Pseudocoordination with 'take' in Baltic and its neighbours

Nicole Nau,
Vilnius University
& Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

Kirill Kozhanov,
Vilnius University

Liina Lindström,
Vilnius University & University of Tartu

Asta Laugalienė,
Vilnius University

Paweł Brudzyński,
Vilnius University & University of Warsaw

This paper is the first empirical study of the construction TAKE (and) V ("he took and left" = 'he left suddenly, unexpectedly') in contemporary Latvian and Lithuanian, carried out on a large sample of corpus data. The results obtained for Baltic are compared with Slavic (Polish, Russian) and Finnic (Estonian, Finnish) data from comparable corpora. It is argued that out of all the languages under consideration, in Baltic the construction is the most frequent and the most fixed in its form, while at the same time being able to appear in various inflectional forms and in various functions. Other languages differ in how they deviate from the Baltic type. It is also shown that its semantics is largely context-dependent, being sensitive to the semantics of the inflectional form, subject and type of the lexical verb.

Keywords: pseudocoordination, hendiadys, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Finnish, Russian, Polish, corpus linguistics

1. Introduction[1]

A construction of the type TAKE (and) V is found in almost all languages of Europe. In this paper we explore and compare the formal and functional characteristics of this construction in six languages: Latvian, Lithuanian,

---

Estonian, Finnish, Polish and Russian. Our focus will be on the two Baltic languages. Examples (1) and (2) illustrate typical instances of the construction.

(1) Latvian (Latvian-English dictionary at letonika.lv, sub *ņemt* 'take')

viņš	*ņēma*	*un*	*aizgāja*
3SG.NOM.M	take.PST.3	and	PVB.go.PST.3

'he just left' (meaning 'he simply left')

(2) Lithuanian (DLKŽ, sub *imti* 'take')

ima	*ir*	*atsidaro*	*durys*
take.PRS.3	and	PVB.RFL.open.PRS.3	door.NOM.PL

'the door opens (unexpectedly)'

In this construction, a verb with the lexical meaning 'take' does not refer to a separate action of taking, but rather modifies another verb or verb phrase, to which it is formally coordinated. In the investigated languages, the construction most often contains the coordinating conjunction 'and'. Asyndetic coordination (or juxtaposition) without a linking element is also possible, but it is less frequent and in Baltic it decidedly plays only a minor role.

Our first aim is to give a thorough description of this construction in the contemporary Baltic standard languages, where it has been very poorly documented and described until now. We then present the construction in the two Finnic and the two Slavic languages according to the same scheme, but in lesser detail. For all languages we use data from comparable corpora compiled from Internet resources. The intriguing questions for the subsequent discussion are what is cross-linguistically common to the construction, where individual languages differ, and how both similarities and differences may be explained. While, as mentioned above, the TAKE and V construction is found in almost all languages of Europe (and beyond), it has both area- and language-specific features, which are not yet well studied and understood. In this paper we will give a profile of the construction in a north-eastern cluster of European languages which in future studies could be compared, for example, to a Scandinavian or a Romance (south-western European) profile. It will turn out that the Baltic languages have a central place in this profile.

In Section 2, we describe the sources and the methods of data selection, which includes the non-trivial question of how to distinguish our construction from other occurrences of a sequence ['take' 'and' V]. In Section 3, we present and discuss in detail the forms and meanings of the

construction in Baltic as found in the corpora. Sections 4 and 5 summarise the findings on the Finnic and Slavic languages. Section 6 discusses the similarities and differences among the six languages and sums up our most important findings.

In the remainder of this Introduction we will give a short overview of previous research on TAKE and V and related construction.

Constructions as the one investigated here have been discussed in the linguistic literature mainly under two terms: VERBAL HENDIADYS (Poutsma 1917; Hopper 2002; Taube MS) and PSEUDOCOORDINATION or PSEUDO-COORDINATION (Wiklund 1996; Ross 2016; Ross forthcoming). More recently, they have been considered as a kind of, or as being related to, SERIAL VERB CONSTRUCTIONS (Hopper 2008; Ivulāne 2015; Andrason 2018; 2019). At least some subtypes of the construction were also discussed as part of DOUBLE VERB CONSTRUCTIONS (for Russian, cf. Weiss 2007). For more details on the history of research on these constructions and the diverse terminology see Ross (2014; 2016; forthcoming).

The term HENDIADYS (after Greek ἓν διὰ δυοῖν <hen dia dyoin> 'one by means of two') draws attention to the fact that a single action is expressed by two verbs, but it does not suggest or question a specific relation between the two verbs. On the other hand, the term PSEUDOCOORDINATION high-lights the fact that what looks like coordination does not meet all semantic and formal characteristics of typical coordination. One line of research, especially based on Germanic languages, has looked in more detail at these characteristics, often from a formal linguistic perspective (for example, Wiklund 1996; Biberauer & Vikner 2015). However, the term is also used in works on other aspects of the constructions and has become the most familiar term for this type of constructions.

Apart from verbs meaning 'take', several other verbs are used in pseu-docoordination in European languages. In many languages, including English, we find motion verbs such as 'go' and 'come' (for example, Kinn 2018 for Norwegian; Škodová 2009 for Czech; Pulkkinen 1966 and Airola 2007 for Finnish, Tragel 2017 for Estonian). In Baltic, constructions with 'go' are attested and deserve a separate investigation (for Latvian, see Ivulāne 2015). They are more restricted and less frequent than constructions with 'take'. Another group, notably found in Scandinavian languages and Dutch dialects, is verbs of body posture, such as 'sit', 'stand', 'lie' (Haslinger & van Koppen 2003; Kvist Darnell 2008). Other verbs are mostly found in individual languages, for example Norwegian *drive* 'carry on' (Lødrup 2017).

Pseudocoordination with 'take' as the first verb is found in almost all languages of Europe and neighbouring areas. Ross (2017) states that it is "possibly the most wide-spread expression in Eurasia" ("Posiblemente la locución más extendido en Eurasia", Ross 2017, slide 50). Furthermore, it may be the only type of pseudocoordination in a language. This latter finding however has to be taken with some caution, as these constructions are often not described in grammars and speakers may not be aware of their existence.

The wide spread of TAKE (and) V has drawn the attention of researchers since the 19th century (see Ross 2014 for references), and various hypotheses about its origin and development have been put forward. In a seminal paper written in German and later translated into Spanish, Coseriu (1966; 1977) puts together the results of a vast number of studies where the construction was mentioned or, less often, described in some detail for individual languages or a group of languages. He also reviews several hypotheses about its origin and proposes his own, attributing a major role to Greek and a spread through Bible translations. Following the title of his paper, the construction was later sometimes named by the Spanish phrase *tomo y me voy* (see Ross 2017 for an overview of research following Coseriu). Coseriu's paper could have been an excellent start for further comparative research, but this did not happen. For the rest of the 20th century, the construction was only sporadically studied by individual researchers. In the past twenty years, TAKE and V, and pseudocoordination in general, have again gained the attention of linguists, most of them investigating a single language, more rarely comparing or contrasting two languages. Constructions with movement and posture verbs were studied more often than constructions with 'take'. A comprehensive cross-linguistic study of pseudocoordination from a typological point of view is currently being undertaken by Daniel Ross (forthcoming). As part of his research he updated and complemented Coseriu's study on *tomo y me voy* (Ross 2017). He found that the construction is attested in more than 60 languages of Europe and Eurasia and concluded that no plausible theory of a single origin and direction of spread can be established.

The presence of the TAKE (and) V construction in Baltic was noted already by Fraenkel (1921, 54–56; 1926), but it has rarely been treated by later researchers. Ambrazas (1965) discusses it from a historical point of view in relation to an older Lithuanian construction where TAKE has the form of a past participle (literally 'having taken and V'). Ivulāne (2015) is exceptional

in discussing the construction in a modern Baltic language from a purely synchronic point of view. For her, it is the most likely candidate for an emerging serial verb construction in Latvian. The construction is not mentioned in grammars, but it is documented in monolingual dictionaries (LVV and LLVV for Latvian; LKŽ (sense VII.2) and DLKŽ (sense 14) for Lithuanian).

For Finnic languages, the situation is slightly better. Lewy (1937; 1951) drew attention to the construction in Mordvin and cited parallels in Finnic as well as Slavic and North Germanic languages. Pulkkinen (1966) has found TAKE (and) V in all Finnic languages and has characterised it as an old feature in these languages. He discusses parallels with Russian, but based on its distribution also in western dialects, he concludes that it is probably not a calque from Slavic, but an outcome of a natural process of development of the basic meaning of 'take' (Pulkkinen 1966, 211–213). Also Tragel (2003; 2017) found that TAKE (and) V, similar to other serial verb constructions, is an old feature in Estonian and a result of a grammaticalisation process whereby TAKE has lost its transitivity. The construction is mentioned in the comprehensive Finnish grammar (Hakulinen *et al.* 2004, 1041).

In Polish, the construction with 'take' was mentioned along other constructions consisting of two verbs in the 1970s by Bąba & Mikołajczyk (1974) and by Bartmiński (1978). In recent years, several Polish researchers have briefly discussed the construction with *wziąć* 'take' in the imperative (*weź*), which is the most characteristic form of the construction in Polish (Komorowska 2008; Góralczyk 2010; Gębka-Wolak 2012; and others). Zinken (2013; 2016) analyzed the construction *weź* V-imperative within an interactional approach. A comprehensive overview of TAKE (and) V in Polish is given in two recent articles by Andrason. Andrason (2018) looks at the construction *wziąć* V (without conjunction) in more detail and argues for its status as a serial verb construction. In a following paper (Andrason 2019), the author analyses the pseudocoordinative construction and discusses which characteristics it shares with prototypical serial verb constructions.

Russian is the language best documented and described in our sample. The TAKE (and) V construction is mentioned in dictionaries and grammars (see Stojnova 2007 for a short overview). Formal and semantic properties are discussed in Fortuin (2000, 149–161); Stojnova 2007; Weiss (2007). Grammaticalisation of the construction is discussed at length in Kor Chahine (2007) and to some extent in Weiss (2007). Fortuin (2000, 155–161) examines the difference between the TAKE (and) V construction and the so-called narrative imperative, which in Russian can have similar meanings.

2. Data and method

Our point of departure is the construction in the form TAKE (and) V, where TAKE stands for the lemma with the most general meaning of 'take', and consequently the most frequent verb with this meaning in the respective languages. Other verbs of taking (with more specific meanings such as 'grab', 'grasp' or 'catch') may also sometimes occur in pseudocoordination, but they are not considered in the present study. In the Slavic languages, perfective and imperfective verbs had to be taken into account, and for Estonian we also considered the phrasal verb *kätte võtma* lit. 'take into (one's) hand', which in the course of our study turned out to represent TAKE in our construction far better than the simple verb *võtma*. For 'and' there is some variation in Russian and to a lesser degree in Estonian, while the other four languages have one straightforward choice. V stands for any lemma tagged as verb.

For data collection we used large, web-based, automatically tagged corpora on the platform Sketch Engine (sketchengine.eu). For five of the languages this was a corpus of the TenTen series — a family of comparable corpora compiled from Internet resources using the same methods (Jakubíček *et al.* 2013). Unfortunately, the Lithuanian corpus of this series is not morphologically annotated, so for Lithuanian we used a smaller corpus of the WaC series (Kilgarriff *et al.* 2010), a predecessor of the TenTen series, compiled with similar methods. For names and sizes of the corpora see References. Despite their different size we found these sources more compatible than other corpora that exist for the languages under investigation. They contain the same kinds of texts, especially in the more informal registers in which our construction is mostly found.

In an initial query we searched for all occurrences of a sequence ['take' 'and' V], with the lemmas for 'take' as described above and shown in Table 1. These raw observations were filtered manually to obtain those instances that represented pseudocoordination. For Latvian and Lithuanian, all observations were considered, while for the other languages we worked with random samples of 1000 observations. The filtered samples are the basis for most of our analyses. For certain questions — concerning among others negation, object placement, or the role of the asyndetic variant — additional queries were made. This will be made explicit in the text.

Table 1 presents the number of hits for the initial query and the size of the samples. The last column gives a first indicator of the convention-

alisation of the construction, in other words, the degree to which a string ['take' 'and' V] represents a construction as a constant pairing of form and meaning.

Table 1. Number and weight of raw and filtered corpus data

Language, construction	Initial query	per million[2]	Unfiltered sample	Filtered sample	% of unfiltered
Latvian *ņemt un* V	3276	5.7	3726	3093	83.0%
Lithuanian *imti ir* V	1003	15.76	1003	943	94.0%
Estonian *võtma ja* V	4573	13.9	1000	89	8.9%
Estonian *võtma kätte ja* V	658	2.0			
võtma kätte [] V	764	2.3	500	480	96.0%
Finnish *ottaa ja* V	8923	5.2	1000	531	53.1%
Polish *wziąć i* V	8360	0.9	1000	670	67.0%
brać i V	8048	0.9	1000	267	26.7%
Russian *vzjat' i* V	84843	4.64	1000	817	81.7%
brat' i V	21271	1.16	1000	454	45.4%
Russian variants *vzjat' da* V	4824	0.26			
vzjat' da i V	10573	0.58			
brat' da V	503	0.03			
brat' da i V	76	< 0.01			

As described above, the essence of a hendiadic construction is the expression of a single action by two verbs. This was our main criterion to determine whether a given observation in the raw sample represented pseudocoordination. In other words, we eliminated those examples that clearly named two separate, coordinated actions. We thus used the following "negative" cues for excluding what was **not** our construction:

---

[2] Figures for per million as given by Sketch Engine.

- TAKE has its literal meaning, most clearly where it is modified by expressions such as 'carefully', 'into her hand', etc., which cannot relate to the action expressed by V, or in the intensifying doubling of 'take and take (all the time)';

- The two actions may happen at different times and places and with different additional participants, most clearly where the adverbials of time or place relate only to either TAKE or the action expressed by V, or in the combination of 'take and give';

- A fixed order, where the action of V follows an act of taking in a literal or metaphoric meaning (as opposed to combinations such as *took and bought the car*, where taking does not precede buying);

- Omitting TAKE changes the meaning or is odd;

- TAKE has arguments which are not shared by V such as a source (for example, *took a book **from the shelf** and started reading*);

- A shared participant has different semantic roles and is not a shared argument in the actual sentence (for example, *took **the knife** and cut the bread*);

- A shared participant is named twice, usually once as a full NP and the other time as a pronoun (*took **a cookie** and ate **it***).

Note that the investigated languages are much freer in word order than English so that objects and adverbials do not need to—and often do not—appear in a place that would split the construction (for example, literally "took and ate a cookie", "from a shelf a book took and read").

Examples of the type *took the cookie and ate it* and *took the knife and cut the bread* could still be regarded as hendiadic in a broader sense (cf. Hopper 2002), but we decided to exclude them.

Evidently, during the process of filtering we also had to deal with instances whose status as pseudocoordination was not straightforward. The meaning of TAKE may be more or less literal,[3] and the meaning of the whole may oscillate between referring to one complex action and two related actions. Such borderline instances occur mostly with transitive verbs as

---

[3] Cf. "If one looks at a large corpus of authentic examples with all their complexity, not making up a few simple ones, one perforce comes to the conclusion that 'lexical bleaching' must be regarded as a scalar variable, from maximally emptied, purely grammaticalised occurrences of *take* to less and less grammaticalized and more lexical ones." (Taube MS, 25)

V and a direct object which may be understood as a shared object of both verbs. The object may also be omitted, but be recoverable from a previous clause. Sometimes a larger context is needed to decide about the status of an example. Therefore, each example was carefully examined and the result is the best we could attain. Each language was examined by only one researcher and though we discussed the principles thoroughly, some of us might have been stricter in dealing with doubtful cases than others.

Another problem in data collection was observations that were doublets, repeated quotations, or almost verbatim repetitions. In the case of clear instances of repetition of the same utterance, the observation was included into the sample only once and its repetitions deleted. The same was done with repeated quotations that were marked by quotation marks.

Finally, we will briefly mention some variants that were not taken into consideration in this paper, but belong to its context and may be worth future studies. First, in some languages the verb for 'take' is also used with a reflexive marker. In Latvian, reflexive *ņēmties* has the meanings 'undertake, be ready to' and 'spend time doing, ponder over'. It usually combines with an infinitive but may also be used with a coordinated verb. In Polish, the use of the reflexive marker *się* in constructions with 'take' needs more thorough investigation — in our data, it was not always clear whether this marker belonged to the lexical verb, to 'take', or to the construction as a whole. Also Estonian *kätte võtma* may take a reflexive pronoun *võtma ennast kätte*, lit. 'take him/herself into hand'. The meaning is similar to *kätte võtma* in the construction and possible differences in meaning need more investigation.

Second, we did not consider prefixed forms of 'take' in the Baltic languages (Latvian *pa-ņemt*, Lithuanian *pa-imti*), which may occur in pseudocoordination similar to the respective simple verbs.

