Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions. Edited by Giuliana Giusti, Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro and Daniel Ross. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, 274], 2022. Vii, 342 pp. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274

Hardbound and e-Book.

Reviewed by Ana Bravo
University of Murcia
ana.bravo@umu.es

How to cite:

Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions (*PCMAC* from now onwards) is the result of the two PseCoMAC (Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions) meetings, organized at Ca' Foscari University of Venice on May 2-3, 2017, for the first time, and on March 18-19, 2019, on its second edition. The volume has been edited by the organizers of the meetings, Nicoló di Caro and Giuliana Giusti, both from Ca` Foscari University of Venice, as well as Daniel Ross,

who joined the team as a co-organizer of the second edition and who is affiliated to the University of Illinois Urbana-Campaign & University of California, Riverside. And this is one of the most valuable features of this book: that all of its authors are specialists in the topic, some of them for a long time and with a number of important and highly cited contributions on the camp, as the editors themselves.

Pseudo-Coordination (PseCo), in particular, and Multiple Agreement Constructions (MAC), in general, being at the intersection of several close but distinct constructions without apparently presenting at the same time a clearly defined set of features, raise a number of questions and for these reasons have attracted the attention of the researchers both from a theoretical and a typological standpoint. PseCo constructions have been compared at least with serial verbs constructions (SVCs), restructuring verbs, auxiliary verbs, light verbs, and finally, coordination and subordination both intra- and cross-linguistically. The editors consider that this intrinsic multiplicity as an argument compelling enough to start 'a cross-theoretical, cross-disciplinary, cross-areal reflection on issues related to PseCo' with the aim of building cross-linguistic, cross-theoretical connections which help to improve our understanding of the questions that both PseCo and MAC present. Accordingly, both a wide range of theoretical models and approaches (formal grammar, construction grammar, formal semantics and pragmatics, diachronic analyses, comparative linguistics, areal and typological linguistics, quantitative and corpus linguistics) and languages (Italian varieties and dialects, Romanian, Brazilian Portuguese, Polish, Czech, Swedish and Scandinavian languages, Semitic languages, Turkish, and Standard and Fukojama Japanese) are represented along the thirteen chapters that comprise the book, apart from chapter number one. The book contains, however, a Language Index (pp. 337-338), which shows that the number and variety of languages that effectively appear amply exceeds the few just mentioned, although not all of them do it to the same extent. Hence, English is still by far the most cited language while canonical SVC-languages, such as Gunge and Igbo Kwa languages, among many others, don't appear. This asymmetry is not only expected, considering the high number of SV languages that exists, but also evidences at the same time both the difficulty and the necessity of the task undertaken by the editors. There is also a Subject Index (pp. 339-342), very useful to quickly access the main issues dwelt with along the different chapters, all relevant phenomena on the grammar, the semantics and the cross-linguistic distribution of PseCo constructions.

The thirteen chapters appear grouped into three sections of different size each, chapter 1 serving as an introductory chapter: Romance languages (Section 1), which extends from page 35 to page 166 and constitutes the longest section by far, Other languages (Section 2), which spans from page 169 to page 242, and Comparative and theoretical issues (Section 3), which goes from page 245 to 335. The content of each chapter is briefly presented in the following.

Chapter 1, **Pseudo-Coordination and Multiple Agreement Constructions. An overview** (pp. 1-32) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.01giu is authored by the three editors of the book, Giuliana Giusti, Vicenzo Nicolò Di Caro and Daniel Ross and serves as a general introduction both to the phenomena of pseudo-coordination and multiple agreement and to each of the individual contributions of the book, which are sketchily described in the second part of the chapter. In the first part of the chapter, the relevant issues concerning pseudo-coordination and of MAC are addressed. As regards PseCo, the authors firstly focus on the core properties, namely, the lack of coordinating

