

Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions

An overview

Giuliana Giusti¹, Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro¹ and Daniel Ross^{2,3}

¹Ca' Foscari University of Venice / ²University of Illinois at

Urbana-Champaign / ³University of California, Riverside

This introductory chapter provides background on the phenomena of Pseudo-Coordination (PseCo) and Multiple Agreement Constructions (MACs) with the aim of familiarizing readers with major previous research on these varied phenomena. Common structural and functional properties used to identify PseCo and MACs are described, along with a detailed discussion of the features that make crucial differences within each phenomenon in individual languages and cross-linguistically. We also observe interesting similarities between the two phenomena and across related and unrelated languages. We maintain a pre-theoretical view here that is compatible with the different theoretical approaches represented in the volume.

1. Introduction

Many languages of the world exhibit the possibility of stacking more than one verb displaying the same inflectional features for Tense, Aspect and Mood (henceforth TAM) in the presence of a linking element homophonous to a coordinative conjunction, as in (1):

- (1) a. *Ramón fue y se cayó.*
Ramon go.PST.3SG and REFL fall.PST.3SG
'Ramon unexpectedly fell.' [Arnaiz and Camacho 1999: 318; Spanish]
- b. *Hans prövar och läser.*
Hans try.PRES and read.PRES
'Hans tries to read.' [Wiklund 1996: 31; Swedish]
- c. *Koška vzjala i umerla.*
cat take.PST.3SG.M and die.PST.3SG.M
'Suddenly, the cat died.' [adapted from Weiss 2007; Russian]

- d. *Qaṣdat wa-katbat...*
 sit.PST.1SG and-write.PST.1SG
 'I was writing...?' [Gamliel and Mar'i 2015: 54–55; *Palestinian Arabic*]

These are said to be instances of Pseudo-Coordination (henceforth, PseCo) because they do not display the semantic and morpho-syntactic properties of a coordination. For example, they refer to a single event and allow extraction of the object of V2. Compare a real coordination in (2) and a PseCo in (3):

- (2) a. *Mary went to her home town and visited her parents.*
 b. **Who did Mary go to her home town and visit?*
- (3) a. *Mary will come and visit them tomorrow.*
 b. *Who will Mary come and visit?*

In this respect the PseCo in (3a) is in some ways more similar to a subordinate infinitival clause such as (4a) than the true coordination in (2a).¹ The same resemblance to infinitival subordination is found in many other languages. The Swedish PseCo in (1b) is semantically and structurally similar to the infinitival construction in (4b):

- (4) a. *John will come to visit us tomorrow.*
 b. *Hans prövar att läsa.*
 Hans try.PRES to read.INF
 'Hans tries to read.' [Wiklund 1996: 31; *Swedish*]

Regarding the coordinative connector, it is not necessarily the synchronic coordinator 'and', as is the case of southern Italian dialects in which the connector *a* is traditionally analysed as derived from the Latin coordinator **AC**, which is no longer used as a coordinator (cf. Ascoli 1898; Meyer-Lübke 1899: 591–592; Rohlfs 1969):²

- (5) a. *Passa a pigghia u pani.*
 pass.IMP.2SG a fetch.IMP.2SG the bread
 'Pass by and fetch the bread.'
 [Cardinaletti and Giusti 1998; Marsala (Trapani)]

1. More precisely, the meaning of *come and visit* is essentially 'come to visit, and (thereby) visit', with a single-event interpretation, which we can identify as Prior Associated Motion (Lovstrand and Ross 2021).

2. Because of the grammaticalized nature of PseCo, it should not be surprising that the erst-while coordinator might split from its source. Compare for example Proto-Polynesian sequential coordinator *ʔo which in a number of modern Polynesian languages takes on different functions including being used as a complementizer only (Hooper 1997: 213), or consider Russian in Example (1c) where the subordinater *da* 'that' could be substituted for the coordinator *i* (or both together as *da i*) with no change in meaning, as both particles have taken on distinct functions within this construction.

- b. *stéc' a ssónə*
 stand.1SG a play.1SG
 'I'm playing (an instrument).' [Andriani 2017: 220; Conversano (Bari)]

Under the diachronic analysis of *a* as derived from Latin AC, the southern Italian constructions in (5) can still be considered cases of PseCo.³

In many languages, the connector in PseCo may be optional, but the omission of the connector is usually not free: it depends on the language, the properties of V1, or even the combination of TAM features on the two verbs, as discussed in Section 4. When the connector is missing, the construction resembles Serial Verb Constructions (henceforth, SVCs), that are well-known from West Africa, East Asia, Oceania, creoles and other languages:

- (6) a. *Mede abuwow migu msum.*
 1SG.take corn 1SG.flow water.in
 'I pour corn into water.' [Aikhenvald 2006: 40; Akan, West Africa]
- b. *Kiapa li-le li-oi teuko.*
 1PL.INCL 1INCL.REAL-go 1INCL.REAL-throw hook
 'We'll go fishing.' [Bolton 1990: 159; Nuaulu, Indonesia]

In fact, some researchers have proposed that PseCo could be analyzed as a kind of SVC (e.g., Déchaine 1993: 801; Manzini and Savoia 2005; Manzini, Lorusso and Savoia 2017; Cruschina 2013; Del Prete and Todaro 2020). However, by most traditional definitions, SVCs do not have any linking element, so PseCo would be excluded in principle. Regardless, important insights can be gained by comparing these two construction types, including regarding their monoclausal structure and monoeventive interpretation and that they also may display the same inflection on each verb (see Ross, this volume). Thus, in many languages TAM morphology appears together with subject agreement in both PseCo and SVCs, and in this respect, they can be considered Multiple Agreement Constructions (henceforth MACs), which have agreement on both V1 and V2 with the unique clausal subject, as is clear from the glosses in (7a) and (7b). This makes them different from canonical auxiliary constructions or verbal periphrases in which subject agreement and TAM is realized only once, on the highest functional verb, while the other verb forms have non-finite, non-agreeing morphology, as shown in (7a') and (7b'):

3. Note however that *a* is homophonous to the Italo-Romance dative preposition which can also function as the subordinating conjunction of an infinitive. Under this hypothesis, the label PseCo is less justified, as claimed by Manzini and Savoia (2005). Some discussion on this is also present in the contributions by Giusti and Cardinaletti and by Manzini and Lorusso to this volume.

- (7) a. *u stok a f'fattsə*
 it.CL stay.1SG a do.1SG
 'I'm doing it.'
~~'They're doing it.'~~ [Manzini and Savoia 2005: 689; Putignano (Bari)]
- a'. *lo sto facendo.*
 it.CL stay.1SG do.GER
 'I'm doing it.' [Italian]
- b. *sta sse l'lava*
 stay.3SG REFL.CL wash.3SG
 'S/he's washing him/herself.' [Manzini and Savoia 2005: 694;
 Nociglia (Lecce)]
- b'. *Si sta lavando.*
 REFL.CL stay.3PL wash.GER
 'S/he's washing him/herself.' [Italian]

A MAC may also have a connector, but which may be unrelated to a coordinator; in this respect, the construction cannot be technically considered a PseCo. This is certainly the case of the Balkan-style infinitive-loss (cf. De Angelis and Krstić 2014; Ledgeway 2016a), which gives rise to MACs (cf. (8b)) replacing what earlier stages of the language or cognate varieties ~~in the synchrony~~ would realize as a verbal periphrasis with a non-finite, non-agreeing V2 (cf. (8c)):

- (8) a. *Oj' a mmangiu.*
 want.1SG a eat.1SG
 'I want to eat.' [Ledgeway 2016b: 159; Avetrana (Taranto)]
- b. *Vogghiu mi veni.*
 want.1SG mi come.3SG
 'I want him to come.' [Leone 1995: 68; North-eastern Sicilian]
- c. *Vuigliu mangiari / vèniri.*
 want.1SG eat.INF come.INF
 'I want to eat / to come.' [Delia (Caltanissetta)]

Multiple Agreement may be partial, allowing variation in affected inflectional features, for example displaying only subject agreement, as is the case in Swahili (9a) from Carstens (2001). It may not involve verbal periphrases as in the case of multiple concord of nominal features on adjectives, determiners (very common in European languages), and even prepositions embedded in nominal expressions, as is the case in Swahili (9b), from Carstens (1991):

- (9) a. *Juma a-li-kuwa a-me-pika chakula.*
 Juma 3SG.PST.be 3SG.PERF.COOK 7food
 'Juma had cooked food.' [Carstens 2001: 150; Swahili]

- b. *Picha mpya ya Amira ya Hasan.*
 9.picture 9.new 9.of Amira 9.of Hasan
 'Hamira's new picture of Hasan. / Hasan's new picture of Amira.'
 [Carstens 1991: 100; *Swahili*]

As already shown by Coseriu (1966, 1977), PseCo has been studied in a wide range of (especially European) languages, but language-specific or family-specific perspectives have predominated. This language-specific and often theory-specific attitude has not been abandoned in the last half century in favor of a broader perspective. Given that PseCo appears to cut across multiple language families with interesting family-internal variation and family-external common features, cross-linguistic and cross-theoretical perspectives are urgent.

This volume is a testament to the puzzles that PseCo presents linguists to study, and we hope that we have succeeded in bringing together different perspectives in order to build cross-linguistic connections with regard to this phenomenon. In this way, this volume is presented as a call for continued theoretical and comparative research on the topic, which aims to cultivate answers to the following fundamental questions:

- i. Are we dealing with a single general property of language that combines multiple inflected items together or are we dealing with diverse phenomena which must be distinguished?
- ii. How can we best capture the morpho-syntactic properties that distinguish PseCo (in the broad sense) from other canonical and non-canonical verbal periphrases present in the languages that display PseCo or have the same functions in other languages?
- iii. What is the range of semantic and discourse properties that are associated to PseCo?
- iv. What are the properties of Multiple Agreement Constructions in non-verbal environments?

This introduction is intended to orient the reader with regard to the main characteristics of PseCo and a wider perspective provided by different MACs across language families and theoretical persuasions. Section 2 summarizes previous research, with a focus on the most influential studies and findings, including the cross-linguistic distribution of PseCo and some representative examples. Section 3 surveys the common structural and functional properties that have been used to identify PseCo. Section 4 describes variation in these and other features. Section 5 is a brief presentation of relevant MACs. Section 6 is an overview of the chapters in this volume.

2. Previous research on PseCo

The history of research on PseCo is best understood by distinct, and sometimes isolated, research traditions on individual languages or families. PseCo can be found in many related and unrelated languages around the world, although most research has focused on Europe. In this section we provide an overview of some of the major works on this topic (see also Ross 2016a, forthcoming).