(3) Lithuanian
[*5 Lt. kainavęs ir antrą kartą naudotas*]

lietsargis	*per*	*lietų*	***pa-ėmė***	***ir***
umbrella.NOM.SG	through	rain.ACC.SG	PVB-take.PST.3	and

pa-lūžo.
PVB-break.PST.3

'the umbrella [that cost 5 litas and was used for the second time] just broke during the rain'

However, this variant is by far less conventionalised and less frequent than the main variant. In Lithuanian, where the hendiadic construction

with *imti* makes up 94% of a total of 1003 occurrences, with *paimti* only 77 of 118 occurrences (65%) of the respective sequence qualified. In Latvian the number of raw observations was 1692 so that we refrained from manual filtering. A first look at the data however led us to assume that the situation is similar to Lithuanian with respect to the percentage of good examples, only the overall frequency is higher.

There is some interesting anecdotal evidence for the difference between Latvian *ņemt un* V and *pa-ņemt un* V. In a much discussed political scandal in 2006, one of the involved persons was recorded with a Russian utterance that literally translates as "he took and deceived us". This was interpreted as 'he took [the bribe] and [after that, nevertheless] he deceived us' (in court, linguistic evidence played a crucial role: there was an audible pause after 'took'). This interpretation was rendered in Latvian with the prefixed verb: *paņēma un uzmeta*. The accused politician tried to defend himself, arguing that the person only said 'he deceived us' (thus, no evidence for the bribing), using the TAKE and V construction, which in this case was translated into Latvian with the simple verb: *ņēma un uzmeta*. Thus, Latvian media discussed whether the person had said 'ņēma un uzmeta' or 'paņēma un uzmeta', and the variant with the prefix stood for the literal meaning of 'take'.

It would be worth investigating how far the construction with the prefixed verb has become an instance of pseudocoordination in Baltic and where it differs from the base construction with the simple verb, but this is beyond the present study. It is also interesting that in Baltic, the prefixed (in some sense "perfective") variant represents the construction less, while in Slavic the construction is much more conventional with the perfective verb. Estonian is similar to Slavic here, as the particle *kätte* has a perfectivising effect (see Section 4).

3. The construction in Baltic — corpus findings

Pseudocoordination with 'take' is well attested in contemporary Latvian and Lithuanian and shows a high degree of conventionalisation and cohesion. As shown in Table 1 in Section 2, the vast majority of occurrences of a string consisting of the lemma 'take', the coordinator 'and' and a lemma tagged as verb, represent the construction under investigation: 94% in Lithuanian (943 of 1003) and 83% in Latvian (3093 of 3726). When counting only the most prominent verb forms, excluding participles and converbs, the percentage is still higher. In this section, we will present details concern-

ing morphological, syntactic and semantic features of the constructions. If not mentioned otherwise, all Latvian examples in this section are taken from the corpus lvTenTen13, and all Lithuanian examples stem from the corpus LithuanianWaC_v2.

3.1 Grammatical categories
Person, tense and mood

The construction is attested with almost all forms of the Latvian and Lithuanian verbal paradigms, the only exceptions being some participles and converbs. Table 2 gives an overview of the attested forms in the two samples in absolute numbers and per hundred.

Table 2. *Overview of inflectional forms in Latvian and Lithuanian*

Category	Lat. N	Lat. %	Lith. %	Lith. N
Present (Latvian: including imperative)	1242	40.2	24.5	231
Imperative (Lithuanian only)	—	—	8.4	79
Past	649	21.0	28.7	271
Past habitual (Lithuanian only)	—	—	1.0	9
Future	357	11.5	15.6	147
Irrealis	75	2.4	5.3	50
Finite verb forms in sum	2323	75.1	83.5	**787**
Infinitive	618	20.0	15.6	147
Finite verb forms and infinitive in sum	**2941**	**95.1**	**99.0**	**934**
Other forms				
Debitive (Latvian only)	49	1.6	—	—
Evidential (Latvian only)	6	0.2	—	—
Past Active Participle	74	2.4	0.5	5
Past Passive Participle	9	0.3	0	0
Present Active Participle	0	0	0	0
Present Passive Participle	3	0.1	0.3	3
Converb (Latvian -*ot*, Lithuanian -*dam*-)	11	0.4	0.1	1
Sum of all verb forms	**3093**	**100%**	**100%**	**943**

As can be seen in the table, in both languages the construction most often occurs with verbs in a simple tense or mood form. Another frequent form is the infinitive, which itself most often depends on a verb in present or past tense (for example, a modal verb).

We will use our counts mainly for cross-linguistic comparison, here between Latvian and Lithuanian and in Section 6 among all our investigated languages. Still, a natural question is how within one language the distribution of forms in the investigated construction relates to the distribution of inflectional forms of verbs in general. Tables 3 and 4 oppose the figures for forms of 'take' within the construction (as in Table 2) and elsewhere[4].

Table 3. *Latvian ņemt 'take' within pseudocoordination (T&V) and elsewhere (not T&V)*

Category	T&V	%	not T&V[1]	%
Present/imperative	1242	24.5	30580	25.2
Past	649	21.0	11101	9.1
Future	357	11.5	7144	5.9
Irrealis	75	2.4	2296	1.9
Infinitive	618	20.0	29017	23.9
other forms	98	4.9	41408	34.1
total	3039	100%	121546	100%
Finite verb forms in sum	2323	75.1	51121	42.1
Finite verb forms and infinitive in sum	2941	95.1	80138	65.9

[1] and not *ņemt vērā* 'take into account'

The comparison shows that pseudocoordination with *ņemt* 'take' indeed occurs more often with finite verbs than could be expected from the general distribution of forms of this word (the difference in "other forms", which comprise participles, converbs and the debitive, is highly significant). We

---

[4] For Latvian, we filtered out occurrences of the idiom *ņemt vērā* 'take into account, consider', which accounts for more than one third of the occurrences of *ņemt* 'take'. As this idiom is used very often as a converb (*ņemot vērā* or *vērā ņemot* 'considering') or in passive voice, it would have skewed the statistics.

also tested for significance in the differences without these "other forms", as they may somewhat distort the picture. The significance is still high (p-value < 0.0001), and, as may be expected from the percentages given in Table 2, the greatest difference is in past tense, which is used significantly more often within pseudocoordination than elsewhere. However, Cramér's V is small (0.066), so the association between construction and inflectional form is not strong, which corresponds to our observation that pseudocoordination is compatible with different tense and mood categories.

Table 4*. Lithuanian* imti *'take' within pseudocoordination (T&V) and elsewhere (not T&V)*

Category	T&V	%	not T&V	%
Present	231	25%	5554	25%
Imperative	79	8%	452	2%
Simple Past	271	29%	9232	42%
Habitual Past	9	1%	385	2%
Future	147	16%	1221	6%
Irrealis	50	5%	425	2%
Infinitive	147	16%	1667	8%
other forms	9	1%	3207	15%
total	**943**	100%	**22143**	100%
Finite verb forms in sum	787	84%	17269	78%
Finite verb forms and infinitive in sum	934	99%	18936	85%

The results obtained for Lithuanian data also show that finite verbal forms are found more often than non-finite ones in the construction than in the overall usage of the verb 'take'. The difference is statistically significant (p-value < 0.0001), even though the effect size is quite small (Cramér's V = 0.026). However, different from Latvian, Lithuanian favors infinitive forms in the construction (they appear twice more often than with the verb *imti* outside of the construction). Out of the finite forms, Lithuanian shows higher numbers for future tense and imperatives and lower numbers of the past tense in the construction than outside of it.

Within the construction, the distribution of tense and mood forms is similar in both languages. A difference can be seen in the relative importance of present and past tense, especially in third person: in Latvian, third person present tense has a share of 24.3% of all forms (N= 751 of 3093) and third person past tense one of 13% (N = 401), in Lithuanian the respective figures are 19.4% for 3.PRS (N = 183 of 943) and 21.6% for 3.PST (N = 204). The following tables show the distribution of person forms in tense forms and the imperative.

Table 5. *Personal forms in Latvian (all forms = 3093)*

	PRESENT/ IMPERATIVE	PAST	FUTURE	Total	% of all forms
1SG	75	209	62	346	11.2%
2SG	281	11	11	303	9.8%
3SG/PL	751	401	225	1377	44.5%
1PL	43	25	56	124	4.0%
2PL	92	3	3	98	3.2%
sum	1242	649	357	2248	72.7%

Table 6. *Personal forms in Lithuanian (all forms = 943)*

	PRS	IMP	PST	PST.HAB	FUT	Total	% of all forms
1SG	12	—	61	1	21	95	10.1%
2SG	31	48	3	0	5	87	9.2%
3SG/PL	183	—	204	8	118	513	54.4%
1PL	4	16	2	0	1	23	2.4%
2PL	1	15	1	0	2	19	2.0%
sum	231	79	271	9	147	737	78.1%

The role of the imperative can only be determined for Lithuanian, which has special forms for this mood. For 2PL and 1PL, the imperative is the most important tense/mood form, but the overall frequency of these forms is low. For 2SG, the imperative makes up only slightly more than half of the forms (48 of 87). This is more than within all occurrences of

the verb *imti* in the corpus, where the imperative accounts for 37.0% (N = 264) of 2SG forms (N = 715), and the most frequent form is present tense (2SG.PRS = 327 or 45.7% of 715).

In Latvian, there is no morphological difference between 2SG imperative and present tense. A special imperative form exists only for 2PL (*ņemiet* 'take!' vs present indicative *ņemat* 'you (PL) take, are taking'), but the distinction is often not made in unmonitored speech and writing, where both forms appear in both functions, and this is what we often find in our sample. For 1PL, the future form is used in hortative meaning (*ņemsim* 'we will take' or 'let's take!'), which may explain the relatively high number of occurrences of future for 1PL in Latvian as compared to the other persons and compared to Lithuanian.

We conclude that in the Baltic languages, the imperative is not especially prominent for the construction: past, present and future tense forms as well as the infinitive are more typical. However, if we look at the percentage of the imperative forms of 'take' outside of the construction, the percentage of the imperative within the construction is a few times higher.

Non-finite forms apart from the infinitive are relatively rare, especially in Lithuanian. However, the fact that the construction can be used in almost any form shows its firm place in the language and its general meaning. It is found in the passive (4) and in converb constructions (5), (6).

(4) Latvian: passive

Notikums	*ņemts*		*un*	*notušēts.*
event.NOM.SG	take.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M		and	hush_up.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M

'The event [was/has been] hushed up.'

(5) Latvian: converb construction

un	*cilvēks*		*var*	*tās*	*izcīnīt,*
and	human.NOM.SG		can.PRS.3	DEM.ACC.PL.F	obtain.INF
vienkārši	*ņemot*	*un*	*sarunājot*	*ar*	*savu*
simply	take.CVB	and	talk.CVB	with	RPOSS.ACC.SG
ķermeni					
body.ACC.SG					

'and a person can obtain these simply by talking to their body'

(6) Lithuanian: converb construction

Imdami	*ir*	*„nudažydami"*	*visus*	*musulmonus*
take.CVB.PL.M	and	PVB.paint.CVB.PL.M	all.ACC.PL.M	Muslim.ACC.PL
viena	*spalva,*			
one.INS.SG.F	color.INS.SG			

[*mes paprasčiausiai užmirštame 600 metų islamo istoriją Lietuvoje.*]
'By "painting" all Muslims in one color, [we simply forget 600 years of history of Islam in Lithuania.]'

Negation

There are two possible ways to use the hendiadic construction with negation. The more common one is to use the negative prefix only with the second verb (29 observations in Latvian and 27 observations in Lithuanian in the samples). Semantically as well as formally, only the second verb is under the scope of negation, while the abstract meaning of TAKE is retained. The negated action is treated as an event or activity — for example, (7) can be paraphrased as 'what happened was that the teacher didn't show up', and (8) as 'what you have to do is not-smoke'.

(7) Latvian: negation with TAKE and NEG-V
Pasniedzēja   ņēma   un   neieradās   uz   eksāmenu!
teacher.NOM.SG   take.PST.3   and   NEG.appear.PST.3   to   exam.ACC.SG
'The teacher did not turn up at the exam!' (unexpectedly, untypically)

(8) Latvian
[*Nekas nav vieglak ka atmest smēķēšanu. nav vajadzīgas ne filmas, ne grāmatas, ne hipnotiskie diski!*]
Vienkārši   ņem   un   nesmēķē.
simply   take.PRS.2SG   and   NEG.smoke.PRS.2SG
'[Nothing is easier than to give up smoking. You don't need films, nor books, nor hypnotic discs!] Just don't smoke.' (without any preparation, just like that)

(9) Lithuanian
Negalėjau   būti   tikra,   kad   Edvardas
NEG.can.PST.1SG   be.INF   sure.NOM.SG.F   that   Edvardas.NOM.SG
vėl   ims   ir   neišnyks.
again   take.FUT.3   and   NEG.PVB.disappear.FUT.3
'I couldn't be sure that Edvardas would not [suddenly] disappear again.'

The second possibility is to formally negate both verbs. In the Latvian corpus there were 11 clear instances, of which 7 were in future tense; in the Lithuanian corpus we found 6, with 3 of them in future tense.[5] The scope of

---

[5] These examples are not part of the sample. A verb with negative prefix is tagged as a different lexeme, thus the initial query did not cover these constructions.

the negation is over the whole construction, that is, meaning components such as 'suddenly', 'unexpectedly', 'without preparation' are also negated. The utterance refers to an event that does not or will not happen.

(10) Latvian: negation with NEG-TAKE and NEG-V

Tā	*vienkārši*	*noteikti*	*neņems*		*un*
so	simply	certainly	NEG.take.FUT(3)		and

neanulēs		*atļauju,*	*bet*	*vērtēs*	*Jūsu*
NEG.cancel.FUT(3)		permit.ACC.SG	but	assess.FUT(3)	2PL.GEN

situāciju.
situation.ACC.SG

'They certainly won't cancel [your] permit just like that, but will assess your situation.'

(11) Lithuanian

Juk	*kiekvienas*	*žaidėjas*	*neims*	*ir*
PTC	every.NOM.SG.M	player.NOM.SG.M	NEG.take.FUT.3	and

neskaitys	*trijų*	*kandidatų*	*laikrasčių.*
NEG.read.FUT.3	three.GEN.PL	candidate.GEN.PL	newspaper.GEN.PL

'Every player will not (suddenly, without good reason) read the newspapers of three candidates.'

The meaning of the two patterns of negation may be described by the following formulas:

Pattern 1: TAKE and [NEG V]
Pattern 2: NEG [TAKE and V]

Note that the abstract meanings of TAKE cannot be negated alone, only within the whole construction. That is, we don't find a third pattern *[NEG TAKE] and V.

3.2 Cohesion and the place of arguments and adjuncts

In Baltic, the construction TAKE and V shows a high degree of cohesion. The construction most commonly consists of exactly these three elements without interrupting words, and the order of the elements is fixed. Arguments and adverbs are usually placed before or after the construction, as can be seen in many of the examples given in this section. We will now explore the range of deviation from this most typical situation. First, we consider variants of the construction without the coordinator 'and'. Second, we explore the possibility of placing arguments, adverbs and particles

within the construction. The observations discussed in this section were obtained by additional queries.

Presence vs absence of 'and'

The asyndetic type TAKE (,) V is not frequent in contemporary Latvian and Lithuanian as reflected in the corpora we used.

In Lithuanian, we found 9 examples of an asyndetic construction, as opposed to 943 examples with 'and'. Asyndetic examples occur with and without a comma between the two verbs.

(12) Lithuanian
Jei   Puteikis   imtų,   prašytų   partijos
if   Puteikis.NOM.SG   take.IRR.3   ask.IRR.3   party.GEN.SG
rėmėjų —   skyrius   skolų   neturėtų.
sponsor.GEN.PL   department.NOM.SG   debt.GEN.PL   NEG.have.IRR.3
'If Puteikis just asked the sponsors of the party—the department would not have debts.'

(13) Lithuanian
[*bet negalvojau, kad jas taip sunkiai pakelsiu,*]
nes   praeitis   ims   smūgiuos   iš
because   past.NOM.SG   take.FUT.3   shoot.FUT.3   from
visų   kampų...
all.GEN.PL   corner.GEN.PL
'[But I didn't think that I would take it so badly,] because the past would suddenly hit from all corners...'

The situation is the same in Latvian. Corpus examples of the type without comma often do not feel really natural; the word 'and' may simply be omitted by mistake. A query searching for ŅEMT V in the past tense got 24 hits, of which only 11 were qualified (8 in third person, 1 = 2SG and 2 = 1SG). Asyndetic pseudocoordination with a functional imperative of 2SG tense was found a bit more often: 12 times without comma (*ņem* V!) and 19 times with a comma (*ņem,* V!). Still, these figures are significantly lower than those for imperatives in pseudocoordination with a coordinator.

