Pseudocoordination with posture verbs in Mainland Scandinavian - a grammaticalized progressive construction?

Helge Lødrup

Pseudocoordination with posture verbs in Mainland Scandinavian (e.g. the Norwegian *Han sitter og arbeider* 'he sits and works') is traditionally considered a grammaticalized progressive construction. The posture verb is said to have a bleached meaning, and to have the grammatical status of an auxiliary or a light verb. In recent years, some researchers have expressed doubt about this view. In this article, I argue that the traditional arguments for grammaticalization do not hold. However, I also give new evidence for beginning grammaticalization. Posture verbs can to some extent be used as light verbs in sentences such as *Kebab må sittes og nytes* 'kebab must sit.PASS and enjoy.PASS', which have never been discussed in connection with grammaticalization. Finally, I argue that pseudocoordination with posture verbs should not be seen as progressive, but rather as a locational (or situative) construction.

Keywords grammaticalization, Norwegian syntax, posture verbs, pseudocoordination, light verbs, Scandinavian syntax

Helge Lødrup, University of Oslo, Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, Pb 1102, Blindern, N-0317 Oslo, Norway. helge.lodrup@iln.uio.no

1. INTRODUCTION

Grammaticalization has been an important research topic for some time now.

Grammaticalization theory has made it possible for researchers to shed new light upon a variety of phenomena from many languages, as can be seen from the work reported in reference works such as Narrog & Heine (2011). However, no analysis is immune to criticism, and each case of grammaticalization must be established on its own.

Grammaticalization proceeds in small steps, and it is not always clear if, or to what extent, an element or a construction should be considered grammaticalized.

A popular topic in the grammaticalization literature has been so-called pseudocoordination with posture verbs in Mainland Scandinavian. An example is (1) (constructed, like all examples without a source).

(1) Da satt han og arbeidet.

then sat he and worked

'Then he sat there working.'

The standard view in the literature is that this is a grammaticalized progressive construction, in which the posture verb is decategorialized and has a bleached meaning. In this article, I will follow up some critical voices from recent years, and argue that the traditional arguments for grammaticalization are not substantiated. However, I will also discuss new evidence for beginning grammaticalization.

It is first necessary to say something more general about pseudocoordination in Mainland Scandinavian. In Scandinavian grammar, the term pseudocoordination is used of

sentences such as the Norwegian (1)-(5). A pseudocoordination contains two verbs with the same inflectional form and the conjunction *og* 'and' between them. It might look like a coordination of two verb phrases, but its grammatical properties are different from those of regular coordination (see Section 2). The first verb can be a posture verb, as in (1), but some verbs of other types are also possible, as shown in (2)-(5).

(2) Da gikk han og grublet.

then walked he and pondered

'Then he was pondering.'

(3) Da drev han og arbeidet.

then carried.on he and worked

'Then he was working.'

(4) Da ringte han og klaget.

then called he and complained

'Then he called and complained.'

(5) Da tok hun og kysset ham.

then took she and kissed him

'Then she (suddenly) kissed him.'

The set of first verbs that allow pseudocoordination in Scandinavian is rather heterogeneous. Pseudocoordination with different first verbs shows different grammatical behavior (Lødrup 2002, 2017). Pseudocoordination has been reported in several languages (Ross 2016), but there is no assumption here that pseudocoordination must have the same grammatical analysis across or within languages.

I take the traditional position that pseudocoordination is not coordination. This is the analysis of the great Danish grammarians Jespersen (1895) and Diderichsen (1957:156). The second verb phrase is 'an infinitive in disguise' (Jespersen 1895:170, original wording 'en forklædt infinitiv'), which is the complement of the first verb (Lødrup 2002, 2014a). Pseudocoordination is most often a control construction in which the subject of the first verb controls the PRO subject of the second verb.¹

In the languages of the world, there are several well established cases of posture verbs grammaticalizing into a progressive marker (see e.g. Newman 2002, Heine & Kuteva 2002). Arabic is often mentioned. An example from Kuwaiti is (6), from Camilleri & Sadler (2017:171). Notice how the meaning of the sentence makes it impossible to interpret the posture verb literally.

(6) gāʕd-a t-nit
sit.ACT.PTCP-SGF 3SGF-jump.IMPFV
 'She is jumping.'

The article is based mainly on Norwegian data. However, Danish and Swedish are only minimally different from Norwegian in relevant respects, and I will also draw on these languages. I will not go into Icelandic and Faroese pseudocoordination, which is discussed in Jóhannsdóttir (2007) and Heycock & Petersen (2012). The term Scandinavian in this article is therefore to be understood as Mainland Scandinavian.

For Mainland Scandinavian, it is a common view that pseudocoordination with posture verbs is a grammaticalized progressive construction. This is the view of Heine (1993:37-39); Ebert (2000), Kuteva (2001), Hopper & Traugott (2003:206-207); Hilpert & Koops (2008), Hesse (2009), Hilpert (2011), Höder (2011:75), Hansen & Heltoft (2011:988); Biberauer &

Vikner (2017). It should be noted, however, that the claims about grammaticalization vary in strength. In some cases, an author just states his or her view in passing (e.g. Höder 2011:75), while in other cases, there is a thorough treatment (e.g. Hesse 2009). Furthermore, some of the authors mentioned primarily give a summary of the work of others, implicitly accepting it, but without having researched the topic themselves.

There is also a question of the degree of grammaticalization. Grammaticalization is a gradual process, and some authors make it clear that they assume grammaticalization to some extent only. For example, Kuteva (2001:46) says that 'we cannot speak of a very high degree of grammaticalization of this structure'. Tonne (1999: 157) says that it is 'grammaticalized to some extent', but she also uses the term 'pre-grammaticalization' (Tonne 1999, 2001). Biberauer & Vikner (2017:80) state that the first verb (in Danish and Afrikaans) is a 'minimally grammaticalized element'. Others are even more critical toward the idea of grammaticalization, raising doubt if there is grammaticalization at all (Behrens et al 2013, Ross & Lødrup 2017).

The question if something is grammaticalized must be an empirical question. Research must take grammaticalization theory as the point of departure, see what predictions it makes for the phenomenon in question, and investigate if they are true - or rather to what extent they are true, because grammaticalization is a gradual phenomenon. Two important predictions of grammaticalization theory concern bleaching of meaning and decategorialization. Grammaticalization affects the meaning of the unit in question; this is usually called bleaching of meaning, or desemanticization (e.g. Heine 1993:54). If pseudocoordination with posture verbs is a grammaticalized construction, it is expected that the original meaning of the posture verb is bleached. Another ingredient in grammaticalization is decategorialization (e.g. Heine 1993:55, Hopper & Traugott 2003:106-115). If the construction is grammaticalized, it is expected that the grammatical status of the posture verb is affected. It

could change from a lexical verb to an auxiliary, or to a light verb, or to something in between (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001).

In the literature on pseudocoordination, both bleaching of meaning and decategorialization are traditional assumptions. I will argue that bleaching of meaning is a general property of posture verbs, which is independent of pseudocoordination. When it comes to the question of category, I will argue that the posture verb is usually lexical. There is, however, a somewhat marginal option for using the posture verb as a light verb in a complex predicate construction. I will also discuss the standard assumption that the construction is progressive. My conclusion is that it is not, following Blenselius (2014, 2015).

