**Pseudocoordination:** apparently coordinate structure used subordinatively. Defined here diachronically as a transitional state originating from coordination. I make no claim that all types of pseudocoordination are the same structure. Many terms such as hendiadys, fake coordination, serialization, etc.

**Goals of this talk:**
- Establish broad typological presence of pseudocoordination.
- Consider historical development on the way; great source of data.
- Explore a preliminary typology of subordination-coordination domain, including examples from pseudocoordination in various languages.

1. Cross-linguistic presence of pseudocoordination

1.1 Germanic (Ross 2013c)
- Most previous research focuses on Germanic, especially Scandinavian.

Swedish, Norwegian and Danish (Jespersen 1895; Lødrup 2002; Wiklund 2007)
- Also found in Faroese (Heycock and Petersen 2012), and to a much lesser extent in Icelandic only with ‘sit’ (Jóhannsdóttir 2006).
- Evidence for early stages of ‘take and’ from Old Norse c.1220 (Vannebo 2003); ‘sit and’ from Old Swedish c.1300-1450 (Hilpert & Koops 2008).

Gothic c.600 (Matthew 8:21, Wulfila Bible)
- frauja, uslaubei mis frumist galeiðan jah gafilhan attan meinana.
  Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father.

English (Poutsma 1917; Carden and Pesetsky 1977; Ross 2013a; Ross in press)
- 3a) I will go and buy a pizza.
- 3b) We always try and eat well.

Used in Old English with motion verbs for purposive semantics:
- 4) Farað and àxið gorníce be þám cilde. (c.1000: W. Saxon Gospels: Matt. 2:8) ‘Go and inquire diligently after the child.’
- “The second verb translates a Latin hypotactic infinitive or participle of purpose.” (Shearin 1903, 12)

Extended to infinitival complements in Channel Islands English (Rosen 2014):
- 5) He went and see them.

Control construction found especially with try (and less frequently other verbs including be sure, promise, decide, pretend, remember, manage):
- Developed c.1550 from reanalysis of forms such as try and examine oneself; non-factive infinitival complementation by c.1800 (Ross 2013a):
  - 6) I will try and complete the assignment, but I might not be able to.
    - Subject to the bare form condition (Carden and Pesetsky 1977):
      - 7a) We try and do our best.
      - 7b) We try and be happy.
      - 7c) *He tries and do(es) his best.
      - 7d) *We tried and fix(ed) it.

Similar phenomenon in Faroese (Heycock and Petersen 2012, 274):
- Royna and prøva ‘try’ in Faroese are limited to imperatives and infinitives in standard usage, but colloquially, some speakers accept third-person plural present forms as well, because this conjugation happens to be homophonous with the infinitive.

8) Tey royna/prøva og lesa bókina.
- They try.3P.PRES and read.INF/3P.PRES book.the
  ‘They try and read the book.’
- This suggests that the “bare form” condition in English may be instead a non-finite form requirement.

Related phenomena in English (and other languages) are semantically-allowed unbalanced extraction from coordinate structures (Lakoff 1986) and “left-subordinating and” used esp. for conditionals (Culicover and Jackendoff 1997).
West Germanic beyond English

- Only found dialectally (not in standard variety) for German (Höder 2011) and Dutch (Haslinger and van Koppen 2002).
- Also in Afrikaans (de Vos 2005), Yiddish (Taube to appear) and Frisian.

1.2 Indo-European beyond Germanic

- An exception to the lack of cross-linguistic work is Coseriu (1966), who found the collocation take and found in Romance, Slavic, Germanic, Baltic, Greek and Albanian, as well as Finno-Ugric and Semitic.
- Other patterns can be found widely in Indo-European as well.

Romance:

- Found with motion verbs in Portuguese (Colaço 2010);
- Apparent serial variant in Brazilian Portuguese (Rodrigues 2006):

10) Eu fui (e) fiz o trabalho. ‘I went (and) did the work.’

- Similar for Italian dialects (Rohffs 1954; Cardinaletti & Giusti 2003)

11a) Va a piggia u pani 11b) vogghiu a vesciu

- In Spanish, ‘go’ has grammaticalized further to become a “topic auxiliary” (Arnaiz and Camacho 1999)

12a) Ramón fue y se cayó. 12b) Juan va y María lo besa.

