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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Aim and scope

In both English and Norwegian words, phrases and clauses may be linked in a paratactic relationship through coordination, and the items responsible for this linking are a closed set of coordinators in each language. One of the central coordinators in both languages is the additive coordinator: og in Norwegian and and in English. And and og fill similar syntactic and semantic functions in the two languages. Generally, a coordinate structure with and in English can be expected to correspond to a coordinate structure with og in Norwegian, and vice versa. However, evidence from the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus (see 1.3) shows that og and and do not correspond in all contexts. In this thesis I will focus on examples where og and and do not correspond. More precisely, I will study examples from the fiction part of the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus where there is verb phrase or clause coordination with og in the Norwegian originals, but where the English translations are rephrased such that one of the coordinated verb phrases or clauses has been incorporated as a subordinate clause or as a phrase in the translation. The types of structures can be exemplified by (1) and (2):

(1) a. Da bøyer plutselig faren seg fram og har noe i hendene. 
   b. Then Father suddenly bends forward with something in his hands.

(2) a. ‘Hilsen Ruby’, hyler han, og det er like før reguleringen spreter ut.

   (LSC1)
b. ‘Hi, Ruby’ he howls just before his retainer pops out.

A pilot study showed that non-correspondence between *og* and *and* is almost twice as common when translating from Norwegian to English as when translating in the other direction: it is more common for coordinate structures with *og* to be translated with something else than coordination with *and* than for coordinate structures with *and* to be translated with something else than *og* (see chapter 3). In many of the examples where a Norwegian coordinate structure did not correspond to a coordinate structure in English, the English translation was rephrased such that one of the coordinated units in the original was incorporated as a subordinate clause or as a phrase in the English translation. These examples are interesting not only from a syntactic point of view, but also from a semantic point of view, as subordination brings with it a semantic downgrading of the information expressed in the subordinate clause (for further discussion of the relationship between coordination and subordination, see 2.4.3).

The aim of the study is to answer the following questions:

- What kind of syntactic structures are found in the English translations?
- Is there a pattern for cases where Norwegian coordinate structures with *og* are translated with subordinate structures in English? What are the characteristics of the Norwegian coordinate structures subject to this change?
- Does the shift from coordination to subordination cause any differences in meaning between the translations and the originals? What kind of differences? What is lost and what is added?

More generally, it is hoped that the study will give insight into differences and similarities
between Norwegian and English in the area of coordination, and that it will shed light on the relationship between coordination and subordination generally. It is also expected that the study will give insight into the different structures analysed, and, in particular, contribute to a better understanding of Norwegian coordinate structures with the coordinator og. As translations aim to render, as faithfully as possible, the meanings expressed in the original language, they are valuable means by which to get at the meaning of a structure.

The material comprises 481 examples, all of which are taken from the fiction part of the corpus.

1.2 Previous contrastive studies

The availability of bilingual corpora such as the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus and its sister corpora in other Nordic countries has made possible a number of contrastive studies on topics exploring the relationship between English and the Nordic languages. Like the present thesis, some studies have been concerned with the relation between clauses. Altenberg (1999) has studied adverbial connectors in English and Swedish, using the English-Swedish Parallel Corpus. The causal relation has been explored by Meier (2001), who compares the English causal subordinators because, since and as with the Norwegian causal subordinators fordi, siden and ettersom. The semantic relation of elaboration and the causal relation have been studied by Behrens (1998) in a doctoral thesis on the interpretation of free -ing participle adjuncts and their translations into Norwegian. The elaboration relation is also discussed in a paper by Behrens and Fabricius-Hansen (forthcoming). Their article is concerned with translations of German indem-clauses into Norwegian and English. An interesting observation for the present study is the frequency of paratactic constructions among the Norwegian
translations as compared to the English translations. While only one of the thirty-two English translations is paratactic, such constructions account for more than one third of the Norwegian translations (12 of 34 translations). Ruin (2001) discusses the relationship between finite and non-finite clauses in a study of *-ing* participle clauses as translations of Swedish finite clauses in literary texts. Some of her material is similar to the kind of examples studied in this thesis; some of the *-ing* clauses occur as renderings of coordinated finite clauses. However, Ruin’s focus is the relationship between finite and non-finite clauses, not primarily the relation between coordination and subordination.