The structure of the article is the following: Section 2 shows how pseudocoordination is grammatically different from coordination. Bleaching of meaning is discussed in Section 3, and decategorialization in Section 4. The question of grammaticalization is discussed in Section 5. Section 6 takes up the question of progressive aspect, and Section 7 gives a conclusion.

2. CRITERIA FOR PSEUDOCOORDINATION

Before discussing grammaticalization of pseudocoordination, it is necessary to have some grammatical criteria for distinguishing pseudocoordination from regular coordination. The basis for assuming pseudocoordination is the fact that some sentences that look like cases of verb or VP coordination have grammatical properties that are different from those of coordination. Discussions of pseudocoordination in Scandinavian usually mention some differences (see Kvist Darnell (2008:86-92) for an overview with references). It is not

unproblematic, however, how this distinction should be operationalized. The sequence POSTURE VERB AND VERB is in principle ambiguous. Posture verbs can of course be coordinated with other verbs, and e.g. (7) is not a pseudocoordination (see (i) below).

(7) På jobben står og går jeg hele dagen.

on work.DEF stand and walk I whole day.DEF

'I stand and walk all day when I am at work.'

We will now discuss five properties of pseudocoordination to see to what extent they can be used as a sufficient condition for assuming pseudocoordination.

(i) A finite second verb does not follow the first verb to the V2 position, as shown in (8).

(8) På jobben sitter jeg og sover hele dagen. / *På jobben sitter og sover jeg hele dagen.

on work.DEF sit I and sleep whole day.DEF / on work.DEF sit and sleep I whole day.DEF

'I sit sleeping the whole day when I am at work.'

Two verbs that are coordinated appear as a unit in the V2 position, as in example (7) above.

When pseudocoordination is not coordination, there is no reason the two verbs should move there together. Not allowing the second finite verb in the V2 position is a necessary condition to assume pseudocoordination. It cannot be a sufficient condition, however, because of sentences such as (9). (Example (9) and many other example sentences in this article are from the Norwegian *www*, either directly, or indirectly through the NoWaC corpus of web texts. Some orthographic corrections have been made silently.)

(9) Så titter solen frem og varmer opp frosne sjeler. (NoWaC)

then peeps sun.DEF out and warms up frozen souls

'Then the sun peeps out, warming frozen souls.'

Sentences such as (9) are VP coordinations in which a second finite verb does not follow the first verb to the V2 position. The corresponding construction in German has been discussed as a kind of asymmetric coordination, see e.g. Höhle (1990).

(ii) The Coordinate Structure Constraint (Ross 1967:89-114), which prohibits movement out of a coordination, is not active in pseudocoordination. Even so, a violation of this constraint is not a sufficient condition to assume pseudocoordination. Lakoff (1986) pointed out that the constraint may be violated under certain conditions. One of his examples is (10).

(10) What kind of herbs can you eat and not get cancer?

(iii) A complement of the first verb can follow the first or the second verb, cf. the Swedish

(11) (from Teleman et al. 1999:904).

(11) Han stod i trädgården och glodde / Han stod och glodde i trädgården

he stood in garden.DEF and stared / he stood and stared in garden.DEF

'He was standing in the garden, staring'

Teleman et al. (1999:904) point out that *i trädgården* 'in garden.DEF' must be selected by *stå* 'stand'. It would be very strange to say *?Han glodde i trädgården* 'he stared in garden.DEF'.

When both the PP and the VP are complements of the posture verb, it is not unexpected that

they do not have a fixed order. This option of letting a complement of a first verb follow a second verb is not possible in regular VP coordination, such as (12). It thus seems to be a sufficient condition for assuming pseudocoordination.

(12) Han tenker på festen og ler. / *Han tenker og ler på festen.

he thinks of party.DEF and laughs / he thinks and laughs of party.DEF

'He thinks of the party and laughs.'

(iv) A negation with the first verb negates the whole pseudocoordination, as in (13). This fact follows from both subordination and complex predicate analyses of pseudocoordination. The option of negating the whole pseudocoordination seems to be a sufficient condition to assume pseudocoordination.²

(13) Han sitter ikke og leser.

he sits not and reads

'He is not reading.'

(v) The presentational focus construction is possible with all first verbs in pseudocoordination, except *ta* 'take'. An example is (14).

(14) Nå sitter det en mann her og skriver om en ny type maskin.

now sits EXPL a man here and writes about a new type machine

'A man is sitting here, writing about a new type of machine.'

(www.stone-oakvalley-studios.com/uploads/00cc41e1/hjemmedata_02-1983.pdf)

The presentational focus construction has an expletive subject and realizes its argument as an object (see e.g. Platzack 1983, Lødrup 1999). It represents a rather general option with one-place verbs in Mainland Scandinavian, independently of pseudocoordination. When two verb phrases are coordinated, the presentational construction is not possible with the first verb. Example (15) must be a regular coordination, because the first verb *arbeide* 'work' does not allow pseudocoordination.

(15) *Nå arbeider det en mann her og tjener gode penger.

now works EXPL a man here and earns good money

'A man is working here now, making good money.' [intended]

The verb *arbeide* 'work' usually allows the presentational focus construction. Even so, (15) is ungrammatical. The reason is that a subject in a coordinated sentence can only be dropped when it is identical to the subject of the preceding sentence. This is different in a pseudocoordination such as (14) (Cormack & Smith 1994:81, Lødrup 2002). The analysis assumed here (Section 1) predicts it to be grammatical. The PRO subject of the second verb, which is usually controlled by the preceding subject, is controlled by the preceding object in presentational focus sentences. The option of the presentational focus construction with the first verb can be considered a sufficient condition for pseudocoordination.

We see, then, that some grammatical criteria for pseudocoordination can be identified. This is necessary to allow us to decide if a sentence can be considered a pseudocoordination, independently of one's assumptions about their more controversial properties.

3. BLEACHING OF MEANING

Bleaching of meaning is an important component in grammaticalization. It is clear that the first verb in a pseudocoordination can have a bleached meaning, when posture verbs are put aside. Examples are *ta* 'take' (Vannebo 2003), and *drive* 'carry on' (Lødrup 2017), as in examples (5) and (3) above. There are also first verbs that could hardly be assumed to have a bleached meaning, such as *ringe* 'call' in (4) above.³

It is a common assumption that posture verbs have bleached meanings in a pseudocoordination (e.g. Vannebo 1969:64; Hansen & Heltoft 2011:994). I agree that this is often the case. However, I will argue that this is not relevant to the analysis of pseudocoordination, because posture verbs often have bleached meanings independently of pseudocoordination.

The idea of bleached meanings with posture verbs in pseudocoordination is older than modern grammaticalization theory; Kvist Darnell (2008:44) sees it as a traditional standard observation. The literature is somewhat vague and ambiguous on this point, however. It has been claimed that the subject of the pseudocoordination must have the orientation denoted by the posture verb (e.g. Teleman et al. 1999:904; Kuteva 2001:46; Bylin 2013:73). However, this is denied by others (e.g. Braunmüller 1991:103-104; Faarlund et al. 1997:648). It has also been claimed that the bleaching effect is weak (e.g. Tonne 2001:110; Behrens et al 2013). To clear this confusion, it is necessary to consider the use of posture verbs more generally, independently of pseudocoordination. Posture verbs are used in rather different ways across languages, as shown by an interesting literature (e.g. Newman 2002, Ameka & Levinson 2007, Viberg 2013). Some languages do not have posture verbs, e.g. French. Other languages, including the Scandinavian languages, use them in ways that extend their basic meaning.