We conclude that the asyndetic type is very rare in contemporary Baltic, and does not seem to evolve into a double verb construction as in Russian.

Another subtype of the construction allows asyndetic coordination between 'take' and V, with one or more additional verbs and 'and' before the last of these verbs.

(14) Lithuanian
Grįši į pamoką? — Gal juokauji?
'Will you come back to class? — Are you kidding?'

Taip	*jau*	*imsiu,*	*apsisuksiu*
this.way	PTC	take.FUT.1SG	PVB.RFL.turn.FUT.1SG

ir	*grįšiu.*
and	return.FUT.1SG

'So I just suddenly turn around and come back.'

(15) Latvian

ja	*nu*	*beidzot*	*ņem,*	*sadusmojas*	*un*
if	PTC	finally	take.PRS.3	get.angry.PRS.3.RFL	and

patiesi	*sāk*	*šaut?*
really	start.PRS.3	shoot.INF

'what if they finally get angry and start to shoot for real?'

In this subtype the last verb often denotes a result, as in the two previous examples. Another use of the construction is with several verbs that have a similar meaning, where the accumulation is used for emphasis.

(16) Latvian

kā	*tevi,*	*nabadzīti,*	*ņēma,*
how	2SG.ACC	poor_one.ACC.SG	take.PST.3

piemānīja,	*izmantoja*	*un*	*maldināja?*
delude.PST.3	use.PST.3	and	mislead.PST.3

'[about] how you, poor girl, were deluded, used and misled?'

These examples show that TAKE may have scope over more than one verb.

Placement of arguments, adverbs and particles

If elements are inserted into the construction, they most often are single words. More complex phrases are possible, but rare. As a rule, a noun phrase immediately following TAKE is an argument of this verb and the sequence does not represent the hendiadic construction (for example, combinations of the type *take a book and read*). We found only a few exceptions to this rule in the Lithuanian and Latvian corpora. We suspect that the possibility of inserting an argument of the hendiadic construction in this slot is higher for arguments consisting of a single word (noun, pronoun or numeral). Subjects seem to be more acceptable than other arguments. In Lithuanian, we found in this position 14 subjects and 10 objects.

(17) Lithuanian: subject after TAKE

O	*dabar*	*įsivaizduok,*		
and	now	imagine.IMP.2SG		
kad	*ima*	*Rusija*	*ir*	*pradingsta*
that	take.PRS.3	Russia.NOM.SG	and	PVB.disappear.PRS.3

'Now imagine that Russia disappears' (suddenly, just like that)

(18) Latvian: subject after TAKE

[*Nu neizklausās jau tīri ticami ...*]

ņēma	*krievi*	*un*	*nogremdēja*	*to*
take.PST.3	Russian.NOM.PL	and	sink.CAUS.PST.3	DEM.ACC.SG
nabaga	*kuteri*	*citiem*		*kuteriem*
poor	boat.ACC.SG	other.DAT.PL		boat.DAT.PL
par	*biedinājumu ...*			
for	threat.ACC.SG			

['Well, it doesn't sound really believable...'] The Russians (just like that) sank the poor boat as a threat to other boats...'

Positioning the subject directly after 'take' puts emphasis on the meanings conveyed by 'take' in this construction, such as 'suddenly', 'unexpectedly', 'just like that'. The position after the second verb would be more neutral in this respect (paraphrasing the Lithuanian example: *ima ir pradingsta Rusija*); it would put the subject into focus ('Russia, of all countries').

Direct objects in this position were found only in Lithuanian. In 8 of 10 observations the object was a pronoun. In some examples such as (19), the object could be considered as shared between 'take' and the lexical verb, while in a few other observations the noun phrase cannot be considered an argument of 'take' (20).

(19) Lithuanian: object of TAKE and/or V

[*nusprendė savų minčių nebemarinuoti,*]

o	*tiesiog*	*imti*	*jas*	*ir*	*įgyvendinti...*
but	just	take.INF	3.ACC.PL.F	and	PVB.bring.to.life.INF

'[[He] decided not to preserve his thoughts] but just bring them to life' / 'take them and bring [them] to life'

(20) Lithuanian: object only of V

[*Kai žemė buvo išdalyta, pievų niekas nenušienavo, todėl dabartiniai savininkai tingėdami dirbti,*][6]

---

[6] Mistake in the corpus example corrected: *dirbti* instead of *dirbi*.

ima	*laukus*	*ir*	*padega*
take.PRS.3	field.ACC.PL	and	PVB.burn.PRS.3

'[When the land was divided, nobody took the hay from the fields, and that's why current owners, being lazy to work,] simply burn the fields' ("take the fields and burn")

In Latvian, a direct object directly after TAKE was always identified as an argument of 'take' in a literal or abstract sense, not as an argument of the hendiadic construction.

Adverbs and particles are a bit more frequent than arguments in the slot immediately after TAKE. What we find here are words with a meaning that corresponds to the meaning conveyed by the construction, such as 'suddenly', 'simply', 'just', 'unexpectedly', 'however', 'yet'.

(21) Lithuanian: 'suddenly' inserted after 'take'

Juk	*tikisi,*	*kad*	*mama*	*kaip nors*	*ims*
PTC	hope.PRS.3.RFL	that	mom.NOM.SG	somehow	take.FUT(3)

staiga	*ir*	*išmoks*	*anglų*	*kalbą.*
suddenly	and	PVB.learn.FUT(3)	English.GEN.PL	language.ACC.SG

'He hopes his mom will somehow suddenly learn English.'

These words may also appear in the following slot.

(21) Lithuanian: 'suddenly' inserted before V

ėmė	*ir*	*staiga*	*išgaravo*	*visas*
take.PST.3	and	suddenly	PVB.disappear.PST.3	all.NOM.SG.M

gražus	*vaizdelis*	*ir*	*mano*
beautiful.NOM.SG.M	view.DIM.NOM.SG	and	my

susikurtas	*romantizmas...*
create.PST.PP.NOM.SG.M	romanticism.NOM.SG

'suddenly the whole beautiful vision and the romanticism created by me disappeared...'

These words are in general collocates of the construction, that is, they are often found in its vicinity (see below Section 3.3). Latvian adverbs and particles in question include *vienkārši* 'simply; just', *tā* 'just (so)', *tikai* 'only', *taču* 'however, yet', *pēkšņi* 'suddenly', *vēl* 'still', *tik* 'hardly, barely' and a few others. Most of these items appear only 1–3 times in one of the positions within the construction. Only two of these words have a more significant number of occurrences: *vēl* 'still' was found 21 times in the first slot and 11 times in the second slot, and for *tik* 'hardly, barely' the respective figures are 19 and 9. It is worth noting that these two words have

little semantic meaning and are rather pragmatic particles. The particle *tik* appears in the first slot most often with a functional imperative (14 of 19 observations), and the construction may be used as a kind of formula, not directed to a particular addressee.

(23) Latvian: particle *tik* after 'take'

Tāds	*rutīnas*	*darbs,*	*ņem*	*tik*
such.NOM.SG.M	routine.GEN.SG	work.NOM.SG	take.PRS.2SG	PTC
un	*mezglo.*			
and	knot.PRS.2SG			

'It's routine work, [you] just make knots.'

The other more frequent particle, *vēl*, appears mostly with the verbs in future tense (20 of 21 observations) and expresses a kind of negative stance, a fear that something might happen as a consequence of another action or situation. Latvian *vēl* shares many of the meanings of the German word *noch*, which would be natural in translations of these examples. There is no English translation equivalent.[7]

(24) Latvian: particle *vēl* after 'take'

Sak,	*uzmanies*	*ko*	*padomā* —
PTC	beware.PRS.2SG.RFL	what.ACC	think.PRS.2SG
ņems	*vēl*	*un*	*piepildīsies!*
take.FUT.3	PTC	and	become.true.FUT.3.RFL

'As they say: beware what you think, it might come true!'
(German: 'Nach dem Motto: pass auf, was du denkst, es wird [sonst] noch wahr!')

Both these particles may also appear in the following slot, between the coordinator and the lexical verb.

(25) Latvian: particle *vēl* after 'and'

ņemsi	*un*	*vēl*	*pats*	*noticēsi*
take.FUT.2SG	and	PTC	self.NOM.SG.M	believe.FUT.2SG
tam	*ko*	*runā*		
DEM.DAT.SG.M	what.ACC	talk.PRS.2SG		

'you are going to believe yourself what you say'
(German: '[am Ende] glaubst du noch selbst, was du sagst')

---

[7] The Lithuanian equivalent is *dar*, which also often occurs in sentences containing our construction; see (35) for an example.

In this example we also see the emphatic pronoun *pats* 'self' in the slot between 'and' and V, which shows that a certain distance between 'take' and the main verb V is allowed without the constructional meaning being at stake.

In general, arguments and manner adverbs in the second slot relate to the following verb, while other adverbs and particles may relate to the whole construction. In (26), the pronoun *viņā* 's/he.LOC' (here: 'with her') is a complement of *iemīlēties* 'fall in love', and *sasodīti* 'damned', here 'madly', is a manner adverb modifying this verb. In (27) *kaut ko* 'something' is a complement of the verb *izdarīt* 'do', while *vienreiz* 'once' modifies the whole construction. Note also the different order of adverb and argument in the two examples.

(26) Latvian: argument and manner adverb before V
[*un tas man nav traucējis*]
ņemt	*un*	*viņā*	*sasodīti*	*iemīlēties*
take.INF	and	3SG.LOC	damned.ADV	fall_in_love.INF.RFL

'[and that hasn't prevented me] from falling madly in love with her'

(27) Latvian: temporal adverb and argument before V
Tad	*ņem*	*un*	*vienreiz*	*kaut ko*
then	take.PRS.2SG	and	once	something.ACC

izdari,	*nečiepsti.*
PVB.do.PRS.2SG	NEG.chirp.PRS.2SG

'Then go ahead and do something for once, don't whimper.'

As can be seen in the examples, the slot between the coordinator and the lexical verb allows the insertion of more than one constituent. Furthermore, elements in this slot may be complex (as in 29), though one-word constituents are much more common.

(28) Lithuanian: simple argument (pronoun) before V
organizatoriai	*paskutiniu*	*momentu*
organiser.NOM.PL	last.INS.SG.M	moment.INS.SG

ima	*ir*	*viską*	*atšaukia.*
take.PRS.3	and	everything.ACC	PVB.call.PRS.3

'at the very last moment the organisers call everything off.'

(29) Lithuanian: prepositional phrase with complex noun phrase before V
jie	*ėmė*	*ir*	*su*	*virvute,*
3.NOM.PL	take.PST.3	and	with	rope.DIM.INS.SG

prakišę	*pro*	*kelnių*	*kišenę*
PVB.put.PA.PST.NOM.PL	through	pants.GEN.PL	pocket.ACC.SG

pririšo	*mane*	*aukštai*	*ties*	*šlaunimi.*
PVB.tie.PST.3	1SG.ACC	high	above	thigh.INS.SG

'they tied me up high above my thighs with the rope put inside [my] pants' pocket'

While the appearance of arguments and adverbials in the slot directly before the main verb is by no means exceptional, it is still much less common than the placement of such elements before or after the string "TAKE and V".

3.3 Lexical variation and semantics of arguments

The construction is found with almost all semantic and formal types of verbs and with all kinds of subjects. In this section we will discuss preferences for certain classes.

Simple and prefixed verbs; event types and boundedness

Prefixed verbs are more often used in the construction than simple verbs. There are slight differences between the two languages (in Lithuanian the percentage of prefixed verbs is higher) and between individual verb forms. In both languages the percentage of prefixed verbs is higher in past tense than in present tense; in Lithuanian also future forms are overwhelmingly found with prefixed verbs. Table 7 shows the differences between the languages and between the three simple tenses for third person forms.[8]

Table 7. Percentage of prefixed lexical verbs in third person forms of the construction

	Lithuanian			Latvian		
	with PFX	total	% PFX	with PFX	total	% PFX
present	155	183	84.7	546	751	72.70
past	186	204	91.18	354	401	88.28
future	109	118	92.37	169	225	75.11

---

[8] Unfortunately, we do not have comparable numbers for the occurrence of prefixed and non-prefixed verbs outside of the construction, but the percentage of prefixed verbs in pseudocoordination seems to be high in any case.

The lowest percentage of prefixed verbs was found in 2SG present tense and imperative. In Latvian, only 47.8% of these forms have a prefix in the construction (N = 131 of 274). In Lithuanian, 2SG.IMP has the lowest number of prefixed verbs, namely 44% (N = 21 of 48), as opposed to 2PL.IMP which has 80% of prefixed verbs (N = 12 of 15). The percentage of prefixed verbs is also relatively low in the present tense (especially 1SG.PRS, 58% of prefixed verbs, or N = 7 of 12), as opposed to the simple past where the percentage of prefixed verbs is 91% (in 3.PST, N = 183 of 204) or higher.

The preference for prefixed verbs relates to a preference for verbs that include an inner boundary. If a root denotes an unbounded activity or state, the prefix either highlights its beginning (ingressive, inchoative verbs), or otherwise delimits its duration. For example, instead of Latvian *gribēt* 'want' we find the verb *sagribēt*, whose meaning is described as 'suddenly begin to want, wish' in the Latvian dictionary LLVV.

(30) Latvian: prefix indicating the beginning of a state
[*Bet vienalga—tā pirmkārt ir jūsu izvēle. Tieši jūs gribējāt dzīvot tādu dzīvi. Apzinieties to!*]

Un	*tagad*	*ņemiet*	*un*	*sagribiet*
and	now	take.IMP.2PL	and	PVB-want.IMP.2PL

izmainīt	*savu*	*dzīvi!*
PVB. change.INF	RPOSS.ACC.SG	life.ACC.SG

'But anyhow—first of all it is your choice. It is you who wanted such a life. Be conscious of it! And now start wanting to change your live!'

The next example shows a prefix with delimitative function: *pie-sēst* 'sit down, usually for a short time' (translated from LLVV), opposed to un-prefixed *sēsties* 'sit down'. The meaning 'for a short time' is additionally spelled out by the adverbial *uz brīdi* 'for a moment'. The following two verbs also have delimitative prefixes: *ie-dzert* 'drink (a certain amount)', *pa-pļāpāt* 'chat (a little bit, for a while)'.

(31) Latvian: prefix delimiting the state resulting from an activity

Ņēmām	*un*	*pie-sēdām*	*uz*	*brīdi,*
take.PST.1PL	and	PVB-sit_down.PST.1PL	for	moment.ACC.SG

ie-dzērām	*mazliet*	*kafijas*	*un*	*pa-pļāpājām.*
PVB-drink.PST.1PL	a_little	coffee.GEN.SG	and	PVB-chat.PST.1PL

'We sat down for a while, had some coffee and chatted a bit.'

However, unbounded processes and states also occur. This may be more acceptable in Latvian than in Lithuanian, but Lithuanian utterances

with verbs like 'believe', 'sleep, be asleep', 'rain, be raining' were found in spontaneous, colloquial writing on the Internet, and were accepted and judged natural by native speakers.

(32) Latvian: unbounded state ('believe')
Iemesls, kādēļ es to gribētu lasīt, ir tas, ka es ticu Dombrovskim.

Tā	*vienkārši —*	*ņemu*	*un*	*ticu*
so	simply	take.PRS.1SG	and	believe.PRS.1SG

'The reason why I would like to read it is that I believe Dombrovski. I simply believe [him].' (The context made it clear that *ņemu* 'I take' here does not refer to taking the book)

In general, all kinds of event types (Vendler's classes) are found with the construction, but activities and accomplishments are more common than achievements and states.

Transitive and intransitive verbs and prominent exemplars

Transitive verbs are more common in the construction than intransitive verbs, but the latter are well attested. With intransitive verbs, the construction appears more clearly, that is, the abstract meaning of TAKE is indisputable, while with transitive verbs TAKE often retains some of its lexical meaning. Thus, numbers of types and tokens of intransitive verbs may be an indicator of the grammaticalisation of the construction.

Among intransitive verbs, the following semantic classes of verbs are especially well attested in Latvian and Lithuanian:

- Movement, especially voluntary, directed movement ('go/run/ drive away', 'come running/by transport', 'go/drive somewhere')
- involuntary change of state, including:
  - 'die' — apart from the basic lexeme for 'die', we find various more specific verbs with meanings such as 'drown', 'freeze to death', 'suffocate', etc.;
  - 'break', 'go to pieces';
  - various other verbs denoting a change of state, for example, 'fall asleep', 'fall in love', 'faint', 'disappear', 'wither', 'turn sour' (of milk etc.).

Verbs denoting a change of state are often found with inanimate subjects.

As a reviewer pointed out, it is interesting that the two prominent classes of intransitive verbs found in the construction are opposite with respect to volitionality. This points to a shift instead of a continuum. As we will suggest below, with the second class (involuntary change of state), the construction gets a new prototype and the meaning of unexpectedness comes to the fore.