PseCo has been observed for a long time (see Ross 2014a for an overview), at least as early as Juan de Valdés who in his c.1535 manuscript *Diálogo de la lengua* described Spanish *tomar y* ‘take and’ as an undesirable colloquialism. Much of the earliest commentary on PseCo was prescriptive in nature, although by the mid-1800s some valuable early descriptive accounts were published, such as Aasen (1848: 206) on Danish and Fulci (1855: 156) on Sicilian. By the end of that century, two important studies dedicated to PseCo appeared: Jespersen (1895) on Scandinavian and other languages, and Ascoli (1898) on Sicilian. Soon after that, Poutsma (1917) surveyed English PseCo in detail.

For Semitic languages, PseCo has traditionally been investigated under the label *verbal hendiadys* (from Greek ‘one through two’) (Gesenius 1844: 270–271; Lillas-Schuil 2006; Lillas 2012). Curiously, the term *verbal hendiadys* has also caught on in some research on Dutch and Afrikaans (Roberge 1994; Haslinger and van Koppen 2002).

A major focus of cross-linguistic research in the previous century centered around the particular expression TAKE AND, which has a remarkably widespread distribution in European languages (Wagner 1955; Coseriu 1966, 1977; Kiparsky 1971; Larsson 1992; Ekberg 1993; Vannebo 2003; Ross 2017), sometimes alongside other VIs in PseCo and sometimes as the only type in a language. Coseriu’s work in particular has considered this type of PseCo to be among the so-called *verbal periphrases* (i.e., auxiliary constructions, typically with aspectual function) in Spanish and other Romance languages.

The exceptional properties of PseCo, often with an emphasis on English, also drew the attention of those working on coordination from a theoretical perspective (Gleitman 1965: 293; Ross 1967; Lakoff 1986, among others), and this trend in research persists today (e.g., Kjeldahl 2010; Brown 2017). Of particular interest has been the restriction on any inflectional morphology in the English TRY AND PseCo construction (Carden and Pesetsky 1977; Ross 2013, 2014b, 2015, 2018), similar also to morphological restrictions in Sicilian PseCo discussed below. Another topic of theoretical interest has been the apparent coordination of an imperative and indicative clause functioning as a conditional, as in *Do that again, and I’m leaving!* (Culicover and Jackendoff 1997); although not a focus in this volume (but see

Mitrović this volume), this particular kind of PseCo is remarkably widespread in the languages of the world (cf. Haiman 1983). The concept of Pseudo-Coordination has also been compared with Pseudo-Subordination (Yuasa and Sadock 2002), which is a subordinate (i.e., dependent) form taking on the functional role of coordination.

Following in the footsteps of Jespersen (1895), PseCo has become a prominent theme in research on Scandinavian languages (Kvist Darnell 2008). In fact, the term *pseudokoordination* first appeared in Telemann's (1974) description of Swedish. From this usage it has now become the dominant term in Scandinavian research, and has also spread to other languages, including by Quirk et al. (1985: 978–979) for English. Although this is now the most general term used cross-linguistically and the one adopted in this volume, due to growing but multi-faceted and sometimes idiosyncratic research on the phenomenon, PseCo has also been assigned a bewildering variety of other labels in the literature, especially in consideration of the fact that most studies deal with this phenomenon as specific to a given language or group of languages. Some of these alternative labels are Asymmetric Conjunction/Coordination (Schmerling 1975; Déchaine 1993), Double Verb Construction, Fake Coordination (Carden and Pesetsky 1977), Subcoordination (Johnsen 1988), Verb-Verb Agreement, Agreeing Complements (Anward 1988), Verbal Hendiadys, Contiguous Coordination (de Vos 2005), Inflected Construction (Cardinaletti and Giusti 1998, 2001, 2003) Doubly Inflected Construction (Cruschina 2013; Todaro and Del Prete 2019; Del Prete and Todaro 2020), Congruence Construction (Nielsen 2011), TMA-copying (i.e., Tense/Mood/Aspect) Construction (Wiklund 2007), and Serial Verb Construction.

While standardized terminology is not necessarily required for productive research on a particular phenomenon, in the case of PseCo in particular it seems that this inconsistency reflects the general disconnectedness of previous research and has obscured cross-linguistic similarities. In fact, a number of authors have reported PseCo in a particular language as an idiosyncratic or even exotic feature, possibly attested only as a quirk of the language they are studying. Thus, one purpose of this volume is to promote awareness of PseCo as a cross-linguistic phenomenon, which we hope in turn will lead to not only continued theoretical research on the languages discussed here, but also expanded documentation of PseCo in more languages around the world.

In summary, fieldworkers, historical linguists, and others should not be dismissive of the possibility that a connecting element has developed from a coordinating conjunction, even though this is not traditionally known as a common grammaticalization pathway (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2002: 43–44; Kuteva et al. 2019: 60).

Among the Scandinavian languages, PseCo is an important feature of Swedish (Josefsson 1991; Wiklund 2007; Hilpert and Koops 2008; Kvist Darnell 2008;

Blensenius and Andersson Lilja, this volume), Norwegian (Lødrup 2002, 2019; Johannessen 1998) and Danish (Bjerre and Bjerre 2007; Nielsen 2011; Biberauer and Vikner 2017); for an overview of the phenomenon in Scandinavian languages, see Hesse (2009) and Kinn, Blensenius and Andersson (2018). It is also found in Faroese (Heycock and Petersen 2012; Ross 2015), but marginal in Icelandic (cf. Wiklund 2007; Jóhannsdóttir 2011).

PseCo is only found dialectally today in Dutch, but it was once more widespread historically, and it is found in Afrikaans (cf. de Vos 2005; Biberauer and Vikner 2017). PseCo is not a typical feature in German, although it is found dialectally (e.g., Ebert 2000; and see Taube forthcoming on Yiddish); the same applies to Frisian, while another similar construction type, traditionally called *imperativus-pro-infinitivo*, features the linker *en* ‘and’ followed by a verb appearing in imperative form (cf. Hoekstra 2017). Many studies have discussed English PseCo, some of which have already been cited, while most studies dedicated to this topic focus specifically either on the TRY AND construction mentioned above, or on the GO/COME AND construction (e.g., Stefanowitsch 2000; Wulff 2006; Nicolle 2009; Bachmann 2013), although see Hopper (2002) for a more general perspective.

For the Romance languages, most research has followed Coseriu’s interest in the TAKE AND construction (which appears to be found in almost all of the Romance languages aside from French: Coseriu 1966, 1977; Ross 2017), but a number of studies have been produced especially about Spanish (cf. Ross 2014; Arnaiz and Camacho 1999; Bravo 2020; Covarrubias et al. 2020; Orqueda et al. 2020; Soto Gómez 2021), as well as Portuguese (cf. Rodrigues 2006; Colaço and Gonçalves 2016; Mendes and Ruda, this volume). It is also an important but less studied feature of Romanian (Guțu-Romalo 1961; Coseriu 1966, 1977; Merlan 1999; Croitor 2017; Bleotu, this volume).

The research on Italo-Romance has focussed on the PseCo that is found with a restricted class of motion and stative verbs, and few other aspectual verbs in southern Italian and varieties of Sicily, Calabria and Apulia (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003; Cruschina 2013; Ledgeway 2016b, 2021, among others; cf. Di Caro 2019a for an overview of the relevant literature; see also the chapters by Giusti and Cardinaletti, Manzini and Lorusso, Di Caro and Cruschina in this volume), although diachronically traces of PseCo, especially in the imperative, can also be found in some other Italo-Romance varieties (cf. Rohlfs 1969: 171; Ledgeway 1997 and references cited there). The TAKE AND construction is also found in Italian where it has surprisingly not been researched as extensively as in other Romance languages (Mašini, Mattioli and Vecchi 2019; Giusti and Cardinaletti, this volume).

In Slavic and other Indo-European languages, as well as Finno-Ugric languages, PseCo has been predominantly documented via the TAKE AND construction (Coseriu 1966; Kiparsky 1971; Larsson 1992; Ross 2017), although there are

also some specific studies worth mentioning here: Kuznetsova (2006); Kor Chahine (2007); Stoynova (2007) and Weiss (2007, 2012) for Russian, Andrason (2018) and Mendes and Ruda (this volume) for Polish, Škodová (2009, this volume) for Czech, and Kuteva (1999) and Kanchev (2010) for Bulgarian; Nau et al. (2019) for the Baltic languages Latvian and Lithuanian; Svorou (2018a, 2018b) for Modern Greek, as well as Rohlfs (1977); Squillaci (2016) and Ledgeway, Schifano and Silvestri (2018) for the Greek dialects spoken in southern Italy; Manzini and Savoia (2007: 315–318) for Albanian. For Finno-Ugric, see in general Larsson (1992), and in particular Hakulinen et al. (2004: § 1093), Drew et al. (2021) and Airola (2007) for Finnish, and Csató (2001) for Hungarian, as well as Turkish.

For Semitic languages, PseCo is often mentioned in passing in general works and descriptive grammars, and often as *verbal hendiadys* (e.g., Badawi, Carter and Gully 2004 for Arabic, and Huehnergard 1997: 125–126 for Akkadian). Recently a few dedicated studies have begun to explore this topic in detail, for example Gamliel and Mar'i (2015) for Modern Hebrew and Arabic, Di Caro (2017) for Arabic, Boneh (2020) for Modern Hebrew, and Camilleri (2016: 296–302) for Maltese; more generally see also Edzard (2014, this volume).

Although not within the scope of studies presented in this volume, PseCo is also found beyond European and Semitic languages (cf. Ross 2016a: *forthcoming*), for example among Austronesian languages in the Formosan languages of Taiwan (Tsai 2007; Tsai and Wu 2012), in Oceanic languages such as Manam (Lichtenberk 1983), and also in some Khoisan languages (e.g., Eaton 2018 on Sandawe; cf. Ross 2016a: 221).

Cross-linguistic studies of PseCo are still a developing area of research (with some important exceptions such as Coseriu 1966, 1977 and Stefanowitsch 1999), but already a number of studies have shown the benefits of comparative approaches, such as Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001) on Sicilian, American English and Swedish; Jørgensen (2003) on Norwegian and Spanish; Ross (2015) on English and Faroese; Di Caro (2017) on Sicilian and Arabic; Nau et al. (2019) on the Baltic region; Drew et al. (2021) on Danish, English, Finnish and Italian; and Mendes and Ruda (this volume) on Polish and Portuguese.