One might say that the lexical meaning of the posture verb is often defocused (or backgrounded, Kinn 2018:86) in pseudocoordination. However, this option of defocusing is very general in Scandinavian. Posture verbs are often used to locate the subject (as in many other languages, see Ameka & Levinson 2007). Blensenius (2015:35-36) shows that using a posture verb is much more frequent than using the copula (in Swedish) in locational sentences such as (16)-(18), adapted from Blensenius (2015:36).

(16) Jeg sitter / er i bilen.

I sit / am in car.DEF

'I am sitting in my car.'

(17) Jeg står / er i dusjen.

I stand / am in shower.DEF

'I am showering.'

(18) Jeg ligger / er i sengen.

I lie / am in bed.DEF

'I am in bed.'

In Scandinavian, posture verbs are not only used of the posture of a person, but also with inanimate and abstract subjects, in various metaphorical uses, and more or less fixed expressions (e.g. Hansen 1974, Holm 2013, Berthele et al. 2014). For example, a beer 'stands' in the fridge, a ring 'sits' on the finger, a city 'lies' on the coast, a word 'stands' in the dictionary, an ability 'sits' in the brain, options 'lie' ahead, etc.

A common way of arguing for bleaching of meaning in pseudocoordination can be found in e.g. Faarlund et al. (1997:648) and Hansen & Heltoft (2011:994). The latter gives sentence (19) as an example, pointing out that the subject 'they' cannot literally have spent

months sitting around a table. However, the posture verb can be used in the same way outside of pseudocoordination, as in (20).

(19) De har siddet og drøftet det problem i flere måneder. (Danish)

they have sat and discussed that problem in several months

'They have been discussing that problem for several months.'

(20) Vi har siddet i forhandlinger i tre år. (Danish)

we have sat in negotiations in three years

'We have been negotiating for three years.'

(www.pressreader.com/denmark/.../281715495933787)

Examples (21)-(30) below are intended to illustrate how the use of posture verbs in pseudocoordination has parallels outside of pseudocoordination. Each pseudocoordination is followed by a non-pseudocoordination which is selected to be as parallel as possible. The examples show that independently of pseudocoordination, a feeling 'sits' inside us, as in (21)-(22), those who govern us 'sit' while doing so, as in (23)-(24), food 'stands' while being prepared, as in (25)-(26), the temperature 'lies' at a certain level, as in (27)-(28), and we 'lie' in a lane when driving on the freeway, as in (29)-(30).

(21) Den følelsen sitter og jobber inni meg konstant. (NoWaC)

that feeling.DEF sits and works inside me constantly

'That feeling is working inside me constantly.'

(22) Den triste følelsen satt inni meg hele natten.

the sad feeling sat inside me whole night.DEF

'The sad feeling was inside me the whole night.'

(theresenn.blogspot.com/2009/02/)

(23) Og hva med alle Arbeiderpartibyråkratene som sitter og styrer? (NoWaC)

and what with all labor.party.bureaucrats.DEF who sit and govern

'And what about all the Labor party bureaucrats who are in power?'

(24) Vi i Arbeiderpartiet sitter med makten.

we in labour.party.DEF sit with power.DEF

'We in the Labor party are in power.'

(www.nrk.no/nordland/soskenkrangel-i-kommunestyret-1.8005833)

(25) La retten stå og trekke i 10 minutter.

let dish.DEF stand and simmer in 10 minutes

'Let the dish simmer for 10 minutes.'

(https://www.skistart.com/nor/bla-band-middelhavspasta-med-kylling.html)

(26) La røren stå i 10 minutter.

let batter.DEF stand in 10 minutes

'Let the batter rest for 10 minutes.'

(letsbake.net/2016/03/16/oppskrift-hnb-episode-5/)

(27) Temperaturen ligger og vaker høyt oppe på 20-tallet. (NoWaC)

temperature.DEF lies and bobs high up on 20-number

'The temperature lies bobbing in the high twenties.'

(28) Temperaturen ligger på nærmere 40 grader.

temperature.DEF lies on nearer 40 degrees

'The temperature is near 40 degrees.'

(www.yr.no/artikkel/hetebolger-over-hele-verden-1.7251445)

(29) (Vi) ligger og kjører i venstre veibane.

we lie and drive in left lane

'We are driving in the left lane.'

(sv-se.facebook.com › Platser › Hammerfests kommun › Brandstation)

(30) Han ligger i venstre fil med sin kassebil.

he lies in left lane with his van

'He is driving his van in the left lane.'

(forum.hegnar.no/thread.asp?id=2273942)

Even some fixed expressions with a posture verb can be used with or without pseudocoordination. An example is *her sitter jeg* 'here sit I', as in (31)-(32), which is used colloquially for 'as for me'.

(31) Her sitter jeg og har aldri hatt så mye som en eneste dame.

here sit I and have never had as much as one single woman

'As for me, I have never had one single woman.'

(<https://vgd.no/helse-sex-og-livsstil/psykologi/tema/1666227/tittel/ensom-usosial-og-ubrukkelig>)

(32) Her sitter jeg med 650 mbite download.

here sit I with 650 mbite download

'As for me, I have 650 mbite download.'

(itavisen.no/2011/12/14/hastigheter-du-bare-kan-dromme-om/)

Posture verbs can also have a secondary subjective use, with what Biberauer & Vikner (2017:83) call 'speaker-perspective-related meanings'. In (33), the speaker expresses a negative attitude toward what is said.

(33) (Du snakker alltid om helse.) Og nå sitter du der og røyker en stor sigar!

you talk always about health - and now sit you there and smoke a big cigar

(You always talk about health.) And now you are smoking a big cigar!

This subjective use has a parallel in other languages. It is discussed by Breed (2017) for Afrikaans pseudocoordination, and by Lemmens (2005:185) for Dutch posture verbs with infinitives.⁴ Again, the relevant use of the posture verb can be found independently of pseudocoordination in Norwegian, as in (34).

(34) (Du snakker alltid om helse.) Og nå sitter du der med en stor sigar!

you talk always about health - and now sit you there with a big cigar

(You always talk about health.) And now you are sitting there with a big cigar!

Our point of departure in Section 3 was the traditional assumption that a posture verb has a bleached meaning in a pseudocoordination. We see now that this is a misrepresentation of the facts. Posture verbs can have bleached meanings, but this is a general phenomenon that does not depend upon pseudocoordination. If there is a connection between bleaching of meaning and pseudocoordination for posture verbs, one could speculate that it goes the other way (as proposed by an anonymous reviewer). It could be that the bleached semantics of posture verbs has opened the way for their use in pseudocoordination. This development must have taken place in prehistoric times, because pseudocoordination with posture verbs is well established in Old Norse (Vannebo 1969:66, 84-86).

