

## A typological perspective on the morphosyntax of pseudocoordination

Daniel Ross

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

[djross3@gmail.com](mailto:djross3@gmail.com) / [danielrosslinguist.com](http://danielrosslinguist.com)

**Invited Seminar at KU Leuven, September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

Pseudocoordination (PC; also *verbal hendiadys*) refers to the apparent coordination of two verbs that nevertheless has non-coordinative structure and/or semantics. Although research on the phenomenon has generally focused on European languages, especially Swedish and Norwegian, examples can be found all around the world from Semitic to Austronesian to ‘Khoisan’, and elsewhere (Ross 2016a).

The distribution within Europe, and Germanic in particular, has also been under-represented in previous research. For example, the use of PC is just beginning to receive specific attention and only for a few languages within Slavic although it appears to be widespread. As for Germanic, PC in the Scandinavian languages and English are well studied, but that leaves an apparent gap of Dutch and German (Höder 2011). However, PC has been researched for Afrikaans, and in fact some of the earliest observations of the phenomenon, from the 1800s, are about Dutch and Flemish dialects, and it was apparently even more common in Middle Dutch (but replaced now by *te*-infinitival constructions in most dialects). That leaves only German lacking PC, but it can be found at least in rare usage in some dialects. The origin remains somewhat opaque for Germanic, whether PC was inherited from Proto-Germanic or evolved independently.

To consider the distribution of PC from a typological perspective, I present several case studies of different construction types:

- Motion PC (English *go and get*) is common but not always clearly grammaticalized as a distinct construction, while *go-and-V* in particular often develops a ‘surprise’ reading: *What did you go and do now?* (Ross 2016b), apparently an independent development in a dozen or more languages.
- *Take-and-V* has a similar ‘surprise’ or inceptive sense, and can be found in over 50 languages across Europe (Coseriu 1966; Ross 2017b). There is an interesting gap in the middle of western Europe: French, Dutch, German and Slovenian.
- Posture PC (e.g. ‘sat and read’, equivalent to *zat te lezen*), found in Germanic, Slavic, Greek, Semitic and elsewhere, is often said to be a progressive construction but may rarely fully grammaticalize as such (Ross & Lødrup 2017).
- *Try-and-V* (Ross 2014) is control-verb PC, which differs morphosyntactically from the other constructions and is rarer. English and Faroese, however, display the same quirky development: that both verbs must *look like* an infinitive (*I try and sing*; *\*He tries...*). Corpus studies on historical origin, dialectal variation and language acquisition are presented as a model for corpus-based PC research.

More broadly, PC can be compared to other phenomena. For example, many types (motion, posture, *take*) can be considered a type of verb-verb complex predicate. In fact, the difference between those PC and serial verb constructions (SVCs) is just definitional: SVCs cannot, by definition, have a linking element. The emphasis on form in both definitions (PC has a linker *and* but SVCs cannot) and their functional similarities strongly suggest a unified analysis may be beneficial to understanding both construction types. For Dutch in particular, it is apparent that *te*-infinitives function in this way as well. Whether a linker (or which) is interposed, and whether the second verb carries the same morphology as the first, are thus independent of the function and structure of the construction (Ross 2017a, f.c.). I emphasize the need to distinguish between form and function/structure in both description and analysis.

## References

- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1966. "Tomo y me voy". Ein Problem vergleichender europäischer Syntax. *Vox romanica: Annales helvetici explorandis linguis romanicis destinati* 25. 13–55.
- Höder, Steffen. 2011. Dialect convergence across language boundaries: A challenge for areal linguistics. In Frans Gregersen, Jeffrey K Parrott & Pia Quist (eds.), *Language variation - European perspectives III: selected papers from the 5th International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 5), Copenhagen, June 2009*, 173–184. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ross, Daniel. 2014. The importance of exhaustive description in measuring linguistic complexity: The case of English *try and* pseudocoordination. In Frederick J. Newmeyer & Laurel B. Preston (eds.), *Measuring Grammatical Complexity*, 202–216. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, Daniel. 2016a. Between coordination and subordination: Typological, structural and diachronic perspectives on pseudocoordination. In Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira & Clara Pinto (eds.), *Coordination and Subordination: Form and Meaning — Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*, 209–243. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ross, Daniel. 2016b. Going to Surprise: the grammaticalization of itive as mirative. In Jacek Woźny (ed.), *Online proceedings of Cognitive Linguistics in Wrocław Web Conference 2016*. Wrocław, Poland: Polish Cognitive Linguistics Association & University of Wrocław. <https://sites.google.com/site/coglingwroc2/a-z-full-papers>.
- Ross, Daniel. 2017a. Pseudocoordination, Multiple Agreement Constructions, and Morphosyntactic Variation. Presented at the *Workshop on Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions*, Venice, Italy.
- Ross, Daniel. 2017b. Pseudocoordinación del tipo tomar y en Eurasia: 50 años después [Pseudocoordination with take and in Eurasia: 50 years later]. Presented at *Lingüística Coseriana VI*, Lima, Peru.
- Ross, Daniel. Forthcoming. Pseudocoordination, serial verb constructions and multi-verb predicates: The relationship between form and structure. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Ph.D dissertation.
- Ross, Daniel & Helge Lødrup. 2017. SIT as a progressive marker in pseudocoordination? Presented at the *Workshop on Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions*, Venice, Italy.