3. Structural and functional properties of PseCo

A prototypical case of PseCo is with pairs of inflected verbs that are connected by a linking element homophonous to a coordinating conjunction, in the form 'V1[TAM.Agr] *(and)* V2[TAM.Agr]'. Strikingly, this construction is not interpreted as a coordination of two separate events but as a single complex event. As a consequence of the monoclausal and monoeventive nature of PseCo, some general

characteristics emerge:⁴ (i) the order of the two verbs cannot be reversed (cf. (10)), (ii) the construction is not subject to the Coordinate Structure Constraint (cf. Ross 1967: 161), so that, contrary to what happens in real coordinations, arguments related to V2 can be extracted (cf. (11)), (iii) the action expressed by the lexical V2 cannot be negated separately (cf. the English example in (12), adapted from Shopen 1971: 258), (iv) the two verbs must share the subject (cf. (13)).

- (10) a. *I'll go and get some milk.*
 b. **I'll get some milk and go.*
- (11) a. *What will you go and get?*
 b. **What will you drive and buy?*
- (12) a. *They go to buy vegetables every day, but there never are any vegetables.*
 b. **They go and buy vegetables every day, but there never are any vegetables.*
- (13) a. *I go and get some milk.*
 b. **I go and he gets some milk.*

In general, V1 is typically restricted to a small class of verbs: most often basic motion verbs like GO and COME, or the basic posture verbs SIT, STAND and LIE, and the verb TAKE in many European languages; and less often, some other verbs including those that would otherwise take an infinitival complement such as *try* in English or *want* in some Italo-Romance varieties.

In contrast, V2 is usually unrestricted,⁵ with the general exception of purely stative V2s like BE and KNOW (e.g., **Go and know it*), as well as any V2 that would be semantically and pragmatically incompatible with the preceding V1 (cf. (14)).

- (14) **Jeg sidder og går.*
 I sit.PRES and walk.PRES
 'I sit and walk.'
 [Kjeldahl 2010: 72; Danish]

Nevertheless, there are two features that seem to favor some V2s cross-linguistically, i.e., transitivity and agentivity. In Sicilian, for example, [+transitive] V2s are generally always possible (with the exceptions of purely stative verbs), whereas [-transitive] V2s are not accepted or at least disfavored in some varieties (see the discussion in Di Caro 2019a; see also Bleotu, this volume on Romanian). Moreover, V2s entailing an action (e.g., fetch something, call someone, etc.) are generally

4. Biclausal accounts of PseCo are also found in the literature (for Romance, see Manzini, Lorusso and Savoia 2017; Manzini and Lorusso, this volume).

5. However, see Di Caro (this volume) for an exceptional case of morphological restrictions on what V2s can enter the construction for some Sicilian dialects.

favored, although this depends on the degree of grammaticalization of V1, in the sense that when V1 loses its original semantics, non-agentive V2s are more likely to be accepted. Finally, we should be careful to distinguish repetitive emphatic coordination, also called reduplicative coordination (ReCo) by de Vos (2005), where the same verb is iterated for effect, as in (15):⁶

- (15) *Peter går og går.*
 Peter walk.PRES and walk.PRES
 ‘Peter walks and walks.’ [Kjeldahl 2010: 72; Danish]

Shopen (1971); Cardinaletti and Giusti (1998) and others have suggested a number of tests for PseCo, collected as a list in de Vos (2005), in order to distinguish it from normal coordination. These include, in addition to those already discussed above, reduced argument structure for the verbs (especially V1) or restricted possibility of modification, obligatorily shared inflection on each verb, the inability to negate either verb independently, semantic or pragmatic functions of V1 distinct from its use as a lexical verb, and an obligatorily phonologically reduced, unstressed realization of linking element ‘and’.

Language-specific morphosyntactic tests may also show the distinct nature of PseCo, such as clitic climbing in Sicilian varieties as a diagnostic of monoclausality. Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001: 388–389), following Cinque’s (2003) insights on restructuring infinitival clauses, compare the Italian infinitival construction in (16), where clitic climbing is optional, according to restructured monoclausal construction (16a) vs non-restructured biclausal construction (16b), and the Sicilian infinitival, where restructuring is generally favored (17a) but non-restructured biclausal infinitive is marginally possible (17a’), with Sicilian PseCo in (17b), where clitic climbing is mandatory:

- (16) a. *Lo vado a prendere.*
 it.CL go.1SG to take.INF
 b. *Vado a prenderlo.*
 go.1SG to take.INF+it.CL
 ‘I’ll go and take it.’ [Italian]
- (17) a. *U vaju a pigghiari.*
 it.CL go.1SG to take.INF
 a’. *’Vaju a pigghiallu.*
 go.1SG to take.INF+it.CL

6. In most Sicilian dialects, where the connecting element is not homophonous to the actual coordinator ‘and’, the construction with the same verb in both positions would be connected with *e* ‘and’, instead of *a* (as used in PseCo).

- b. *U vaju a ppigghiu.*
 it.CL go.1SG a take.1SG
 b'. **Vaju a (lu) pigghiu(lu).*
 go.1SG a it.CL take.1SG+it.CL
 'I'll go and take it.'

[adapted from Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001: 388; *Marsalese*]

Having established PseCo as a unique phenomenon structurally distinct from normal coordination, the next section turns to some of the main ways in which the properties of PseCo vary cross-linguistically.

4. Variation in PseCo

Although some properties of PseCo tend to be shared cross-linguistically, it is also important to consider possible dimensions of variation concerning different syntactic, morphological and semantic aspects of the construction. One of the most prominent ways in which PseCo varies is the number of verbs entering the construction as V1, as already shown in examples above, and in fact this may often be a small, closed class of verbs. So, while motion verbs, for example, are quite common cross-linguistically, individual languages may permit only a specific, small set of them in PseCo, while V2 is generally unrestricted, as discussed above. The semantic functions of these V1s may also vary, especially to what extent they retain their literal lexical meanings in PseCo. Motion verbs can retain their meaning of literal motion, but also often undergo semantic bleaching or take on pragmatic functions, including GO taking on an emphatic role marking unexpectedness or self-determination, (Sornicola 1976; Stefanowitsch 1999, 2000; Wiklund 2009; Josefsson 2014; Ross 2016b; Cruschina, this volume), as in (1a) above and (18a) below, which is also a typical function of TAKE in PseCo, as in (18b):

- (18) a. *She's gone and ruined her dress now.* [Ross 1967: 170]
 b. (S-)a luat și a plecat în
 (REFL-)have.PRES.3SG take.PTCP and have.PRES.3SG leave.PTCP in
lumea largă.
 world wide
 'He took and set off into the wide world.' [Merlan 1999: 168; *Romanian*]

Likewise, LIE, SIT and STAND may follow a well-known path of grammaticalization of posture verbs and take on a progressive-like function (cf. Kuteva 1999; Heine and Kuteva 2002; Newman 2002), as in (19a). But in some languages, GO may be used similarly, as in (19b). And posture verbs may also have a sense of unexpectedness or stubbornness in some usage, as in (19c):

- (19) a. *Jeg står og venter.*
I stand.PRES and wait.PRES
'I'm waiting.' [Kjeldahl 2010: 30; Danish]
- b. *Hon gick og grunnade.*
she go.PST and ponder.PST
'She was pondering' [Blensenius 2015: 37; Swedish]
- c. *Sedi i se oplakva vmesto da se*
sit.3SG.PRES and REFL complain.3SG.PRES instead to REFL
xvane za rabota.
take.3SG.PRES for work
'S/he has been complaining all the time instead of starting to work.'
[Kuteva 1999: 191; Bulgarian]

In fact, V1 GO (especially in the imperative) can even be completely neutralized and lose its semantics to the extent that the whole PseCo conveys the same meaning as that of just V2 (cf. Sornicola 1976), as illustrated in (20):

- (20) a. *Va' pigghia sta cosa!*
go.IMP.2SG fetch.IMP.2SG this thing
'Go fetch this thing!'
- b. *Pigghia sta cosa!*
fetch.IMP.2SG this thing
'Fetch this thing!'
[Sornicola 1976: 71; Santo Stefano di Camastra (Messina)]

Looking beyond semantics, the rest of this section will survey some of the major types of structural variation found in PseCo in different languages.

In some, but not all, languages with PseCo, there are specific mood, tense and person restrictions (cf. (21)), subject to a very high degree of variation across languages. The more morphological richness a given language has, the more likely it will be that PseCo displays some paradigmatic limitations (cf. Kjeldahl 2010), although cases are also attested in languages like English as well (cf. Carden and Pesetksy 1977):

- (21) a. Try and win the race! [Then even if you do not succeed, you tried.]
b. I will try and win the race [but I am tired and might not be able to win].
c. I try and win the race every time [even though I rarely succeed].
d. *He tries and win(s) the race every time [but he rarely succeeds].
e. He did try and win the race [but his injury made it impossible].
f. *He tried and win/won the race [but his injury made it impossible].
g. *I am trying and win(ning) the race [but I am too tired]. [Ross 2015: 74]

A multi-faceted scenario emerges, for example, in Sicilian, where at least three different configurations have been identified. The most recurring configuration

is the one in which PseCo occurs only in some persons of the imperative and the present indicative (extensively discussed in Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003). In other dialects PseCo is further extended in the preterite indicative, where it is again limited to some persons of the paradigm but following a different pattern (cf. Di Caro, this volume). Finally, a third group of Sicilian dialects can be found in which PseCo is also possible in the imperfect indicative and in the imperfect subjunctive (cf. Di Caro and Giusti 2015; Di Caro 2019b).

The imperative seems to be the favored mood cross-linguistically, so that whenever limited cases of PseCo are found in a given language, they are most likely to be in the imperative (see, e.g., the cases of some modern Dutch dialects, namely the West Flemish of Bruges and the East Flemish of Eeklo described in de Vos 2005: 131, where PseCo survives only in the imperative). In a corpus study of English, Hopper (2002) also finds that even when PseCo is grammatical in all verb forms, the imperative and other non-finite forms are much more frequent in usage.

The indicative is the second most recurring mood in PseCo, with present as the favored tense. A tentative hierarchy of mood/tense selection for PseCo in Sicilian is provided in Di Caro (2019a: 129) based on more general considerations on data mainly from Romance and Germanic:

- (22) imperative > present indicative > preterite indicative > imperfect indicative > imperfect subjunctive

A comprehensive cross-linguistic mood/tense selection hierarchy does not seem to be straightforward, in part because the factors interacting with this selection have not been all analyzed in depth yet. The same holds true for the selection of the persons within a given paradigm, which however seems to be a phenomenon affecting mostly Italo-Romance varieties (cf. Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003; Di Caro, this volume). Capitalizing on work by Shopen (1971), and Carden and Pesetsky (1977) on English, Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001, 2003) account for the selectional restrictions found in Sicilian PseCo by referring to unmarked and marked forms, the former being the ones licensing PseCo. But other morphological factors (see Cruschina 2013 and references cited there; also Corbett 2016: 82–85) seem to come into play when it comes to the person restrictions.