For Norwegian, there seems to be no way of using a posture verb in a pseudocoordination that does not have a parallel outside of pseudocoordination.⁵ However, Danish gives an example of such a case. Danish, or variants of Danish, has a use of *ligge* that

is special for pseudocoordination. Korzen (2016:29-30) says that *ligge* can intensify the action, especially in contexts where irritation or desperation is expressed. One of her www examples is (35). This use of *ligge* does not seem to exist in Norwegian or Swedish.

(35) Jeg har ligget og ringet til jer med dages mellemrum. (Danish)

I have lain and phoned to you with days' intervals

'I have been calling you every few days.'

This use of *ligge* in Danish is interesting. It seems to be an instance of a posture verb that can have a specialized meaning in pseudocoordination. It is not clear, however, that this can be related directly to grammaticalization.

4. DECATEGORYALIZATION

If pseudocoordination with posture verbs is a grammaticalized construction, it is expected that the grammatical status of the posture verb is affected. It could change from a lexical verb to an auxiliary or a light verb, or to something in between.

There are several claims in the literature that the grammatical status of the posture verb is reduced to that of an auxiliary or a light verb in a complex predicate construction. The idea that the posture verb is a kind of auxiliary is independent of modern grammaticalization theory; it can be found e.g. in Thorell (1973:190). Explicit claims of auxiliary status can be found in Heine (1993:37-39); Hesse (2009); Bylin (2013:72-74). It is also hinted at in

Faarlund et al. (1997:534) and Teleman et al. (1999:902). A light verb analysis can be found in Wiklund (2007) and Kjeldahl (2010).

If posture verbs are decategorialized in pseudocoordination, it would provide an important argument for grammaticalization. The prediction is then that their grammatical properties are affected, such as their syntactic selection and their ability to undergo valency-changing rules. It will be argued that the posture verbs are usually not decategorialized. Even so, there is a somewhat marginal option for using the posture verb as a light verb in a complex predicate construction.

4.1 Selectional properties

If the posture verb has changed its categorial status to an auxiliary or a light verb, it could affect its syntactic selection. Hesse (2009:51) says that only a posture verb without a locative can be considered a part of a pseudocoordination. However, it is clear that a sentence can satisfy the criteria for pseudocoordination that were discussed in Section 2 even if the posture verb takes a locative. An example is (14) above, repeated as (36), whose first verb takes part in the presentational focus construction (see the discussion under (v) in Section 2).

(36) Nå sitter det en mann her og skriver om en ny type maskin.

now sits EXPL a man here and writes about a new type machine

'A man is sitting here, writing about a new type of machine.'

(www.stone-oakvalley-studios.com/uploads/00cc41e1/hjemmedata_02-1983.pdf)

Even if posture verbs in pseudocoordination can take a locative complement, they often don't. This might seem to be an important difference in syntactic selection from posture verbs in other uses. However, a closer look at the facts shows that this is not the case. A posture verb outside pseudocoordination often requires a complement. The exception is the agentive 'maintain position' meaning of Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995:127). Locative complements are common, but it is important that various types of complements can satisfy this requirement, as exemplified in (37). (There is a gradual transition to fixed expressions.)

(37) Vi satt der / med leksene / i forhandlinger / fast.

we sat there / with homework.DEF / in negotiations / stuck

'We sat there / doing homework / negotiating / stuck.'

In pseudocoordination, one might think that there is no requirement for the posture verb to take a complement. However, with the analysis assumed here, the pseudocoordinated VP is a complement to the posture verb, which must be specified in its lexical entry. Posture verbs have a relatively meager meaning, and this is probably the reason that they usually require a complement. The posture verbs could be compared to the verb *bo* 'live, reside'. This verb also requires a complement of some kind. There is often a locative complement, but other complements can also satisfy the requirement, as shown in (38).

(38) Jeg bor her / i Oslo / bra / som en greve / sammen med min bror.

I live here / in Oslo / well / like a count / together with my brother

'I live here / in Oslo / well / like a count / together with my brother.'

We must conclude then, that the selectional properties of posture verbs in pseudocoordination is in principle not very different from those of posture verbs outside of pseudocoordination. Pseudocoordination does not reduce their complement taking options.

4.2 *Valency-changing rules*

If the posture verb has developed into an auxiliary or a light verb, it is not expected to undergo valency-changing rules. However, posture verbs in pseudocoordination keep their regular options in this respect (Lødrup 2002, 2014a). They can passivize, as in (39), and they can take part in the presentational focus construction (discussed in Section 2), as in (14), repeated as (40).

(39) Her skal det sittede og koses.

here shall EXPL sit.PASS and cuddle.PASS

'We will sit here and cuddle.'

(louiselady.blogspot.com/2012/02/)

(40) Nå sitter det en mann her og skriver om en ny type maskin.

now sits EXPL a man here and writes about a new type machine

'A man is sitting here, writing about a new type of machine.'

(www.stone-oakvalley-studios.com/uploads/00cc41e1/hjemmedata_02-1983.pdf)

The presentational focus construction does not affect the second verb of the pseudocoordination in any way.⁶ This gives a reason for not analyzing the first verb as an auxiliary, because auxiliaries do not undergo valency-changing rules. The second verb can

also show its independence. For example, it can passivize without affecting the posture verb, as in (41).

(41) Der ligger han og blir vasket av alle de pene sykepleierne.

there lies he and becomes washed by all the beautiful nurses.DEF

'He is lying there, being washed by all the beautiful nurses.'

(books.google.no/books?isbn=9150741632)

We see, then, that both the first and the second verb can undergo valency-changing rules independently of each other. This gives an argument that the two verbs do not constitute a complex predicate, because a complex predicate undergoes this kind of rule as a unit.

Another argument against a complex predicate analysis is given by sentences such as (42) with a periphrastic future and (43) with a periphrastic perfect (Lødrup 2014a). It is a general rule that complex predicate formation is not possible when the second verb has independent tense, i.e. when it refers to a time that is independent of the time of the first verb (Wurmbrand 2001:79-99). This gives an argument against assuming complex predicates in (42)-(43). (Note that (42) has time adjuncts with incompatible time references.)

(42) Nå sitter jeg her og skal settes i gang med lillesøster om ei uke.

now sit I here and shall put.PASS into action with little.sister in a week

≡ 'I am now waiting for the birth of little sister to be initiated in a week.'

(<http://forum.babyverden.no/threads/kroppen-etter-senabort.1926216/>)

(43) Jeg sitter her og har gjort alt utenom å betale. (NoWaC)

I sit here and have done everything except to pay

'I am sitting here, having done everything apart from paying.'

4.3 Pseudocoordination with a complex predicate

There are, however, two phenomena that give evidence for a complex predicate analysis of pseudocoordination with posture verbs in some cases. This was pointed out by Lødrup (2014a, 2014b), who did not discuss grammaticalization. In examples such as (44)-(45), the two verbs have passivized as a unit. The passive subject corresponds to an argument of the second verb: the object in (44), and the oblique object in (45).

(44) Kebab må sattes og nytes.

kebab must sit.PASS and enjoy.PASS

'One should enjoy kebab sitting down.'

(forum.kvinneguiden.no/index.php?showtopic=404086)

(45) Det skal ligges og koses med så fort jeg legger det i fra meg.

it shall lie.PASS and cuddle.PASS with as soon I lay it in from me

≡ '[The cat] wants to cuddle with [whatever I knit] as soon as I put it down.'