Celtic subordinating/absolute ‘and’:

- A well known construction in the Celtic languages, as well as English dialects in contact with these languages, is formed with ‘and’ followed by a participle or verbless clause (Häcker 1994).

18) Tháimig Seán agus é ólta lit. ‘Came John and him drunk.’

- Kiparsky (1968) provides evidence that this may relate to a type of tenseless coordinated verb in Proto-Indo-European.

There is also some comparative evidence that suggests a left-subordinating conditional usage of “and” as far back as Proto-Indo-European (Eichner 1971).

1.3 Europe

- While not as common as within Indo-European, pseudocoordination can be found elsewhere in Europe also.

Basque pseudocoordination may be due to borrowing (Ross 2013b, 70):

19) (Ni) joango naiz eta liburu hartuko dut. (I) go.FUT AUX and book get.FUT AUX

‘I will go and get the book.’

However, for discussion of the range of usage of Basque eta, see (Rotaetxe 2006).
Finno-Ugric
- Pseudocoordination does not appear to be widespread in Finno-Ugric, but Coseriu (1966) finds instances of the take and construction.
- In Finnish there may be some borrowing from Swedish sit and.

1.4 Africa
Semitic
- Hendiadys in the Hebrew Bible is most studied (Lillas-Schuil 2006)
- Arabic pseudocoordination is found with aspectual meanings:

Kartvelian
- Georgian da ‘and’ is cognate with Mingrelian da ‘if’ (Harris and Campbell 1995, 290). See also Boeder (1983) for Kartvelian ‘and’ usage.

1.5 Asia and the Pacific
- There is little evidence for pseudocoordination in Asia, but see below for discussion of pseudosubordination.
- Mei (2003) suggests that serial verb constructions in modern Chinese may have grammaticalized from coordination in Ancient Chinese:

Austronesian
- Pseudocoordination of several different types is widespread in multiple branches of Austronesian.

20) Istun ja kirjoitin ‘I sit and write.’
21) Mutta että mies menee ja nitkahtaa budapestilaisessa puistossa johonkin haisevaan rättälään [telttaan] ‘But then for the man to go and fall for some smelly rag heap [a tent] in a Budapest park…’

21) rāttiläjään [telttaan]…’

Khoisan
- In a number of the (so-called) Khoisan languages, ‘and’ can be used for a variety of purposes including aspect and reason:

Atlantic Niger-Congo
- In Akan, serial verbs may have developed from coordination (Lord 1989)
- In a number of languages in West Africa, there is no sharp distinction between coordinator and complementizer, as in Kabiye (Roberts 2013):

27) Tast ḳa do mānî !
repeat-IMP speak-INF and 1SG-understand-AOR
‘Say that again so that I understand.’

Pseudocoordination is also found in some Ethiopian Semitic languages, in usage similar to Amharic gerundives (Leslau 1970):

25a) šir yilô-ma yidègebolel
lit. ‘one sits in a circle and eats’
25b) zätbêsâla-ma zihêlâdo-sa
lit. ‘when he finished and taught’
‘One eats sitting in a circle.’
‘when he finished teaching’

26a) tâ-sâ íé-ć
26b) yâ /oa tê ta yâ fia ëhi.
run-3SG stay-and 3SG NEG come and 3SG PROG be.sick
‘He doesn’t come because he is sick.’
(Sandawe: Eaton 2003)
(Sandawe: Eaton 2003)
( met: Heine and Kuteva 2002, 44)
1.6 Australia and the Americas

- Lichtenberk (1983) gives examples of causative pseudocoordination in Manam (Oceanic); motion verb pseudocoordination is also present.

29) wása ʔusí i-emáʔi-be i-moáʔusí
   wind loin.cloth 3SG-cause-3SG-and 3SG-move
   ‘The wind made the loincloth move.’

- Pseudocoordination can also be found in other Oceanic languages, such as Tawala (Ezard 1997, 248):

30) hí-wiógatala na po hi-na-bagabagi 3PL-plan and FUT 3PL-POT-work
   ‘They planned to work.’