As regards the connecting element, some varieties display a certain degree of optionality, especially in the imperative. For example, Kjeldahl (2010: 87–88) reports that in Danish PseCo featuring V1 COME in the imperative, the connecting element may optionally be omitted:

- (23) *Kom lad mig mærke dig igen.*
 come.IMP let.IMP me feel.INF you again
 ‘Come let me feel you again.’

[Kjeldahl 2010: 88; *Danish*]

Optionality of the coordinator is more general in Portuguese and Polish (Rodrigues 2006; Andrason 2018; Mendes and Ruda, this volume), where omission is preferred or obligatory for at least some speakers in some contexts, although in fact especially in the imperative. On the other hand, in English PseCo contrasts sharply with a functionally similar *go get* construction without the coordinator, which is strictly limited to bare forms of the verb (compare TRY in (21) above), but *go and get* PseCo with an overt coordinator is possible in any inflection. Despite their similar appearance, this contrast in morphosyntactic distribution suggests they are distinct constructions (Shopen 1971; Jaeggli and Hyams 1993; Zwicky 2003; Wulff 2006), with two different origins, one from juxtaposed imperatives ('Go! Look!'), and the PseCo pattern grammaticalized from frequent coordination of motion verbs in discourse.

Furthermore, the connecting element in PseCo is typically phonetically reduced. In Germanic, where the phenomenon is widespread, the connecting element usually has the pronunciation corresponding to a reduced coordinating conjunction and may be obligatorily unstressed. So, for example, the English *and* can be reduced to [ən] (cf. Carden and Pesetsky 1977; de Vos 2005). In Mainland Scandinavian, the unmarked pronunciation of *and* in PseCo is homophonous to the infinitival marker (cf. Wiklund 1996: 34, fn. 13), as e.g. in Danish, where the unmarked pronunciation of both *og* (coordinator) and *at* (infinitival marker) is [ɔ].⁷

PseCo normally exhibits multiple agreement, that is, parallel inflection, on V1 and V2, but rarely V1 may appear in a morphologically more basic form (see also Ross, this volume). For example, Bravo (2020: 158–159) reports that Spanish *va* (go.PRES.3SG) can be used as a default form even when it does not agree with the subject or match the tense of V2. In Sicilian, this goes further, such that some V1s (unsurprisingly, the most frequent V1s GO and COME) can occur in reduced, sometimes invariable, forms, sometimes merged with the coordinator (as shown only by reduplication of the initial consonant of V2 (cf. Di Caro and Giusti 2015; Di Caro 2019a; b)).⁸

Although typically the connector is the only element intervening between the two verbs, other material can sometimes intervene, varying by language and the degree of grammaticalization of V1. In Sicilian, nothing but the connecting element can separate the two verbs, not even frequency adverbs or floating quantifiers, as shown in (24) (cf. Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001, 2003). In Germanic, some verb

7. In fact, Endresen (1995) has even argued that in spoken Norwegian, the coordinator has fully replaced the infinitive marker in all contexts, although this is not reflected in the orthography.

8. This, curiously, seems to be orthogonal to their semantic bleaching, in the sense that a reduced or invariable V1 does not have to occur necessarily in a grammaticalized PseCo and can thus retain its semantic of motion.

particles related to the V1 can occur between V1 and V2 (cf. (25)),⁹ as well as negation (cf. (26)). Moreover, in verb second order with inversion, the subject can intervene between the two verbs (cf. (27)):

- (24) a. *I picciotti vanno *(tutti) a pigghiano (tutti) u pani ne sta butia.*
 the boys go.3PL all a fetch.3PL all the bread in this shop
 ‘The boys all go and buy the bread in this shop.’
 b. *Un vaju *(mai) a pigghiu (mai) u pani ne sta butia.*
 NEG go.1SG never a fetch.1SG never the bread in this shop
 ‘I never go and buy the bread in this shop.’
 [Cardinaletti and Giusti 2001: 390; Marsala (Trapani)]

- (25) *Han gik hen og døde.*
 he went over and died
 ‘He just died (suddenly)’ [Kjeldahl 2010: 32; Danish]

- (26) *Han sitter ikke og leser.*
 he sit not and read
 ‘He is not reading.’ [Lødrup 2019: 92; Norwegian]

- (27) *Den boken satt Lars och läste.*
 the book.DEF sit.PST Lars and read.PST
 ‘Lars was reading the book.’ [Wiklund 1996: 36; Swedish]

To summarize, cross-linguistically there is a high degree of variation in PseCo, and although certain common trends emerge, studies of individual languages are required to fully explore this topic, and for that we refer the reader to the detailed studies included in this volume.

5. Multiple agreement constructions

Double verb structures like PseCo can be considered as a particular case of Multiple Agreement Constructions (MACs), which more generally describes any construction featuring two elements that share agreement features. Some Southern Italo-Romance varieties in Salento, Central and Southern Calabria and Northern

9. Note that this may not always be permitted, such as indicated by de Vos (2005) for English in the distinguishing between PseCo (his Contiguous Coordination, ConCo) and what he calls Scene-setting Coordination (SceCo), such that a locative expression with a motion verb would be permitted only in SceCo, e.g. ‘go (to the store) and...’. What seems to apply cross-linguistically is a clear reduction in the potential argument structure of V1s. Consider also the verb TAKE used intransitively in PseCo in most languages, but with an optional reflective marker in Romanian in (18b) above.

Sicily feature cases of a specific MAC, which we will call *mu*MAC (following Giusti and Cardinaletti this volume).¹⁰ Contrary to PseCo, the *mu*MAC is biclausal and cannot be generally replaced by a construction featuring an infinitival V2, in line with the ‘unpopularity of the infinitive’ ascribed by Rohlfs (1969) to those areas of Southern Italy where Greek was spoken until the Middle Ages.

One of the characteristics of the *mu*MAC that set it apart from PseCo is the non-obligatory mood/tense feature sharing between the two verbs, as shown in (28a)–(28d), where the embedded clause is in the present indicative but the matrix clause can be in the imperfect indicative (28a), in the preterite indicative (28b, c), and in the conditional (28d).

- (28) a. *Vulia mu mi porta.*
 want.IMPERF.3SG *mu* to-me.CL bring.3SG
 ‘S/he wanted to bring me.’ [Rohlfs 1969: 103; *Southern Calabrian*]
- b. *Pinsau mi parti.*
 think.PST.3SG *mi* leave.3SG
 ‘He thought about leaving.’ [Rohlfs 1969: 103; Province of Messina]
- c. *Vinni ma ti viju.*
 come.PST.1SG *ma* you.CL see.1SG
 ‘I came to see you.’ [Manzini and Savoia 2005: 654; Sorbo San Basile (Catanzaro)]
- d. *Vorria mu sacciu.*
 want.COND.1SG *mu* know.1SG
 ‘I would like to know.’ [Rohlfs 1969: 103; *Southern Calabrian*]

Another crucial difference between *mu*MAC and PseCo is that, irrespective of what syntactic account is provided for PseCo (i.e., monoclausal vs. biclausal), the *mu*MAC is consistently considered biclausal. The connecting elements in the *mu*MAC are labeled by De Angelis (2016: 75) as *subordinators* (in the sense of Nordström 2010: 95ff.) since in some Calabrian varieties these elements, originally complementizers, have turned to modal affixes that have lost their stress, having procliticized to the embedded verb. They can also be preceded by another element acting as complementizer, such as *pe*, and cannot be separated from their embedded verb by a negation.

Moreover, in Southern Italo-Romance, procliticization of the pronouns associated with V2 onto V1 is not possible in the *mu*MAC, whereas it is obligatory in PseCo. Compare the position of the clitic pronoun *ti* in (28c) with (29) (see also Giusti and Cardinaletti, this volume).

10. This kind of MAC has also been referred to as the Finite Construction by Cardinaletti and Giusti (2001: 373–374), abbreviated in FinCo in later works (cf. Di Caro 2017, 2019a).

- (29) a. **Vinni a ti vitti.*
 come.PST.1SG a you.CL see.PST.1SG
 b. *Ti vinni a bbitti.*
 you.CL come.PST.1SG a see.PST.1SG
 ‘I came to see you.’ [Deliano]

Another structural difference between the two constructions *lies on* which verb bears the mood and tense realizations. Whereas in PseCo it is V2 that must necessarily display mood and tense features, to the extent that V1 can appear in an invariable reduced form (such as *o-* in (30b)), in the *muMAC* it is the V1 that provides the mood and tense features to interpret the utterance (cf. (28)).

- (30) a. *u 'ia a ffa'fia*
 it.CL go.HPV.1SG a do.HPV.1SG
 ‘I used to go and do it.’ [Manzini and Savoia 2005: 696; Modica (Ragusa)]
 b. *U offaceva.*
 it.CL o-do.HPV.1SG
 ‘I used to go and do it.’ [Catanesè]

As already shown in (28), the Southern Italo-Romance *muMAC* can appear in a number of configurations too and display different diatopically distributed types of connecting elements, namely *(m)u*, *(m)i*, *ma* and *cu*. These connectors function as complementizers of the embedded clause (see De Angelis 2017 for an overview and for additional connecting elements merging with other complementizers).

More generally, we can also consider issues of multiple agreement in other domains and in syntactic theory (Carstens 2001; Hiraiwa 2001, among others), as in (31) below. The question of how multi-valuation or multiple agreement is an area of growing interest in general, and also in particular regarding coordinating constructions, especially in terms of subject agreement and the phenomenon often labeled Closest Conjunct Agreement (cf. Benmamoun, Bhatia and Polinsky 2009; Tat and Kornfilt, this volume).

- (31) *Kpeinzen dank-k (ik) morgen goan.*
 I.think that-I I tomorrow go
 ‘I think that I’ll go tomorrow.’ [Carstens 2003: 393; West Flemish]

Taken together, PseCo and MACs pose a number of challenges but also opportunities for linguistic research, as shown by the contributions to this volume.

6. Overview of the contributions

Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions are remarkable linguistic phenomena to study because they are challenging from descriptive, comparative, and theoretical viewpoints, yet even partial answers to the questions they introduce can provide important insights into areas such as the morphology-syntax and syntax-semantics interfaces, dialectal variation and language contact, and linguistic typology. Following this introduction, the other papers in this volume offer a variety of perspectives on PseCo and related phenomena, and those contributions are summarized here to conclude our introduction. The first section focuses on PseCo in Romance languages, especially with motion verbs in southern Italian and Sicilian varieties but also with ‘take’ in Italian and Romanian. The second section turns to PseCo in other languages, notably Slavic, Scandinavian and Semitic. The third section concludes the volume with comparative and theoretical perspectives on PseCo and related phenomena in verbal as well as nominal domains.