(kattemorskosekrok.blogspot.com/2009_09_01_archive.html)

In cases such as (44)-(45), passivization gives evidence that that the two verbs must be analyzed as a complex predicate in a monoclausal construction. This kind of passive sentence is often called long passives. They can also be found in Swedish, cf. (46), and Danish, cf. (47).

(46) Det som finns kvar av lördagen kan bara sittas och avnjutas!

that which exists left of Saturday.DEF can just sit.PASS and enjoy.PASS

'We can just sit and enjoy what is left of Saturday!'

(<https://moabjork.wordpress.com/author/moabjork/>)

(47) Det er virkelig lækkert med en masse små retter som kan siddes og nippes til

it is really delicious with a lot small dishes that can sit. PASS and nibble. PASS to

'It is really delicious with a lot of small dishes that you can nibble'

(www.newyorkerbyheart.com/2008/06/lidt-a-la-tapas.html)

Long passives can also be found with pseudocoordination verbs that are clearly grammaticalized, namely *ta* 'take' and *drive* 'carry.on' (Lødrup 2014a, 2017).

(48) Alt styret (..) blir tatt og lagt lokk på av TV 2. (NoWaC)

all fuss.DEF becomes taken and put lid on by TV 2

'TV 2 puts a lid on all the fuss.'

(49) (Dette skal ikke) drives og debatteres gjennom avisen.

this shall not carry.on.PASS and discuss.PASS through paper.DEF

'One should not be discussing this in the paper.'

(<https://www.ostlendingen.no/arkiv/leserinnlegg-12-mars-2002/s/2-2.2757-1.4429717>)

Norwegian also allows this kind of passive outside of pseudocoordination with a small number of verbs (Lødrup 2014b). An example is (50).

(50) Denne funksjonen forsøkes nå å etterlignes.

this function.DEF try.PASS now to copy.PASS

'They are trying to copy this function now.'

(leif-daland.com/blogg/category/program/page/5/)

Long passives such as (44)-(47) are interesting in that they give an indication that a pseudocoordination with a posture verb can restructure to a monoclausal complex predicate construction. This said, examples such as (44)-(47) seem to be somewhat marginal and infrequent.⁷ There is, however, another phenomenon that might also indicate restructuring to a complex predicate (mentioned in Lødrup 2014a). In presentational focus sentences with pseudocoordination, the object in some cases follows the second verb, as in (51), and not the first verb as in (14) above.

(51) Det lå og fløt minst tre bosspann på sjøen.

EXPL lay and floated at.least three garbage.cans on sea.DEF

'At least three garbage cans were floating in the sea.'

(okalen.wordpress.com/2012/08/19/kastet-flere-bosspann-pa-sjoen/)

This could be taken as an indication that the two verbs constitute a complex predicate that has undergone the the presentational focus rule as a unit.⁸ Norwegian also allows presentational focus sentences with complex predicates outside of pseudocoordination in some cases (Holmberg 2002:122, Lødrup 2014b). An example is (52).

(52) Det forsøkte å komme en masse studenter. (Holmberg 2002:122)

EXPL tried to come a lot students

'A lot of students tried to come.'

It is a marked option to let the object follow the second verb in a pseudocoordination such as (51) above. Examples do not abound in texts. The option seems to require that the first and the second verb form a collocation, such as *ligge og flyte* 'lie and float' in (51) above.

We see then that there are two independent phenomena - long passives and presentational focus sentences - that indicate that a pseudocoordination can be restructured to a monoclausal complex predicate construction in some cases. The first verb is then used as a so-called light verb. This should be seen as a case of grammaticalization: a light verb merges its argument structure with that of the following verb, and no longer has its own clausal domain. It has been claimed, however, that the emergence of light verbs represents a rather minimal case of grammaticalization. Butt & Lahiri (2013) argue that there is a tight connection between a light verb and its corresponding main verb.⁹ This makes light verbs different from auxiliaries, which lose the connection to the verb they are derived from. There seems to be no (further) bleaching of meaning when the posture verbs are used as light verbs. Example (44) above is illustrative in this respect. Its point is, as its textual context on the *www* makes clear, that one should eat one's kebab sitting, not walking.

An important fact is that many sentences with pseudocoordination have grammatical properties that are incompatible with a complex predicate analysis, e.g. (40)-(43) above. It is therefore impossible to assume that the posture verb is always a light verb in a pseudocoordination. This situation is parallel to the what we find with non-pseudocoordination verbs that can be used as light verbs. For example, *forsøke* 'try' allows restructuring, as can be seen from sentences such as (50) and (52). Even so, it is easy to construct sentences with properties that are incompatible with restructuring, e.g. (53), in which the infinitival complement of *forsøke* 'try' is realized as a passive subject.

(53) Å reparere bilen er aldri blitt forsøkt.

to repair car.DEF is never been tried

‘Nobody has ever tried to repair the car.’

The parallel is also interesting in that there seems to be no clear bleaching of meaning effect with the restructuring verbs that do not allow pseudocoordination (such as *forsøke* 'try').

5. THE QUESTION OF GRAMMATICALIZATION

The emergence of pseudocoordination with posture verbs could be considered a case of grammaticalization. It seems natural to assume that its origin is regular coordination, as in Vannebo (1969:66) (see also Heine 1993:37-39; Kuteva 2001:67-73; Ross 2016:229-230). We do not know how this happened in Scandinavian, however. Pseudocoordination is well established in Old Norse (Vannebo 1969:66, 84-86), and it seems to be impossible to follow it further back in time.

It is clear that pseudocoordination can be grammaticalized. A construction that has come far in this respect is pseudocoordination with the verb *ta* 'take' (Vannebo 2003).

Pseudocoordination with the verb *drive* 'carry on' is also grammaticalized to some extent (Lødrup 2017). On the other hand, there are cases of pseudocoordination that could hardly be thought of as grammaticalized, e.g. those with *ringe* 'phone' as their first verb (example (4) above - see also note 3).

Is pseudocoordination with posture verbs a grammaticalized construction, as is usually assumed in the literature? The discussion in Section 3 and 4 has argued against the traditional assumptions about bleaching of meaning and decategorialization. There seems to be no evidence that there is an established grammaticalized construction to which all cases of

pseudocoordination with posture verbs belong. However, modern grammaticalization theory sees grammaticalization as a gradual process (Traugott & Trousdale 2010, Roberts 2010). The discussion also showed that there is one phenomenon that seems to indicate beginning grammaticalization, namely the somewhat marginal option of using a posture verb as a light verb in a complex predicate construction (Section 4.3). This option has never been mentioned as an argument for grammaticalization before, apart from a hint in Ross & Lødrup (2017). However, the emergence of light verbs represents a rather minimal case of grammaticalization, according to Butt & Lahiri (2013). They argue that light verbs are tightly connected to their corresponding main verbs, and do not represent a first stage of further grammaticalization. If this is correct for the present case remains to be seen (see note 9).

