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1.0. Introduction

The issue of coordination of finite verb forms and infinitives in Biblical Hebrew, especially in Late Biblical Hebrew, as well as the use of the infinitive absolute as an inner object (comparable to the Arabic mafʿūl muṭlaq) or as an imperative, have received proper attention in Hebrew philology and linguistics. Important references (after treatment in the classic grammars) include Rubinstein (1952); Huesman (1956); Hammershaimb (1963); Waltke and O'Connor (1990, 595ff); Fassberg (2007); Callaham (2010); Morrison (2013); van der Merwe and Andrason (2014); as well as Wang and Noonan (2017).

1 The author wishes to thank two anonymous reviewers for valuable input regarding a number of details and bibliographical references.
In this paper, the issue is examined from the perspective of the concepts of (pseudo-)coordination and (pseudo-) subordination, as proposed by Yuasa and Sadock (2002; see below), drawing on comparison of a wide range of Semitic and non-Semitic data. Deliberately, no attempt is made to trace back the types of (pseudo-)coordination and (pseudo-)subordination dealt with in this paper to any particular branch of Semitic. Rather, the various attestations of coordination and subordination will be placed and analysed within Yuasa and Sadock’s aforementioned typology.

A Biblical Hebrew example illustrating the issue is provided in (1):

(1) Pseudo-subordination in Biblical Hebrew (finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

\[ \text{זְרַעְתִּמ} \text{הַרְבַּה} \text{וְהָבֵא} \text{מְעָט} \]

\[ \text{sow.PF.2PL.M} \text{much and-harvest.INF.ABS little} \]

‘You have sown much but harvested little.’ (Hag. 1.6) (cf. Morrison 2013, 267)

In the case of (1) and the following Phoenician (2), Safaitic (3), and Sabaic (4) examples, we argue for the following scenario. While the infinitive absolute usually denotes a subordinated activity, the semantics of the two or more activities in these cases appear to be more coordinated than subordinated. Hence the categorisation as ‘pseudo-subordination’.

(2) Pseudo-subordination in Phoenician (finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

\[ \text{wā-šibbirtī/šabantī milisim wa-taroq} \text{'anoki kull ha-ra’c} \]

\[ \text{and-break.PRF.1SG villain.PL and-uproot.INF 1SG all DEF-evil} \]
'And I shattered the villains and uprooted all the evil.' (cf. Hackett 2013)

(3) Pseudo-subordination in Safaitic (Old North Arabic) (finite verb form joined with an infinitive; cf. Al-Jallad 2015, 182)

\[ r'y \quad h-rmh \quad bql \quad w \quad km't \]

\text{pasture}.\text{PRF}.3\text{SG}.M \quad \text{DEF-camel}.\text{COL} \quad \text{herbage} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{gather_truffles}.\text{INF}

‘He pastured the camels on spring herbage and gathered truffles.’

(4) Pseudo-subordination in Sabaic (finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

\[ w-y'ttmw \quad w-tqdm \quad w-rt\text{dh}n \]

\text{and-regroup}.\text{PRET}.3\text{PL}.M \quad \text{and-advance}.\text{INF} \quad \text{and-engage_in_battle}.\text{INF}

‘And they [the Sabeans] regrouped, came to a confrontation, and joined in battle.’ (cf. Nebes 1988, 65)


(5) Pseudo-coordination in Norwegian (finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

\[ De \quad ble \quad stående \quad og \quad vente \]

\text{3PL} \quad \text{become}.\text{PRET} \quad \text{stand}.\text{PRES}.\text{PART} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{wait}.\text{INF}

‘They remained standing, waiting.’ (cf. Lødrup 2002, 138)

In this case, the infinitive ‘to wait’, which we would expect in a syntactically subordinated position (not on the same level), is coordinated by the conjunction og ‘and’; hence the categorisation ‘pseudo-coordination’.

In contrast, the Swahili example (6) again represents a case of pseudo-subordination, as semantic coordination obtains:
Pseudo-subordination in Swahili (finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

\[\text{wa-na-andika na ku-soma}\]

\[3\text{PL-PRS-write} \text{ and INF-read}\]

‘They write and read.’ (cf. Erickson and Gustafsson 1984)

In the following, we investigate the model of (pseudo-)coordination and (pseudo-)subordination proposed by Yuasa and Sadock (2002), which contains the four different categories exposed in (7), with a modular categorisation into syntax and semantics. We first present Yuasa and Sadock’s model, based on a number of Yiddish examples, and then apply it to Semitic data.