meaning, its monoeventive and monoclausal condition, and the restrictions affecting V1, being lexically limited mainly to GO and COME, some posture verbs (SIT, STAND, LIE) and TAKE, and grammatically, since V1 seems to be highly grammaticalized functioning hence as a functional head, and V2. This explained, PseCO admits also a high degree of variation, main. Variation is found on the tense, aspect, and mood area on the one hand, and on the other hand on the paradigms accepted in V1 and on the grade up to which the requirement of parallel inflection in the two verbs is observed, although V1 is itself subject to a high amount of cross-linguistic variation too as well as the meaning of the overall construction. Finally, both the form and the possibility of omitting the linking element under certain conditions is also an important factor of cross-linguistic variation. MAC, on the contrary, 'more generally describe(s) any construction featuring two elements that share agreement features' (p. 16), so PseCo would be, in fact, a sub-case of MACs. In addition to this general introduction to the functional and structural properties of PseCo and MAC the authors offer a most valuable overview of previous research on PseCo classified following different criteria: typological families (Semitic, Scandinavian, German, Romance languages, Slavic, Semitic, Oceanic and Austronesian languages), properties of V1, overall properties. The result is an impressive and up-to-date list of references on PseCo, which in conjunction with the rest of chapter 1 constitutes without any doubt the essential guide for anyone who wants to learn in a few pages what is PseCo about, which are the main questions it raises and where to start from. It might be useful to remind the reader that the complete list of references is accessible online through the webpage of the book under the corresponding chapter.

Section 1 focuses on PseCo in Romance languages and consists of five chapters. In Chapter 2, **Theory driven approaches and empirical advances. A protocol for Pseudo-Coordinations and Multiple Agreement Constructions in Italo-Romance** (pp. 35-64) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.02giu, its authors, Giuliana Giusti and Anna Cardinaletti, propose a diagnostic tool, which they call a protocol, that is, 'an established procedure, which applies in the same way with the same tools in different but comparable situations' intended 'to ensure comparability in the collection, organization, and presentation of data' (p. 43). In their case, the protocol divides the predicted properties of PseCo and MAC around two elements, namely, V1 and the realization of Tense, and apply it to three different structures, which, in turn, and according to these authors, correspond to the three types of constructions (*e*PseCo, or canonical TAKE AND construction, *a*PseCo, or Inflected Construction, and *mu*MAC, or Finite Construction) present in Italo-Romance varieties. Both the *e*PseCo and the *a*PseCo are monoclausal but only in the former V1 is functional. As to *mu*MAC, although it is the only biclausal, it shares with *a*PseCo the property of having a lexical V2. The protocol allows to check the condition lexical or functional of V1 depending on the presence or absence of the following features in the relevant construction: restricted class of V1, argument structure, coreference, reduced morphology. The second cluster of features measures the independence of the two verbs through the realization of Tense, and hence, the monoclausality: restrictions on the paradigm, clitic climbing, clausal negation. The three constructions are tested against each of these features and evaluated as '+', '-' or '?'. There is a table with the results, which is very much appreciated. Apart from proving in a very elegant way that the *a*PseCo and the *mu*MAC present two different syntactic structures, the protocol allows the authors to present new facts in the very well-studied area of *a*PseCo and

m*u*MAC as well as to advance in the understanding of the understudied *e*PseCo. Finally, the authors defend that this protocol can be applied to other PseCo and MAC in other languages since it is theoretically neutral.

In Chapter 3, **A bisentential syntax for *a/bare* finite complements in South Italian varieties. Motion verbs and the progressive** (pp. 65-98) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.03man, by M. Rita Manzini and Paolo Larusso, defend on the contrary that the Ita. *a*PseCo firstly is biclausal and secondly it is not properly a pseudocoordination construction as far as the linking element is not the conjunction *a(c)* but the dative preposition *a(d)*, a complementizer in the present analysis. The authors argue that a unifying analysis for both *a*PseCO and the *mu*MAC[1] is to be preferred on the basis of the following properties: tense restrictions in V1 and V2, the position of pronominal clitics, and the person split paradigm versus the full person paradigm. In passing, the authors observe that the huge amount of variation that the Southern Italian varieties present with respect to the *a*PseCo 'is inconsistent with the traditional ideas about dialectological boundaries' (p. 74), which is just one difficulty to be added to the description of PseCo. The main obstacle for a biclausal analysis stems from the monoeventive meaning of the construction, but the authors argue that a biclausal structure is to be interpreted along the same lines of a partitive semantics for the progressive, as proposed in Landman (1992), which includes hence the reference to two events. In fact, the authors show that a biclausal structure along the lines that they defend offers 'a template for many externalizations of progressive' (p. 93) involving two elements, hence, making this way transparent the partitive relation. The chapter presents a couple of typos in the formulae: in (30) *vannu* is a present tense, and as such the relation is that of coincidence of e and U (p. 80). In (44b) the y has to be house in Theme (e)=y. As to (30), observe, however, that in any case *eat* can be simultaneous to the utterance time, which is a shortcoming of the biclausal analysis of this authors, so something has to be said.