Animacy and volition; semantic roles of subjects

The construction is used with all kinds of subjects and may refer to involuntary, unconscious, accidental actions and processes. There are many examples with an inanimate subject, often concrete ones such as cars, machines, but also abstract ones such as ideas, incidents.

(33) Lithuanian: inanimate concrete subject, change of state
miestas *ėmė* *ir* *tapo* *didžiausiu*
city.NOM.SG take.PST.3 and become.PST.3 largest.INS.SG.M
visoj *Nevadoj*
all.LOC.SG.F Nevada.LOC.SG
'all of a sudden the city became the largest in the whole [state of] Nevada'

(34) Lithuanian: inanimate abstract subject ('thoughts'), change of state
neduok *Dieve,* *tos* *blogo*
NEG.give.IMP.2SG God.VOC.SG DEM.NOM.PL.F bad.NOM.PL.F
mintys *dar* *ims* *ir* *materializuosis.*
though.NOM.PL PTC take.FUT.3 and materialise.FUT.3.RFL
'God forbid those bad thoughts will materialise.'[9]

The subject may also be semantically vague and does not have to be explicitly named.

(35) Latvian: inanimate abstract subject ('something new')
[*Kaut gan mēs domājām, ka arī ar veco labo peli vairs nekas jauns nenotiks...*]
bet *ņēma* *un* *notika*
but take.PST.3 and happen.PST.3
'Although we thought that nothing new would happen to the good old [computer] mouse... But [it] did.' ("[it] took and happened")

Also zero-valent weather verbs are attested.

---

[9] The particle *dar* emphasises the meaning of 'God forbid'; cf. Latvian *vēl* discussed above with (24) and (25).

(36) Latvian: weather verb
[*Vien žēl, ka laika apstākļi tā izbojājās. Turējās, turējās, bet nu,*
kad patiesi vajadzētu salu,]

ņem	*un*	*līst.*
take.PRS.3	and	rain.PRS.3

'[Only a pity that the weather has turned bad. [The good weather]
lasted, lasted, but now, when we really would need frost,] it is raining.'

With human subjects, the construction may refer to an action carried
out involuntarily, unconsciously, or a process happening without conscious
influence.

(37) Lithuanian: unconscious, unintentional action

Aš	*pati*	*nesuvokdama*	*kartais*
1SG.NOM	self.NOM.SG.F	NEG.realise.CVB.SG.F	sometimes
imdavau	*ir*	*padarydavau*	*ką nors*
take.PST.HAB.1SG	and	do.PST.HAB.1SG	something.ACC
neįprasta...			
unusual.N			

'Sometimes I, not realising myself, would suddenly do
something unusual...'

As mentioned above, a prominent group of verbs denoting involuntary
actions/processes are verbs of dying.

(38) Lithuanian

O	*žiūrėk*	*koks*	*sveikuolis*
and	look.2SG.IMP	what.NOM.SG.M	healthy_person.NOM.SG
ėmė	*ir*	*pasimirė*	*60-ties.*
take.PST.3	and	PVB.RFL.die.PST.3	sixty.GEN.SG

'And look what a healthy person suddenly died [being] 60 years old'

All semantic roles are attested for subjects. Agents as subjects of tran-
sitive and intransitive verbs and patients as subjects of intransitive verbs
have been shown in many of the above examples. Recipients are rare, but
attested — which shows the total bleaching of the meaning 'take'.

(39) Latvian: recipient subject

bet	*viņš*	*ņēma*	*un*	*dabūja*
but	3SG.NOM.M	take.PST.3	and	get.PST.3
galveno		*balvu*		
main.ACC.SG.DEF		award.ACC.SG		

'but he got the main award (unexpectedly)'

The occurrence of experiencers may be in some way restricted, which needs further investigation. For example, in our corpora there are no examples of the use of uncontrolled sensory experience in the construction (with verbs such as 'see', 'hear'). Another verb which seems to be impossible to use in the construction is 'know'. This may be related to volitionality rather than aspectuality, as 'believe' is attested (assuming that it is easier to influence one's belief by will than one's knowledge). Emotions and bodily sensations are often expressed in Baltic in a construction where the experiencer is in the dative and thus cannot be coordinated with the nominative subject of 'take'. With such verbs, it is the stimulus that is the subject of the construction.

(40) Latvian: stimulus subject
  Un   skaties   tās   Tev   ņem
  and   look.PRS.2SG.RFL   DEM.NOM.PL.F   2SG.DAT take.PRS.3
  un   iepatīkas.
  and   please.PRS.3.RFL
  'And look, you suddenly like them (= the slippers)'
  (constructed as 'they please you')

3.4 The meaning(s) of the construction

We found the construction with the same range of meanings in Latvian and Lithuanian. For the sake of brevity, we will concentrate here on Latvian.

It is not easy to name a core meaning of the TAKE (and) V construction, as several factors influence the reading of a particular occurrence of the construction. In monolingual Latvian dictionaries the construction is defined in different ways. In the largest dictionary, LLVV (Vol. 6, 1986) the meaning is described as intensifying the action expressed by the lexical verb, while the one-volume dictionary LVV (1987) also ascribes an inchoative component to the construction ('suddenly start and carry out straight away, definitely'). As already stated by Ivulāne (2015), both definitions fit only a part of the attested uses of the construction. Ivulāne (2015, 144) draws the following conclusion from her discussion of various examples from corpora and Internet sources:

> "Tātad iespējamās nozīmes, kuras *ņemt* piešķir konstrukcijai, ir **pabeigtība** [...], darbības **pēkšņums**, **apņēmība**, **uzdrošināšanās**, **nejaušība**, **pamatojuma trūkums**, iespējams, vēl kādas." (emphasis added)

> "Thus the possible meanings that *ņemt* bestows upon the construction are **completeness** […], **suddenness** of the action, **resoluteness**, **daring**, **haphazardness**, **lack of reason**, and maybe others."

We agree with Ivulāne that the construction does not have one (invariant) meaning, but may convey various meanings, which may even be contradictory (such as 'resoluteness' and 'haphazardness'). Morphological categories and the communicative function (purpose) of an utterance influence the interpretation of an individual instance of the construction. Thus, *ņēma un nomira* 'took and died' (unintentional change of state, past tense third person, narrative) gets interpreted as 'died suddenly, unexpectedly', while these meaning components do not arise in constructions such as *ņem un izdari!* 'take and do (it)!' (intentional action, present/imperative 2SG, persuasive), which is rather interpreted as 'go ahead, just do it'.

As the usage of the construction spreads from transitive to intransitive verbs, from volitional actions to uncontrolled processes, from activities to states, it develops a more and more abstract base meaning, or rather a pragmatic function. This general function of the construction is to put the action, process or state expressed by the lexical verb into focus, in a way by "pointing to it". The English idiomatic expression *(just) like that* conveys meanings similar to that of the TAKE and V construction in Latvian, and its etymology is clearly related to "pointing at" something.

By laying the focus on the action or process itself, the speaker abstracts from any preparations for it, which invites the meaning components 'spontaneously, by itself', 'suddenly' and 'unexpectedly'. These meanings are often additionally expressed by co-occurring words such as *pēkšņi* 'suddenly', *vienkārši* 'simply, just', *tā* 'so, just', or more elaborate expressions such as *ne no šā, ne no tā* 'without reason'.

(41) Latvian: 'without preparation', 'without warning'—'without (apparent) reason'; patientive verb, change of state

Braucot,	*ne*	*no*	*šā*	*ne*	*no*	*tā,*
drive.CVB	NEG	from	DEM.GEN.SG.M	NEG	from	DEM.GEN.SG.M

mašīna	*ņem*	*un*	*noslāpst.*
car.NOM.SG	take.PRS.3	and	conk_out.PRS.3

'Out of the blue, without any reason, the car conked out while [I was] driving.'

A spontaneous and unexpected change of state seems to be more noteworthy if it is also unwanted. The majority of constructions with an

inanimate subject and a sudden change of state in Latvian and Lithuanian report about an unpleasant process or result: machines breaking down, objects falling to pieces, documents suddenly disappearing, rain spoiling weekend plans. Thus, the construction gets associated with something negative – but only with involuntary changes of state or with states, not with voluntary actions by humans, and probably also not with abstract subjects such as ideas or events, as constructions with these are often about something that is evaluated positively.

By explicitly pointing to an action or state, the speaker may also contrast it to others, carried out by the same or another actor. The meaning of contrast is further emphasised by the frequently co-occurring connectives and adverbs *bet* 'but', *taču, tak* or *tomēr* 'however, yet', *kamēr* 'while'.

(42) Latvian: 'in contrast (to action by other actor)'

kamēr	*es*	*runāju*	*viņa*	*ņēma*
while	1SG.NOM	talk.PST.1SG	3.NOM.SG.F	take.PST.3
un	*izdarīja*			
and	PVB.do.PST.3			

'while I was talking, she just did (it)'

Often, there is a contrast: not one between two actions, but between an actual situation and the expectations of someone.

(43) Latvian: 'in contrast (to expectations)'

Neticēja,	*nedomāja*	*elite,*	*ka*	*PSRS*
NEG.believe.PST.3	NEG.think.PST.3	elite.NOM.SG	that	USSR
tā	*ņems*	*un*	*sabruks*	
PTC	take.FUT.3	and	fall_to_pieces.FUT.3	

'The elite did not believe, they did not think that the USSR would just fall to pieces'

Thus, the meaning of unexpectedness, which we find so often with this construction, is maintained from two sources: the meaning components 'without preparation or warning' and 'in contrast'. Furthermore, when the main function is to point to a contrast between an actual situation and an expectation, agentivity and volitionality are no longer necessary.

Finally, a purely pragmatic stage is reached when by pointing to the action or process expressed by the verb, the speaker emphasises the assertion of it: something 'indeed' happens or has happened. This may or may not be unexpected or sudden, and the meaning components described above are often absent.

(44) Latvian: 'indeed'
[*Cik reižu nav dzirdēts prasām, lai "tie tur augšā" vismaz reizēm*
"padomā par tautu" un ievēlējam taču tos, kuri "domā par tautu"
visvairāk.]

Nu	*viņi*	*tagad*	*ņem*	*un*	*domā,*
PTC	3.NOM.PL.M	now	take.PRS.3	and	think.PRS.3

[*a tādam darbam nekādu uzskaiti neiztaisīsi.*]
'[How often have we not heard someone require that "those on top" (the ruling class) at least sometimes "think about the people". After all we elect those who more than others "think about the people".] Well, now they are indeed thinking, [but that's a job that defies bookkeeping.]'

The meanings discussed so far, which we argue derive from a "pointing to" the action or process denoted by V, are those found most often in text passages of narrative or descriptive genres. In various kinds of directives, on the other hand, emphasis of the action denoted by the lexical verb is directed to the hearer. Here, we do not find involuntary actions nor processes that "just happen", but instead actions that are supposed to be carried out consciously. The meaning of the construction is an enforcement of the directive: 'do it by all means', 'go ahead'. Various examples with imperatives given in this section illustrate this, for example, (8) *ņem un nesmēķē* 'just don't smoke', or (27) *ņem un vienreiz kaut ko izdari, nečiepsti* 'go ahead and do something for once, don't whimper'. In addition to the imperative, this function is also found with various other verb forms that are used in directives, such as the Latvian construction with the particle *lai*, the debitive, or some infinitive constructions.

Some differences between Latvian and Lithuanian can be found when comparing collocation candidates of the construction (using the respective function in Sketch Engine). In both languages, words translating as 'suddenly' and as 'simply, just' are on the very top of the lists, but in a different order: in Lithuanian, *staiga* 'suddenly' is the most important collocate, while in Latvian, it is *vienkārši* 'simply, just'. This finding corresponds to our intuitions (based on intensive work with the corpus examples) that in Lithuanian the meaning of sudden, unexpected (beginning) of an action is more prominent, while in Latvian the meaning is vaguer and more often than in Lithuanian cannot be explained as unexpectedness.

4. The construction in Estonian and Finnish

In Estonian, there are two variants of the TAKE (and) V construction. The first one, with the verb *võtma* 'take' alone, is relatively infrequent. Within a sample of 1000 random uses of VÕTMA *ja* V from the corpus etTenTen13, there were only 89 occurrences of the investigated construction. The other variant contains the phrasal verb *kätte võtma*, literally 'take into (one's) hand'. This variant is much more frequent. With the query [lemma="võtma"] [word="kätte"][][tag="V.*"] altogether 764 occurrences of the sequence were found; among the first 500 instances, 480 clauses represented the construction (96%).

The construction VÕTMA *ja* V mainly has an intentional meaning (Tragel 2017), as illustrated in (45). It means that the action expressed by V is or will be done intentionally, quite often putting some extra effort into it. This is true for both variants and evident especially with *kätte võtma* (46). The construction also has an ingressive meaning, i.e. it focuses on the starting point of the event, which seems to be a kind of decision-making or planning point.

(45) Estonian: hendiadic construction with *võtma*
Mina   võtsin   ja   lugesin   oma   kirja
1SG.NOM take.PST.1SG and   read.PST.1SG RPOSS   letter.GEN
läbi!
through
'I set my mind to it and read the letter'

(46) Estonian: hendiadic construction with *kätte võtma*
Siis   võtsin   kätte   ja   lindistasin
then   take.PST.1SG hand.ILL and   record.PST.1SG
mõned   demod.
some.NOM.PL demo. NOM. PL
'I set my mind to it and recorded some demos'

One reason why *kätte võtma* is more usual in the construction can be related to grammatical aspect. In Estonian, grammatical aspect is expressed with particles belonging to verbs and with object case marking. *Kätte* 'into someone's hands' acts as a particle belonging to the verb 'take'. Semantically it is a logical endpoint of the event of TAKING and thus makes the event bounded, expressing thus that the decision is made at this point ('I made

up my mind and ...'). This interpretation is present also in non-literal usages, including this construction.

The construction is typically (but not always) accompanied with total object, which marks that the event has reached or may reach its inner endpoint and the object is quantitatively totally affected (cf. Metslang 2017). Total object can be marked either with genitive as in (45) or nominative as in (46). The construction (either with *võtma* or *kätte võtma*) tends to take total object and is accompanied with a particle expressing perfective aspect, e.g. *läbi* 'through' in (45).

In Finnish, we found the construction with the verb *ottaa* 'take' well represented in the corpus fiTenTen14_tt2, though it is less frequent than the construction in the Baltic languages. There were 531 instances of the construction in a random sample of 1000 instances of the sequence OTTAA *ja* V. Like in Estonian, the Finnish construction often denotes an agentive, intentional action as in (47).

(47) Finnish

Välillä	*otan*	*ja*	*teen*	*kaikki*
sometimes	take.PRS.1SG	and	do.PRS.1SG	all
vauhdilla	*loppuun, ...*			
speed.ADE	end.ILL			

'Occasionally I finish everything in one go.'

There seems to be no Finnish equivalent to the Estonian variant with *kätte võtma*, which not only by frequency, but also with respect to its characteristics discussed in this section turned out to be the best Estonian instantiation of the TAKE (and) V construction.

Person, tense and mood

Although our sample of Estonian *võtma ja* V contains only 89 observations, it shows that the construction can be used with a wide range of person, tense and mood combinations (see Table 8), and the same is true for *kätte võtma ja* V (Table 9). The main difference between *võtma* and *kätte võtma* seems to be how often they are used in the past tense and imperative: *kätte võtma* shows higher occurrence in indicative past tense forms (as in (46)) while *võtma* is used more often in imperatives (48). In this respect, the Estonian construction with *kätte võtma* is closer to its Finnish counterpart than the construction with *võtma* (see Table 10 for Finnish), and it is also closer to the same construction in the Baltic languages in this respect.

Table 8. *Distribution of person, tense and mood forms in Estonian pseudocoordination with* võtma

	PRS	PST	IMP	COND	sum
1SG	3	6			9
2SG	8		21		29
3SG	4	7	2	3	16
1PL	2	1			3
2PL			8		8
3PL	2				2
sum	19	14	31	3	67
in %	21.3%	15.7%	34.8%	3.4%	75.3%
impersonal	1	3			4
infinitive 1	14				14
infinitive 2	2				2
participles		2			2
sum total					89

Table 9. *Distribution of person, tense and mood forms in Estonian pseudocoordination with* kätte võtma

	PRS	PST	IMP	COND	sum
1SG	23	83		3	109
2SG	18	0	42	1	61
3SG	52	74	7	29	162
1PL	11	15		1	27
2PL	0	0	26		26
3PL	18	30		5	53
sum	122	202	75	39	438
in %	25.4%	42.1%	15.6%	8.1%	91.3%
impersonal	5	5			10
infinitive 1	20	0			20
infinitive 2	1	0			1
participles	0	11			11
sum total					480

(48) Estonian
[*Pagan, meie riik on selline, nagu me ta teinud oleme.*]
Kui   sulle   ei   meeldi,
if   2SG.ALL   NEG   please.CNG
võta   ja   HAKKA   PAREMAKS   TEGEMA /../
take.IMP.2SG   and   start.IMP.2SG   better.TRL   make.INF2
'[Damn, our country is the way we have made it.]
If you don't like it, set yourself to making it better.'