2.0. The Yiddish and Semitic Data in Terms of Yuasa and Sadock (2002)

2.1. A Basic Typology

With respect to Semitic data, ‘pseudo-coordination’ and, to a lesser degree, ‘pseudo-subordination’ (which terms are defined below) have received implicit attention in the realm of converb (gerund) and serial verb constructions. Cf., e.g., Woidich (2002); Versteegh (2009) for Arabic; Meyer (2012) for Amharic; Edzard (2014a; 2014b) for (Ethio-)Semitic; Johannessen and Edzard (2015) for Semitic and north-Germanic; Andrason (2019) for Biblical Hebrew; Andrason and Koo (2020) for Biblical Aramaic (with many further references); cf. also, e.g., Ross (2016, 211).

As always in linguistics, the following caveat should right away be formulated: one should not automatically consider the syntactic features of a target language or language of analysis, typically
English, as the norm or even the ‘underlying’ structure of the source language, or language under analysis. This holds also and especially for the categories coordination (parataxis) and subordination (hypotaxis).

Table 1 lists the basic categories presented in Yuasa and Sadock (2002), a classic bi-polar scheme. The fact that Yuasa and Sadock base their typology on nominal syntax in no way affects the validity of their model for verbal syntax. What matters here is simply the Boolean bi-polar scheme (the category ‘subordinate’ could also be encoded as ‘− coordinate’):

Table 1: Scheme (Yuasa and Sadock 2002, 91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>Semantics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple coordination</td>
<td>Coordinate</td>
<td>Coordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-coordination</td>
<td>Coordinate</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple subordination</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-subordination</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Coordinate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the sake of illustration, we start by reviewing some of Yuasa and Sadock’s (2002, 111ff) Yiddish examples in the nominal realm. The case of simple coordination is the most basic. In (7a), *tate* ‘father’ and *mame* ‘mother’ are on the same level, and one would expect plural agreement with any following verbal predicate (7a):

(7a) Simple (‘normal’) nominal coordination in Yiddish

\[
\text{דער טאַטע אוֹן דוֹ מאמע}
\]

\[
\text{der tate un di mame}
\]

\[
\text{DEF.M.NOM father.NOM and DEF.F.NOM mother.NOM}
\]

‘the father and the mother’ (i.e., ‘father and mother’)

\[
\text{‘the father and the mother’ (i.e., ‘father and mother’)}
\]
Yuasa and Sadock provide no matching example of nominal pseudo-coordination, e.g., an example where the second noun would be dependent on the first one, but one might compare a standard Classical Arabic construction, such as (7b):

(7b) Nominal pseudo-coordination \((\textit{maf'ūl ma‘a-hū})\) in Arabic

\[
\textit{sirtu} \quad \textit{wa-n-nīl-a}
\]

\text{travel.1SG.PF and-DEF-Nile-ACC}

‘I travelled with the Nile’.

The traditional grammatical explanation here is that the conjunction \textit{wa}- ‘and’ is reanalysed as a preposition, but an account of (7b) may well refer to the concept of pseudo-coordination in this case.

Yuasa and Sadock’s example of simple (or ‘normal’) subordination in Yiddish is the following (7c):

(7c) Simple (‘normal’) nominal subordination in Yiddish

\[
\textit{der rebe mit-n hunt}
\]

\text{DEF.M.NOM rabbi with-DEF.M.DAT dog}

‘the rabbi with the dog’

Here \textit{hunt} ‘dog’ is both syntactically and semantically subordinate, i.e., a subsequent verbal predicate would refer only to the \textit{rebe} ‘rabbi’, not to the dog, and would always be in the singular.

Example (7d) is \textit{a priori} ambiguous. Formally it looks like simple subordination (7c), but in principle, both subordinate ‘in-egalitarian’ and coordinate ‘egalitarian’ readings are possible:
(7d) Nominal pseudo-subordination in Yiddish

dер тате́ мит дэр ма́мен

`the father with the mother’ (i.e., ‘father and mother’)

The appropriate reading as a pseudo-subordination is borne out in example (7e), clearly a construction *ad sensum*, i.e., a construction in which semantics override syntax. The verbal predicate exhibits plural agreement, referring to both *tate* ‘father’ and *mame* ‘mother’, even though *mame* ‘mother’ is syntactically subordinate (in standard German, (7e) would be ungrammatical):

(7e) Nominal pseudo-subordination in Yiddish

dер тате́ мит дэр ма́мен зинге́н

`Father and mother are singing together.’