In Chapter 4, **Preterite indicative Pseudo-Coordination and morphomic patterns. The case of the W-Pattern in the dialect of Delia** (p. 99-127) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.04dic, Vincenzo Nicolò Di Caro shows that the W-pattern is a well stablished pattern in the *a*PseCo in Delia, a dialect of Sicilia. The W-pattern excludes the second persons in V2 in the past perfective, which are substituted by the infinitive construction. In addition to this, V2 is restricted to only those verbs that have rizhotonic perfective pasts, which do not exceed the number of 13. In all other cases, V2 appears in the infinitive. A grammaticality judgment-based study consisting in a questionnaire answered by 140 participants confirms that the W-pattern has the condition of a 'morphome' and that as such it has psychological reality for the speakers, since it appears consistently throughout the sample, not being affected by variables such as the gender or the age. In addition to this, and considering that the number of verbs that can function as V2 is highly limited, a situation that the survey confirms, the study corroborates the fact that 'it is the morphological nature of V2 that licenses the construction' (p. 123), which point towards the fact that *a*PseCo in Deliano is a sort of a residual construction, although very resistant due to the high usage of the V2 accepted (*dari* 'give', *fari* 'make, do', vìdiri 'see', vìviri 'drink').

---

[1]   Unfortunately, terminology changes from one author to another, although the phenomena being described be the same. In the following I will try to stick whenever is possible to the descriptive terms proposed by the editors in chapter 2 for expository reasons.

Chapter 5, **Gone unexpectedly: Pseudo-coordination and the expression of surprise (**pp. 129–148) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.05cru, by Silvio Cruschina, closes Section 1. In this chapter, Cruschina proposes a formal analysis for the expressive meaning standardly acknowledged to the *e*PseCo. Specifically, Cruschina focuses on the Sicilian *e*PseCo and argues that V1-GO is a functional verb that introduces a conventional implicature of surprise and unexpectedness, hence, the mirativity. Surprise is defined in terms of comparison between worlds and stereotypical ordering sources, which implies analyzing ePseCo as a modal construction. In addition to this, two other elements are relevant. On the one hand, on cognitive grounds, GO conveys the idea of 'movement or distancing away from the speaker's expectations or beliefs' (p. 136). On the other hand, the narrative present or fake tense anchors the evaluation time of the speaker's expectations to the utterance time, although the situation is located in the past. Observe, however, that if this is to be the case, on the hand, the present is functioning as a present, and hence it is not a fake tense. On the other hand, this analysis would amount to treating V1-GO as an epistemic modal, which I don't think to be the case. The chapter ends with an extension of this mirative meaning to other contexts, namely the Catalan *go*-past.

Chapter 6, **The properties of the '(a) lua şi X' ('take and X') construction in Romanian: Evidence in favor of a more fine-grained distinction among pseudocoordinative structures (**pp. 149–166) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.06ble, by Adina Camelia Bleotu, closes Section 1. In this chapter, it is argued that Romanian *(a) lua şi* 'take and' represents a special case of pseudocoordination. The author carries out an exploratory acceptability judgment task with 52 native speakers of Romanian in order to test 16 structural properties of this construction as defined in de Vos (2005), such as the Coordinate Structure Constraint, coordinator substitution, the VP-deletion, or some semantic tests concerning the semantic bleaching of V1. The results of the study show that *(a) lua şi* presents properties in between GO-PseCo and *try and* coordination in de Vos' classification, which according to the author needs, hence, a revision 'in order to accommodate Romanian 'take' as an additional type' (p. 149).

Section 2, which focusses in languages other than Romance languages, starts with Chapter 7, **Pseudo-coordination and ellipsis: Expressive insights from Brazilian Portuguese and Polish** (pp. 169–190) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.07men, in which their authors, Gesoel Mendes and Marta Ruda offer several proofs which confirm that the TAKE-PseCo construction belongs both in BP and in Polish to the realm of the expressive domain. The evidences concern the possibility of being ignored for ellipsis purposes in contexts such as verb-echo answers, polarity contrast, verb-doubling and VP-topicalization, all of which only target the propositional or truth content leaving outside the expressive content. The second part of the chapter examines the structural position of TAKE-V1 with respect to the rest of the clause. Distributional patterns regarding the placement of both adverbs and sentential negation, which can only attach to V2 in both languages, make the authors conclude that TAKE-V1 is an appositive element in these languages, very much like an epithet, and as such it adjoins to V2's extended projection vP, either as a vP or as the first conjunct of an &P, depending on whether a linking element is present (the latter) or not (the former).