- In Old High Fijian, relative clauses were formed via apparent coordination with ka ‘and’ (Dixon 1988, 252; Milner 1956, 35):

31) na waqa ka yali mai a koro ‘the boat which was missing from the village’

- Several languages in Vanuatu have an “echo subject” (same-subject) switch-reference marker -m, originating from *ma ‘and’ (Lynch 1983):

32a) r-im-va (kani) m-im-augín 32b) r-im-va (kani) r-im-augín
   3SG-PAST-come (and) ES-PAST-eat ... 3SG-PAST-eat
   ‘He, came and (he) ate.’
   ‘He, came and he, ate.’

- The Formosan languages (Taiwan) have especially extensive use of pseudocoordination; in fact, in some cases ‘and’ has been extended to use as a general linker beyond the verbal domain (Liu 2003, 167–168).

33) sa-harakat-sa ci aki (a) k<um>aqen tu hemaj
   SA-fast-SA Nom Aki A eat<AV>eat Acc meal
   ‘Aki ate his meal quickly.’

34) m-i-ta asoní m-ainenu ho m-i-ta uhne Tapangu ‘e-Pasuya (Tsou)
   AV-Rea-3S can AV-how and AV-Rea-3S go Tapang Nom-Pasuya
   ‘By what means can Pasuya go to Tapang?’

1.6 Australia and the Americas

- The languages found in Australia and the Americas typically have few overt coordinators equivalent to English ‘and’, so in general finding pseudocoordination is unlikely, assuming an overt coordinator is required (which is not theoretically motivated). Still, several instances are found where overt coordinators are present.

South America

- Baure (Arawakan: Danielsen 2011):

35) ririkopa a chiejerik
   3SGf.sit.G0 and 3SGf.spin
   ‘She sat down and spun (made thread).’

36) enevera nga rosowesha ach niyonpa riwer
   next.day NEG 3SGm.rain.BRR and 1SG.walk.G0 3SGf.house-LOC
   ‘If it doesn’t rain tomorrow, I will walk to her house.’

Australia

- Binin Gun-wok (Evans 2003) and Maung (Capell and Hinch 1970), languages from two different families (Arnhem and Iwaidjan respectively) in close contact, both display pseudocoordination:

37) Yirrangbalhmen dja kunkedjelk (Binin Gun-wok)
   shut.the door and it.is.cold
   ‘Shut the door because it is cold.’

38) nárabanamaya nuwu da guli la jiradad, la nuji ganmadju/ (Maung)
   ‘We shall bring you yams and meat, because you are sick.’

1.7 Summary of types encountered

- Motion, in many languages.
- Aspectual (Scandinavian, Semitic, Khoisan)
- Control (English, Greek, Tawala)
- Reason (Kabiye, Bininj Gun-wok and Maung)
- Complementation (Akkadian)
- Causal (Manam, Greek)
- Conditional (Indo-European, Kartvelian)
- Precursor to serialization (Akan, Chinese)
- Switch-reference (Vanuatu Austronesian)
- Generalized linker (Formosan)

This list is not exhaustive, but clearly there is a widespread tendency in languages for subordination (and several other systems) to develop out of coordination.

Additional research is required for all of these languages. As shown for English, the intermediate state between coordination and subordination that arises in pseudocoordination provides unique puzzles for grammatical theory.
2. Related phenomena

2.1 Pseudosubordination (Yuasa and Sadow 2002)

- May be defined as: apparently subordinate structure used coordinatively.
- Often in the form of converses, this is found widely throughout the world, including in, for example, Japanese, Korean (Kwon and Polinsky 2008), Turkish (Johanson 1995) and Hindi (Montaut 2006).

39) Ojisan-ga yama-de hatarai-te, (Japanese: Yuasa and Sadow 2002, 92) old.man-NOM mountain-at work-and
obaasan-ga mise-no ban-o shi-ta
old.woman-NOM store-GEN sitting-ACC do-PAST
‘The old man worked at the mountain, and the old woman tended the store.’

40) Oda-ya gir-ip otur-d-um (Turkish: Johanson 1995, 333) room-DAT enter-CONV sit-PAST-1SG
‘I went into the room and sat down.’