2.2. The Semitic Material

On both the phrasal (nominal) and the sentential (verbal) level, there exist coordinating (paratactic) and subordinating (hypotactic) constructions in Semitic that are not fundamentally different from comparable constructions in Germanic or Romance, so they will not be covered here. In the following, we will concentrate on instances of verbal pseudo-coordination and pseudo-subordination.
As a further preliminary remark: it is not always possible to place a given construction in the model by Yuasa and Sadock, as borderline cases do exist. The main issue in Semitic is that coordinated structures may appear asyndetically, i.e., without an intervening conjunction, and that subordinated structures may appear with an intervening conjunction, thus blurring the basic picture. The following instances of pseudo-coordination and pseudo-subordination are salient in Semitic and beyond and will be treated here, first cases of pseudo-coordination (§§2.2.1–4), and then cases of pseudo-subordination (§§2.2.5–6). It is not claimed that the following typology is in any way exhaustive.

Pseudo-coordination

2.2.1. Syndetic constructions with posture or motion verbs
2.2.2. Syndetic serial-verb constructions
2.2.3. Asyndetic serial-verb constructions
2.2.4. Syndetic converb(-like) constructions

Pseudo-subordination

2.2.5. Asyndetic converb construction
2.2.6. Syndetic constructions consisting of finite VPs and infinitives

2.2.1. Syndetic Constructions with Posture or Motion Verbs

We start out with cases of pseudo-coordination, i.e., cases, where, in spite of coordinating syntax, subordination obtains on the semantic level. Typically, such constructions involve as first constituents verbs that are semantically reduced. As in Scandinavian
languages, syndetic constructions with a posture verb are not unusual in both older and more recent Semitic language varieties. In (8), representing Levantine Arabic, the posture verb *qaʿdat* ‘she sat’ is semantically bleached (reduced) or, if one so pleases, grammaticalised.

(8) Pseudo-coordination with a posture verb (cf. Ross 2016, 211)

\[ qaʿdat \text{ } wa-\text{katbat} \]
\[ \text{sit.PF.3SG.F and-write.PF.3SG.F} \]

‘She was writing...’ (Levantine Arabic)

A Biblical-Aramaic example of pseudo-coordination with a posture verb, here *qām* ‘to arise’, is the following (9):

(9) Pseudo-coordination with a posture verb in Biblical Aramaic (cf. Andrason and Koo 2000, 10)

\[ bēdāyin \text{ } qāmū \text{ } zərubbāʾēl \text{ } bar-šəʾaltīʾēl \text{ } wa-\text{yešūaʿ} \]
\[ \text{then rise.PF.3PL PN son.cs-PN and-PN} \]
\[ \text{bar-yōšāḏāq} \text{ } wa-\text{šārīw} \text{ } la-\text{mībnē} \text{ } bēt \text{ } žēlāhā \text{ } di \text{ } b-\text{irūšlem} \]
\[ \text{son.cs-PN and-begin.PF.3PL to-build-INF house.cs God REL} \]

in-Jerusalem

‘Then Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel and Jeshua the son of Jozadak arose and began to build the house of God, which [is] in Jerusalem.’ (Ezra 5.2)

Syndetic constructions with motion verbs occur as well; these are typologically close to the following type represented in
(10) and (11), to wit, syndetic serial-verb constructions. First is a Gǝʿəz example of pseudo-coordination with a motion verb, ʾaqdāmku ‘I preceded’, which in English is best rendered by an adverb (10).

(10) Pseudo-coordination with a motion verb (cf. Rubin 2005, 33)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ʾaqdāmku} \quad \text{wa-nāgārkū-kəmu} \\
\text{precede.}^{\text{pf.1sg}} \quad \text{and-tell.}^{\text{pf.1sg-2pl.m}}
\end{array}
\]

‘I told you beforehand.’ (1 Thess. 3.4) (Gǝʿəz)

The Norwegian example (5) cited above and repeated below (11), in which ‘remaining standing’ and ‘waiting’ are also syntactically parallel (on the same level), likewise belongs to the category of pseudo-coordination. On the semantic level, however, we observe subordination in this case (‘standing’ and ‘waiting’ are not on the same level).