Section 1 opens with **Giusti and Cardinaletti** who reflect on developments in research on PseCo in Italian and Sicilian varieties since their influential works set in motion the current enthusiastic description and theoretical analysis of PseCo in dialect syntax in Italy two decades ago (Cardinaletti and Giusti 1998, 2001, 2003, 2019, 2020). In particular, they add a new empirical perspective to this discussion by including the Italian ‘take and’ construction with *e* ‘and’ in comparison to the more extensively studied *a*PseCo construction in southern Italian and Sicilian varieties. This chapter adopts the protocol approach, in order to unite theoretical and descriptive insights and to make the contribution more accessible to a general audience. The authors conclude that the three constructions analyzed represent three distinct structures: ‘take’ PseCo with *e*, PseCo with *a*, and biclausal Multiple Agreement Constructions with *mu* and other linkers.

Manzini and Lorusso continue with this theme, drawing on their earlier work as well (Manzini and Savoia 2005; Manzini, Lorusso and Savoia 2017), considering the theoretical analysis of PseCo from the perspective of a broad dialectal comparison. In particular, they diverge in their theoretical analysis from the trend of other studies to analyze PseCo as monoclausal, arguing that the properties and variation of PseCo across South Italian varieties of Apulia, Calabria and Sicily better fit a biclausal analysis, even with the same inflectional features realized on each verb. By analogy to other finite constructions such as Balkan subjunctives, which are biclausal, the authors argue that a biclausal analysis requires less stipulation and is a better explanation for the observed properties. They analyze progressive constructions in these dialects, formed as PseCo with cognates of standard Italian *stare* ‘stand’.

Focusing on one Sicilian dialect, **Di Caro** describes PseCo in Deliano and especially its use with the preterite indicative paradigm, which is not possible in many other Sicilian dialects, where instead PseCo is often restricted to present-tense and imperative forms; additionally, more V1s, although primarily motion verbs, are possible in this dialect. This paper expands on the author's doctoral and continued research on PseCo in Sicilian dialects (Di Caro 2015, 2019a, b), and on other verbal periphrases (Di Caro 2019c), presenting a detailed case study based on judgments collected from 140 speakers. The results support the so-called W-Pattern as a salient feature in the dialect, such that PseCo is only possible for a subset of forms in the paradigm, related to morphomic patterns regarding irregular versus regular forms. Interestingly, there are also inflectional restrictions imposed on V2, such that only those irregular verbs, reflecting distinct inflectional sub-patterns in Latin, are allowed.

Cruschina also investigates Sicilian PseCo, building on previous research (Cruschina 2013; Cruschina and Calabrese 2021), but now turning to the semantic and pragmatic function of the motion verb **GO** and its use to express surprise and unexpectedness. Often this usage refers to a past event, although via the historical present due to paradigmatic gaps in availability of this construction. Taking the expression of surprise as a conventional implicature, the author suggests that in the same way that motion verbs can grammaticalize as tense or aspect markers, they can also be used for a type of modality indicating surprise or movement away from expectations. It is further suggested that these developments may help to explain the origin of the past-tense auxiliary *anar* 'go' in the history of Catalan.

To close this section, **Bleotu** studies a different Romance language, to propose a preliminary classification of the (a) *lua și* 'take and' construction in Romanian. Although this construction type has been widely observed in European languages (Coseriu 1966, 1977), this chapter addresses the need for a detailed theoretical analysis of this expression in Romanian, based on the results of an acceptability judgment task with 52 speakers. It is shown that the properties associated with this construction differ from those reported by de Vos (2005) for other common types of PseCo, including those with motion or posture verbs, and the **TRY** type. This study also demonstrates some of the challenges associated with gathering and interpreting data for PseCo constructions that are often systematically ambiguous with normal coordination.

To begin Section 2, **Mendes and Ruda** expand the coverage of Romance languages to Brazilian Portuguese in a parallel analysis with Polish. This paper also addresses the 'take and' construction, which is shown to have strikingly similar properties in both languages. Through a series of creative diagnostic tests based on the possible ellipsis of the first verb (**TAKE**), the authors argue that the second (lexical) verb is the more central component of the PseCo clause. They consider

TAKE to have an expressive function, conveying the attitude of the speaker, rather than contributing narrowly to the syntactic structure or semantics of the sentence. In an appendix, the authors also report variation, both across languages and between speakers, in the use or optionality of the linker ‘and’ in this construction.

Škodová also studies Slavic PseCo, specifically with the verb *jít* ‘go’ in Czech, building on this theme from her doctoral studies (Škodová 2009). The morphosyntactic properties of this construction are surveyed in order to distinguish between normal coordination and PseCo. Based on a large corpus study with 1611 tokens of the verb *jít* connected with *a* ‘and’ to a following verb, 668 are identified as PseCo. PseCo is associated with the past and future tenses, as well as imperatives. The two verbs are considered to form two phases of a single event in a complex predicate, the first as the initialization of the event, and the second indicating the consequent event, such that the verbs cannot be independently negated, modified by adverbials, and so forth. Czech is an interesting example of PseCo, due to highly inflected verbs alongside periphrastic tenses.

Blensenius and Andersson Lilja bring us to Scandinavia, the locus of their continued PseCo studies (Blensenius 2015; Andersson and Blensenius 2018; Kinn, Blensenius and Andersson 2018), and take us back in time, with a diachronic corpus study of the development of motion and posture PseCo constructions in Swedish. The semantic and pragmatic functions of three types of PseCo are studied in detail. Motion PseCo with *gå* ‘go, walk’ can express either a non-goal-directed, progressive-like meaning, or a goal-directed meaning, which often is metaphorically extended to a subjective meaning (see also Cruschina, this volume; Mitrović, this volume). Posture PseCo with *sitta* ‘sit’ can express a progressive-like meaning, which can be extended to suggest that one sits and continues doing something *instead* of doing something else, which would be preferred. However, these meanings and pragmatic functions are nuanced in several ways, as explored in the chapter, demonstrating that multiple levels of analysis may be required to fully understand PseCo.

Edzard’s research began as a collaboration with Janne Bondi Johannessen whose untimely death meant she unfortunately could not participate in this volume despite her enthusiastic participation at our workshop in Venice in 2017 (see also Johannessen and Edzard 2015). This chapter looks beyond Scandinavian PseCo, to draw connections to a wide array of constructions in several Semitic languages and associated terminology. What is striking about these construction types is their variation in form, with regard to the linking element ‘and’ and the morphology on each verb (whether displaying multiple agreement or not), while expressing similar functions across the languages. Beyond coordination, subordination and pseudo-coordination, also discussed are pseudo-subordination, as well as para-hypotaxis, where an individual construction displays overt marking of both coordination and subordination together (Bertinetto and Ciucci 2012).

Section 3 includes four contributions taking comparative or theoretical perspectives. The first by **Shimada** and **Nagano** is a study of Japanese multi-verb constructions with progressive and perfective aspectual functions. Even though strictly defined these may be better classified as pseudo-subordination than pseudo-coordination (cf. Yuasa and Sadock 2002), given that conjunctive *-te* is a non-finite suffix, substituting for finite inflection on the initial verb, such that the construction does not exhibit multiple agreement, these grammaticalized verb combinations resemble typical PseCo in that the two verbs function together as a unit and are linked by a form that otherwise can mark the function of clause coordination. The authors compare the available readings in Standard Japanese (SJ) and the Fukuoka Japanese (FJ) dialect, concluding that the availability of a progressive interpretation in FJ (but not SJ) reflects not a difference in syntax *per se*, but simply that SJ has not grammaticalized a morpheme to pronounce that particular function.

Tat and **Kornfilt** consider the complementary question to multiple agreement: how and when do constructions *not* agree as expected? Specifically, they describe the phenomenon of partial agreement in Turkish possessive nominal phrases and with nominalized predicates. They argue that partial agreement is *post-syntactic* and that syntax, strictly defined, need not allow for optionality. Instead, it is the realization of agreement, via spell-out to the sensorimotor system, that results in partial agreement phenomena. Although this contribution does not deal with (verbal) PseCo or MAC directly, the insights included here are useful for understanding variation in agreement in general (whether normal, partial, or multiple), focusing on the nominal domain, which is often taken to be parallel to the clausal domain but with a less complex structure.

Mitrović attempts to develop a formal semantic and pragmatic analysis for PseCo with **GO** in English, with implications for other types of PseCo in general. Expanding on doctoral and other work on coordination (Mitrović 2014, 2021), which introduced Junction as a general device for coordination, this proposal rests on PseCo being a type of improper Junction, such that PseCo can be derived via Dynamic Conjunction, essentially as a way to interpret a coordination-like but deviant expression in which the two apparently conjoined parts are mismatched. The characteristic features of PseCo, distinguishing it from standard coordination, can be systematically derived from this analysis, and a compositional semantic account is presented that also supports the derivation of the pragmatic function of surprise for PseCo with **GO** (see also Cruschina, this volume).

Ross closes the volume with a broad typological perspective. Drawing on work on the distribution and typology of PseCo (Ross 2016a; [forthcoming](#)), as well as research on Serial Verb Constructions (SVCs), this chapter considers PseCo in the context of multi-verb constructions cross-linguistically. The characteristic features of PseCo – the linker ‘and’ and multiple agreement, as well as their typical

interpretation as monoclausal expressions of a single event – overlap and vary with features of other multi-verb constructions. A more general category is needed to encompass these types, which are not all included in the traditional definition of SVCs, and this category is introduced as Multi-Verb Predicates (MVPs). In this way, the notion of MVPs can capture the properties that have compelled some researchers to use the term “SVCs” loosely (for example, to explain properties of PseCo), while opening doors between research traditions.

It is encouraging and exciting to be part of such a diverse group of linguists asking the relevant and timely questions brought up in this volume. In addition to the value of these chapters as individual research contributions, we hope that this volume as a whole will continue to promote interest in PseCo, MACs and related topics. In the future, we look forward to seeing connections to more languages, and continued and detailed descriptive and theoretical analyses.