- Pseudosubordination, like pseudocoordination, often results in a mixed structure with anomalous grammatical properties. In this sense, they may be the same phenomenon despite grammaticalizing inversely.
- Additionally, these two constructions often are functionally equivalent.

2.2 Serialization

- May be defined as a closely linked sequence of two verbs with no conjunction or complementizer linking them (Aikhenvald 2006).
- However, there is no necessary theoretical reason that serial verbs (that is, the phenomena represented by that structure) may never have a linking element.
- Urarina is said to have serial verbs linked by the neutral suffix -a (NTR):

41) kwitek-erat-ia kare (Olawsky 2006, 631)
know-CAUS-NTR go-3PL
‘They went to let him know.’
- Often found with the same lexical items and meanings as pseudocoordination and pseudosubordination.

2.3 Associated motion, compared

- Associated motion encodes motion accompanying an event morphological on the verb.
- It is found in Pama-Nyungan (Koch 1984; Wilkins 1991); Tacanan (Guillaume 2013); Rgyalrong (Jacques 2013).
- Itive and venitive markers found widely elsewhere (Bourdin 2005).
- Although typically defined both semantically and formally (as an affix), there is no necessarily theoretical reason for this. The other constructions we have seen encode the same grammatical category:

42) We went and bought a pizza.
43) Let’s go see a movie.

Pseudocoordination

44) Taroo-ga hasit-te gakkoo-ni it-ta 45) are-ye-ne-
Turoo-NOM run-CONV school-to go-PAST see-GO
‘Taro went to school running.’ ‘find’ lit. ‘go see’

Serialization

Converb (Japanese: Shibatani and Chung 2007, 27)

- In faction, motion verbs are among the most common cross-linguistically to be found in pseudocoordination, converses and serialization.
- This also explains the surprise reading in the go and construction (Wiklund 2009), because this is a natural metaphorical extension of movement away from the deictic center, away from expectations.

2.4 Para-hypotaxis

- Constructions in some languages display overt marking of subordination. This is found in at least Indo-European, Semitic, Bantu and Zamucoan.

46) Quando i fatti diventano personali, e sono difficili da gestire.
‘When the things become personal, and are difficult to deal with.’

(Bertinetto and Ciucci 2012, 92)
- Clearly ‘and’ cannot be encoding coordination in this construction. Rather, it must be encoding a clause boundary.
- Given para-hypotaxis, asyndetic coordination, and similarities between pseudocoordination and serialization, it is natural to assume that the conjunction ‘and’ is not, in any formal sense, part of the structure but rather a phonological indication of a boundary in general.

Ross: pseudocoordination between coordination and subordination
3. Typology of subordination/coordination domain, with examples

- Preliminary typology of properties that distinguish various constructions.

3.1 Argument or adjunct status

**Argument:** *try and*

- Auxiliary usage (e.g., aspectual) is a subject of argument selection.

**Adjunct:**

- Reason clauses

38) /ŋarabanaməya nuwu da guli la jiradad, la nuji ganmadju/ (Maung)

‘We shall bring you yams and meat, because you are sick.’

- Circumstantial clauses

48) I figured the trickiest part would be fooling you and keep a straight face.

(From TV series: *Castle*, April 1, 2013)

Between adjunct and argument? English *go and*:

49a) *I will go.

49b) I will go and buy a book.

49c) I will go to buy a book.

50) I will go and buy a book, *(but I might not buy the book).

51) *And buy a book, I will go.

Neither:

- Conditional (left-subordinating and)

52) Tell me the best places to visit in Lisbon, and I’ll have a good trip.

- Standard coordination

53) John ate pizza, and Mary ate cake.

3.2 Semantic relationship between clauses

- Directionality (associated motion); *go and get*

- Aspectual information:

  - Progressive

  1b) Han satt o skrev dikter.

  He sat & wrote poems

  ‘He was writing poems.’

  - Absentive (de Groot 2000)

54) Jan er og handlar (Norwegian)

John is and shops

‘John is off shopping.’

- Converbs must usually be embedded.

- Consecutive tense forms and switch-reference rely on existing context.