Chapter 8, **Pseudo-coordination of the verb jít ('go') in contemporary Czech (**pp. 191–212) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.08sko, by Svatava Škodová, compares the use of *jít* ('go') in Czech in PseCo and in prototypical coordination

(ProCo) as they appear in the 1611 examples from the Czech National Corpus, subcorpus SYN2005, out of which 923 examples are ProCo and 668 PseCo. From the research it follows that Czech counts with a canonical GO-PseCo as far as it meets all the relevant properties concerning its grammar and its meaning standardly attributed to this construction. In any case, it should be noted that, on the one hand, this editor has its doubts as regards the analysis given for telic predicates in an imperfective tense, at least at it has been translated in (7) (p. 196): V2 in (7) does not seem to express 'a durative action in progress'. It is either coerced into an inchoative meaning (I start to sing) or it is interpreted as referring to a habitual situation made up of an open series of punctual microevents (see Bravo 2020: 142). On the other hand, Ross' Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC) dates back to 1967, when it is formulated in his thesis. However, in the article it is cited as Ross (1986). Although it is true that the CSC appears in his 1986 book, in a collection of articles specialized in PseCo it is expected that this well-known information among the specialists is cited in an informative way.

In chapter 9, **In search of subjective meaning in Swedish pseudocoordination (**pp. 213–230) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.09ble**,** Kristian Blensenius and Peter Andersson Lilja propose an account for the development of the subjective meaning associated with Swedish PseCo construction using data from two different sources. Historical data from 12th to 19th century come from the corpus tool Korp, with over 100 million tokens. Present-day data come from Twitter. Specifically, their study confirms this meaning for *gå och* V 'go/walk and V', for which they defend that got reinforced during time through a process of subjectification associated to the construction itself in the first place rather than a process of semantic bleaching on the part of V1. For this reason, it is argued that this type of change 'suggests a usage-based model to grammar' (p. 226). As to the posture-verb pseudocoordination *sitta och* V 'sit and V', the authors argue, on the first place, that contrary to what it is currently accepted in the relevant literature *sitta* still conveys its lexical meaning. There has not been, hence, any semantic bleaching process. Secondly, very interestingly as well, it is defended that its alleged subjective meaning depends more on the negative social or cultural meaning that the posture itself may merit, as associated with being relaxed, together with certain locatives as well as certain intrinsically pejorative verbs than to the construction itself.

Chapter 10, **Pseudo-coordination, pseudo-subordination, and para-hypotaxis. A perspective from Semitic linguistics** (pp. 231-242) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.10edz, by Lutz Edzard, is the last in Section 2. The author takes as a starting point a Boolean scheme based on Yuasa and Sadock's (2002) modular syntax and semantics for predicting the different types of syntactic and semantic relations permitted in coordination and subordination schemes. This Boolean scheme, however, leaves out a construction, characteristic of the Semitic languages, that syntactically is a coordination of a finite verb and a non-finite verb, not necessarily in this order, but whose semantics may be either that of coordination or that of subordination. If coordination, the two verbs are semantically at the same level, but the action denoted by the second verbs depends on the one conveyed by the first. For this reason the author labels this construction as 'para-hypotaxis'. The last section of the article is dedicated to review other languages with this type of construction.

The last section, Section 3, starts with Chapter 11, **Ambiguities in Japanese pseudo-coordination and its dialectal variation** (pp. 245–270) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.11shi**, by** Masaharu Shimada and Akiko Nagano. This

chapter analyses the Japanase *-te aru* constructions focusing in the variation between Standard Japanese (SJ) and Fukoyama Japanese (FJ). The construction credits as a bona fide pseudo-coordination structure as far as it is formed out of two verbs mediated by *-te*, a conjunctive marker. However, the chapter does not address this topic very much but concentrates, on the contrary, on the properties of the construction in SJ, on the one hand, compared to its properties in FJ, where it is realized as *chaa*, on the other hand. Both in SJ and in FJ *-te aru* allows for a perfective interpretation, which, according to the authors, can be explained if *-aru* is a lexical existential verb in a control structure. In addition to this, only in FJ *chaa* allows for a progressive reading. In this case, *iru* is a grammaticalized functional category and hence, without any possibility for restricting its superficial subject.

Chapter 12, **Partial versus full agreement in Turkish possessive and clausal DP-Coordination** (pp. 271–286) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.12tat**,** by Deniz Tat and Jaklin Kornfilt, dwells with a case of partial agreement characteristic of Turkish nominal phrases and clauses. The phenomenon, hence, belongs to the wider domain of the MAC and allows the authors for propose an analysis for 'what is possible in natural language and what is not' (p. 284) with respect to the agreement phenomenon.

