative TAKE and GO can occupy the Asp\textsubscript{inceptiveP} 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 daMAC 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 bicausal). 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)).

\[(33)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Boris} & \quad \text{vze} / \text{trăgna} / \text{započna} \quad (*\text{Marija}) \\
\text{Boris} & \quad \text{take} / \text{leave} / \text{start}.\text{AOR}.\text{PFV}.3\text{SG} \quad \text{Mary} \\
\text{DA} & \quad \text{write}.\text{PRS}.\text{IMPFV}.3\text{SG} \\
\text{‘Boris started writing.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{*Vzex} / \text{trăgnax} / \text{započnax} \quad \text{da napisax.} \\
& \quad \text{take} / \text{leave} \quad \text{start}.\text{AOR}.\text{PFV}.1\text{SG} \quad \text{DA} \quad \text{write}.\text{AOR}.\text{PFV}.1\text{SG}
\end{align*}
\]

The parallelism in this case is noteworthy: the inchoative semantics can be expressed by the same syntactically monoclausal daMAC with three different V1s,\footnote{With “monoclausal” we mean the absence of a CP layer sandwiched between two independent TPs.} 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\textsubscript{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).

\[(34)\]
\[
\text{[TP pro [Asp}^{\text{inceptiveP}}\{\text{započna/vze/trăgna}\} \quad \text{[da [VP piše ]]]}\]
\]

As we proposed in Section 4.1, we claim that in Bulgarian as well inchoative GO and TAKE can occupy Asp\textsubscript{inceptiveP} (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/taMACs are instead very different from canonical periphrases with the complementiser če/ta. The example (26) featuring ta and (35)
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/taMAC (and iPseCo), 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
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 daMACs. However, the difference in the case of the TAKE če/taMACs is the obligatory TAM sharing between V1 and V2. The TAKE iPseCo features exactly the same properties as the TAKE če/taMACs (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 neštò!
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 ePseCo: 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). 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 ePseCo
   Adesso vado e gliene dico quattro!
   now go.PRS.1SG and to-him+NE say.PRS.1SG four

b. Italian, GO aInfCo
   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 daMAC; Simeonova (2023: 6)
   Vzemi da napišeš nešto!
   take.IMPER.PFV.2SG DA write.PRS.PFV.2SG something

b. Bulgarian, TAKE čeMAC; *ibid.*
   Vzemi, če napiši nešto!
   take.IMPER.PFV.2SG and write.IMPER.PFV.2SG something

c. Bulgarian, TAKE iPseCo; *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).\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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 Ermiljč był ogoročen: ugoščal-ugoščal dorogogo gostja, a tot v nagradu vzjal da i umer …*  
*PRT* Taras Ermiljč was upset offered-offered dear guest and that in reward took DA and died  

‘Taras Ermiljč 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 Josefssson (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 târși
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 \textit{trăgvm}/\textit{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 \textit{trăgna} (query [lemma=“тръгна”]; 99,002 results) reveals that the most frequent lemma occurring right after the verb is \textit{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 \textit{trăgvm}/\textit{trăgna} is expressed via a daMAC. As a consequence, we have a clue to explain why inchoative structures with either GO or TAKE in Bulgarian are daMACs, while mirative TAKE MACs and PseCo feature a different connector. What remains to be clarified is the role of the (pseudo-)complementisers \textit{čelta} and the (pseudo-)coordinator \textit{i}.

Functional TAKE and GO undergo a process of subjectification, just like what happens with \textit{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
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Table 4. An overview of the verbal periphrases with functional GO and TAKE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inchoativity</th>
<th>Mirativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. TAKE ePseCo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. TAKE aInfCo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. GO aInfCo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. GO ePseCo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sicilian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. GO aInfCo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. GO aPseCo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. TAKE ePseCo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bulgarian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. TAKE daMAC</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>- (+ with imperative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. GO daMAC</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. TAKE čeMAC</td>
<td>- (+ with imperative)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. TAKE taMAC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. TAKE iPseCo</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/taMAC formally behave like PseCo. Furthermore, the Bulgarian daMAC 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.
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