3.4 Factivity: is the secondary clause independently asserted

- Yes: English *go and get*

- No: English *try and do*

- Also consider *I believe that* vs. *I know that* vs. *I saw that*

3.5 Morphosyntactic dependencies between the clauses

- Parataxis, serialization and pseudocoordination all are functionally equivalent but only one involves an overt linker; this should not matter.

- Para-hypotaxis involves an extra linker; again, this is irrelevant.

- In some languages, there may be multiple coordinators to select from, associated with particular constructions. For example, Italian *a(c)* and *e(t)* are found in pseudocoordination and coordination respectively.

3.6 Relative clauses:

31) na waqa ka yali mai a koro

‘the boat which was missing from the village’

- Manner specification:

44) Taroo-ga hasit-te gakkoo-ni it-ta

Taroo-NOM run-CONV school-to go-PAST

‘Taro went to school running.’

- Causation:

29) wása ŭsi i-emaʔ-i-be i-moaiʔusu

wind loin.cloth 3SG-cause-3SG-and 3SG-move

‘The wind made the loincloth move.’

- Control Complementation; *try and do*

- Perception Complementation:

24) kīma immer fišū ešme-ma

COMP sheep.ACC you.have.SUB I.heard-and

‘I have heard that you have sheep.’

- Perfective (Arabic: Badawi, Carter, and Gully 2004, 433)

55) kamā sabaqā wa-quinā

as do,previously and-said

‘As he previously said.’

- Parallel morphology requirements in pseudocoordination.

- Not otherwise generalizable in the grammar (Ross in press)
3.6 Summary

- “Subordination” and “coordination” are determined by a number of properties that are related but not dependent on each other.
- Analyzing pseudocoordination forces us to leave the traditional dichotomy of coordination and subordination behind, focusing instead on the (in fact independent) underlying properties that once made that analysis desirable.

4. Implications for further research and grammatical theory

- Substantial descriptive (and theoretical) work is required in this area with individual languages. There is surely much more to be discovered!
- As with English try and, pseudocoordination reveals that languages can have constructions that copy or require parallel morphology; additionally, sometimes paradigmatic gaps arise in these constructions.
- Coordination and subordination are not distinct, at least not as currently defined; a construction may share properties of both.
- One possibility is to consider almost everything to be a type of subordination (embedding), with true coordination a discourse and linearization phenomenon.
- Form-function mapping is non-isomorphic in language. For example, associated motion may be encoded through morphology, serialization, subordination or (pseudo)coordination. What we observe on the surface in languages is due to a linearization process that must be investigated after establishing the underlying similarities.
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Ross, pseudecoordination between coordination and subordination


Abstract

Between coordination and subordination: typological, structural and diachronic perspectives on pseudocoordination

As exemplified by go and get or try and do in English, pseudocoordination refers to the use of coordinator ‘and’ in constructions that behave unlike typical coordination, possibly best defined diachronically as a transitional state between coordination and subordination. I present clear evidence of originally coordinative structures undergoing reanalysis and grammaticalizing as subordinate, such as English try and. The resulting constructions often still display some properties of coordination and cannot be identified as either coordination or subordination. Thus syntactic analysis of pseudocoordination is challenging and important.

The phenomenon has received relatively little attention cross-linguistically, yet careful investigation reveals a variety of examples in many language families; it is not unusual or unexpected. The most extensive work deals with the Scandinavian Germanic languages, especially Swedish and Norwegian, where pseudocoordination is a salient grammatical feature (cf. Wiklund, 2007; Lødrup, 2002). It has also been discussed some for English (Ross, 1967; Carden & Pesetsky, 1977). Beyond these languages, descriptions are sparse and rarely cross-referenced, but descriptive grammars reveal instances elsewhere. With inconsistent nomenclature (pseudocoordination, fake coordination, serialization, verb-verb agreement, etc.) and a general lack of awareness of its cross-linguistic presence, it is not surprising that the phenomenon is rarely identified; for example, Heine & Kuteva (2002) identify the pattern VP-AND > SUBORDINATOR but give only two examples and write:

“While such context-induced uses appear to be not uncommon in a number of languages, it is not entirely clear whether, or to what extent, VP-AND markers are really conventionalized to subordinating conjunctions. In any case, this grammaticalization appears to be part of a more general process whereby markers of clause coordination give rise to subordination markers.”