To my knowledge, no previous English-Scandinavian contrastive studies have been concerned with the linking of clauses by coordination with *og*/*and*, nor are there any such studies on the relation between coordination and subordination.

### 1.3 Material and method

The English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus (ENPC) is a 2.6-million-word computer corpus of Norwegian original texts and their translations into English and English original texts with their translations into Norwegian. The corpus comprises both fiction and non-fiction texts: 30 original fiction texts and 20 original non-fiction texts in each language. The texts are extracts, rather than complete texts, and are about 10,000-15,000 words long. A complete list of the corpus texts can be found in the Appendix. The corpus is further described in Johansson (1998).\(^1\)

\[\]

The corpus can be used both as a *comparable* corpus and as a *translation* corpus

---

\(^1\) More information may also be obtained from the corpus website [http://www.hf.uio.no/iba/prosjekt/](http://www.hf.uio.no/iba/prosjekt/) (accessed September 2001).
Original texts in the two languages may be compared, or Norwegian and English original texts may be compared with their translations into the other language. It is also possible to compare original texts and translations in the same language, and to compare translated Norwegian texts with translated English texts. With this composition, the ENPC may be used for different types of studies. It may be used for contrastive studies, as in the present thesis, but also for translation studies, such as studies of the relationship between original texts and translated texts in the same language, or studies of translated texts across languages.

A variety of searches can be performed in the ENPC, both regarding the items searched for and defining in what parts of the corpus to perform the search. The material analysed in this thesis was selected manually from a total number of 1708 examples of non-correspondence between og and and in the fiction part of the Norwegian originals. The searches used to find examples of non-correspondence between og and and are described in section 3.1, and a further description of the examples studied in this thesis, together with the criteria used in delimiting the material, is found in chapter 4, section 4.2.

The study is a text-based contrastive analysis. Contrastive analysis (CA) may be explained as a ‘systematic comparison of the linguistic systems of two or more languages’ (Ringbom 1997:737). One of the advantages of using corpora in these kinds of studies is that one can look at language as it is actually used, rather than focus merely on a theoretical comparison of linguistic systems. Studying language in use increases the possibility of discovering things one may not intuitively be aware of.
1.4 Outline

Chapter 2 provides a theoretical introduction to the field of coordination, with the main emphasis on a comparison between Norwegian and English. The main findings of a pilot study leading up to the present investigation are presented in chapter 3. The remaining chapters are concerned with the main study of the thesis: Chapter 4 gives a general overview of the material and a more thorough discussion of the minor categories of English correspondences. Chapter 5 deals exclusively with one major group of correspondences: -ing participle clauses, and chapter 6 is devoted to a discussion of the correspondences to Norwegian pseudocoordination in the material. Finally, a concluding section with a summary of the main findings is given in chapter 7.
Chapter 2  Coordination in Norwegian and English

2.1 Introduction

The main focus in this chapter is a comparison between Norwegian and English in the field of coordination. In addition, more general theoretical aspects of coordination are discussed. The first main part of the chapter (2.3) comprises sections on the system of coordinators in Norwegian and English, followed by sections more specifically concerned with the relationship between og and and, including both syntactic and semantic aspects. The second main part of the chapter (2.4) gives an introduction to some much debated theoretical issues in the literature on coordination.