References

- Aasen, Ivar. 1848. *Det norske Folkesprogs Grammatik*. Kristiania: Trykt hos Werner & Comp.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2006. Serial Verb Constructions in Typological Perspective. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds), *Serial Verb Constructions: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 1–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Airola, Anu. 2007. Coordinated Verb Pairs in Texts. University of Helsinki Ph.D. dissertation. <http://hdl.handle.net/10138/19253>
- Andersson, Peter & Blensenius, Kristian. 2018. En historisk studie av pseudosamordning: konstruktionen gå och v i svenskan. In Harry Lönnroth, Bodil Haagenen, Maria Kvist & Kim Sandvad West (eds), *Studier i svensk språkhistoria 14* (Vaasan Yliopiston Tutkimuksia 305), 80–101. Vaasan yliopisto. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-476-800-9>
- Andrason, Alexander. 2018. The WZIAĆ gram in Polish: A serial verb construction, or not? *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 71, 577–629. <https://doi.org/10.1515/stuf-2018-0022>
- Andriani, Luigi. 2017. The Syntax of the Dialect of Bari. University of Cambridge Ph.D. dissertation. <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.15625>
- Anward, Jan. 1988. Verb-Verb agreement in Swedish. *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics* (Special Issue on Comparative Germanic Syntax). 1–34.
- Arnaiz, Alfredo & Camacho, José. 1999. A Topic Auxiliary in Spanish. In Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach & Fernando Martínez Gil (eds), *Advances in Hispanic Linguistics: Papers from the 2nd Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, vol. 2, 317–331. Boston: Cascadilla Press.
- Ascoli, Graziadio I. 1898. Un problema di sintassi comparata dialettale. *Archivio glottologico italiano*, 14: 453–468.
- Bachmann, Ingo. 2013. Has go-V ousted go-and-V? A study of the diachronic development of both constructions in American English. In Hilde Hasselgård, Jarle Ebeling & Signe Oksefjell Ebeling (eds), *Corpus perspectives on patterns of lexis*, 91–111. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.57.09bac>
- Badawi, El-Said, Carter, Michael G. & Gully, Adrian. 2004. *Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.

- Benmamoun, Elabbas, Bhatia, Archana & Polinsky, Maria. 2009. Closest conjunct agreement in head final languages. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 9. 67–88. <https://doi.org/10.1075/livy.9.02ben>
- Bertinetto, Pier Marco & Ciucci, Luca. 2012. Parataxis, Hypotaxis and Para-Hypotaxis in the Zamucoan Languages. *Linguistic Discovery* 10(1). 89–111. <https://doi.org/10.1349/PS1.1537-0852.A.404>
- Biberauer, Theresa & Vikner, Sten. 2017. Having the edge: a new perspective on pseudocoordination in Danish and Afrikaans. In Nicholas LaCara, Keir Moulton & Anne-Michelle Tessier (eds). *A Schrift to Fest Kyle Johnson*. Linguistics Open Access Publications 1. 77–90. http://scholarworks.umass.edu/linguist_oapubs/1
- Bjerre, Anne & Bjerre, Tavs. 2007. Pseudocoordination in Danish. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the HPSG07*. 6–24. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Blensenius, Kristian. 2015. Progressive constructions in Swedish. Göteborgs Universitet Ph.D. dissertation. <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/40179>
- Bolton, Rosemary A. 1990. A Preliminary Description of Nuauulu Phonology and Grammar. University of Texas at Arlington M.A. thesis.
- Boneh, Nora. 2020. Pseudo-grammaticalization: The anatomy of “come” in Modern Hebrew pseudo-coordination constructions. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America* 5(2): 16. <https://doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v5i2.4791>
- Bravo, Ana. 2020. On Pseudocoordination in Spanish. *Borealis – An international Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 9(1): 125–180. <https://doi.org/10.7557/1.9.1.5365>
- Brown, Jessica M. M. 2017. Heads and adjuncts: An experimental study of subextraction from participials and coordination in English, German and Norwegian. University of Cambridge Ph.D. dissertation. <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.14324>
- Camilleri, Maris. 2016. Temporal and Aspectual auxiliaries in Maltese. University of Essex Ph.D. dissertation. <http://repository.essex.ac.uk/17171/>
- Carden, Guy & Pesetsky, David. 1977. Double-Verb Constructions, Markedness, and a Fake Coordination. Papers from the Thirteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. 82–92.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti. 1998. Motion Verbs as Functional Heads. *GenGenP (Geneva Generative Papers)* 6(1). 50–60.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giusti, Giuliana. 2001. “Semi-lexical” Motion Verbs in Romance and Germanic. In *Semi-lexical categories*, Norbert Corver & Henk Van Riemsdijk (eds), 371–414. Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110874006.371>
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giusti, Giuliana. 2003. Motion Verbs as Functional Heads. In *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, Christina Tortora (ed.), 31–49. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giusti, Giuliana. 2019. Multiple Agreement in Southern Italian Dialects. In *Linguistic Variations: Structure and Interpretation – Studies in Honor of M. Rita Manzini*, SGG, Ludovico Franco & Paolo Lorusso (eds), 125–148. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giusti, Giuliana. 2020. Multiple agreement in southern Italian dialects. In *Linguistic variation: structure and interpretation* [Studies in Generative Grammar 132] Ludovico Franco & Paolo Lorusso (eds), 125–148. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Carstens, Vicki. 1991. The Morphology and Syntax of Determiner Phrases in Kiswahili. Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA.
- Carstens, Vicki. 2001. Multiple Agreement and Case Deletion: Against ϕ -incompleteness. *Syntax* 4(3). 147–163. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9612.00042>

- Carstens, Vicki. 2003. Rethinking Complementizer Agreement: Agree with a Case-Checked Goal. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34(3). 393–412. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002438903322247533>
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2003. The Interaction of Passive, Causative and “Restructuring” in Romance. In *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, Christina Tortora (ed.), 50–66. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Colaço, Madalena & Gonçalves, Anabela. 2016. <V-and-V> constructions in Portuguese: The case of <ir-and-V>. In Mary Aizawa Kato & Francisco Ordoñez (eds), *The morphosyntax of Portuguese and Spanish in Latin America*, 135–156. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190465889.003.0006>
- Corbett, Greville G. 2016. Morphomic splits. In Ana Luís & Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero (eds), *The Morpheme Debate*, 64–88. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198702108.003.0004>
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1966. “Tomo y me voy”: ein Problem vergleichender europäischer Syntax. *Vox Romanica*, 25, 13–55.
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1977. « Tomo y me voy »: Un problema de sintaxis comparada europea. In *Estudios de lingüística románica*, 79–151. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
- Covarrubias, Magdalena, Guerrero, Silvana, González, Carlos, Jaque, Matías, Orqueda, Verónica & Hasler, Felipe. 2020. *Aquí llegas, pero allá coges*: distribución dialectal de los auxiliares de las construcciones multiverbales de verbos finitos coordinados en español. *Itinerarios* 31. 229–250. <https://doi.org/10.7311/ITINERARIOS.31.2020.12>
- Croitor, Blanca. 2017. Un tip special de coordonare. In *Sintaxa ca mod de a fi: omagiu Gabrielei Pană Dindelegan, la aniversare* [Colecția Personalități Ale Universității Din București], Adina Dragomirescu, Alexandru Nicolae, Camelia Stan & Rodica Zafu (eds), 149–57. București: Editura Universității din București.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2013. Beyond the Stem and Inflectional Morphology: an Irregular Pattern at the Level of Periphrasis. In *The Boundaries of Pure Morphology*, Silvio Cruschina, Martin Maiden & John Charles Smith (eds), 262–283. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199678860.003.0014>
- Cruschina, Silvio & Calabrese, Andrea. 2021. Fifty shades of morphosyntactic microvariation: Motion verb constructions in southern Italian dialects. In Marc-Olivier Hinzelin, Natascha Pomino & Eva-Maria Remberger (eds), *Formal Approaches to Romance Morphosyntax*, 145–198. Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110719154-006>
- Csató, Éva Ágnes. 2001. Turkic double verbs in a typological perspective. In Karen H. Ebert & Fernando Zúñiga (eds), *Aktionsart and aspectotemporality in non-European languages: proceedings from a workshop held at the University of Zürich, June 23–25, 2000*, 175–187. Zürich: Universität Zürich, Seminar für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.
- Culicover, Peter W. & Jackendoff, Ray. 1997. Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28(2). 195–217.
- De Angelis, Alessandro. 2016. Origini formali e funzionali della particella (m)i, (m)u, ma nell’area messinese e calabrese centro-meridionale. In Patrizia Del Puente (ed.), *Dialetti: per parlare e parlarne. Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Dialettologia. Progetto A.L.Ba.* (Potenza, Castelmezzano, Lagopesole, 6–8 novembre 2014). 75–95. Venosa: Osanna Edizioni.
- De Angelis, Alessandro. 2017. “Between Greek and Romance: Competing complementation systems in Southern Italy”. In Piera Molinelli (ed.) *Language and Identity in Multilingual Mediterranean settings. Challenges for Historical Sociolinguistics*. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter. 135–156.

- De Angelis, Alessandro & Krstić, Milena. 2014. "Perdita dell'infinito e obviation effect in alcune varietà slave e italo-romanze: per un'analisi contrastiva". In Ivica Pesa Matracki, Maslina Ljubicic, Nada Zupanovic Filipin, Vinko Kovacic (eds) *Atti del Convegno internazionale in onore del Prof. Zarko Muljagic (1922–2009)*. Zagreb: FF-press. 249–260.
- de Vos, Mark. 2005. The syntax of verbal pseudocoordination in English and Afrikaans. LOT Dissertation Series 114. Utrecht: LOT.
- Déchaine, Rose-Marie. 1993. Serial Verb Constructions. In Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann (eds), *Syntax: ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung* [An International Handbook of Contemporary Research], vol. 1, 799–825. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110095869.1.12.799>
- Del Prete, Fabio & Todaro, Giuseppina. 2020. Building complex events: The case of Sicilian Doubly Inflected Construction. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 38(1). 1–41. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-018-09439-2>
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2015. Syntactic constructions with motion verbs in some Sicilian dialects: a comparative analysis. Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia M.A. thesis. <http://hdl.handle.net/10579/6229>
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2017. Multiple Agreement Constructions: A Macro-Comparative Analysis of Pseudo-Coordination with the Motion Verb *Go* in the Arabic and Sicilian Dialects. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 19(2).
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2019a. Multiple Agreement Constructions in Southern Italo-Romance. The Syntax of Sicilian Pseudo-Coordination. PhD dissertation, Ca' Foscari University of Venice.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2019b. The Inflected Construction in the dialects of Sicily: parameters of micro-variation. In *Italian Dialectology at the Interface*, Silvio Cruschina, Adam Ledgeway & Eva-Maria Remberger (eds), 63–78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.251.03dic>
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò. 2019c. Perifrasi verbali deontiche e paradigmi difettivi nel dialetto di Delia, in *Bollettino del Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani*, 30: 217–244.
- Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò & Giusti, Giuliana. 2015. A Protocol for the Inflected Construction in Sicilian Dialects. *Annali di Ca' Foscari. Serie occidentale* 49. 393–421. <https://doi.org/10.14277/2385-3034/AnnOc-49-15-20>
- Drew, Paul, Hakulinen, Auli, Heinemann, Trine, Niemi, Jarkko & Rossi, Giovanni. 2021. Hendiads in naturally occurring interactions: A cross-linguistic study of double verb constructions. *Journal of Pragmatics* (article in press). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.02.008>
- Eaton, Helen. 2018. *Coordination and Subordination in Sandawe Clauses* (SIL Electronic Working Papers 2018–001). SIL International. <https://www.sil.org/resources/publications/entry/76092>
- Ebert, Karen H. 2000. Progressive Markers in Germanic Languages. In Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, 605–653. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Edzard, Lutz. 2014. Complex Predicates and Circumstantial Clause Combining (CCC): Serial Verbs and Converbs in a Comparative Semitic Perspective. In Maria Persson & Bo Isaksson (eds), *Strategies of Clause Linking in Semitic Languages: Proceedings of the International Symposium on Clause Linking in Semitic Languages, Kivik, Sweden, 5–7 August 2012*, 207–230. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Ekberg, Lena. 1993. The cognitive basis of the meaning and function of cross-linguistic take and V. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 8, 21–42. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.8.03ekb>
- Endresen, Rolf Theil. 1995. Norwegian og and å – a Cognitive View. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 18(2), 201–218. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586500000160>