Also in Finnish, the construction can be used with a wide range of person, tense and mood combinations, as can be seen in Table 10. However, we can see that the 3SG past tense forms dominate (54%,). Compared to Estonian, imperative is considerably less frequent.

Table 10. *Distribution of person, tense and mood combinations in Finnish pseudocoordination with* ottaa.

	PRS	PST	IMP	COND	sum
1SG	11	32			43
2SG	3		11		14
3SG	60	288		11	359
1PL	1	2			3
2PL	0		5		5
3PL	9	12			21
sum	84	334	16	11	445
in %	15.8%	62.9%	3.0%	2.1%	83.8%
impersonal	5	4			9
infinitive	71				71
3infinitive	4				4
perfect	2				2
sum total					**531**

Compared to Estonian, Finnish *ottaa ja* V seems to have less intentionality in its meaning and the construction is often used for expressing events that happen without (expressed) external planning or intention (like in (49)). Such examples are rare in Estonian and may occur only with *kätte*

võtma; in Baltic languages, however, unexpected non-intentional events are usual. Such usages as in (49) also explain why 3rd person singular past tense forms are so frequent in Finnish (compared to Estonian).

(49) Finnish

Sosialististen	*Neuvostotasavaltojen*	*Liitto*	*otti*	*ja*
socialist.PL.GEN	Soviet_republic PL.GEN	union	take.PST.3SG	and

hajosi	*lähes*	*parikymmentä*	*vuotta*	*sitten.*
fall_apart.PST.3SG	about	twenty	year.PRT	ago

'The USSR unexpectedly fell apart almost twenty years ago.'

Negation

Estonian *võtma* (*ja*) V does not occur with negation, at least a series of corpus queries did not reveal any examples of it. It seems to be impossible to negate it without losing the constructional meaning, i.e. without losing the interpretation as one event. When example (50a) is negated as shown in (50b), it sounds strange and can be interpreted only as two coordinated events, i.e. *võtma* gets literal interpretation.

(50) Estonian

a.

Mina	*võtsin*	*ja*	*lugesin*	*oma*	*kirja*
1SG.NOM	take.PST.1SG	and	read.PST.1SG	RPOSS	letter.GEN

läbi!
through

'I set my mind to it and read the letter.'

b.

?*Ma*	*ei*	*võtnud*	*ega/ ja*	*ei*
1SG.NOM	NEG	take.PST.PA	neither/ and	NEG

lugenud	*oma*	*kirja*	*läbi.*
read.PST.PA	RPOSS	letter.PRT	through

intended meaning: 'I didn't set my mind to it and (didn't) read the letter'

The only way to use the construction under negation seems to be as an infinitive of negated modal verbs. This works both with *kätte võtma* (51) and *võtma*.

(51) Estonian

Üks	*minister*	*ei*	*saa*	*kätte*	*võtta*
one	minister.NOM	NEG	can.CNG	hand.ILL	take.INF

ja	*hakata*	*mingit*	*asja*	*kellegi*
and	start.INF	some.PRT	thing.PRT	someone.GEN

eest	*menetlema.*
behalf	process.INF2

'One minister cannot pick up and process some business
on behalf of someone else.'

The construction *kätte võtma ja* V can be negated without changes in interpretation (52), although negation is still rare. Formally both predicates are negated.

(52) Estonian

Kuni	*ma*	*tõepoolest*	*ei*	*võta*	*kätte*	*ja*
until	I.NOM	indeed	NEG	take.CNG	hand.ILL	and

ei	*hakka*	*seda*	*lähtekoodi*	*muutma.*
NEG	start.CNG	this	source_code.PRT	change.INF2

'As long as I really do not pick up and change this source code myself'
In both instances it is the whole construction that is negated: (can)
NEG [TAKE and V].

In Finnish, the construction can be used in negation similarly to Estonian *kätte võtma*, but it is rare in Finnish as well: there are only a few instances of negation in our data. In Finnish, negation is formed with a negation verb inflected for person. In example (53), the negation verb is attached to the question word *miksi* 'why'. However, the example seems exceptional because semantically it is affirmative, although grammatically negative.

(53) Finnish
[*paljon   nähtävää,*]

miksen	*siis*	*vain*	*ota*	*ja*	*lähde*
why_NEG.1SG	then	just	take.CNG	and	go.CNG

'[There are many things to see,]
why wouldn't I just take a chance to leave'

To conclude, both Estonian and Finnish do not use negation in the construction often. In Estonian, it is possible only with *kätte võtma*. Differently from Baltic languages, Finnic languages do not have the pattern TAKE and [NEG V], e.g. Estonian **võta-n ja ei tee* (take-1SG and not do.CNG, '(I) take and don't do'). For forming the construction, both verbs have to have the same polarity.

Cohesion

According to Pulkkinen (1966) and Tragel (2003, 2017), in Estonian and other Finnic languages the construction can be used either with the coordinator *ja* or without it (asyndetic construction). Sporadically in written Estonian also the coordinator *ning* 'and' is found. It has the same meaning

as *ja* 'and', but is remarkably less frequent in written texts (according to Kaalep and Muischnek 2002, 6, *ning* is 6.2 times less frequent than *ja*) and hardly occurs in spoken Estonian. In our data, *ning* was not used with the verb *võtma*, but occurred with *kätte võtma*.

Example (54) illustrates the asyndetic construction with *võtma* in Estonian. In written data, the two verbs are sometimes separated by a comma.

(54) Estonian
Aga sina võta oota ära, millal
But you take.IMP.2SG wait.IMP.2SG away when
testi teha ja [...]
test.PRT make.INF and
'But wait until you can do the test.'

In Table 11, the use of some of the most frequent person forms with and without a coordinator is compared. We see that in written data the use of the coordinator is more common, but the asyndetic construction is not rare. Interestingly, it is not the imperative that shows the strongest tendency to drop the coordinator. These data were obtained by additional queries.

Table 11. *Occurrence of the coordinator in some frequent forms of Estonian* võtma ja V

Person form	*ja* 'and'	No coordinator	% of using *ja*
IMP.2SG	103	52	66%
IMP.2PL	48	16	75%
PRS.1SG	11	9	55%
PRS.3SG	12	27	31%

In Finnish, the asyndetic variant is attested as well, but it is rare in comparison to the construction with the coordinator. A comma is rarely used in this construction. A query on past tense personal forms revealed that there were 66 instances of the asyndetic variant without comma in the whole corpus (as in 55), and only 7 instances with a comma.

(55) Finnish
Hän otti vaihtoi kortteja.
s/he take.PST.3SG change.PST.3SG card.PL.PRT
'He/she changed the cards.'

Estonian *kätte võtma* (*ja*) V is more strongly used with the coordinator than *võtma* (*ja*) V. Of the 480 instances in our sample, 431 have the coordinator *ja*, 23 the coordinator *ning* (see examples (57) and (62)), and 26 show combinations without coordinator but with a comma; there are no examples of asyndetic combination without a comma. Thus, in this construction, *ja* (or *ning*) seems to be more tightly attached to the construction than with *võtma* (*ja*) V. Interestingly, some usages imply that using comma indicates that the parts of the construction are not so closely related as with *ja*: there are often more than two verbs in the clause and it can more easily be interpreted as common coordination. The following example is similar to the observations in Baltic where the last verb indicates a kind of final result.

(56) Estonian

Võta	*kätte,*	*õpi*	*arstiks*	*ja*
take.IMP.2SG	hand.ILL	learn.IMP.2SG	doctor.TRL	and
päästa	*kogu*	*maailm!*		
save.IMP.2SG	whole	world.NOM		

'Just study medicine and save the world!'

Thus in both Estonian and Finnish the construction without a coordinator is well attested, but the use of the coordinator is more frequent — with the Estonian construction with *kätte võtma* and in Finnish, the asyndetic variant is rare.

In Estonian and Finnish TAKE and V constructions, the tense and person of TAKE and the following verb must be the same, otherwise they do not form the hendiadic construction.

However, Estonian *kätte võtma ja* V sometimes exhibits a mismatch in the uses of grammatical tenses. While verbs in *võtma* (*ja*) V are always used in the same grammatical form, *kätte võtma ja* V has more flexibility in it. Examples like (57) indicate that there is also an option to interpret the clause as expressing two related events, or at least the event can be interpreted as having two parts: the first part (*kätte võtma*) expresses decision-making or the starting point, and the second part expresses the main event. However, interestingly, in this clause the subject is inanimate and thus is not able to make decisions, neither can things live (as expressed in the second part).

(57) Estonian

[*Sina tegid omale mugava nurga,*]

aga	*ASJAD*	*võtsid*	*kätte*	*ning*	*elavad*
but	thing.PL	take.PST.3PL	hand.ILL	and	live.PRS.3PL

hoopis   sinust   sõltumatut   elu.
quite   2SG.ELA   independent.PRT   life.PRT
'[You made a comfortable corner for yourself]
but THINGS live their own lives'

Lexical variation of V2

Estonian *võtma ja* V can take as a second verb only agentive verbs like *tegema* 'do, make', *lugema* 'read', *sööma* 'eat', *hakkama* 'start', *viima* 'bring', *minema* 'go', *vaatama* 'look at', *kasutama* 'use', *sõitma* 'drive' etc. It means that volitionality and intentionality are related to the use of the construction, and the construction takes only animate subjects. Both transitive and intransitive verbs can be used. Clauses with *ja* and without it do not show any difference in this respect.

(58) Estonian
Sa   ära   kõgise,   ma   võtan,
2SG.NOM   NEG   grumble.IMP.2SG   1SG.NOM   take.1SG
vaatan   järgi
look.PRS.1SG   after
'Don't grumble, I'll go check'

(59) Estonian
[*Lubasin endale praegu,*]
et   võtan   ja   tuletan   mõned
that   take.PRS.1SG   and   recall.PRS.1SG   some.NOM.PL
nõiduslikud   kohad   jälle   meelde.
mysterious.NOM.PL   place.NOM.PL   again   mind.ILL
'[Now I promised myself] that I'd try and remember some
mysterious places.'

Interestingly, *kätte võtma ja* V shows more variability in the choice of V. Here too the most frequent verbs (among 480 examples of the construction) are agentive transitive or intransitive verbs: *tegema* 'do, make' (75 occurrences), *hakkama* 'start' (49), *minema* 'go' (38), *kirjutama* 'write' (24), *lugema* 'read' (14), *panema* 'put' (14), *sõitma* 'drive' (10). However, we can also find examples such as *surema* 'die' or *põdema* 'suffer' that express clearly non-agentive, unintentional events.

(60) Estonian
[*.. ning siis oleks nagu koolnukangestus kallale tulnud,*]
sekundipealt   võttis   kätte   ja   suri   ära.
second_by   take.PST.3SG   hand.ILL   and   die.PST.3SG   away
'[And then there was like rigor mortis,] all at once [he/she] died.'

(61) Estonian

Meie   võtsime   kätte   ja   põdesime
1PL.NOM   take.PST.1PL   hand.ILL   and   suffer.PST.1PL
tuulerõuged   läbi...
chicken_pox.NOM.PL   through
'We suffered through chicken pox'

Also inanimate subjects can be used with *kätte võtma*, but typically they are shown as being volitional agents, see (62).

(62) Estonian

[*Ja siis läheb mööda mõni ensüüm või koputab keegi ärritav*
valk tüviraku uksele,]
see   võtab   kätte   ning   hakkab   arenema ...
it   take.PRS.3SG   hand.ILL   and   start.PRS.3SG   develop.INF
näiteks   ajurakuks.
for_example   brain_cell.TRL
'[And then an enzyme passes by or an irritating protein knocks on the stem cell's door,] it decides to develop ... for example into a brain cell.'

In Finnish, the choice of verbs in the construction is less restricted than in Estonian (esp. in comparison to Estonian *võtma ja* V) and in this respect, Finnish is closer to the Baltic languages than Estonian. Both transitive and intransitive verbs can be used in the construction. Just as in Estonian, agentive, volitional verbs are frequent, such as *vaihtaa* 'replace, change', *käyttää* 'use', *lukea* 'read', *ostaa* 'buy', *palkata* 'employ', *panna* 'put', *vähentää* 'decrease', *valloittaa* 'conquer', *kirjoittaa* 'write', *liittää* 'join, connect', *lähteä* 'leave', *juosta* 'run', *käydä* 'visit, go to', *liittyä* 'join', *mennä* 'go' etc. See, e.g., ex. (47) and (55).

However, in Finnish we also found a considerable number of examples with non-agentive verbs, especially verbs denoting a change of state,[10] such as *sairastua* 'get sick', *sammua* 'flame out', *kaatua* 'fall', *kuolla* 'die', *hajota* 'fall apart', *nukahtaa* 'fall asleep', etc., as in (63–65). As can be seen in the examples, the construction can be used also with inanimate subjects, similarly to Baltic languages.

---

[10] That these verbs are common in the Finnish construction can also be inferred from the fact that two out of three examples in the comprehensive Finnish grammar (Hakulinen *et al.* 2004, 1041) contain a verb indicating a change of state (*syttyä* 'catch fire, ignite', *kaatua* 'fall'; the third one is 'leave'), and one of the examples contains an inanimate subject.

(63) Finnish

Ja	*sitten*	*se*	*mies*	*otti*	*ja*	*kuoli.*
and	then	this.NOM	man.NOM	take.PST.3SG	and	die.PST.3SG

'And then this man just died.'

(64) Finnish

Ritun	*auto*	*ottaa*	*ja*	*hajoaa*	*kesken*
Ritu.GEN	car.NOM	take.PRS.3SG	and	fall_apart.PRS.3SG	middle

kaiken:	*polttoainetta*	*valuu*	*tielle…*
everything.GEN	petrol.PRT	run.PRS.3SG	street.ALL

'Ritu's car breaks in the middle of everything: petrol runs on the street'

(65) Finnish

Rahat	*kun*	*ottivat*	*ja*	*loppuivat*
money.NOM.PL	then	take.PST.3PL	and	end.PST.3SG

heti	*alkuunsa.*
right	beginning.ILL.POSS3

'The money surprisingly ran out at the very beginning.'

By the choice of lexical verbs in the second position, it can be seen that Finnish is somewhat closer to the use of the same construction in Baltic languages than to Estonian. The construction can be used both for expressing intentional actions and for unintentional, non-volitional events with inanimates. In the last examples we can see that the construction may express also unexpected negative events with inanimate subjects. In Estonian, this can be done only with *kätte võtma ja* V, but is still rare. Estonian *võtma ja* V does not allow such usages at all and is limited to intentional events where TAKE expresses rather a planning point of the action.

In Estonian it mostly emphasises that the action is carried out intentionally and decidedly; the same can be found in Finnish. Estonian *kätte võtma ja* V and Finnish *ottaa ja* V often indicate unexpectedness. The Finnish grammar (Hakulinen *et al.* 2004, 1041), describes the meaning of the construction shortly as "unexpected event" ("odottamaton tapahtuma"). This indicates that unexpectedness is at least one central meaning of the construction, though it is not the only one attested in our sample. Estonian dictionaries include some examples of the constructions, explaining the meaning of TAKE in the construction as "assuring the action expressed with the second verb" (for *võtma* + V) or 'get on with it, take something to do it' (for *kätte võtma* + V) (EKSS).

5. The construction in Polish and Russian

The TAKE (and) V construction exists in both Polish and Russian (Slavic in general; cf. Ross 2017). In both languages, the verb 'take' can appear in perfective (Pol. *wziąć* and Rus. *vzjat*) or imperfective (Pol. *brać* and Rus. *brat*) form. The perfective is significantly more common (see figures in Table 1 in Section 2). If not otherwise indicated, examples in this Section are taken from the corpora plTenTen12 and ruTenTen11.

Person, tense and mood

In both languages, the construction is well attested with various verb forms. More than 40% of all usages of the perfective form are in the past, as in example (70). In Russian, a similarly significant number of examples of the construction are in the infinitive form (example 66). Cf. Tables 12–13.

(66) Polish
[*Na całym świecie modliło się,*]
aby   *nie*   *umierał,*
so_that   NEG   die(IPFV).PST.3SG.M
a   *on*   *wziął*   *i*
but   3SG.M.NOM   take(PFV).PST.3SG.M   and
umarł
die(PFV).PST.3SG.M
'In the whole world people prayed that he wouldn't die,
but he died [regardless].'

(67) Russian
Stranno, čto   *v*   *Izraiľ*   *možno*   *prosto tak*
weird.N that   to   Israel   possible just_like_that
vzjať   *i*   *poleteť.*
take(PFV).INF   and   fly(PFV).INF
'It is weird that one can fly to Israel just like that.'

Specific of Russian is the use of the construction in the so-called narrative imperative, which describes an unexpected event in the past. Morphologically, the narrative imperative is always IMP.2SG and does not agree with the subject, see (68).