2.2 Preliminary notes on coordination

Coordination is the linking of linguistic units at the same level of constituent structure. Languages vary in the way they express semantic coordination (Johannessen 1998:244), but in both English and Norwegian coordination is expressed with the use of a coordinating conjunction. The units being linked may be single words, phrases, clauses or parts of clauses. The coordinated units are sometimes referred to as ‘conjoins’ and other times as ‘conjuncts’. In this paper I will use the term ‘conjunct’. The items responsible for the linking are sometimes labelled ‘coordinating conjunctions’ and other times simply ‘conjunctions’ or ‘coordinators’. Throughout this paper I will refer to them as coordinators. A coordinate structure, then, is made up of two or more conjuncts and a coordinator.
A distinction is traditionally made between ‘syndetic’ and ‘asyndetic’ coordination (Quirk et al. 1985:918). The term ‘syndetic coordination’ is used about coordinate structures with a coordinator. This is the most common type of coordination. The coordinator may, however, sometimes be left out, in which case one talks about ‘asyndetic coordination’:

(1) *The witticisms, the embraces, the nocturnal wanderings*, which earlier had been mysterious glimpses of an enigmatic existence, were changed to helpless gestures - - attempts at life that she saw through in all their vulgarity.

With asyndetic coordination it is always possible to insert the coordinator.

### 2.3 Coordination in Norwegian and English

In this section I will discuss some aspects of coordination in Norwegian and in English. My main focus will be on the coordinators in the two languages: What are the coordinators in English and Norwegian and what similarities and differences are there between the systems of coordinators in the two languages? Basing my account on Quirk et al. (1985) and Faarlund et al. (1987), I will discuss the members traditionally considered to belong to the coordinator class in the two languages and also give some attention to the criteria used in defining the coordinators. The last part of this section will focus on *and* and *og*, with special reference to the semantic relation that may obtain between conjuncts linked by *and* and *og*.

---

2 Examples with this type of reference are all taken from *The English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus* - the ENPC. For a full text identification of the examples from the ENPC the reader is referred to the Appendix. The type of example identification used in example (1) must be distinguished from the identification used in example (2), which refers to *The International Corpus of English - Great Britain*. See footnote 3.
2.3.1 Characteristics of coordinators

In discussing the English coordinators and distinguishing them from other linking items, such as subordinators and linking adverbs, Quirk et al. list the following characteristics of coordinators (1985:921-926):

1. Clause coordinators are restricted to clause-initial position
2. Coordinated clauses are sequentially fixed
3. Coordinators are not preceded by a conjunction
4. Coordinators can link clause constituents
5. Coordinators can link subordinate clauses
6. Coordinators can link more than two clauses

Some of these features are exclusive to coordinators, while others are characteristic also of linking adverbs and subordinators.

The first feature has to do with the position of the coordinator within the clause. The coordinator is restricted to clause-initial position (2a). It cannot be placed anywhere later in the clause, (2b) and (2c):

(2) a. THE Falklands war saved Mrs Thatcher in 1982, and she went on to leave her mark on history.

3 Examples with this type of reference have been collected from *The International Corpus of English - Great Britain*, which is a fully tagged monolingual one-million-word corpus of spoken and written English. Examples from the spoken part of the corpus are marked <ICE-GB:S.....>, and written material is marked <ICE-GB:W.....>. More information about the corpus can be obtained from 'http://www.ucl.ac.uk/english-usage/' (accessed September 2001).
Subordinators behave in the same way as the coordinators. In this respect, both categories differ from linking adverbs, which may be found in non-initial positions:

(3) A literal account of creation was impossible, since nobody had been present at these unimaginable events: myth and symbol were thus the only suitable way of describing them.

(KAR1)

The second criterion relates to the order of the coordinated clauses. The clause introduced by a coordinator has to follow the clause to which it is linked (4a). It cannot be moved in front of that clause (4b):

(4) a. Behind the two men Miriam called from somewhere in the house and she was answered by Anne’s high-pitched, excited voice. 

<ICE-GB:W2F-007 #24:1>

b. *And she was answered by Anne’s high-pitched, excited voice, behind the two men Miriam called from somewhere in the house.