- Fulci, Innocenzio. 1855. *Lezioni filologiche sulla lingua siciliana*, Catania, Tip. del Reale Ospizio di Beneficenza.
- Gamliel, Ophira & Mar'i, Abd al-Rahman. 2015. Bleached Verbs as Aspectual Auxiliaries in Colloquial Modern Hebrew and Arabic Dialects. *Journal of Jewish Languages* 3(1–2). 51–65. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22134638-12340039>
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. 1844. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament Including the Biblical Chaldee*. (Ed.) E. Robinson. Washington, D.C.: Crocker and Brewster.
- Gleitman, Lila R. 1965. Coordinating Conjunctions in English. *Language* 41(2). 260–293. <https://doi.org/10.2307/411878>
- Guțu-Romalo, Valeria. 1961. Semiauxiliare de aspect? *Limba Română* 10. 3–15.
- Haiman, John. 1983. Paratactic if-clauses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 7(3). 263–281. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(83\)90014-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(83)90014-0)
- Hakulinen, Auli, Vilkkuna, Maria, Korhonen, Riitta, Koivisto, Vesa, Heinonen, Tarja-Riitta & Alho, Irja. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. <http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk/etusivu.php>
- Haslinger, Irene & van Koppen, Marjo. 2002–2003. De verbale hendiadys als pseudocoördinatie. *Taal en Tongval* 15–16. 102–122.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511613463>
- Hesse, Andrea. 2009. *Zur Grammatikalisierung der Pseudokoordination im Norwegischen und in den anderen skandinavischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Francke.
- Heycock, Caroline & Petersen, Hjalmar. 2012. Pseudo-coordinations in Faroese. in Kurt Braunmüller & Christoph Gabriel (eds), *Multilingual individuals and multilingual societies. Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism*, vol. 13. 259–280. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hsm.13.18hey>
- Hilpert, Martin & Koops, Christian. 2008. A quantitative approach to the development of complex predicates. *Diachronica* 25(2). 242–261. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dia.25.2.06hil>
- Hiraiwa, Ken. 2001. Multiple Agree and the Defective Intervention Constraint in Japanese. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 40. 67–80.
- Hoekstra, Eric. 2017. On the Origin and Development of an Embedded V-Initial Construction in Frisian. *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 77(1–2). 171–190. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18756719-12340071>
- Hooper, Robin. 1997. Semantic differentiation between three Tokelauan complementizers. *Oceanic Linguistics* 36(2). 208–226. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3622985>
- Hopper, Paul. 2002. Hendiadys and auxiliation in English. In Joan L. Bybee & Michael Noonan (eds), *Complex Sentences in Grammar and Discourse: Essays in honor of Sandra A. Thompson*, 145–173. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.110.09hop>
- Huehnergard, John. 1997. *A grammar of Akkadian*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Jaeggli, Osvaldo & Hyams, Nina. 1993. On the Independence and Interdependence of Syntactic and Morphological Properties: English Aspectual Come and Go. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 11. 313–346. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992916>
- Jespersen, Otto. 1895. En sproglig værdiforskydning: *og = at*. *Dania: Tidsskrift for Folkemål og Folkeminder* 3. 145–183.
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi. 1998. *Coordination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi & Edzard, Lutz. 2015. Coordinated clause structures in Scandinavian and Semitic involving a finite verb form and an infinitive. In Lutz Edzard (ed.), *Arabic and Semitic Linguistics Contextualized: A Festschrift for Jan Retsö*, 486–505. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc2rmgq.30>

- Jóhannsdóttir, Kristín M. 2011. Aspects of the Progressive in English and Icelandic. PhD dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- Johnsen, Lars G. 1988. A note on subcoordination. *Trondheim Working Papers in Linguistics* 6. 195–201.
- Jørgensen, Annette Myre. 2003. La pseudocoordination verbale en norvégien et en espagnol. *Revue Romane* 38(1). 53–66.
- Josefsson, Günlog. 1991. Pseudocoordination – A VP + VP coordination. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 47. 130–156.
- Josefsson, Günlog. 2014. Pseudo-coordination in Swedish with *gå* 'go' and the 'surprise effect'. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 93. 26–50.
- Kanchev, Ivan. 2010. Семантика, типология и произход на конструкцията *вземам/взема че* (*та, и*) + глагол от свършен вид [On the semantics, typology and origin of the construction *вземам/взема че* (*та, и*) + perfective aspect verb]. *Съпоставително езиковедие* [Contrastive Linguistics] 35(3). 40–44. <http://www.slav.uni-sofia.bg/index.php/nova-knizhka/611-3-2010>
- Kinn, Torodd, Blensenius, Kristian & Andersson, Peter. 2018. Posture, location, and activity in Mainland Scandinavian pseudocoordinations. *CogniTextes: Revue de l'Association française de linguistique cognitive* 18. <https://doi.org/10.4000/cognitextes.1158>
- Kiparsky, Valentin. 1971. « Взял и ... л ». In Viktora Ivanoviča Borkovskogo (ed.), *Problemy istorii i dialektologii slavjanskich jazykov*, 134–139. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka."
- Kjeldahl, Anne. 2010. The syntax of quirky verbal morphology. Ph.D. dissertation. Aarhus: University of Aarhus.
- Kor Chahine, Irina. 2007. О Возможном Пути Грамматикализации Русского Взять. *Russian Linguistics* 31(3). 231–248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11185-007-9016-x>
- Kuteva, Tania A. 1999. On sit/stand/lie auxiliiation. *Linguistics* 37(2). 191–213. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.37.2.191>
- Kuteva, Tania, Heine, Bernd, Hong, Bo, Long, Haiping, Narrog, Heiko & Rhee, Seongha. 2019. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316479704>
- Kuznetsova, Julia. 2006. *The first verb of pseudocoordination as an auxiliary*. Presented at Slavic Linguistic Society 1, Indiana University Bloomington, 2006.
- Kvist Darnell, Ulrika. 2008. Pseudosamordningar i Svenska: särskilt sådana med verben sitta, ligga och stå. Institutionen för lingvistik, Stockholms universitet Ph.D. dissertation. <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:su:diva-7490>
- Lakoff, George. 1986. Frame Semantic Control of the Coordinate Structure Constraint. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 22(2). 152–168.
- Larsson, Lars-Gunnar. 1992. "Ta och prata om ringfingret". Om begränsningar i den jämförande språkforskningens möjligheter. *Årsbok (Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundets i Uppsala)* 1991–1992. 87–97.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 1997. Asyndetic complementation in Neapolitan dialect. *The Italianist* 17(1). 231–273. <https://doi.org/10.1179/ita.1997.17.1.231>
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2016a. Clausal complementation. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 1013–1028. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0063>
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2016b. From Coordination to Subordination: The Grammaticalisation of Progressive and Andative Aspect in the dialects of Salento. In Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira & Clara Pinto (eds), *Coordination and Subordination: Form and Meaning – Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*, 157–184. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

- Ledgeway, Adam. 2021. Coming and going in Calabrian. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 66(1): 3–35.
- Ledgeway, Adam, Schifano, Norma & Silvestri, Giuseppina. 2018. The Expression Of Progressive Aspect In Grico: Mapping Morphosyntactic Isoglosses In An Endangered Italo-Greek Variety. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 116(2). 179–217. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-968X.12118>
- Leone, Alfonso. 1995. *Profilo di sintassi siciliana*. Palermo: Centro studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 1983. *A Grammar of Manam*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Lillas, Rosmari. 2012. Hendiadys in the Hebrew Bible. An Investigation of the Applications of the Term. University of Gothenburg Ph.D. dissertation. <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/29024>
- Lillas-Schuil, Rosmari. 2006. A survey of syntagms in the Hebrew Bible classified as hendiadys. In Lutz Edzard & Jan Retsö (eds), *Current issues in the analysis of Semitic grammar and lexicon II: Oslo-Göteborg Cooperation 4th-5th November 2005*, 79–100. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Lødrup, Helge. 2002. The Syntactic Structures of Norwegian Pseudocoordinations. *Studia Linguistica* 56 (2). 121–43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9582.00090>
- Lødrup, Helge. 2019. Pseudocoordination with posture verbs in Mainland Scandinavian: A grammaticalized progressive construction? *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 42(1). 87–110. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586519000027>
- Lovestrand, Joseph & Ross, Daniel. 2021. Serial verb constructions and motion semantics. In Antoine Guillaume & Harold Koch (eds), *Associated Motion*, 87–128. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110692099-003>
- Manzini, M. Rita, Lorusso, Paolo & Savoia, Leonardo M. 2017. *a*/bare finite complements in Southern Italian varieties: mono-clausal or bi-clausal syntax? *Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali* 3. 11–59. <https://doi.org/10.13128/QULSO-2421-7220-21337>
- Manzini, Rita & Savoia, Leonardo. 2005. I dialetti Italiani e Romanci. Morfosintassi Generativa, vol. I: Introduzione – Il soggetto – La struttura del complementatore, frasi interrogative, relative e aspetti della subordinazione. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- Manzini, M. Rita & Savoia, Leonardo M. 2007. *A Unification of Morphology and Syntax: Investigations into Romance and Albanian dialects*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203968154>
- Masini, Francesca, Mattioli, Simone & Vecchi, Greta. 2019. La costruzione “*prendere e V*” nell’italiano contemporaneo. In Bruno Moretti, Aline Kunz, Silvia Natale & Etna Krakenberg (eds), *In Le tendenze dell’italiano contemporaneo rivisitate: Atti del LII Congresso Internazionale di Studi della Società di Linguistica Italiana (Berna, 6–8 settembre 2018)*, 115–137. Milano: Società di Linguistica Italiana.
- Merlan, Aurélia. 1999. Sobre as chamadas “perífrases verbais paratáticas” do tipo « PEGAR E+ V2 » nas línguas românicas (com referência especial ao português e romeno). *Línguas e Literaturas, Revista da Faculdade de Letras, Universidade do Porto* 16. 159–205.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1899 [1890–1902]. *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen* vol. 3, *Romanische Syntax*. Leipzig: O. R. Reisland.
- Mitrović, Moreno. 2014. Morphosyntactic atoms of propositional logic: a philological programme. PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Mitrović, Moreno. 2021. *Superparticles: A Microsemantic Theory, Typology, and History of Logical Atoms* (Studies in Natural Language & Linguistic Theory). Dordrecht: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-2050-0>