(11) Pseudo-coordination in Norwegian (finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{De ble} \quad \text{stående} \quad \text{og vente} \\
\text{become.}^{\text{pret}} \quad \text{stand.}^{\text{pres.part}} \quad \text{and wait.}^{\text{inf}}
\end{array}
\]

‘They remained standing, waiting.’ (cf. Lødrup 2002, 138)

2.2.2. Syndetic Serial-verb Constructions

Closely related to the previous type are serial-verb constructions sometimes referred to a ‘verbal hendiadys’ (cf., most recently, Andrason 2019), in which the first semantically bleached or grammaticalised verb is again best rendered by an adverb in European languages. The prototypical case here is to do something again, as expressed by the verbs יָשָׁע, way-yōṣēp ‘and he added’ and atūr
‘I returned’ in Biblical Hebrew and Akkadian, respectively, as in the following two examples.

(12) Syndetic serial-verb constructions in Biblical Hebrew

\[
\text{way-}\text{yōseph} \quad \text{`abrāhām} \quad \text{way-yiqqah} \quad \text{`iššā}
\]

and-add.PRET.3SG.M Abraham and-take.PRET.3SG.M wife

‘And Abraham took once again a wife.’ (Gen. 25.1)

(13) Syndetic serial-verb constructions in Akkadian (cf. Huehnergard 2005, 125)

\[
atūr-ma \quad \text{wardam} \quad \text{ana} \quad \text{bēli-ya} \quad aṭrūd
\]

return.PRET.1SG-and slave.ACC to lord.GEN-1SG send.PRET.1SG

‘I sent the slave to my lord again.’ (Akkadian)

2.2.3 Asyndetic Serial-verb Constructions

Asyndetic serial-verb constructions also occur in more recent registers of Arabic. Alongside the already encountered verb \( \text{rigi} \) ‘he returned’ one finds the ingressive verb \( \text{qāmū} \) ‘they began’, as in the following two examples.

(14) Asyndetic serial-verb construction in Middle Arabic (cf. Versteegh 2009, 196)

\[
\text{qāmū} \quad \text{taqātalū}
\]

get.up.PF.3PL.M fight.PF.3PL.M

‘They began to fight with each other.’

(15) Asyndetic serial-verb construction in Cairene Arabic (cf. Woidich 2002, 128)

\[
\text{rigi} \quad \text{hirib} \quad \text{tānī}
\]

return.PF.3SG.M flee.PF.3SG.M second.time

‘He fled a second time.’ (Cairene Arabic)
2.2.4. Syndetic Converb(-like) Constructions

In the following two examples, the two converb-like constructions *ka-hārīm-i* ‘as my lifting’ (Biblical Hebrew) and *p₁l ṣnk* ‘my making’ (Phoenician), i.e., infinitives followed by either an enclitic pronominal suffix or an independent pronoun—from a Semitic perspective, this is the underlying structure of converbs—are followed by a finite verb (cf. also Lipiński 2010). Even though the semantics of the resulting construction are of a subordinating character, the syntax is basically coordinating; hence the categorisation as pseudo-coordination.

(16) Syndetic converb(-like) construction in Biblical Hebrew (cf. Lipiński 2001, 427)

`wā-yhī ka-hārīm-ī qōl-ī wā-ʾeqrā`

‘Lifting up my voice I cried.’ (Gen. 39.18)

(17) Syndetic converb(-like) construction in Phoenician (cf. Lipiński 2001, 427)

`p₁l ṣnk ... l-rbt-y ... w-šmʾ ql`

‘I having made (this) ... for my Lady ..., she heard my voice.’

2.2.5. Asyndetic Converb Constructions

We now turn to the opposite scenario, pseudo-subordination, in which one constituent appears in a typically subordinate state (converb/gerund or infinitive), even though the semantics of the resulting construction are more of a coordinating character (as

The fact that the events expressed by converbs in (18), ṭärtäw ‘having called (PL)’ and täsaffəräw ‘having gotten in (PL)’, precede the final event expressed by a finite verb, yədärsallu ‘they arrive’, does not necessarily make the non-final events semantically subordinate.

(18) Asyndetic converb construction in Amharic (cf. Appleyard 1995; Edzard 2014)

\[
\text{taksi } \text{ṭärtäw } \text{täsaffəräw } \text{kä-₃qit gize bā-h₃ala}
\]

\[
\text{taxi } \text{call.CVB.3PL } \text{get_in.CVB.3PL } \text{of-little } \text{time after}
\]

\[
\text{məgəb } \text{bet } \text{yədärsallu}
\]

\[
\text{food } \text{house } \text{arrive.IPF.3PL}
\]

‘They call a taxi, get in, and after a while they arrive at the restaurant.’ (‘having called, a taxi, having gotten in,...’)