One exception to the lack of broadly cross-linguistic work is Coseriu (1966), who identifies a large number of languages, primarily in the Indo-European family, with a construction of the form take and, which he originally proposed as an areal feature, shared through borrowing. But constructions with remarkable similarities (as well as variation) are found in many unrelated families, which cannot be due to contact. Pseudocoordination can be found throughout Indo-European, as well as in Semitic, Khoisan, several Atlantic Niger-Congo languages, Kartvelian, the Oceanic and Formosan languages in Austronesian, Baure (Arawakan, Bolivia), the Iwaidjan and Gunwinyguan families in Australia, Kabardian (Northwest Caucasian), Piman within Uto-Aztecan, and possibly in ancient Chinese. In fact, despite limited descriptive work, most languages with overt general coordinators like English and are likely to extend its use beyond strictly additive coordination in the verbal and clausal domains via pragmatic implicature, which in many cases results in grammaticalization.

At the same time, many other languages (including for example Japanese, Korean and Turkish) display an apparently inverse pattern of pseudosubordination where originally subordinate forms act as coordinate structures thereby displaying many of the same properties as pseudocoordination (Yuasa & Sadock, 2002), a common development for converbs (Haspelmath & König, 1995; Haspelmath, 2004). More broadly there are also syntactic similarities in other constructions such as serialization and verbal affixation. These various strategies in form appear to all serve the same function: to associate the action of a main predicate with secondary properties. For example, directional usage of all of these strategies is extremely common. Throughout the world in various language families, we find evidence of pseudocoordination similar to English go and get, similar patterns with pseudosubordination and converbs, the extremely common serialization of motion verbs, and the affixal category of Associated Motion or itive/andative and ventive (Bourdin, 2005).

Finally, para-hypotaxis (cf. Bertinetto & Ciucci, 2012), found in at least Indo-European, Semitic, Bantu and Zamucoan demonstrates that a coordinator can be found linking an
explicitly marked dependent clause to an independent clause. Clearly the presence of a particular conjunction in itself is not sufficient in determining structure.

The goals of this talk are threefold: first, and most importantly, I will establish the cross-linguistic presence of pseudocoordination with examples from diverse language families. Second, I will discuss semantic and syntactic properties of coordination. From a semantic perspective, pseudocoordination can encode numerous meanings including directionality, manner specification, complementation (such as control), progressive, absentive, perfective and other aspects, and even causation. From a syntactic perspective, pseudocoordination presents many challenges for analysis such as the ‘bare form condition’ for English try and (*He tries and do(es) it) as a parallel morphology constraint (also found in Faroese, Heycock & Petersen, 2012), same-subject (non-switch-reference) requirements, and the relationship with semantic structure, which is likely similar to that of, for example, serialization. Third, I will propose a new typology that can incorporate coordination, pseudocoordination and subordination based on a number of factors including: i) whether the second clause is an argument or adjunct of the first (structure); ii) the meaning relation between the clauses (semantics); iii) the type of conjunction, if any (linker); iv) whether the clauses are independently asserted (factivity); and v) whether there are any morphosyntactic dependencies between the clauses (dependency). Analyzing pseudocoordination will force us to leave the traditional dichotomy of coordination and subordination behind, focusing instead on these (in fact independent) underlying properties that once made that analysis desirable.

Pseudocoordination examples:
(1) Han sitter og skriver dikt. ‘He is writing poetry.’
   (Norwegian; Lodrup, 2002: 121)
(2) Yirrangbalhimen dja kunkedjelk
   shut.the.door and it.is.cold
   ‘Shut the door because it is cold.’
   (Kunwinjku; Etherington & Etherington, 1998: 129)
(3) tê-sâ-íé
   run-3FSG stay-and
   ‘She is running.’
   (Sandawe [Khoisan]; Eaton, 2007: 9)
(4) enevere nga rosowesha ach niyonpa river-ye
   next.day NEG it.rain.LRR and I.walk.go her.house-LOC
   ‘If it doesn’t rain tomorrow, I will walk to her house.’
   (Baure; Danielsen, 2011: 87)
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