In Portuguese there are constructions where some motion verbs (such as *ir, agarrar, pegar*) are devoid of semantic content and are associated with other verbs by a particle similar to the copular coordinating conjunction *e* ‘and’. They are used in specific contexts and are associated with the narration of events, thus contributing to the progression of the narrative.

1. A Maria vai e diz assim...  
   [the Mary goes and says...]
2. A Maria pegou e foi-se embora.  
   [the Mary took and went away]

These constructions are close to the English *come/go-(and)-verb*, studied by Pullum (1990), Stefanowitsch (1999), Hopper (2002), a.o.

3. Come (and) see us next week.

They are also similar to constructions available in other languages, such as Brazilian Portuguese (Rodrigues 2006; (4)) and some Spanish varieties (Arnaiz & Camacho 1999; (5)):

4. Eu fui e fiz o trabalho.
5. Y entonces, el niño va y se cae.

In this talk, we will focus on the construction involving the verb *ir* ‘go’ with the following goals: (i) to compare the properties of this construction in European Portuguese (EP) – see Colaço (2010) and Colaço & Gonçalves (2010) – with the ones of Brazilian Portuguese (BP); (ii) to propose an analysis within the Generative Grammar framework. We will show that, contrary to what happens in BP (Rodrigues 2006), different types of EP *<ir-e- V>* constructions follow from the subject position and not from the presence or absence of the conjunction. So, in EP both pre- and post-verbal subjects are allowed while in BP only the latter are available, as expected since subject-verb inversion is restricted in this variety (Kato 2000, a.o.):

6a. A Maria vai e diz assim...  
   (okPE / okPB)  [the Mary goes and says...]
6b. Vai a Maria e diz assim...  
   (okPE / *PB)  [goes the Mary and says...]

The fact that, in this construction, the verb *ir* ‘go’ has a discursive value related to the progression of the narrative leads us to propose the projection of a functional node F, which features are associated with speech.

We argue that the different positions of the subject in the EP *<ir-e-V>* result from two distinct constructions available in this language, which differ fundamentally on two
aspects: (i) agreement between subject and V1, (ii) temporal agreement between V1 and V2.

In the construction with a pre-verbal subject, either in EP or in BP, V1 agrees with the subject (cf. (7)-(8)). Moreover, with this word order, V1 and V2 must share their tense specifications (cf. (9)).

(7)a. Então, eu vou e dou um empurrão ao Pedro.
    [Then, I go and give a boost to_ the Peter]
b. Então, a Maria vai e dá um empurrão ao Pedro.
    [Then, the Mary goes and gives a boost to_ the Peter]
(8) *Então, eu vai e dou um empurrão ao Pedro.
    [Then, I goes and give a boost to_ the Peter]
(9) *Então, a Maria vai e deu um empurrão ao Pedro.
    [Then, the Mary goes and gave a boost to_ the Peter]

The observation of empirical data leads us to assume that, in this construction, *ir* ‘go’ still maintains a verbal status, being generated as a VP head, although, as we shall show, it is not a predicative element. The analysis that we propose for this construction is essentially based on the following aspects: (i) T does not project in the V1 domain, so the temporal location of the event is set based on temporal specifications of embedded T; (ii) the functional head F has an uninterpretable feature, which forces the rise of V1 to F; (iii) raising the subject to Spec, FP (which determines its pre-verbal position) is motivated by the EPP feature of F.

Concerning the construction with a post-verbal subject, only possible in EP, V1 can remain invariable, occurring in the most neutral form [*vai* ‘goes’, regardless of the person and number marks of the subject (10). Furthermore, V1 and V2 may differ with respect to their tense specifications (11).

(10) Então, vai eu e digo assim…   [then goes I and say …]
(11) Então, vai a Maria e disse assim  [then goes the Mary and said]

These facts suggest that in this case *ir* ‘go’ is no longer a verb, but a functional head encoding discursive information. In this sense, we will argue that: (i) *ir* ‘go’ is directly merged in F; (ii) T does not project in the V1 domain; (iii) the subject remains in the embedded [Spec, CP]; (iv) F may be specified for Φ-features and, in such a case, optional agreement between the V1 in F and the subject in the Spec position of CP results from the Agree operation.

Finally, concerning *e* ‘and’ in both varieties, we will claim that this is not a conjunction but the lexicalization of T (see Pesetsky & Torrego 2001, 2004 and Duarte et al. 2005 for the complementizers *that* and *que*, respectively). In fact, this head does not relate two events; instead, it sets the beginning of the only event described in the sentence, which is built from the thematic properties of the V2.
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