6. PROGRESSIVE ASPECT

The assumption that pseudocoordination with posture verbs is an expression of progressive (or durative) aspect can be found in e.g. Ebert (2000), Tonne (2001), Wiklund (2007), Hesse (2009). Kvist Darnell (2008:44) says that there is agreement on this point in most modern descriptions. The assumption is older than modern grammaticalization theory (see e.g. Vannebo 1969), but it fits well with a grammaticalization analysis. However, Blenselius (2014, 2015) argues that pseudocoordination with posture verbs differs from progressives in several ways, and this section is partly based upon his work.

Scandinavian has no systematic opposition between progressive and non-progressive forms. A simple verb form can have a progressive interpretation. In actual language use, pseudocoordination with posture verbs is seldom used to express progressivity. It has been shown that the predicate following the posture verb is usually atelic (see Tonne 2001:77 on

Norwegian, Blensenius 2015:14, 44 on Swedish). Typical predicates are e.g. 'read', 'talk', and 'wait'. These predicates would get a progressive interpretation independently of the posture verb.

The question is then what happens in the few cases where the predicate following the posture verbs is telic. It is often claimed in the literature that the posture verb changes the aspectual meaning from completed to incomplete. Faarlund et al. (1997:649) compare the examples (54) and (55). Without pseudocoordination, as in (54), the action is understood as completed, while (55) with pseudocoordination is understood as incomplete.

(54) Britta skrev et brev.

Britta wrote a letter

'Britta wrote a letter.'

(55) Britta satt og skrev et brev.

Britta sat and wrote a letter

'Britta was writing a letter.'

This effect is not surprising, because a posture verb is in a sense progressive in itself (Blensenius 2015:38). However, Teleman et al. (1999:905) point out that the interpretation of a telic second predicate is not necessarily affected by the posture verb. They give Swedish examples such as (56).

(56) Står han inte och somnar på sitt pass! (Swedish)

stands he not and dozes.off on his guard

'He actually stands there and dozes off on his guard!'

It is not difficult to find other examples in which the interpretation of a telic predicate is not affected by the posture verb, such as the Norwegian (57).

(57) Hun satt og sa at hun og pappa skulle skilles.

she sat and said that she and daddy should divorce.PASS

'She said that she and daddy were going to be divorced.'

(nouw.com/frukvernes/category/blogg/page/3)

There is also no aspectual effect when a posture verb takes a stative second verb (Tonne 2001:80-81), as in (58). With regular progressives, stative verbs are typically not used.

(58) Nå står den og symboliserer at det ikke nytter å gi seg.

now stands it and symbolizes that EXPL not works to give REFL

'Now it [the sunflower] stands there, symbolizing that you should not give up.'

(Østlendingen 14. September 2013, page 9)

It is interesting to compare to pseudocoordination with *drive* 'carry on' as a first verb, which only exists in Norwegian (Lødrup 2017). This verb always has an aspectual effect, giving a progressive or habitual or iterative interpretation. (Alternatively, it could be described as pluractional, see Lødrup (2017).) It often takes a telic second predicate, which gets an incomplete or iterative interpretation, as in (59)-(60). The Norwegian verb *drive* is different from the posture verbs in that it always has an aspectual effect in sentences with a telic second predicate.

(59) Han driver og sovner på vakt. (constructed)

he carries.on and dozes.off on guard

'He is dozing off on his guard.'

(60) Hun drev og sa hun veide 50 kg i fjor.

she carried.on and said she weighed 50 kilo in last.year

'She used to say that she weighed 50 kilo last year.'

(www.carolinebergeriksen.no/2011/07/29/avvenning-sinne/)

Posture verbs in pseudocoordination do not consistently have an aspectual effect, and the construction should not be considered progressive. This conclusion is strengthened by studies of how Norwegian pseudocoordination with posture verbs is translated into languages with a grammaticalized progressive construction (Tonne 2001, Ebeling 2015, Hareide 2016). A pseudocoordination is not always translated into a progressive. For translations to Spanish, Hareide (2016) shows that the progressive construction with *estar* 'be' + gerund is seldom used - only in 12.5% of the cases in her material. In translations to English, Ebeling (2015) says that it is common to keep the posture verb, often adding locative *there*, and using the *-ing*-form of the second verb. Among her examples is (61), a sentence from a Norwegian novel, and its published English translation, (62).

(61) Han sitter og grunner en liten stund.

he sits and ponders a little while

(62) He sits there pondering a little while.

We see that posture verbs in pseudocoordination do not consistently have an aspectual effect. The aspectual perspective seems to have been misleading. A better alternative could be to follow Tonne (2001:121), Behrens et al. (2013:129-130), and Blensenius (2015:35-42) in

seeing the construction as locational. (A better term might be situative, as suggested by an anonymous reviewer.) The function of the construction is characterized in the following way in Behrens et al. (2013:129-30):

... the posture pseudocoordinations in Norwegian are expressions of temporary localizations in space (stand–sit–lie) that contribute to the interpretation of the description of a situation in two ways: They "localize" the subject referent in space (statively), and their temporary state denotation adds temporariness to the situation expressed by the main verb.

7. CONCLUSION

The idea that pseudocoordination with posture verbs is a grammaticalized progressive construction has been popular and influential. In this article, I have argued against the traditional assumptions, following up some critical voices from recent years' research. The construction was argued not to be aspectual, but rather locational or situative. The traditional assumptions about bleaching of meaning and decategorialization were found to be unsubstantiated. I also discussed new evidence for grammaticalization, namely the use of posture verbs as light verbs in complex predicates (Section 4.3). This is an 'extra' option for some sentences with pseudocoordination, which must be considered a rather minimal case of grammaticalization.

In Section 1, it was observed that pseudocoordination in Scandinavian is a rather heterogeneous phenomenon. This observation extends to the degree of grammaticalization shown by the different types. The extremes are represented by pseudocoordination with *ta*

'take', which could be considered completely grammaticalized (Vannebo 2003), and pseudocoordination with *ringe* 'call' (see note 3), which can hardly be grammaticalized at all. Between these extremes we find pseudocoordination with *drive* 'carry on' (Lødrup 2017). This is also where we find the posture verbs, leaning a bit more to the side of *ringe* 'call'.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For valuable input to this work, I would like to thank the participants at the Workshop on Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions (Ca' Foscari University of Venice, May 2017), and at a departmental seminar (Oslo, September 2017). I would also like to thank my colleagues Ingebjørg Tonne and Janne Bondi Johannessen for discussion. Special thanks are due to Daniel Ross (University of Illinois), co-author of Ross & Lødrup (2017). I am also grateful to the anonymous NJL reviewers, who made me reconsider some of my views. Special thanks to one of them for exceptionally thorough and constructive feedback.

CORPUS

NoWaC (Norwegian Web as Corpus)

<http://www.hf.uio.no/iln/om/organisasjon/tekstlab/prosjekter/nowac/index.html>

REFERENCES

- Ameka, Felix K. & Stephen C. Levinson. 2007. Introduction: The typology and semantics of locative predicates: posturals, positionals, and other beasts. *Linguistics* 45(5/6), 847-871.