The same holds for (19), even though gäbto ‘coming in’ is reminiscent of a motion verb. However, no semantic bleaching or grammaticalisation takes place in this case.

(19) Asyndetic converb construction in Amharic

\[
\text{gäbto } \text{täqāmmātā}
\]

\[
\text{come_in.CVB.3SG.M } \text{sit_down.PF.3SG.M}
\]

‘he came in and sat down’ (‘his coming in, he sat down’)

In other cases, e.g., (20), true subordination obtains (here indicating manner).
(20) Asyndetic converb construction in Amharic

\[ \text{lag-u roto gabbage} \]

child-def run.cvb.3sg.m come_in.pf.3sg.m

‘the boy came in running’ (‘the boy his running he came’)

In other languages, e.g., Turkish, true subordination can be observed in similar constructions, as in (21). Here, the first event clearly conditions the occurrence of the second event.

(21) Asyndetic converb construction in Turkish (cf. Johanson 1995, 313)

\[ \text{Ali gelince Osman } \text{saşır-d-t} \]

Ali come-cvb Osman be_surprised-trm.pst-3sg

‘When Ali came, Osman was surprised.’

2.2.6. Syndetic Constructions Consisting of Finite VPs and Infinitives

We turn now to the origin of our paper, i.e., the phenomenon of syndetic constructions consisting of finite VPs and infinitives. These are also subsumed under the category pseudo-subordination. While an infinitive usually marks a semantically subordinated event, in the following examples the events mostly occur on the same semantic level. A possible explanation, suggested by several of the cited authors, is that once the tense/aspect of the first event is firmly established by a finite verb form, the relevant morphological information can be ‘economised’ in a subsequent verb form, leaving a blank infinitive. Here follow examples, some of which were already introduced at the outset of this paper, in the languages Phoenician, Safaitic (old Northern Arabic), Sabaic,
and Biblical Hebrew (cf. also Rubinstein 1952; Huesman 1956; and Morrison 2013).

(22) Phoenician (finite verb form joined with an infinitive) (cf. Hackett 2013)

\[ \text{wa-šibbirti/šabarti } \text{milīṣīm } \text{wa-taroq } \text{'anoki kull} \]

and-break.PRF.1SG villain.PL and-uproot.INF 1SG all

\text{ha-ra}^{c}

DEF-evil

‘And I shattered the villains and uprooted all the evil.’ (cf. Hackett 2013)

(23) Safaitic (finite verb form joined with an infinitive) (cf. Al-Jallad 2015, 182)

\[ \text{rʿy } \text{h-rmḥ } \text{bql } \text{w kmʿt} \]

pasture.PRF.3SG.M DEF-camel.COL herbage and gather_truffles.INF

‘He pastured the camels on spring herbage and gathered truffles.’

(24) Safaitic (finite verb form joined with an infinitive) (cf. Al-Jallad 2015, 182)

\[ \text{w wrd } \text{f nyt } \text{(b-)ʿmtn} \]

and go_to_water.PF.3SG.M and migrate.INF (in-)Libra

‘And he went to the water, and then migrated when the sun was in Libra.’

(25) Sabaic (finite verb form joined with an infinitive) (cf. Nebes 1988, 54)

\[ \text{w-yʿttmw } \text{w-tqdm } \text{w-rtdlḥn} \]

and-regroup.PRET.3PL.M and-advance.INF and-engage_in_battle.INF

‘And they [the Sabeans] regrouped, came to a confrontation, and joined in battle.’
(26) Biblical Hebrew (finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

‘Did I not clearly reveal myself to your ancestor’s family when they were in Egypt under Pharaoh? And did I not choose him from all the tribes of Israel...’ (1 Sam. 2.27b–28a) (cf. Morrison 2013, 267)

(27) Biblical Hebrew (finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

‘You have sown much but harvested little.’ (Hag. 1.6) (cf. Morrison 2013, 267)

(28) Biblical Hebrew (finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

‘When you fasted and mourned.’ (Zech. 7.5) (cf. Morrison 2013, 267)

In some of these examples, e.g., in Phoenician (22) and Biblical Hebrew (28), the events occur strictly on the same level. In other examples, the final event (expressed by an infinitive) is indeed
the end of a chain of actions, without, however, engendering the subordination of the previous events. Therefore, the labelling pseudo-subordination is perfectly justified.

