

Pseudo-coordinate constructions with ‘go’ in Greek: A feature-based account
Gerasimos Georgopoulos, *University of Vienna*

1. Introduction. Pseudo-coordinations are broadly defined as inflected double verb constructions which, even though superficially they resemble a coordination in the verbal system, they otherwise exhibit distinct semantic and syntactic properties. The phenomenon has been attested in a variety of languages and has been discussed by several scholars (cf. Cardinaletti and Giusti, 2001 for Marsalese; Wiklund, 2007 for Scandinavian languages; de Vos, 2005 for English and Afrikaans; Heycock & Petersen, 2012 for Faroese, among others). In Greek, pseudo-coordinate constructions are formed with the motion verb *pijeno* (go) as the first verb (V1), the conjunction coordinator *ke* (and) and a second verb (V2) selected from a wide range of lexical verbs, as in (1):

- (1) O fititis pije ke thimithike tis askisis
ART student go-PST.3SG and remember-PST.3SG ART exercises
‘The student (went and) remembered the exercises.’

In the Greek pseudo-coordinate construction (GPC), the motion verb does not contribute its full lexical semantics, but rather acts as a conceptual frame on the meaning of V2 (Svorou, 2018). In (1), *pije* does not entail movement towards a deictic center, but rather attributes additional intentionality on the subject participant in carrying out the event described by V2.

2. Morphological Sameness Condition. It is cross-linguistically assumed that verbs involved in a pseudo-coordination exhibit a strong degree of integration and dependency, in that they are required to share the same morphological specification. This is captured by de Vos (2005, p.49) under the Morphological ‘Sameness’ Condition (MSC), which posits that “both verbs of a pseudo-coordinative construction must have the same type of morphological marking”. With regard to Greek, the grammatical categories of mood and tense are often not specified in the inflectional morphology of the verb but are rather realized through overt inflectional material such as subjunctive markers, future particles or tense auxiliaries. While the MSC is usually satisfied through surface morphemes such as tense auxiliaries taking scope over both V1 and V2, as in (2), in the GPC, morphological sameness is achieved through overt inflectional material being individually repeated for both V1 and V2, as in (3):

- (2) The warders have gone and watched the convict continuously (de Vos, p. 87)

- (3) Itan anamenomeno o fititis na echi pai ke na echi
be-PST.3SG expected ART student SUBJ have-3SG gone-PFV and SUBJ have-3SG
thimithi tis askisis
remember-PFV ART exercises
‘It was expected for the student (to have gone and) to have remembered the exercises.’

3. The issue with monoclausality. The following properties suggest that the GPC exhibits clause union effects and is thus mapped into a monoclausal syntactic structure: (i) negation markers cannot individually scope over either V1 or V2 but rather have to occur in a position preceding V1 and have an unambiguous wide scope interpretation, as in (4); (ii) V1 and V2 cannot be separately targeted by event modifiers, instead the latter apply to the ‘V1 *ke* V2’ sequence as a whole, as in (5); (iii) following the assumption that licensing of emphatic NPIs

in finite contexts is restricted to the same tense domain (Giannakidou & Quer, 1997; Grano, 2015), in (6), licensing of *kamia* can only occur if the negative marker *den* is clause-mate; (iv) following the assumption that while indefinites have an unbounded inverse scope, universal quantifiers can only take scope within their clause boundary (Grano, 2015), in (7), the inverse scope of the universal quantifier is considered clause-local.

(4) O fititis den pije ke (*den) thimithike tis askisis
 ART student NEG go-PST.3SG and NEG remember-PST.3SG ART exercises
 ‘The student did not (go and) remember the exercises.’

(5) O fititis pije (*dio fores) ke thimithike tesoris fores tis askisis
 ART student go-PST.3SG two times and remember-PST.3SG four times ART exercises
 ‘The student (went and) remembered the exercises four times.’

(6) O fititis den pije ke thimithike KAMIA askisi
 ART student NEG go-PST.3SG and remember-PST.3SG any exercise
 ‘The student did not (go and) remember any exercise.’

(7) Kapios fititis pije ke thimithike oles tis askisis
 some student go-PST.3SG and remember-PST.3SG all ART exercises
 ‘Some student (went and) remembered all the exercises.’ $\exists > \forall / \forall > \exists$

However, instances as in (3) cannot be accounted for under a monoclausal analysis. Given that in overt syntax, morphemes associated with mood or tense are realized as heads of the respective functional categories, the presence of separate instances of overt inflectional material on each verb suggests that V1 and V2 are headed by separate functional domains.

4. Analysis. In this paper, I propose that morphological sameness between V1 and V2 in the GPC is instantiated as a result of both verbs being feature-valued by a single functional domain. For this purpose, I adopt Wurmbrand’s (2012) Reverse Agree model which licenses downward valuation of uninterpretable and unvalued features associated with verbal heads by interpretable and valued features associated with functional heads. This offers an elegant solution to the MSC, since it accounts for a single functional head being able to license inflectional features on potentially multiple verbal heads.

In order to also account for instances as in (3), Reverse Agree is combined with a DM approach, under which syntactic heads do not directly correspond to surface morphemes but are rather interpreted as collections of features which receive their morphological realization post-syntactically (Halle & Marantz, 1993). Thus, the morphemes related to mood and tense are not interpreted as elements present within the syntactic derivation but rather as features which, after being manipulated by Reverse Agree, receive their phonological realization through the insertion of the corresponding morphological markers at the morphological component of the derivation.

References

- Cardinaletti, A., & Giusti, G. (2001). ‘Semi-lexical’ motion verbs in Romance and Germanic. In N. Corver & H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *Semi-lexical categories: on the function of content words and the content of function words* (pp. 371-414). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- de Vos, M. (2005). *The syntax of verbal pseudo-coordination in English and Afrikaans*

- [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Leiden]. Utrecht: LOT.
- Giannakidou, A., & Quer, J. (1997). Long-distance Licensing of Negative Indefinites. In D. Forget et al. (Eds.), *Negation and Polarity: Syntax and Semantics* (pp. 95-113). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grano, T. (2015). *Control and restructuring*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halle, M., & Marantz, A. (1993). Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection. In K. Hale & S. J. Keyser (Eds.) *The View From Building 20* (pp. 111-176). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Heycock, C., & Petersen, H. P. (2012). Pseudo-coordination in Faroese. In K. Braunmueller & C. Gabriel (Eds.), *Multilingual Individuals and Multilingual Societies* (pp. 259-280). Hamburg: John Benjamins B.V.
- Svorou, S. (2018). Motion Verb Integration and Core Cosubordination in Modern Greek. In R. Kailuweit, L. Künkel & E. Staudinger (Eds.), *Applying and Expanding Role and Reference Grammar*. Freiburg: FRIAS.
- Wiklund, A.-L. (2007). *The Syntax of Tenselessness*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wurmbrand, S. (2012). Parasitic participles: evidence for the theory of verb clusters. *Taal en Tongval*, 64(1), 129-156.