In Chapter 13, **Syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of Pseudo-Coordination** (pp. 287-314) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.13mit, Moreno Mitrović provides an strictly compositional formal semantics analysis for GO-PseCo expressions. According to Mitrović, in GO-PseCO GO-V1 is semantically bleached and 'denotes an event of causing of a state'. As a consequence, V2 is coerced into denoting the state resultant of having been caused by the event introduced by V1 and the whole construction is a 'resultative-like' (p. 292) expression. In the chapter, the pragmatic meanings of surprise and negative-emotive factivity are also formalized. Although the causative-resultative meaning of the construction is not entirely clear, and in fact the author just undertakes it and cites Kratzer (2005) for any further discussion concerning this issue (p. 305), the analysis interestingly enough is the only one, to my knowledge, that assumes that the linking element is still meaningful at some level and aims at reflecting its contribution. Specifically, it is defended that the relevant contribution is that of sequencing in a junction structure. In Del Prete and Todaro (2019) a two events semantic analysis is proposed as well, but motion is still relevant in the overall account as in other proposals.

In the last chapter of the book, chapter 14, **Pseudocoordination and Serial Verb Constructions as Multi-Verb Predicates** (pp. 315–336) https://doi.org/10.1075/la.274.14ros, Daniel Ross addresses a very much discussed topic: the relationship between PseCo and SVCs and argues that sequences of (normally two, but not necessarily) verbs is sufficiently widespread across the languages of the world to merit an unitary analyses, and disregards hence differences in their respective syntactic realizations. There exist prior proposals to draw bridges between SVCs and other multiple verb constructions, not typologically related, such as Anderson (2006, 2011) and Aboh (2009) but they are not as systematic and overarching as Ross'.

As a general comment, I would like to point out that the book would have undoubtedly benefit from a unified list of references for all the chapters, since on the one hand, there is an ample number of works cited chapter after chapter. On the other hand, the reader would have had most of the relevant works on the subject listed all together -however, they can be found in Ross (2021). Likewise, the contributions have

been grouped in sections according to typological considerations, but a thematic ordering would have been also possible as far the same issues are addressed in several chapter, sometimes with the content pretty much coincident although with differences in the language or the theoretical approach. Thus, the meaning of PseCo is specifically examined as the main topic in at least chapter 5, chapter 7 and chapter 13, and chapter 9, this one from a historical point of view. Presenting them together under the same section would have contributed to gain a better understanding of the properties of the PseCO, since the same semantics obtains cross-linguistically. Other arrangements, for instance 'Morpho-syntaxic properties', could have been proposed for other chapters so that the structural similarities be highlighted instead of the typological ones, which can make the discussion sometimes rather repetitive, as in the case of the chapters dedicated to Ita. PseCo. In general, this reviewer finds that the content is probably a little Italian centered in some aspects while issues such as whether V1 has to lack or not of lexical content are still not clear after all. Probably, a concluding chapter in which the editors go back to the questions they raise in the introductory chapter (p. 5) in order to review the advances achieved with respect to them would have helped to get a clear view of the point where we are. In any case, this is a most welcome and necessary book. The editors amply achieve their aims and the volume is indeed a must to researchers interested either in PseCo in particular or in MAC and complex verbs clusters in general regardless of their theoretical commitments, as well as to anyone who wants to learn in a few pages the main issues that PseCo and MAC present.

References

Aboh, Enoch Oladé. 2009. Clause Structure and Verb Series. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40: 1-33.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2006. *Auxiliary Verb Constructions*. Oxford / NY: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199280315.001.0001

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2011. Auxiliary Verb Constructions (and Other Complex Predicate Types): A Functional–Constructional Overview. *Language and Linguistics Compass*: 795–828. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2011.00311.x

Bravo, Ana. 2020. On Pseudo-Coordination in Spanish. *Borealis: An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 9: 125–180. https://doi.org/10.7557/1.9.1.5365

Del Prete, Fabio & Giuseppina Todaro. 2020. Building complex events: The case of Sicilian Doubly Inflected Construction. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 38: 1–41.https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-018-09439-2

Ross, Daniel. 2021. *Pseudocoordination, Serial Verb Constructions and Multi-Verb Predicates: The relationship between form and structure*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois Urbana-Campaign. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5546426