(29) Biblical Hebrew (imperfective finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

\[\text{וּ} \, \text{וְכִֽי־יִמְכְּר} \, \text{מִמְכָר} \, \text{לַעֲמִית} \, \text{אֵוֹ} \, \text{קָנ} \, \text{מִיֵַד} \, \text{עֲמִית} \, \text{אַל־תוֹנָו} \, \text{אִֵ֥יש} \, \text{אָחִיו׃} \]

And if you sell anything to your neighbour, or buy from your neighbour's hand, you shall not wrong one another.' (Lev. 25.14) (cf. Waltke and O'Connor 1990, 596)

(30) Biblical Hebrew (jussive finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

\[\text{זָֽבַּאַ֑שְׁו} \, \text{לַמְּלֵ֖כ} \, \text{נְעָרֵּ֥וֹת} \, \text{בְתוּלָ֖וֹת} \, \text{טָוֹבֵּ֥וֹת} \, \text{מַרְא} \, \text{יוֹ} \, \text{תַםְרֻק} \, \text{יה} \, \text{ן׃} \]

‘Let there be sought for the king young virgins fair to look on… and let their ointments be given to them.’ (Est. 2.2–3) (cf. Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 596)
Comparable examples of pseudo-subordination of consecutive verb forms, participles, and infinitives construct with an infinitive absolute exist as well, e.g., in the case of a mixture of infinitives and participles.

(31) Biblical Hebrew (participle joined with an infinitive)

 kd kōtāḥ ’āšer nikīṭāḥ bā-šēm
 CONJ document REL write.PTCP_PASS in-name.CS

 ham-melek wō-nīḥōm bō-ṭabbā’āt ham-melek
 DEF-king and-seal.PASS.ABS in-ring.CS DEF-king

 ēn lō-ḥāṣīḥ
 NEG to-overturn.INF.CS

 ‘...for no document written in the king’s name and sealed with his ring can be revoked.’ (Est. 8.8) (cf. Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 597)

2.3. Typological Considerations

Interestingly, similar constructions are also found in other language families, e.g., in totally unrelated Swahili, thus pointing to a typologically widespread feature. Again, the events in the following three examples (Nadine Bayer, personal communication; cf. also Schadeberg 2010) all occur on the same level.

(32) Swahili (finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

 wa-na-andika na ku-soma
 3PL-PRS-write and INF-read

 ‘They write and read.’ (cf. Erickson and Gustafsson 1984)
(33) Swahili (finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

\[ \text{mi-me a i-me-kauka na ku-haribika} \]

\(NC4\)-plant \(CL4\)-PRF-dry\_out and \(INF\)-get\_damaged

‘The plants are dried out and got damaged.’

(34) Swahili (finite verb form joined with an infinitive)

\[ A-na-tu-tembelea ma-shamba-ni na ku-tu-shauri \]

\(3SG\)-PRS-1PL-visit \(NC6\)-field-LOC and \(INF\)-1PL-give\_advice

‘He visited us on the fields and gave us advice.’

3.0. Conclusion

In section 2 of this paper we have provided numerous examples from Semitic languages of seeming mismatches involving coordination. The main issue in Semitic is that coordinated structures may appear asyndetically, i.e., without an intervening conjunction, and that seemingly subordinated structures may appear with an intervening conjunction, thus blurring the basic picture. We have applied Yuasa and Sadock’s (2002) modular syntax and semantics model, which allows a structure to be coordination at one level and subordination at the other, and vice versa. First, cases of pseudo-coordination were presented, and subsequently cases of pseudo-subordination, in the hope that the system is intuitive enough and the application meaningful.

It is often claimed (e.g., Andrason and Koo 2020, 8, 29), at least as regards the older Semitic languages, especially Akkadian and Northwest Semitic, that there is a linear grammaticalisation path of serialisation in Semitic from the late third millennium BCE up to the early first millennium CE. As a corollary of this paper, this impression is not necessarily confirmed, as already
Akkadian features clear cases of grammaticalised serial verbs. Equally, the specific combination of the infinitive absolute and finite verbs is already attested in Phoenician. Within Biblical Hebrew, however, the observation that this construction becomes more salient in Late Biblical Hebrew appears to be true.
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