- Nau, Nicole, Kozhanov, Kirill, Lindström, Liina, Laugalienė, Asta & Brudzyński, Paweł. 2019. Pseudocoordination with “take” in Baltic and its neighbours. *Baltic Linguistics* 10. 237–306. <https://doi.org/10.32798/bl.365>
- Newman, John (ed.). 2002. *The linguistics of sitting, standing, and lying*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.51>
- Nicolle, Steve. 2009. *Go-and-V, come-and-V, go-V and come-V: A corpus-based account of deictic movement verb constructions*. *English Text Construction* 2(2). 185–208. <https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.2.2.o3nic>
- Nielsen, Peter Juul. 2011. *Kongruenskonstruktion i dansk: en syntaktisk analyse af indhold og udtryk*. Oslo: Novus.
- Nordström, Jackie. 2010. *Modality and Subordinators*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.116>
- Orqueda, Verónica, González, Carlos, Guerrero, Silvana, Hasler, Felipe, Jaque, Matías, Garrido, Claudio & Covarrubias, Magdalena. 2020. *Llegar no es igual a coger*. Dos momentos en la gramaticalización de las construcciones multiverbales en español. In Mar Garachana (ed.), *La evolución de las perífrasis verbales en español. Una aproximación desde la gramática de construcciones diacrónica y la gramaticalización*, 287–313. Berlin: Peter Lang. <https://doi.org/10.3726/b17520>
- Poutsma, Hendrik. 1917. Hendiadys in English: Together with some observations on the construction of certain verbs I & II. *Neophilologus* 2(1). 202–218, 284–292. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01509135> & <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01509152>
- Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Leech, Geoffrey & Svartvik, Jan. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Roberge, Paul. 1994. On the origins of the Afrikaans verbal hendiadys. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics* 28. 45–81. <https://doi.org/10.5774/28-o-67>
- Rodrigues, Angélica. 2006. “Eu fui e fiz esta tese”: as construções do tipo foi fez no português do Brasil. São Paulo: Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem, Universidade Estadual de Campinas Ph.D. dissertation. <http://repositorio.unicamp.br/jspui/handle/REPOSIP/271023>
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1969. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. Vol. 3, Sintassi e formazione delle parole. Torino: Einaudi.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1977. *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci: (Calabria, Salento)*. (Trans.) Salvatore Sicuro. Rev. and extended ed. München: Beck.
- Ross, Daniel. 2013. Dialectal variation and diachronic development of *try*-complementation. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences: Illinois Working papers* 38. 108–147. <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/46461>
- Ross, Daniel. 2014a. El origen de los estudios sobre la pseudocoordinación verbal [The origin of research on verbal pseudocoordination]. *Diálogo de la Lengua* 6. 116–132. <http://www.dialogodelalengua.com/articulo/numero6.html>
- Ross, Daniel. 2014b. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199685301.003.0010>
- Ross, Daniel. 2015. What can Faroese pseudocoordination tell us about English inflection? *LSO Working Papers in Linguistics* (University of Wisconsin-Madison) 10: 74–91. <https://langsci.wisc.edu/working-papers-in-linguistics/>

- 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.
- 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: Polish Cognitive Linguistics Association & University of Wrocław. <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/108897>
- Ross, Daniel. 2017. Pseudocoordinación del tipo tomar y en Eurasia: 50 años después [Pseudocoordination with take and in Eurasia: 50 years later]. Presented August 3, 2017, at *Lingüística Coseriana VI*, Lima, Peru. <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/110127>
- Ross, Daniel. 2018. Small corpora and low-frequency phenomena: *try and* beyond contemporary, standard English. *Corpus* 18. <https://doi.org/10.4000/corpus.3574>
- Ross, Daniel. *Forthcoming*. Pseudocoordination, serial verb constructions and multi-verb predicates: The relationship between form and structure. PhD dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Schmerling, Susan F. 1975. Asymmetric coordination and rules of conversation. In Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (eds), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, 211–231. New York: Academic Press.
- Shopen, Timothy. 1971. “Caught in the Act”. *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. 254–263.
- Škodová, Svatava. 2009. Pseudokoordinace v syntaxi současné češtiny [Pseudo-coordination in the syntax of contemporary Czech]. Univerzita Karlova v Praze Ph.D. dissertation. <https://is.cuni.cz/webapps/zzp/detail/75132/>
- Sornicola, Rosanna. 1976. *Vado a dire, vaiu a ddicu*: problema sintattico o problema semantico? *Lingua Nostra* 37(3–4). 65–74.
- Soto Gómez, Juan Francisco. 2021. Pseudo-Coordination in Spanish: A two constructions analysis. Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia M.A. thesis. <http://hdl.handle.net/10579/18854>
- Squillaci, Maria Olimpia. 2016. *When Greek meets Romance: A morphosyntactic analysis of language contact in Aspromonte*. University of Cambridge Ph.D. dissertation.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol. 1999. The go-and-Verb construction in a cross-linguistic perspective: image-schema blending and the construal of events. In *Proceedings of the Second Annual High Desert Linguistics Society Conference, 1999*, Dawn Nordquist & Catie Berkenfield (eds), 123–34. Albuquerque, University of New Mexico: High Desert Linguistics Society.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol. 2000. The English GO-(PRT)-AND-VERB Construction. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 26(1). 259–270. <https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v26i1.1158>
- Stoynova, N. M. 2007. Конструкция типа *взять и сделать* в русском языке. In Ф. И. Дудчук, Н. В. Ивлиева & А. В. Подобриваев (eds), *Структуры и интерпретации: работы молодых исследователей по теоретической и прикладной лингвистике*, 144–171. Moscow: Издательство Московского университета.
- Svorou, Soteria. 2018a. Constructional pressures on ‘sit’ in Modern Greek. In K. Aaron Smith & Dawn Nordquist (eds), *Functionalist and Usage-based Approaches to the Study of Language: In honor of Joan L. Bybee*, 17–58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.192.02svo>

- Svorou, Soteria. 2018b. Motion Verb Integration and Core Cosubordination in Modern Greek. In Rolf Kailuweit, Lisann Künkel & Eva Staudinger (eds), *Applying and Expanding Role and Reference Grammar*, 281–304. Freiburg: Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität. <https://doi.org/10.6094/978-3-928969-60-4>
- Taube, Moshe. Forthcoming. Verbal hendiadys in Yiddish (2014 draft). In Neil G. Jacobs, Howard I. Aronson & T. Shannon (eds), *Yiddish and Typology*. <http://www.academia.edu/9056438/>
- Teleman, Ulf. 1974. *Manual för grammatisk beskrivning av talad och skriven svenska*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Todaro, Giuseppina & Del Prete, Fabio. 2019. The morphosyntax-semantics interface and the Sicilian Doubly Inflected Construction. In *Italian Dialectology at the Interface*, Silvio Cruschina, Adam Ledgeway & Eva-Maria Remberger (eds). 131–154. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.251.07tod>
- Tsai, Wei-Tien Dylan. 2007. Conjunctive Reduction and its Origin: A Comparative Study of Tsou, Amis, and Sqliq Atayal. *Oceanic Linguistics* 46(2). 585–602. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2008.0009>
- Tsai, Wei-Tien Dylan & Wu, Chun-Ming. 2012. Conjunctive Reduction Revisited: Evidence from Mayrinax Atayal and Southern Paiwan. *Oceanic Linguistics* 51(1). 160–181. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2012.0005>
- Vannebo, Kjell Ivar. 2003. *Ta og ro deg ned noen hakk*: on pseudocoordination with the verb *ta* 'take' in a grammaticalization perspective. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26(2). 165–193. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586503001070>
- Wagner, Max Leopold. 1955. Expletive Verbalformen in den Sprachen des Mittelmeeres. *Romanische Forschungen* 67(1/2). 1–8.
- Weiss, Daniel. 2007. The Grammar of Surprise: The Russian Construction of the Type *Koška vzjala da umerla* 'Suddenly, the cat died'. In Kim Gerdes, Tilmann Reuther & Leo Wanner (eds.), *MTT 2007: Meaning-Text Theory 2007: proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Meaning-Text Theory, Klagenfurt, May 20–24, 2007*, 427–436. München: Otto Sagner. <http://meaningtext.net/mtt2007/proceedings/>
- Weiss, Daniel. 2012. Verb serialization in northeast Europe: The case of Russian and its Finno-Ugric neighbours. In Björn Wiemer, Bernhard Wälchli & Björn Hansen (eds), *Grammatical replication and borrowability in language contact*, 611–646. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110271973.611>
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 1996. Pseudocoordination is subordination. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 58. 29–53.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2007. *The Syntax of Tenselessness. Tense/Mood/Aspect-agreeing Infinitivals*. Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197839>
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2009. The syntax of surprise: Unexpected event readings in complex predication. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 84. 181–224.
- Wulff, Stefanie. 2006. *Go-V* and *go-and-V* in English: A case of constructional synonymy? In Stefan Th. Gries & Anatol Stefanowitsch (eds), *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics: Corpus-Based Approaches to Syntax and Lexis*, 101–125. Berlin: de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197709.101>
- Yuasa, Etsuyo & Sadock, Jerrold M. 2002. Pseudo-subordination: a mismatch between syntax and semantics. *Journal of Linguistics* 38(1). 87–111. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226701001256>
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 2003. Go look at the modern language to test hypotheses about the past [Abstract]. <http://web.stanford.edu/~zwicky/lsaabst.qsv.pdf>