- Behrens, Bergljot, Monique Flecken & Mary Carroll. 2013. Progressive attraction: On the use and grammaticalization of progressive aspect in Dutch, Norwegian, and German. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 25(2), 95-136.
- Berthele, Raphael, Matthew Whelpton, Åshild Næss & Pieter Duijff. 2015. Static spatial descriptions in five Germanic languages. *Language Sciences* 49, 82-101.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Sten Vikner. 2017. Having the edge: a new perspective on pseudo-coordination in Danish and Afrikaans. In Nicholas LaCara, Keir Moulton & Anne-Michelle Tessier (eds.), *A Schrit to Fest Kyle Johnson*. Linguistics Open Access Publications. 1. 77-90. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.
http://scholarworks.umass.edu/linguist_oapubs/1
- Blensenius, Kristian. 2014. En tveksam imperfektivmarkör: Aspekt hos pseudosamordningar med positionsverb. In Anna W. Gustafsson et al. (eds.), *Svenskans beskrivning* 34, 105-118. Lund University: Centre for Languages and Literature.
- Blensenius, Kristian. 2015. Maintaining contact with pseudoprogressive pseudocoordinations. Swedish verbal coordinations with 'sit', 'stand', and 'lie' from a spatial perspective. In Kristian Blensenius: *Progressive Constructions in Swedish*. Dissertation, University of Gothenburgh.
- Braunmüller, Kurt. 1991. *Die skandinavischen Sprachen im Überblick*. Tübingen: Francke.
- Breed, Adri. 2017. The subjective use of postural verb in Afrikaans (I): evolution from progressive to modal. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 52(1), 1-21.
- Butt, Miriam & Aditi Lahiri. 2013. Diachronic pertinacity of light verbs. *Lingua* 135, 7-29.
- Bylin, Maria. 2013. *Aspektuella hjälpverb i svenskan*. Dissertation, University of Stockholm.
- Camilleri, Maris & Louisa Sadler. 2017. Posture verbs and aspect: A view from vernacular Arabic. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG17 Conference*. 167-87. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

- Cardinaletti, Anna & Giuliana Giusti. 2001. "Semi-lexical" motion verbs in Romance and Germanic. In Norbert Corver & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Semi-lexical Categories*. 371-414. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cormack, Annabel & Neil Smith. 1994 Serial verbs. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 6, 63-88. Department of Phonetics and Linguistics, University College London.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1957. *Elementær dansk grammatik*. København: Gyldendal.
- Ebeling, Signe Oksefjell. 2015. A contrastive study of Norwegian pseudo-coordination and two English posture-verb constructions. In Signe Oksefjell Ebeling & Hilde Hasselgård (eds.), *Cross-Linguistic Perspectives on Verb Constructions*. 29-57. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ebert, Karen H. 2000. Progressive markers in Germanic languages. In Östen Dahl (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. 605-654. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Enger, Hans-Olav. 2000. Verbendelsen -s i norsk bokmål: Bøying eller avledning. *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskrift* 18(1), 9-36
- Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie & Kjell Ivar Vannebo. 1997. *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Hansen, Erik. 1974. Stå, sidde, ligge. *Mål & Mæle* 1(2), 26-32.
- Hansen, Erik & Lars Heltoft. 2011. *Grammatik over det danske sprog. Volume II: Syntaktiske og semantiske helheder*. København: Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab.
- Hareide, Lidun. 2016. The translation of formal source-language lacunas: An empirical study of the *Overrepresentation of Target-Language Specific Features* and the *Unique Items* hypotheses. In Meng Ji, Lidun Hareide, Defeng Li & Michael Oakes (eds.), *Corpus methodologies explained: An Empirical Approach to Translation Studies*, 137-187. London: Routledge & WiAS.

- Heine, Bernd. 1993. *Auxiliaries: Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hesse, Andrea. 2009. *Zur Grammatikalisierung der Pseudokoordination im Norwegischen und in den anderen skandinavischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Francke.
- Heycock, Caroline & Hjalmar P. Petersen. 2012. Pseudo-coordinations in Faroese. In *Multilingual Individuals and Multilingual Societies*, Kurt Braunmüller & Christoph Gabriel (eds.), 259-280. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hilpert, Martin. 2011. Grammaticalization in Germanic languages. In Heiko Narrog & Bernd Heine (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press.
- Hilpert, Martin & Christian Koops. 2008. A quantitative approach to the development of complex predicates: The case of Swedish Pseudo-Coordination with *sitta* "sit". *Diachronica* 25(2), 242-261.
- Hobæk Haff, Marianne & Helge Lødrup. 2016). Où en est le «passif long» en français? *Syntaxe et sémantique* 17, 153-73.
- Höder, Steffen. 2011. Dialect convergence across language boundaries. In Frans Gregersen, Jeffrey K. Parrott & Pia Quist (eds.), *Language Variation - European Perspectives III*. 173-184. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Höhle, Tilman. 1990. Assumptions about asymmetric coordination in German. In Joan Mascaró & Marina Nespôr (eds.), *Grammar in Progress*. 221–235. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Holm, Elisabeth. 2013. *Det sto aldri på noe papir, men det lå i luften og satt i veggene: Kroppspositurverb brukt om eksistens og lokasjon i norsk*. MA Thesis, University of Oslo.

- Holmberg, Anders. 2002. Expletives and agreement in Scandinavian passives. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4(2), 85-128.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Second edition. Cambridge University Press.
- Jespersen, Otto 1895 En sproglig værdiforskydning. OG = AT. *Dania* III, 145-182.
- Jóhannsdóttir, Kristín M. 2007. The Posture verb progressive in Icelandic. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*. Vol. 11.
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi & Lutz Edzard. 2017. Pseudo-coordination in Scandinavian and Semitic involving a finite verb form and an infinitive. Workshop on Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions. Ca' Foscari University of Venice. 2.-3. May 2017.
- Kinn, Torodd. 2018. Pseudocoordination in Norwegian. Degrees of grammaticalization and constructional variants. In Evie Coussé, Peter Andersson & Joel Olofsson (eds.) *Grammaticalization Meets Construction Grammar*, 75-106. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kjeldahl, Anne. 2010. *The Syntax of Quirky Verbal Morphology*. Dissertation, University of Aarhus.
- Korzen, Hanne. 2016. Hvordan man 'ligger sig til hovedrollen' på fransk efter først at have 'væltet kaffen': To anvendelser af Per Durst-Andersens teori om aspekt og sprogtypologi til forklaring af centrale aspekter ved dansk og fransk. *Globe: A Journal of Language, Culture and Communication*. Special issue 1. 26-36.
- Kuteva, Tania. 2001. *Auxiliation: An Enquiry into the Nature of Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press.
- Kvist Darnell, Ulrika. 2008. *Pseudosamordningar i svenska: särskilt sådana med verben sitta, ligga och stå*. Dissertation, University of Stockholm.