(68) Russian
A   *medsestra*   *voz'mi*   *i*   *otlučis'.*
and   nurse.NOM.SG   take(PFV).IMP.2SG   and   leave(PFV).IMP.2SG
'And the nurse [unexpectedly] went away.'

Out of 29 examples of IMP.2SG that we classified as our construction, 14 have the narrative reading. The narrative imperative is possible only with the perfective form of the verb 'take'.

Tables 12–13 show the distribution of all possible forms with perfective and imperfective verbs across both languages in the construction. To compare the use of the construction with other uses of TAKE, the numbers for overall usage of the latter are also provided.

Table 12. Distribution of inflectional forms in Polish

	TAKE & V	%	all T	%		T&V	%	all T	%
	wziąć					brać			
PST	306	46%	704444	40%		17	6%	486027	27%
NON-PST	119	18%	306927	18%		89	33%	893836	49%
ANAL.FUT						3	1%	21294	1%
IMP	127	19%	223072	13%		58	22%	76381	4%
IRR	1	0.1%	16701	1%		2	1%	9024	0.5%
INF	117	17%	492445	28%		98	37%	344498	19%
Total	670	100%	1743589	100%		267	100%	1831060	100%

Table 13. Distribution of inflectional forms in Russian

	TAKE & V	%	all T	%		TAKE & V	%	all T	%
	vzjať					brať			
PST + IRR	348	43%	1535856	39%		19	4%	391811	16%
NON-PST	85	10%	500358	13%		236	52%	1139754	46%
IMP	56	7%	389006	10%		125	28%	171467	7%
INF	324	40%	1506417	38%		74	16%	761826	31%
Total	813	100%	3931637	100%		454	100%	2464858	100%

The non-past verb forms are more common with the imperfective form, i.e. they have present tense meanings (52% of all examples in Russian, and 33% in Polish). The imperfective form is somewhat rare in the past tense

(4% in Russian, and 8% in Polish). Such misbalance between perfective and imperfective forms in the past and present might hint "that our construction has not yet reached the final stage of aspectual pairedness" (this claim was made for Russian by Weiss 2007, 432). It is worth noting that while in Baltic the imperative is rare in this construction, in both Slavic languages, and especially in Polish, utterances with the imperatives are quite frequent, rounding around 20% of all examples (it is least frequent with Russian *vzjať*, only 6.8%).

In both languages the perfective verb for TAKE may combine with an imperfective second verb, even though this phenomenon occurs in different contexts: in Polish in imperative and past, and in Russian in past and simple future (cf. Andrason 2018, 592–593 for Polish; Fortuin 2000, 152 and Weiss 2007, 429–430 for Russian). In Russian, the aspectual difference between the verbs in the construction in the past is usually accompanied by a difference in tense: the 'take' verb is in the past, and the lexical verb is in the historical present. In our sample, there was one example where TAKE was used in the narrative imperative and the second verb in present tense, (69); however not all speakers accept such examples as grammatical.

(69) Russian
[*Vylovil kak-to mužik prekrasnuju rusalku.*]
A   ta   voz'mi   i   govorit
and   DEM.NOM.SG.F   take(PFV).IMP.2SG   and   say(IPFV).PRS.3SG
jemu   barxatnym   goloskom...
3SG.M.DAT   velvet.INS.SG.M   voice.DIM.INS.SG
'[Once a man caught a beautiful mermaid.] And she [suddenly] tells him in a mellow voice...'

Negation

Both patterns of negation found in Baltic are also attested in Russian and Polish. The negative marker is a free morpheme, otherwise the patterns are also formally the same as in Baltic: with only one negative marker placed directly before V, the abstract meanings of TAKE are retained (70), while the whole construction is negated by formally negating both TAKE and V individually (71).

(70) Polish, Pattern 1: TAKE and [NEG V]
[*Przyjechali w nadziei, że spotkają się oko w oko z „premierem z Krakowa",*]
a   ten   wziął   i   nie
but   DEM.NOM.SG.M   take(PFV).PST.SG.M   and   NEG

przyjechał   na   "marsz   niepodległości".
come(PFV).PST.SG.M to   march.NOM.SG independence.GEN.SG
'[They came in the hope to meet the "prime minister from Kraków"
face to face,] but he did not come to the "march of independence".'

(71) Polish, Pattern 2: NEG [TAKE and V]
      [*Bo pies sobie nie pójdzie,*]
      nie   weźmie   i   nie   kupi
      NEG   take(PFV)NPST.3SG   and NEG   buy(PFV).NPST.3SG
      jedzenia.
      food.GEN.SG
      '[For a dog will not go (to the shop)], it will not buy food (itself).'

In the literature on Russian, only the first pattern has been reported
so far (Weiss 2007, 4; Stojnova 2007, 187). However, the second pattern is
also attested in our sample:

(72) Russian
      Počemu   by   mne   vot tak   ne   vzjať
      why   IRR   1SG.DAT like_this   NEG   take(PFV)INF
      i   ne   otpraviťsja   v   kosmos?
      and NEG   PVB.set_off(PFV)INF.RFL   in   space
      'Why shouldn't I just set off to space?'

This pattern is contextually limited and usually appears in contexts
of potential situations (as in (72), in a question). There is no wonder it is
several times less frequent than the first pattern.

In Russian, both negation patterns are possible with perfective and
imperfective forms of TAKE. Example (73) shows the imperfective verb.

(73) Russian
      Nikogda   serdce   ot   etogo
      never   heart.NOM.SG   from   DEM.GEN.SG.N
      ne   beret   i   ne   ostanavlivajetsja.
      NEG   take(IPFV).NPST.3SG   and NEG   stop(IPFV).NPST.3SG.RFL
      'Never does a heart [unexpectedly] stop because of it.'

In Polish, negation seems to occur only with the perfective verb. Both
patterns are equally frequent (66 observations of Pattern 1 and 67 of Pat-
tern 2). As in other languages, neither pattern of negation is particularly
frequent, and negation of the TAKE and V construction may be a source of
confusion or give rise to explicit comment. This is shown in the following
example, where the speaker does not oppose two logical options but two
forms of negation, presumably having the same content in mind.

(74) Polish

Edwardzie!	*Ty*	*byś*	*pewnie*	*w*	*tej*
Edward.VOC	2SG.NOM	IRR.2SG	surely	in	DEM.LOC.SG.F

sytuacji	*wziął*		*i*	*nie*	*umarł.*
situation.LOC.SG	take(PFV).PST.3.M		and	NEG	die(PFV).PST.3.M

Albo	*też*	*nie*	*wziął*		*i*	*nie*	*umarł ?? :)*
or	also	NEG	take(PFV).PST.3.M		and	NEG	die(PFV).PST.3.M

'Edward! You surely would have not-died in this situation.
Or [should I say] would not have died?? :)'

There are some further interesting observations regarding the negation of imperatives in Polish, where a couple of interpretations are possible. The first is a straightforward directive: the negated lexical verb expresses an activity that should not be done or continued.

(75) Polish: negation of imperatives with TAKE and NEG-V type a.

Weź		*i*	*nie*	*gadaj* —
take(PFV).IMP.2.SG		and	NEG	talk(IPFV).IMP.2.SG

powiedział	*stanowczo,*	*więc*
say(PFV).PST.3SG.M	resolutely	so

ustąpiłem.
concede(PFV).PST.M.1SG

'"Stop talking," he said resolutely, so I stopped.'

The second one is more puzzling, because negation is used somewhat ironically. The outcome of the action expressed by the negated lexical verb is about to happen, i.e. given price is a bargain and it is wise to use it:

(76) Polish: negation of imperatives with TAKE and NEG-V type b
[*67 złotych bodajże na fan.pl.*]

No	*weź*		*i*	*nie*	*weź.*
PTC	take(PFV).IMP.2.SG		and	NEG	take(PFV).IMP.2.SG

'67 zlotys on fan.pl, it is a must take.' ('how could I go ahead and not take it')

Another interesting observation is a difference between the variant with the coordinator and the asyndetic variant. It seems that the latter cannot be used with the second pattern of negation, while it is quite usual with the first (in the last two examples, the coordinator *i* could be omitted without change of meaning). The following example shows a (joking) answer to a command: while the positive imperative uses the asyndetic form, its negation in the response is formulated using the coordinator.

(77) Polish (context: the speaker was annoyed about continuous questioning about Christmas presents)

— A	weź		przestań!!
PTC	take(PFV).IMP.2.SG		stop(PFV).IMP.2SG
— Nie	wezmę	i	nie
NEG	take(PFV).NPST.1SG	and	NEG
przestanę,		jutro	Wigilia!
stop(PFV).NPST.1SG		tomorrow	Christmas_Eve.NOM.SG

'[A:] Stop it! [B:] I won't stop, it's Christmas Eve tomorrow.'

Finally, we also found 8 examples in the Polish corpus where only the first verb was negated. However, all of these observations look like errors of some sort and sound odd. Despite the fact that the meaning of the sentences is rather clear, it feels like the negation of the second verb is missing. Formally only *wziąć* is negated, but the scope of negation is over the whole construction, it therefore represents the second pattern: NEG [TAKE and V].

(78) Polish (not standard, not accepted by all speakers)

[*A skąd mamy wiedzieć że*]

go	nie	weźmiesz		i
3SG.M.ACC	NEG	take(PFV).NPST.2.SG		and
umieścisz		gdzieś	w	sieci.
upload(PFV).NPST.2SG		somewhere	in	net.LOC.SG

'How should we know that you will not upload it | somewhere on the Internet?'

While this construction is not part of contemporary standard Polish, it might be a further development where the TAKE (and) V construction is considered as a complex form of a verb and consequently needs only one marker of negation with scope over the whole.

Cohesion

The TAKE (and) V construction in both languages shows a high degree of cohesion. The construction most commonly consists of exactly these three elements, however there might be a number of interrupting words, such as adverbs or in Polish the reflexive marker *się*. Similar to Baltic, arguments and adverbs are usually placed before or after the construction, but some variation occurs. The observations discussed in this section were obtained by additional queries.

Presence vs absence of 'and'

In contrast to Russian and to Baltic, in Polish the asyndetic type TAKE V is quite frequent, although it is less frequent than TAKE and V with the coordinator. It is especially common in colloquial registers with an imperative (79).

(79) Polish

Lepiej	*weź*	*sprawdź*	*sobie*
better	take(PFV).IMP.2SG	check(PFV). IMP.2SG	RFL.DAT
jak	*powstawała*	*książka.*	
how	arise(PFV).PST.3SG.F	book.NOM.SG	

'Better check how the book was created.'

As noted by Andrason (2018, 585), the use of the coordinator may even be ungrammatical in frequent combinations such as *Weź (*i) przestań!* 'Stop it!' (see (82) above). Interestingly, the insertion of the coordinator may lead to a different interpretation: *Weź i przestań!* 'How could I stop?' (with irony). The properties of the asyndetic TAKE V construction in Polish lead Andrason (2018) to categorise it as a serial verb construction.

In Russian the asyndetic construction is rare. The following is one of a few examples we found in the corpus.

(80) Russian

Na	*korable*	*probyl*	*on —*	*ne*
on	ship.LOC.SG	stay(PFV).PST.SG.M	3SG.M.NOM	NEG
skazať,	*dolgo:*	*vdrug*	*vzjal,*	
say(PFV).INF	for_long_time	suddenly	take(PFV).PST.3SG	
isčez.				
disappear(PFV).PST.SG.M				

'One wouldn't say he stayed on the ship for a long time: suddenly [he] disappeared.'

Weiss (2007) lists the following formal types of the Russian TAKE (and) V construction:

> *vzjať i* V
> *vzjať da* V
> *vzjať da i* V
> *vzjať,* V
> *vzjať* V

The very last subtype is considered "the starting point of verbal serialisation" (Weiss 2007, 428). It differs prosodically (one stress on the lexical

verb) and morphosyntactically from other subtypes, for instance, it allows fronting of the lexical verb, as in (81). The other subtypes require strict verb order, first 'take' and then a lexical verb.

(81) Russian (Fortuin 2000, 154–155)
    kakoj   *vy*   *otec?..*
    what_kind.NOM.SG.M   2PL.NOM   father.NOM.SG
    Udavljus'   *vot*   *voz'mu!*
    strangle_oneself(PFV).NPST.1SG   PTC   take(PFV).NPST.1SG
    'What kind of father are you? ... I will strangle myself!"

This subtype is specific of Russian and does not have correlates in the other languages under discussion. Weiss (2007) also mentions cases when the lexical verb is not present or an interjection is used instead of it, as in (82):

(82) Russian (Weiss 2007, 3)
    On   *vzjal*   *i*   *bux!*
    3SG.NOM.M   take(PFV).PST.3SG   and   splash!
    v   *vodu.*
    in   water.ACC.SG
    'All of a sudden, he fell / dived into the water.'

Placement of arguments, adverbs and particles

In both languages, some elements may be placed into the construction, and usually they are single elements. In Polish it is not rare to see a direct object placed after *wziąć* or before the lexical verb, especially pronouns, but more complex phrases are also possible, as in (83). Also adverbs such as *tylko* 'only', *nagle* 'suddenly', *po prostu* 'simply' may be inserted either after TAKE or between 'and' and V.

(83) Polish
    No   *to*   *wzięła*   *i*   *sanie*
    PTC   PTC   take.PST.3SG.F   and   sleigh.ACC.PL
    razem   *ze*   *stodołą*   *podpaliła.*
    together   with   barn.INS.SG   set_fire.PST.3SG.F
    'So she set the sleigh with the whole barn on fire.'

While in Russian and in Baltic the reflexive marker is a bound morph, in Polish it is a free word (*się*), and it is found in different positions inside and outside of the hendiadic construction. In clauses with the TAKE (and) V construction, it is not always clear whether a *się* belongs to the lexical verb, to 'take', or to both. More detailed research is needed. In the following

examples some of the variation can be seen. In (84) and (87) *się* is placed in front of the construction, although it seems to belong to the lexical verb (*rozchorować się* 'fall ill', *rozpadać się* 'start to rain'). Thus, it is treated as belonging to the complex.

Lexical variation of V2

In both languages, the construction can be used with animate as well as inanimate subjects (concrete and abstract entities) and also with zero-valent verbs. As in Baltic, the construction is used not only for actions carried out intentionally by an actor, but also for involuntary changes of state. So far in this section we showed mostly examples with intentional human actors, so we will add here some illustrations of other types of subjects and verbs. We did not notice any significant difference between Polish and Russian with respect to lexical classes of verbs and subjects.

(84) Polish (human undergoer, involuntary change of state)
[*Planowany tydzień skracaliśmy do 4 dni,*]

bo	*się*	*ten*	*maluch*	*wziął*
because	RFL	this	infant.NOM.SG	take(PFV).PST.3SG.M

i	*rozchorował.*
and	fall_sick(PFV).PST.3SG.M

'[We shortened the planned week to 4 days,]
because our little one fell sick.'

(85) Russian (inanimate concrete subject, undergoer)
[*V takoj termos možno naliť čaj, i vse kak budto v porjadke,*]

a	*potom*	*on*	*voz'met*
and	then	3SG.NOM.M	take(PFV).PRS.3SG

i	*vzorvetsja.*
and	explode(PFV).PRS.3SG.RFL

'[You can pour tea in such a thermos, and everything will be seemingly ok,] but then it will [suddenly] explode.'

(86) Russian (inanimate abstract subject, change of state)

Predskažeš	*čto-nibuď,*	*a*	*on*
foretell(PFV).NPST.2SG	something.ACC	and	3.NOM.SG.N

voz'met	*i*	*sbudetsja —*
take(PFV).NPST.3SG	and	come_true.(PFV).NPST.3SG.RFL

čto	*togda?*
what.NOM	then

'You will foretell something, and it will [suddenly, indeed] come true — what then?'

(87) Polish (weather verb)
[*Rano, gdy już wlazłem we wszystkie te ciuchy,*]

się	*wzięło*	*i*	*rozpadało*
RFL	take(PFV).PST.3SG.N	and	PVB.rain(PFV).PST.3SG.N

'[In the morning, when I got into all these clothes,] it started to rain.'

In both Russian and Polish the construction usually cannot be used with unbounded activities and states like 'sleep', 'be asleep', 'believe', 'rain'. Examples with such predicates found in Latvian and Lithuanian could (according to several consultants) not be translated into Polish or Russian with the TAKE (and) V construction.

Semantics

The semantics of the construction is similar in both languages. Similar to the Baltic languages, the meaning most often may be paraphrased by 'suddenly', 'unexpectedly', 'contrary to the usual situation or norm', 'contrary to my will', 'all by itself', 'without apparent reason', 'indeed', and others.

Judging by the Russian data, the meaning 'all by itself, without reason' seems to be dominant with the imperfective verb for 'take', whereas the pure meaning of unexpectedness is more frequent with the perfective form.