This does not mean that a sentence cannot be introduced by a coordinator, nor that the order of the conjuncts cannot be switched around. A coordinator may occur in sentence-initial position when the coordinator relates the content of its clause to the previous sentence in the discourse. This is different from (4) where the coordinator links two clauses within the same sentence. The order of the conjuncts in a coordinate structure may be switched around, as in she sings and he plays the guitar and he plays the guitar and she sings, but then the coordinator is left at its place before the last conjunct. It does not move up front together with the second conjunct: *and he plays the guitar, she sings. Subordinators are not restricted in the same manner. Clauses introduced by a subordinator may occur either before or after the clause to which it is subordinate:
Because power stations were built on the Thames the most efficient way of delivering the millions of tons of coal they devoured was by ship. 

The most efficient way of delivering the millions of tons of coal they devoured was by ship, because power stations were built on the Thames.

Another characterising feature, distinguishing them from both subordinators and linking adverbs, is that coordinators may not be preceded by other conjunctions. Whereas both linking adverbs and subordinators are readily preceded by one of the coordinating conjunctions, neither coordinators nor subordinators may be placed in front of one of the coordinators:

She first fell in love with Will when she was eighteen, and she adores him still.

*She first fell in love with Will when she was eighteen, because/but/or and she adores him still.

In the examples discussed so far the coordinated units have all been clauses. It is a characterising feature of coordinators, however, that they not only link clauses, but typically also smaller units, such as phrases (7) or words (8):

He would ask Fibich and his wife to join them, since they both loved her.

…if you are going to dispatch a lobster cocktail followed by steak and kidney pie…

Neither the subordinators nor the linking adverbs typically link units smaller than a clause.

---

4 Certain concessive subordinators may link constituents smaller than a clause:

I immediately recognised Sarah’s bold if barely legible handwriting.

Martin was inclined to boast about his rich though disreputable ancestors. 

(Examples from Quirk et al. 1985:929)

For comments on some of the linking adverbs see 2.3.2.2.
Next, the coordinators may link subordinate clauses. Again, the feature is not shared by
the linking adverbs and the subordinators. In (9) *and* coordinates two nominal *that*-clauses
and in (10) it links two adverbial reason clauses:

(9) I believe *that he was crucified dead and buried and that we do not give enough
thought to this*. <ICE-GB:S2B-028 #2:1:A>

(10) ‘He’d keep them *because he liked the feeling of having them and because he might
like to use them some day*.’ (PDJ3)

Finally, coordinators can link more than two conjuncts. When they do, the coordinator is
normally overtly present only between the last two conjuncts:

(11) Money supply growth is weak, the housing market is flat, unemployment is rising
rapidly and wage settlements are falling. <ICE-GB:W2E-010 #109:2>

2.3.2 The English coordinators

Not all the items generally recognised as coordinators exhibit all of the criteria discussed
above. They differ slightly in their syntactic behaviour. Quirk et al. recognise *and, or* and *but*
as clear cases of coordinators (1985:920). Above *and* was used to illustrate the six
characterising features of coordinators. *Or* is similar to *and* in that it exhibits all these

---

5 Coordination of more than two conjuncts is called ‘multiple coordination’ (Quirk et al. 1985:925). The term
‘polysyndetic coordination’ (Quirk et al. 1985:926) is applied to coordinate structures where more than two
conjuncts are linked and where the coordinator is overtly present between each pair of conjuncts:

Money supply growth is weak *and* the housing market is flat *and* unemployment is rising rapidly *and*
wage settlements are falling.
features. *But*, on the other hand, differs from the other two in some respects. It is similar in that it is restricted to clause-initial position, that the clauses are sequentially fixed, that it may not be preceded by another conjunction and that it may link constituents smaller than a clause. However, it differs from *and* and *or* in that it can only link certain types of subordinate clauses and that it cannot link more than two clauses. *But* mainly links subordinate clauses of three types (Quirk et al. 1985:925): a) *that*-clauses (12), b) temporal adverbial clauses (13) and c) subordinate clauses where both clauses are introduced by the same type of conjunction, such as *in order that*, *so that*, *because* or a *wh*-word, and where the first part of the sentence is negative such that it contrasts with the positive meaning of the clause introduced by *but* (14):

(12) It’s not just that *nothing can harm them* (that old suave illusion), but *that nothing can harm anyone they care about* either.