- Lakoff, George. 1986. Frame semantic control of the Coordinate Structure Constraint. *Chicago Linguistics Society (CLS)* 39(2), 152-167.
- Lemmens, Maarten. 2005. Aspectual posture verb constructions in Dutch. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 17(3), 183-217.
- Levin, Beth, & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1995. *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- Lødrup, Helge. 1999. Linking and optimality in the Norwegian presentational focus construction. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 22, 2, 205-229.
- Lødrup, Helge. 2002. The syntactic structures of Norwegian pseudocoordinations. *Studia Linguistica* 56(2), 121-143.
- Lødrup, Helge. 2014a. There is no reanalysis in Norwegian pseudocoordinations (except when there is). In Hans Petter Helland & Christine Meklenborg Salvesen (éds.), *Affaire(s) de grammaire: Mélanges offerts à Marianne Hobæk Haff à l'occasion de ses soixante-cinq ans*, 43-65. Oslo: Novus.
- Lødrup, Helge. 2014b. Long passives in Norwegian: Evidence for complex predicates. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 37(3), 367-391.
- Lødrup, Helge. 2017. Norwegian pseudocoordination with the verb *drive* 'carry on': Control, raising, grammaticalization. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG17 Conference*. 264-84. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Narrog, Heiko & Bernd Heine (eds.) 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford University Press.
- Newman, John. 2002. A cross-linguistic overview of the posture verbs 'sit', 'stand', and 'lie'. In John Newman (ed.), *The Linguistics of sitting, standing, and lying*. 1-24. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Platzack, Christer. 1983. Existential Sentences in English, Swedish, German and Icelandic. In Fred Karlsson (ed.), *Papers from the Seventh Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*. 80–100. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of General Linguistics.
- Reis, Marga and Wolfgang Sternefeld. 2004. Review article of Susanne Wurmbrand 'Infinitives Restructuring and Clause Structure'. *Linguistics* 42, 2, 469–508.
- Roberts, Ian. 2010. Grammaticalization, the clausal hierarchy and semantic bleaching. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Graeme Trousdale (eds.) *Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization*, 45-73. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ross, Daniel. 2016. Between coordination and subordination: typological, structural and diachronic perspectives on pseudocoordination. In Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira & Clara Pinto (eds.), *Coordination and Subordination: Form and Meaning – Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*. 209-243. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ross, Daniel & Helge Lødrup. 2017. SIT as a progressive marker in pseudocoordination? Handout. Workshop on Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions, Ca' Foscari University of Venice. May 2-3.
- Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Dissertation, MIT.
- Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska akademiens grammatik. Volume 4*. Stockholm: Svenska Akademien.
- Thorell, Olof. 1973. *Svensk grammatik*. Stockholm: Esselte Studium.
- Tonne, Ingebjørg. 1999. A Norwegian progressive marker and the level of grammaticalization. *Languages in Contrast* 2(1), 131-159.
- Tonne, Ingebjørg. 2001. *Progressives in Norwegian and the Theory of Aspectuality*. Dissertation, University of Oslo.

- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, & Graeme Trousdale. 2010. Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization: How do they intersect. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Graeme Trousdale (eds.) *Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization*. 19-44. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Vannebo, Kjell Ivar. 1969. *Aksjonsart i norsk: Ein syntaktisk funksjonsanalyse*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- 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.
- Viberg, Åke. 2013. Posture verbs: A multilingual contrastive study. *Languages in Contrast* 13(2), 139-169.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 2007. *The Syntax of Tenselessness*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

NOTES

¹ There are also cases of pseudocoordination that are not control constructions.

Pseudocoordination with *drive* 'carry on' can be a subject-to-subject raising construction in colloquial Norwegian (Lødrup 2002, 2017), while pseudocoordination with *ta* 'take' calls for a complex predicate analysis (Lødrup 2002, 2014a; Vannebo 2003).

² Johannessen & Edzard (2017) say that this kind of negation is also possible in regular coordination, but the example that they give is not readily acceptable (with the given interpretation), and it could be taken as an argument against their view.

(i) Hun tier ikke og holder munn i forsamlinger. (Johannessen & Edzard 2017)

she is.silent not and keeps mouth in meetings

'She doesn't keep quiet and doesn't keep her mouth shut in meetings.' [intended]

³ It might seem strange that a verb such as *ringe* 'call' can take pseudocoordination. This is not controversial, however. Teleman et al. (1999:909) lists its Swedish equivalent and some other verbs of communication as pseudocoordination verbs. The verb satisfies the criteria in Section 2. For example, it allows presentational focus sentences parallel to (14) above.

(i) Da ringte det en mann og sa at ...

then called there a man and said that

'A man then called and said that ..'

⁴ This subjective effect can also be achieved with some other pseudocoordination verbs, such as *drive* 'carry on' and *gå (rundt)* 'walk (about)'. Breed (2017) relates the subjective use of pseudocoordination to the subjective use of the progressive that can be found in English.

⁵ The same kind of argument could be made for other pseudocoordination verbs, such as *gå* 'walk'. It has been said that this verb can be used without its concrete meaning in pseudocoordination (e.g. Braunmüller 1991:103, Ebert 2000:628, Kinn 2018:86). This is true, but it can be used the same way outside pseudocoordination. Examples are (i)-(ii).

(i) Han går og spekulerer over fremtiden. (Danish, Braunmüller 1991:103)

he walks and speculates over future.DEF

'He contemplates the future.'

(ii) Han går med tanker, som han ikke kan dele med nogen. (Danish)

he walks with thoughts that he not can share with anybody

'He has thoughts that he cannot share with anybody.'

(spotidoc.com/doc/3426295/portvinsmarineret-svinemørbrad---jj)

⁶ Passivizing the first verb seems to be different in this respect. There is a question, however, how a passive such as (39) should be analyzed. It is assumed here that the second verb in a pseudocoordination has a PRO subject. This assumption makes the analysis of (39) difficult, because an expletive subject of the *there* type cannot control PRO. Lødrup (2017) proposes an analysis for a parallel case. The point of departure is the general requirement that the first and the second verb of a pseudocoordination must have the same inflectional form. The Norwegian morphological passive is usually considered inflectional (see e.g. Enger 2000). One could therefore assume that the passivity of the second verb is not real - it is an active verb that has a passive form because of the requirement for same inflectional form. With this analysis, PRO realizes the external role of the second verb. It is controlled by the implicit agent of the first verb.

⁷ It is not easy to establish the status of pseudocoordination with the long passive. Both my Swedish and my Danish informant find these sentences reasonably acceptable, while I do not.

It is not frequent in Norwegian; for example there seem to be no examples with posture verbs in the NoWaC corpus of Norwegian web texts, with 700 million words. Norwegian linguists vary in their reactions to them, from 'Surprisingly acceptable' to 'I don't like them, but I know they exist'. This said, it must also be mentioned that this kind of mixed speaker reactions can be found with complex predicate constructions more generally, outside of pseudocoordination. For example, some speakers don't like sentences such as (50). To me, (50) is reasonably acceptable, but I don't like long passives with some other first verbs (e.g. *begynne* 'begin'), which can easily be found on the www. Variation in speaker reactions to complex predicate constructions also exist in other languages. This has been discussed by Reis & Sternefeld (2004) for German, and Hobæk Haff & Lødrup (2016) for French.

⁸ A possible problem with this argument is that it presupposes that the analysis is as in (i) (using English words). If the analysis is as in (ii), there is no argument for a complex predicate - there is just a marked word order with the clausal complement preceding the object.

(i) [there] [lay and floated] [three garbage cans] [in the sea]

(ii) [there] [lay] [and floated] [three garbage cans] [in the sea]

The analysis in (ii) does not seem plausible, however, one reason being that objects have a very strong tendency to precede other complements.

⁹ The verb *ta* 'take' seems to be used as a light verb only in pseudocoordination. It has clearly lost its connection to the main verb *ta* 'take', which makes it a counterexample to the claim in Butt & Lahiri (2013).