A special case is the imperative (not narrative) use of the construction. It differs semantically from other grammatical forms, because the imperative cancels the unexpectedness. Fortuin (2000, 152) formulates that in Russian "...the *vzjat'*-construction is used to eliminate the addressee's possible hesitation to do the action". Thus, as described for Baltic, with an imperative the meaning of the construction is something like 'go ahead', 'just do it', and not 'do it suddenly / against expectations'. The same is true for Polish.

6. Discussion and conclusions

In the preceding Sections 3–5 we assembled data from six languages from three genetic groups, of which two, Baltic and Slavic, are branches of one family. The three groups have been in an areal relationship since prehistoric times, and contacts between two or more individual languages have played a role at various times in history. However, the similarities we find in the form and function of the TAKE and V construction do not seem to closely follow genetic relationship (except for Baltic) or contact histories. Moreover, two constructions in one language may be more different than

constructions across languages. We may assume that the constructions have been developing for a considerable time mostly language-internally, and that similarities across languages are connected to general factors rather than to shared heritage or mutual influences. However, the similarities between Latvian and Lithuanian are striking. Though constructions in all six languages have much in common, the Baltic languages still stand out with respect to frequency and functional range of the construction. We therefore conclude that there is a Baltic type of the TAKE (and) V construction, whose features are found to a varying degree in neighbouring languages.

In this section we will compare the six languages according to four basic research questions, compiling and discussing the findings of the previous sections:

- How frequent and conventional (grammaticalised) is the construction?
- Which inflectional forms are most prominent for the construction?
- Which kind of verbs and subjects are used in the construction?
- What are the meanings and functions of the construction?

6.1 How much of a construction is TAKE and V?

In Section 2 we explained how we extracted the investigated construction from the corpora. A first indicator of the degree of conventionalisation of the construction was the percentage of "good" examples in a sample of occurrences of the sequence of the lemma 'take', followed by 'and' and a verb. The exact figures were given in Table 1. Accordingly, we may arrange the languages on a scale as given in Table 14.

Table 14. *How great a portion of instances of a sequence* TAKE *and V represent the construction?*

Percentage	Language, construction	Degree of conventionalisation
> 90%	Lithuanian; Estonian verb + particle	high
> 80%	Latvian; Russian perfective	
> 60%	Polish perfective	
> 50%	Finnish	medium
> 40%	Russian imperfective	
> 25%	Polish imperfective	
< 10%	Estonian simple verb	low

A construction that is a conventional pairing of form and meaning does not have to be frequent. However, three of the four top constructions in Table 14 are also the most frequent in our corpora. In Table 15 we present the frequency with which the constructions are represented in the corpora. For Lithuanian and Latvian all occurrences are considered, while the figures for the other languages are based on an estimate, assuming that the percentage of good examples in the whole corpus corresponds to the percentage of good examples in the random sample that we filtered manually.[11]

Table 15. *Frequency of hendiadic* TAKE *and V in the corpora (per million)*

Lithuanian *imti ir* V		19.37
Latvian *ņemt un* V		5.83
Russian *vzjať i* V	(perfective verb)	4.76
Finnish *ottaa ja* V		3.37
Estonian *võtma kätte* [] V	(particle verb)	2.81
Estonian *võtma ja* V	(simple verb)	1.56
Polish *wziąć i* V	(perfective verb)	0.73
Russian *brať i* V	(imperfective verb)	0.66
Polish *brać i* V	(imperfective verb)	0.28

The hierarchy implied in Table 15 corresponds to our intuition and expert knowledge of the languages, though the large difference between Lithuanian and Latvian came as a surprise. Thus, the construction is well established in the Baltic languages and in Russian, to a lesser degree in Finnish and Estonian. In standard Polish the construction is rather rare.

---

[11] For example, for Finnish 53.1% of a random sample of 1000 represented the construction, so we assumed that 53.1% of the total of 8923 observations of the sequence (= 4738) would represent the construction in the corpus of 1,404,100,049 words, which gave us the figure of 3.37 per million.

In the languages using both a perfective and an imperfective expression for 'take' (Russian, Polish, Estonian), pseudocoordination is more frequent with the perfective verb.

One reason for the lower frequency of the TAKE and V construction in Polish in our comparison is that in that language we find more syntagmatic variability. While in the Baltic languages, the most important form of the construction is the one we searched for in our initial query, in Polish the asyndetic variant TAKE (,) V is quite frequent. We also more often find elements such as pronouns inserted into the construction, and such variants are not included in our counts. Though not as frequent as the construction with the coordinator, asyndetic TAKE V is salient in colloquial registers of Polish, which may be the reason that it has received more attention among linguists than the variant with the coordinator. In Estonian, the construction with the simple verb is also quite frequent without coordinator, while the construction with the particle verb behaves more like Baltic in this respect. Finnish in turn has a very strong preference for using the coordinator; asyndetic forms were judged as odd by native speaker consultants. The asyndetic construction and its relation to the coordinated construction is certainly worth further investigation in Polish and also in Estonian, but for the Baltic languages and Finnish it seems to be of less interest, at least in the modern standard varieties.[12]

6.2 Grammatical categories: Tense, mood, aspect, polarity

In Table 16 we have compiled the frequencies of the most important forms in which 'take' and the lexical verb are used in the hendiadic construction (only the variant with 'and' was counted). Note that the comparison glosses over language-specific differences. The Slavic and Finnic languages have a non-past category rather than present and future tense. In Latvian, we did not distinguish imperative from present tense (see Section 3).

---

[12] In the comprehensive grammar of Finnish (Hakulinen *et al.* 2004, 1041), the construction is partly described in the section on coordination, and an asyndetic variant is not mentioned at all.

Table 16. *Distribution of most important verb forms*

Language	PRS	IMP	PST	FUT	IRR	INF	100% =
Latvian	40.2		21.0	11.5	2.4	20.0	3093
Lithuanian	24.5	8.4	28.7	15.6	5.3	15.6	943
Estonian *kätte võtma*	25.4	15.6	42.1	—	8.1	4.4	480
Estonian *võtma*	21.3	34.8	15.7	—	3.4	18.0	89
Finnish	15.8	3.0	62.9	—	2.1	13.4	531
Polish *wziąć*	—	19.0	45.7	17.7	0.1	17.5	670
Russian *vzjat'*	—	6.9	41.4	10.4	1.2	40.0	817
Polish *brać*	33.3	21.7	8.2	—	—	36.7	267
Russian *brat'*	52.0	27.5	4.2	—	—	16.3	454

Some languages use the construction most often in past tense, most clearly Finnish with over 60%, but also Estonian with *kätte võtma*, and Polish and Russian[13] with perfective 'take'. Also in Lithuanian, past tense forms are more frequent than others, but the distribution is more balanced. In Latvian, past tense is less frequent compared to Lithuanian, but we found that it is significantly more frequent in our construction than in other uses of the verb *ņemt* 'take'. The Slavic constructions with imperfective 'take' clearly prefer present tense over past tense. With these verbs, also imperatives are more important. Interestingly, in Polish also in constructions with perfective 'take' the imperative has a significant share of almost 20%. In fact, imperatives are the first forms that come to people's minds when asked about examples for the construction *wziąć i* V. It is possible that the imperative (especially the 2SG *weź i* V) , despite being less frequent in corpora than third person past tense, has got its prominence through certain exemplars typical for slang. The highest share of imperatives was found with Estonian *võtma*. A low share of imperatives (less than 10%) was found in the Baltic languages, in Russian (perfective) and especially in

---

[13] Stojnova (2007, 160–161) states a much higher preference than we found for the past tense with the Russian perfective *vzjat'*, "about 70%" of her sample.

Finnish. However, in Lithuanian imperative is used in pseudocoordination significantly more often than elsewhere.

It is interesting that the highest frequency of imperative forms occurs in the constructions that are least frequent (cf. Table 15) and less conventionalised (cohesive) (cf. Table 14).

Aspect

In Polish and Russian, where aspect is an established grammatical category, there is a marked difference between the use of perfective and imperfective 'take'. The construction is more frequent, more versatile, and more similar to Baltic with the perfective form. In Estonian, there is a similar and still more pronounced difference between the simple verb and the particle verb. While the Estonian simple verb is neutral with respect to aspect (rather than being imperfective), the particle verb is a conventional means of expressing perfective aspect in Estonian (together with object marking). Thus, not only in Slavic, but also in Estonian we see a preference of the construction for perfective aspect. Finnish, on the other hand, has no perfectivising particles, and the verb *ottaa* 'take' is aspectually neutral.

Where do the Baltic languages fit in here? On the one hand, one may argue that the simple verbs for 'take' (Ltv. *ņemt*, Lith. *imti*) are aspectually neutral, just as their equivalent in Finnish. On the other hand, they do stand in a partly grammaticalised opposition to verbs with a semantically neutral prefix: Ltv. *pa-ņemt*, Lith. *pa-imti*. On this background we may state that in contrast to Slavic (and Estonian), Baltic uses an imperfective verb for TAKE, or maybe rather: does not prefer a perfective verb. This may be an argument for the thesis that the Baltic construction has developed independently from the Slavic construction, or if not independently, then certainly not after a Slavic model. In fact, in Latvian the use of *paņemt* in pseudocoordination is often attributed to Russian influence, the proper Latvian form being simple *ņemt*. The use of the prefixed verb in Latvian needs further investigation. In Lithuanian, we have shown that it is by far less frequent than the simple verb (77 observations = 1.58 per million).

Negation

Negation is found in two patterns that differ formally and with respect to scope. In the first pattern, negation has scope only over the lexical verb V, while the meaning components conveyed by TAKE are not negated: TAKE

[NEG V]. In the Baltic languages, negation is expressed by a prefix attached to the verb V, while in the Slavic languages it is a free particle positioned immediately before V, for example Latvian *ņēma un **nei**eradās* '(unexpectedly) did not show up' (cf. 7), Polish *wziął i **nie** przyjechał* '(unexpectedly) did not come' (70). In the Finnic languages, this pattern is not found: the verb 'take' and the lexical verb V must have the same polarity.

In the second pattern, negation has scope over the whole construction: NEG [TAKE and V]. In Baltic and Slavic this pattern is realised through formally negating both verbs, for example Polish ***nie** weźmie i **nie** kupi jedzenia* 'will not buy food' (71). This pattern is usually found in non-real contexts or contexts describing potential situations. This pattern is significantly less frequent than the first one.

In Estonian, this pattern is (marginally) found with the phrasal verb *kätte võtma*, but not with *võtma* alone. Also in Finnish, it appears but rarely.

Table 17. Negation patterns found with the investigated constructions

Language	LTV	LIT	EST v.	EST k.v.	FIN	POL PFV	RUS PFV	POL IPFV	RUS IPFV
Pattern 1: TAKE and [NEG V]	✓	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	—	✓
Pattern 2: NEG [TAKE and V]	✓	✓	—	✓	✓	✓	✓	—	✓

In Polish both patterns of negation are equally frequent, but they are possible only with perfective 'take'. In the other languages which have both patterns, the second is clearly less frequent than the first. Even if it is possible to put TAKE under the scope of negation, this is rarely done. A third logically possible pattern, where only TAKE would be negated, "[NEG TAKE] and V", is not attested in any of the languages. This is to be expected, as the meanings of TAKE become more grammatical — grammatical categories are not negated by the common means of negation.

At present, languages that have the second pattern formally use two instances of the negating element. A further step into grammaticalising the construction would be to drop the second negator. Constructed example in Polish: ?*nie* [*weźmie i kupi jedzenia*], intended meaning as in *nie weźmie i nie kupi jedzenia* 'will not buy food'. We found a few such examples in Polish, but they are not accepted by all native speakers, or they are ambiguous between the hendiadic construction and a literal interpretation of 'take'.

6.3 Lexical-semantic variation in subjects and lexical verbs

The lexical meaning of the verb 'take' involves an animate (most commonly human) agent and a voluntary action. In some languages which have a similar TAKE and V construction, this construction is restricted to agentive verbs and/or to actions carried out intentionally. In these languages, if a non-intentional verb is used in this construction (such as 'disappear'), it is implied that the action is carried out "as if" intentionally. This is the situation described for Norwegian by Vannebo (2003, 172–173). Similarly, for varieties of American English that have a "TAKE and V" construction, Krivochen & Schmerling (2016, 5–6) show that it is only used for deliberate actions (while this restriction is not observed for pseudocoordination with *go* and with *up*). Ekberg (1993) postulates that not only in Swedish, but cross-linguistically, the TAKE and V construction encodes volitionality so that "a verb which is neutral (or ambiguous) with respect to volitionality gets an unambiguously volitional reading" (Ekberg 1993, 33) and the verbs such as 'be murdered', 'cry', 'fall', "which take a nonvolitional subject role are incompatible with *take and*" (Ekberg 1993, 34).[14] This is not true for our languages.

Our languages of investigation have taken the TAKE and V construction farther, although the majority of observations still involve activities that can be controlled by the actor and consequently are used most often with human subjects. These features are inherited from the literal meaning of 'take' (here we agree with Ekberg 1993), and they characterise the prototype of the construction, at least in its initial stages. The Estonian construction with the simple verb *võtma* seems to have stayed closest to this prototype: it is used only with agentive verbs and requires volitional, human subjects. With the particle verb *kätte võtma*, the Estonian construction can also take patientive, non-volitional verbs such as 'die', but it is still largely restricted to human subjects. In examples with other subjects, these are treated as if they were volitional (such as in 57 things living their own life, or in 62 an enzyme knocking on a door). The other languages do not

---

[14] Note that some of the "impossible" constructed examples given by Ekberg (1993) for Finnish and Polish are indeed attested in our samples. See also Fortuin (2000, 158) for the fact that Ekberg's claims do not hold for Russian.

show this restriction. Especially in the Baltic languages and Finnish, we noticed a prominent set of verbs denoting a change of state of inanimate undergoers: cars breaking down, states falling apart, things disappearing, dreams (or fears) coming true. Such examples are also attested in Polish and Russian. These verbs are at the centre of a new prototype of the construction. It is probably here that the meaning 'unexpectedly' comes to the fore. Finally, only in the Baltic languages we found the TAKE and V construction with unbounded activities and states, such as 'rain', 'sleep', 'believe'. This is (still) rare, and some Lithuanian examples we discussed with native speakers got different interpretations — for example, 'it takes and is raining' in one and the same example was interpreted by some as 'it started to rain suddenly and continues to rain' and by others as 'it is raining against my expectations/against my wishes'. Some translated examples seemed to be marginally acceptable in Russian, but only in past tense, not present tense.

Taking into account only intransitive verbs, we may roughly distinguish three types of verbs and arrange them on a scale as shown in Table 18.

Table 18. *Occurrence of lexical-semantic types of intransitive verbs in the* TAKE *and V construction*

Type	Verbs	Subjects	Example	Language
1	intentional actions	human actor	'leave'	Norwegian, English LTV, LIT, RUS, POL, FIN, EST (both verbs)
2a	change of state	human undergoer	'die' 'fall ill'	LTV, LIT, RUS, POL, FIN, EST (particle verb)
2b	change of state	inanimate concrete / abstract	'fall to pieces' 'turn sour' 'start raining' 'come true'	LTV, LIT, RUS, POL, FIN
3	state, unbounded activity	all	'sleep (be asleep)' 'rain (be raining)' 'believe'	LTV, LIT (states are still exceptional)

While we did not conduct a diachronic study and historical sources for the construction are hard to come by in our languages, we find it likely that the "types" in Table 18 also represent stages in the spread of pseudo-coordination with TAKE through the lexicon of a language.

6.4 The meaning(s) of the construction

There have been several attempts to ascribe the hendiadic construction TAKE (and) V a single meaning, both within one language and for a larger group of languages. Coseriu (1966) reviewed and criticised several earlier attempts, for example, the view that the construction essentially has ingressive meaning. He then proposed his own, very general interpretation of the construction in all European languages where it is attested: according to Coseriu, the construction expresses the *holisticity* of the action expressed by the second verb ("drückt die Wendung die *Gesamtheitlichkeit* der von dem zweiten Verb bezeichneten Handlung aus", Coseriu 1966, 42).[15] While we find this concept of "holisticity" rather vague and do not see how to apply it to our data, we are more sympathetic with Coseriu's further thesis that the various concrete meanings the construction may have arise as context-dependent interpretations of a general function. In Section 3.4 we showed that most of the functions of the construction in Latvian can be related to the general function of explicitly pointing to the action or process expressed by the second verb. The alternative to such an approach would be to ascribe several concrete meanings to the construction, thus treating it as polysemous. In any case it seems clear that the construction does not have just one special meaning, but its interpretation depends on several factors. Although the meanings of suddenness and unexpectedness are very often present, in our view calling the construction an "inexpective"[16] fails to pay full justice to its range of meanings and functions. Cf. also Fortuin (2000, 156–161) for a differentiated account of the meaning of the Russian construction.