(13) I spoke to him *after the conference was over*, but *before he started work*.

(14) And that’s *not because I think any less of your painting*, but *because I think less of you*.

That *but* does not link more than two clauses can be seen from (15) below:

(15) John played football, Mary played tennis, *but* Alice stayed home.

The sentence does not allow a reading where *but* is inserted between the first and the second conjunct. Rather, the first and the second conjunct are interpreted as being coordinated by *and*, and these two clauses, as a coordinated unit, enter into a relationship with the clause introduced by *but*.

*And*, *or* and *but* are the most common English coordinators. In addition to these *plus* is
also recognised as a coordinator, though one in ‘marginal’ use (Quirk et al. 1985:921). *And* sometimes combines with *both*, giving structures like *both X and Y*, and *or* sometimes combines with *either* in structures like *either X or Y*, but in Quirk et al. neither *both* nor *either* are themselves recognised as coordinators. They are ‘optional endorsements of the coordination’ (Quirk et al. 1985:920). There are also a number of items which resemble coordinators in several respects. There is some indeterminacy between the subordinator class and the coordinator class, and there are some linking adverbs that resemble coordinators in various ways. In the following sections I will discuss this area of gradience between the coordinator class and other word classes.

2.3.2.1 Coordinator-subordinator gradient: so that (resultative) and for

Quirk et al. (1985:920) discuss the linkers *for* and *so that* (meaning ‘with the result that’), arguing that they are on the gradient between being ‘pure’ coordinators and ‘pure’ subordinators:

\[\text{(16) a. It was simply that they preferred to feel themselves at home, for the idea of home was central to their lives. (AB1)}\]

\[\text{(17) a. The vertical groove between his nose and mouth had deepened so that he had trouble shaving it. (AT1)}\]

*For* and resultative *so that* are similar to coordinators, and unlike subordinators, in that they cannot introduce a complex sentence. The clause beginning with *for* or *so that* cannot be moved to the front.\[6\]

---

\[6\] Resultative *so that* must be distinguished from purposive *so that* which allows fronting of the clause with
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(16) b. *For the idea of home was central to their lives, it was simply that they preferred to feel themselves at home.

(17) b. *So that he had trouble shaving it, the vertical groove between his nose and mouth had deepened.

They also resemble coordinators in not allowing other conjunctions to precede them:

(16) c. *It was simply that they preferred to feel themselves at home, *and/*or/*because for the idea of home was central to their lives.

(17) c. *The vertical groove between his nose and mouth had deepened *and/*or/*because so that he had trouble shaving it.

They are, however, unlike the central coordinators in that they do not link units smaller than a clause, they do not link subordinate clauses nor do they link more than two clauses. Quirk et al. classify these linkers as subordinators rather than coordinators, but recognise that they are ‘more coordinator-like than the more typical subordinators if and because’ (1985:928). Other writers on the subject have come to other conclusions. In van Oirschot for is considered a coordinator along with and, but and or (1987:105, 106, 265).

2.3.2.2 Coordinator-linking adverb gradient: so, yet and nor

There are also other linkers that resemble coordinators. So, yet and nor function in many ways like coordinators:

clause-initial so that:

He left both their doors open, so that he could hear her if she called in the night.

So that he could hear her if she called in the night, he left both their doors open. (AB1)
(18) Every one of the primates mentioned so far is protected, yet chimps, orangs and gibbons are all still traded.

(19) I had intended to take them dancing and to hear Colin sing but they wanted to see a film so I was outnumbered.

(20) Conversely readers may not take books that have been issued to another reader, nor may they take books from another reader’s place.

In (18), (19) and (20) yet, so and nor link clauses in a manner like the central coordinators. 

Nor and yet are also coordinator-like in that they may link clause constituents (21), or even smaller constituents (22), not only full clauses:

(21) …Kryuchkov was no military man nor even a professional intelligence officer…

(22) …this was nascent in that vague yet insistent sense of responsibility he had.

