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Introduction This study discusses the sharing properties of pseudocoordination in Norwegian where two inflected verbs are joined by a coordinator: \([V_1 \text{ and } V_2]\) and only one subject appears. The construction examined here has a positional verb as \(V_1\) (Pos-NPC) which expresses one event of progressive aspect (cf. Lødrup 2002) (1). The proposal is that Pos-NPC is a coordination where the subject and the other arguments of the two verbs are shared in a multidominance structure.

Previous approaches Wiklund (2007) gives a TMA-copy analysis of pseudocoordination (PC) in Swedish where tense on \(V_2\) is vacuous and simply copied from \(V_1\). Evidence against this is that temporal overlapping in Pos-NPC is actually attested. Lødrup (2003, 2014) shows that \(V_2\) can be headed by an auxiliary expressing passive (2) or future (3) while \(V_1\) has present (active) tense. This indicates that tense is not vacuous on \(V_2\). The availability of an auxiliary and the tense-marking on both verbs could indicate that \(V_2\) is headed by a TP projection. However, sentence adverbials and negation which are assumed to adjoin to T' (or TP), cannot precede \(V_2\) in Pos-NPC (4).

Sharing properties Data show that VP-modifying adjuncts as well as c-selected PPs can intervene and also freely switch position between the two verbs in main and subordinate clauses (1), (6). This also happens when adverbials are not c-selected by both verbs. In (5-a) the PP \(i\ hagen\) is an argument of \(V_1\) but not of \(V_2\). \(V_2\) alone is not an acceptable with the PP \(i\ hagen\) as in (5-b) (cf. Telemen et al. (1999) and Lødrup (2003)). Regardless of this, it can freely switch position after the verbs. This is an indication of argument sharing between \(V_1\) and \(V_2\). Another observation regards the subject of Pos-NPC which appears to be subcategorized by \(V_2\) alone. In (7-a), the subject ‘the light’ belongs lexically to \(V_2\). It is ungrammatical with \(V_2\) as main verb (7-b).

The fact that a sentence adverbial can intervene between \(V_1\) and \(V_2\) excludes an analysis where Pos-NPC is a complex head like de Vos (2005) has suggested for certain PC constructions in English and Afrikaans. Assuming a coordinative structure, the verbs cannot be coordinated in their base position because if so, no (sentence) adverbials could intervene. However they do intervene as in (8). This shows us that the &P projection must be above the vP. If Pos-NPC is not TMA-copying and not a complex head, what is it? Under an ellipsis account, it would have to be assumed that the subject of vP2 in Pos-NPC is deleted under identity with the subject of the first conjunct. However, the subject in Pos-NPC can never be overt and also, no independent reading of non-referential DPs within each conjunct is available.

Proposal The current proposal for Pos-NPC is showed in (9) and involves a bottom-up sharing process in a multidominance structure. The two conjuncts are headed by &P and the arguments are shared by two mother nodes each conjunct. Following Assmann (2012), I propose that the Pos-NPC has imperfect numeration so that positional \(V_1\) enters the derivation without an external theta role. A positional verb normally sub-categorizes a lexical D feature which is checked by a lexical item and realized as a subject. In Pos-NPC, the numeration of vP1 lacks a D and \(\phi\) feature. Therefore \(V_1\) is defect. What is special about \(V_1\) is that it has properties both an auxiliary and a lexical verb. On one side it has a fixed position always preceding the lexical \(V_2\) and it is a closed class. On the other side it can still subcategorize arguments such as the PP \(i\ hagen\) in (1) and (5-a). Because of this, it not entirely an auxiliary. Instead it carries both aspectual information as well as lexical information. The proposed rationale of this is as follows: Because \(V_1\) arrives into the derivation as an aspectual verb but still subcategorizes a PP like \(i\ hagen\), it undergoes parallel merge (cf. Citko 2005) with \(V_2\) in order to share its features with a lexical, non-defect verb. This results in a shared PP. The sharing continues at vP where vP2 has an interpretable D and \(\phi\) feature available to project the subject DP. vP1 on the other hand is borne without this and in order to save the derivation, it checks its uninterpretable D and \(\phi\) features by merging with the specifier position of vP2. This is the trigger for the shared subject node. Evidence for that the subject originates in \(V_2\) was shown in (7). In sum, the bottom-up sharing results from the \(\phi\) having properties of both an auxiliary and a lexical verb.

There is one challenge worth mentioning regarding this proposal. Pos-NPC allows for violations of the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC) by extractions out of one conjunct alone. I account for this by following Wilder (1999) who states that CSC is not violated by movement of constituents out of a conjunct when they are shared by all conjuncts. Because of bottom-up sharing until &P, no violations of CSC occur when constituents are topicalized above the coordination site.
Gutten står (i hagen) og hopper (i hagen).

'a. Han står (i hagen) og hopper (i hagen).
   'The boy is jumping in the garden.'

Der står bilen og blir lakkert i hagen.

'b. Han glor i hagen og hoppet (i hagen).
   'He's staring in the garden.'

Hun sitter og skal spise.

'a. Hun sitter og skal spise.
   'She will be eating.'

*b.a. Han sitter og ikke leser.

Lødrup (2014: 5)

De fleste sto bare og glodde.

'a. De fleste sto bare og glodde.
   'Most people were just staring.'
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