We have found and shown in several places in this paper that the meaning of an individual instance of the construction depends on the function

---

[15] Fortuin (2000, 157) translates Coseriu's *Gesamtheitlichkeit* as "unity and indivisibility", but we tried to imitate the strangeness Coseriu's term has to a German reader by coining the term *holisticity*.

[16] Weiss (2008, 334) speaks of the Russian construction as "die "Inexpektativ"-Konstruktion"

of the utterance (and related to that, the inflectional form of the verb) and on lexical-semantic properties of the second verb. As a first step it seems to be necessary to distinguish between directives (mostly containing an imperative form) and narrative or descriptive uses. Within the latter, the meaning of the verb plays a greater role. With agentive verbs the meaning of intentional, decided actions is emphasised by the construction; unexpectedness may be part of the meaning, but this is not always the case (especially not with first person subjects). With patientive verbs expressing an uncontrolled change of state, on the other hand, it is mostly unexpectedness that is signaled by the construction. Additionally we often find a negative stance towards this unexpected event (or sometimes irony and other attitudinal nuances). With all verbs there may also be a secondary function of affirming the statement that V happens. This function may become primary with ongoing situations expressed by durative or even stative verbs. Often, the meaning of the construction can be described as 'indeed'. Thus, when we move down the scale given in Table 18, the function of the construction becomes more pragmatic, speaker-related and discourse-related.

6.5 Conclusions

This research started out from a wish to investigate, document and describe the TAKE (and) V construction in the Baltic languages, where its existence has been known to linguists for at least a hundred years without ever getting a thorough description. Working in a larger team opened the possibility of including studies on Finnic and Slavic languages with the same method and comparable data. The result not only enabled us to get a broader picture of the construction, viewing it in areally related languages, but also helped us better understand and appreciate the construction in contemporary Latvian and Lithuanian. As it turned out, it is the Baltic languages where the construction is the most frequent, the most fixed in a certain form, and the most versatile in combining with the widest range of verbs and serving a range of mutually related functions.

> The following features characterise the Baltic type of the TAKE (and) V construction:

- a strong preference for the use of the coordinator over the asyndetic variant;

- a wide distribution of verb forms in which the construction occurs, with a relatively minor role of the imperative;
- two patterns of negation with the abstract meanings of TAKE outside or (more rarely) inside the scope of negation;
- a possible scope of TAKE over more than one following verb;
- a preference for agentive verbs and human actors, but also
- a well attested use with patientive verbs and inanimate undergoers;
- unexpectedness as one recurrent meaning;
- pragmatic meanings such as expressing stance and affirmation;
- the possibility to use the construction with unbounded activities and states.

The analysed constructions in the other languages share many of these features and differ in where they deviate from this type. Most similar is the Russian construction with perfective *vzjat'*. However, Russian has additionally developed several special features with the TAKE (and) V construction which are not found in any of the other languages. Polish stands out with a wider use of the asyndetic variant and of the imperative. Of the Finnic languages, it is sometimes Finnish and sometimes Estonian (with the particle verb) that is more similar to Baltic.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 — first, second, third person, ACC — accusative, ADE — adessive, ADV — adverb, ALL — allative, ANAL.FUT — analytic future, CAUS — causative, CNG — connegative (verb form), COMP — comparative, CVB — converb, DAT — dative, DEF — definite, DEM — demonstrative, DIM — diminutive, ELA — elative, EMPH — emphatic pronoun, F — feminine, fut — future, GEN — genitive, HAB — habitual, ILL — illative, IMP — imperative, INE — inessive, INF – infinitive, INF2 – second infinitive (supine), INS — instrumental, IPFV — imperfective, IRR — irrealis, LOC — locative, M — masculine, N — neuter, NEG — negation, NOM — nominative, NPST — non-past, PA — active participle, PFV — perfective, PFX — prefix, PL — plural, POSS — possessive, PP — passive participle, PRS — present, PRT — partitive, PST — past, PTC — particle, PVB — preverb, RFL — reflexive, RPOSS — reflexive possessive pronoun, SG — singular, TRL — translative, V — verb, VOC — vocative

Corpora

(all corpora are available at the platform sketchengine.eu)
Latvian: lvTenTen14 (530,367,474 words)
Lithuanian: LithuanianWaC_v2, (48,650,918 words)
Estonian: etTenTen13 (260,559,829 words)
Finnish: fiTenTen14_tt2 (1,404,100,049 words)
Polish: plTenTen12 (7,715,835,214 words)
Russian: ruTenTen11 (14,553,856,113 words)

References

AIROLA, ANU. 2007. *Coordinated verb pairs in texts.* PhD Dissertation. Publications No. 41. University of Helsinki. Available at: http://hdl.handle.net/10138/19253, accessed June 5, 2019.

AMBRAZAS, V[YTAUTAS]. 1965. Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių ir vieksmažodžių konstrukcijos su ir bei jų slaviški atitikmenys. [Lithuanian verb and participle constructions with *ir* 'and' and their Slavic equivalents]. *Baltistica* 1.1, 53–66.

ANDRASON, ALEXANDER. 2018. The wziąć gram in Polish: A serial verb construction, or not? STUF *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 71.4, 577–629.

ANDRASON, ALEXANDER. 2019. A pseudo-coordinated serial verb construction "wziąć i V2" in Polish. *Slovo a slovesnost* 80.3, 163–191.

BARTMIŃSKI, JERZY. 1978. Swoiste formy orzeczeń w języku ustnym (orzeczenie onomatopeiczne, kompozycjonalne, zaimkowe, podwojone). [Peculiar predicate forms in spoken language (onomatopoeic, compositional, pronominal, and double predicates)]. In *Studia nad składnią polszczyzny mówionej* [*Studies in Spoken Polish Syntax*], Wrocław etc.: Ossolineum, 159–175.

BĄBA, STANISŁAW & STANISŁAW MIKOŁAJCZYK. 1974. O orzeczeniu szeregowym [The serial predicate]. *Poradnik Językowy* 4. 117–128.

BIBERAUER, THERESA & STEN VIKNER. 2015 (manuscript). *Pseudo-coordination in Danish and Afrikaans.* Published electronically, version 19.05.2015

COSERIU, E[UGENIO]. 1966. «Tomo y me voy». Ein Problem vergleichender europäischer Syntax. *Vox Romanica* 25, 13–55.

Coseriu, Eugenio. 1977. «Tomo y me voy»: Un problema de sintaxis comparada europea. *Estudios de lingüística románica*. Madrid, Gredos, 79–151.

dlkž = *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas* [Dictionary of Contemporary Lithuanian]. Updated electronic edition 2017. Ed. in chief Stasys Keinys. Available at: lkiis.lki.lt.

Ekberg, Lena. 1993. The cognitive basis of the meaning and function of crosslinguistic *take and V. Belgian Journal of Linguistics 8. Perspectives on Language and Conceptualization*, 21–41.

ekss = *Eesti keele seletav sõnaraamat* [Explanatory Dictionary of Estonian], 2nd edition, ed. by Margit Langemets, Mai Tiits, Tiia Valdre, Leidi Veskis, Ülle Viks, Piret Voll. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus. 2009. Online: http://www.eki.ee/dict/ekss/ekss.html , last visited November 23, 2019.

Fortuin, Egbert L. J. 2000. *Polysemy or Monosemy: Interpretation of the Imperative and the Dative-Infinitive Construction in Russian.* PhD dissertation, University of *Amsterdam.*

Fraenkel, Ernst. 1921. *Baltoslavica. Beiträge zur balto-slavischen Grammatik und Syntax.* (Ergänzungsheft zur Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen, Nr. 1). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Fraenkel, Ernst. 1926. Zur Parataxe und Hypotaxe im Griechischen, Baltoslawischen und Albanischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 24, 290–315.

Gębka-Wolak, Małgorzata. 2012. *Weź się zastanów!* Problem statusu gramatycznego przyimperatywnego *weź* [*Weź się zastanów!* The problem of the grammatical status of imperatival *weź* 'take']. *Poradnik Językowy* 4. 49–63.

Góralczyk, Iwona. 2010. *Weź, pokochaj smoka.* The *wziąć* construction in Polish: A Construction Grammar analysis. *Prace Językoznawcze* 12. 89–104.

Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen & Irja Alho. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi.* [Comprehensive Grammar of Finnish] sks:n toimituksia (skst) 950. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Haslinger, Irene & van Koppen, Marjo. 2003. De verbale hendiadys als pseudocoördinatie [Verbal hendiadys as pseudocoordination]. *Taal & Tongval* themanr. 15–16 (2002–2003), 102-122.

Hopper, Paul. 2002. Hendiadys and auxiliation in English. In: Joan Bybee & Michael Noonan, eds., *Complex Sentences in Grammar and Discourse: Essays in Honour of Sandra A. Thompson*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 145–174.

Hopper, Paul. 2008. Emergent serialisation in English: Pragmatics and typology. In: Jeff Good, ed., *Linguistic Universals and Language Change.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 253–284.

Ivulāne, Baiba. 2015. *Palīgnozīmē lietotu darbības vārdu sistēma latviešu valodā* [The system of verbs with auxiliary meaning in Latvian]. PhD thesis, University of Latvia, Riga.

Jakubíček, Miloš, Adam Kilgarriff, Vojtěch Kovář, Pavel Rychlý & Vít Suchomel. 2013. The TenTen Corpus Family. *7th International Corpus Linguistics Conference CL,* 125–127. Available online at https://www.sketchengine.eu/wp-content/uploads/The_TenTen_Corpus_2013.pdf, accessed November 16, 2019.

Kaalep, Heiki-Jaan & Kadri Muischnek. 2002. *Eesti kirjakeele sagedussõnastik.* [The frequency dictionary of Written Estonian]. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Kilgarriff, Adam, Siva Reddy, Jan Pomikálek & Avinesh PVS. 2010. A corpus factory for many languages. *Proceedings of lrec 2010.* Available online at http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2010/summaries/79. html, accessed November 16, 2019.

Kinn, Torodd. 2018. Pseudocoordination in Norwegian: Degrees of grammaticalization and constructional variants. In: Evie Coussé, Peter Andersson, and Joel Olofsson, eds., *Constructional Approaches to Language* 21, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 75–106. https://doi.org/10.1075/cal.21.c4.

Komorowska Ewa. 2008. *Pragmatyka dyrektywnych aktów mowy w języku polskim* [The pragmatics of directive speech acts in Polish]. Szczecin–Rostock.

Kor Chahine, Irina. 2007. O vozmožnom puti grammatikalizacii russkogo "vzjat'" [On a possible grammaticalisation path of Russian *vzjat'* 'take']. *Russian Linguistics* 31.3, 231–248.

Krivochen, Diego Gabriel & Susan F. Schmerling. 2016 (manuscript). Mirage Coordinations in English. Unpublished paper available at https://www.academia.edu/25110015/_Squib_Mirage_Coordinations_in_English, accessed November 16, 2019.

Kvist Darnell, U. 2008. *Pseudosamordningar i svenska: särskilt sådana med verben* sitta, ligga *och* stå [Pseudocoordination in Swedish, especially with the verbs *sitta* 'sit', *ligga* 'lie' and *stå* 'stand']. Stockholm: Institutionen för lingvistik.

Lewy, Ernst. 1937. Erzjamordwinisches *sajems* «nehmen» perfektivierend. *Finnisch -Ugrische Forschungen* 24, 288–291.

Lewy, Ernst. 1951. Ein Nachtrag. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 30, 284–288.

LKŽ = *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* [Dictionary of Lithuanian] (t. 1–xx, 1941–2002): elektroninis variantas. Updated version 2017. Ed. in chief Gertrūda Naktinienė. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, Available at www.lkz.lt.

LLVV = *Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca.* [Dictionary of Standard Latvian]. Vol. 6.1 Ņ–P. 1986. Editor in Chief R. Grabis. Rīga: Zinātne.

Lødrup, Helge. 2017. Norwegian Pseudocoordination with the Verb *drive* 'carry on': Control, raising, grammaticalization. In: Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King, eds., *Proceedings of the LFG'17 Conference, University of Konstanz.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 264–284.

LVV= *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca* [Dictionary of Latvian]. 1987. Editor in chief Dainuvīte Guļevska. Rīga: Avots.

Metslang, Helle. 2017. Sihitis [Object]. In: Mati Erelt & Helle Metslang, eds., *Eesti keele süntaks* [Estonian syntax]. Eesti keele varamu III. Tartu: Tartu University Press, 258–277.

Poutsma, H. 1917. Hendiadys in English. Together with some observations on the constructions of certain verbs. *Neophilologus* 2, 202–218.

Pulkkinen, Paavo. 1966. *Asyndeettinen rinnastus suomen kielessä* [Asyndetic coordination in Finnish]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Ross, Daniel. 2014. El origen de los estudios sobre la pseudocoordinación verbal. [The origin of research on verbal pseudocoordination]. *Diálogo de la Lengua* 6. Available at http://www.dialogodelalengua.com/articulo/numero06.html.

Ross, Daniel. 2016. Between coordination and subordination: Typological, structural and diachronic perspectives on pseudocoordination. In Fernande Pratas, Sandra Pereira, Clara Pinto, eds., *Coordination and Subordination: Form and Meaning. Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 209–243.

Ross, Daniel. 2017. Pseudocoordinación del tipo *tomar y* en Eurasia: 50 años después [Pseudocoordination with *take and* in Eurasia: 50 years later]. Presented at *Lingüística Coseriana VI*, Lima, Peru. Presentation available at http://publish.illinois.edu/djross3/files/2013/11/Ross-tomar-y.pdf.

Ross, Daniel. Forthcoming. *Pseudocoordination, Serial Verb Constructions and Multi-Verb Predicates: The Relationship between Form and Structure.* University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign PhD dissertation.

Škodová, Svatava. 2009. *Pseudokoordinace v syntaxi současné češtiny* [Pseudocoordination in the syntax of contemporary Czech]. PhD dissertation, Prague.

Stojnova, Natalia M. 2007. Konstrukcija *vz'at' i sdelat'* v russkom jazyke [The construction *vz'at' i sdelat'* 'take and do' in Russian]. In: F. I. Dudčuk, N. V. Ivlieva & A. V. Podobrjaev, eds., *Struktury i interpretacii: raboty molodyx issledovatelej po teoretičeskoj i prikladnoj lingvistike.* Moscow, 158–188.

Taube, Moshe. Draft. Verbal hendiadys in Yiddish. [downloaded 10.10.2009, was announced as "to appear" in *Yiddish and Typology*, eds. Neil Jacobs *et al.*, this book has never appeared, but the draft is still online].

Tragel, Ilona. 2003. Seriaalkonstruktsioonist eesti keeles [On serial constructions in Estonian]. *Keel ja Kirjandus,* 12, 919–934.

Tragel, Ilona. 2017. Serial verb constructions in Estonian. In: Brian Nolan & Elke Diedrichsen, eds., *Argument Realisation in Complex Predicates and Complex Events: Verb-Verb Constructions at the Syntax-Semantics Interface.* Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 169–189.

Vannebo, Kjell Ivar. 2003. *Ta og ro deg ned noen hakk*: On pseudocoordinations with the verb 'take' in a grammaticalization perspective. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 26, 165–198

Weiss, Daniel. 2007. The grammar of surprise: the Russian construction of the type *Кошка взяла да умерла* 'Suddenly, the cat died'. In: Tilman Reuther, Leo Wanner & Kim Gerdes, eds., *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Meaning-Text Theory* (*Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 69). München, Wien: Verlag Otto Sagner, 427–436.

Weiss, Daniel. 2008. *Živi sebe normal'nenko!* Zur Lexikalisierung von russ. *sebe* als Partikel. *Schweizerische Beiträge zum XIV. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Ohrid, September 2008*, 327–344. Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich.

Wiklund, Anna-Lena. 1996. Pseudocoordination is subordination. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 56, 29–54.

Zinken, Jörg. 2013. Reanimating responsibility. The *weź*-V_2 (*take*-V_2) double imperative in Polish interaction. In: Nadine Thielemann & Peter Kosta, eds., *Approaches to Slavic Interaction*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 35–61.

Zinken, Jörg. 2016. *Requesting Responsibility. The Morality of Grammar in Polish and English Family Interaction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nicole Nau

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
Department of Scandinavian Studies
al. Niepodległości 4, PL-61-874 Poznań
naunicol@amu.edu.pl

Kiroll Kozhanov

Vilnius University
Institute for the Languages and Cultures of the Baltic
Universiteto 5, LT-01131 Vilnius
kozhanov.kirill@gmail.com

Liina Lindström

University of Tartu
Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics
Ülikooli 18, EE-50090 Tartu
liina.lindstrom@ut.ee

Asta Laugalienė

Vilnius University
Institute for the Languages and Cultures of the Baltic
Universiteto 5, LT-01131 Vilnius
asta.zuklyte@flf.vu.lt

Paweł Brudzyński

University of Warsaw
Faculty of Polish Studies, KJOWPiB
PL-00-927 Warsaw
pawel.brudzynski@gmail.com