Quirk et al. also note this possibility with so in informal spoken English:

(23) They were tired, so (they) left early.

Like coordinators, and unlike many of the linking adverbs, yet, so and nor are restricted to clause-initial position. Despite the coordinator-like features, Quirk et al. group them together with the linking adverbs (1985:920, 928). They lack other coordinator characteristics such as the ability to link more than two clauses and the ability to link subordinate clauses. They also differ from the coordinators in that they may be preceded by the coordinator and:

(24) There is considerable variation in personal preference, and so the more flexibility that is built into the arrangements from the start, the easier it will be to accommodate people with different tastes.
Although they allow a preceding coordinator, the coordinator is often left out, so this feature really illustrates both the adverb-like and the coordinator-like characteristic of these items.

2.3.2.3 Summary: coordinator-subordinator-linking adverb gradient

The discussion above has been concerned with the syntactic characteristics of coordinators and also with which items, based on these criteria, to recognise as coordinators. We have seen that *but* differs from *and* and *or*, and also that there is some overlap between items clearly belonging to the coordinator class and other linking items. Table 2.1 sums up the above discussion, illustrating the area of gradience between coordinators and subordinators on the one hand, and coordinators and linking adverbs on the other hand. *For* and *so that* may be compared to the more typical subordinators *if* and *because*, and *yet*, *so* and *nor* may be seen against the syntactic behaviour of prototypical linking adverbs like *however* and *therefore*. The table is taken from Quirk et al. (1985:927) and is based on their criteria for distinguishing coordinators from other linking items, as presented above in section 2.3.1.
Table 2.1: Coordinator-linking adverb-subordinator gradient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinators</strong></td>
<td>and, or</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>but</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conjuncts</strong></td>
<td>yet, so, nor</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(linking adv.)</td>
<td>however, therefore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subordinators</strong></td>
<td>for, so that</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>if, because</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria:

(a) It is immobile in front of its clause.
(b) A clause beginning with it is sequentially fixed in relation to the previous clause, and hence cannot be moved to a position in front of that clause.
(c) It does not allow a conjunction to precede it.
(d) It links not only clauses, but predicates and other clause constituents.
(e) It can link subordinate clauses.
(f) It can link more than two clauses, and when it does so all but the final instance of the linking item can be omitted.

The table shows ‘the absence of a clear divide between coordinators and other linking items’ (Quirk et al. 1985:928) and that the distinctions between the various types of linkers are ‘gradient […] rather than clear-cut’ (ibid.:921). The various arguments concerning the status of *yet, so* and *nor* and *for* and *so that* have already been presented. Quirk et al. exclude them from the coordinator group proper, but nevertheless call them ‘semi-coordinators’ because of their coordinator-like features (1985:928).

---

7 But only links certain types of subordinate clauses. See 2.3.2.
8 Yet, *so* and *nor* readily allow a preceding conjunction, but very often the conjunction is left out (see 2.3.2.2). Their behaviour in relation to criterion (c) thus illustrates both their coordinator-like and their linking adverb-like characteristics.
9 As a general rule (b) does not apply to subordinators, but Quirk et al. (1985:928) note examples like:

She paid for the book, because I saw her. # Because I saw her, she paid for the book.

where the subordinator introduces a disjunct clause which cannot be moved to the front; hence the +/- in column (b).
2 Coordination in Norwegian and English

2.3.3 The Norwegian coordinators

Norwegian and English agree in general as regards the characteristics of coordinators as presented in section 2.3.1, using English examples. The most common Norwegian coordinators are og, eller, men, for and så (Faarlund et al. 1997:1116-1117). Og and eller may coordinate all kinds of words (27), phrases (28) and clauses (29), and they may link more than two conjuncts (30):

(27) Først da skipet kom inn i smult farvann, gled han inn i en lang og god søvn. (TTH1)

(28) Ved fiskebåtene ryddet mennene sammen kasser med fisk, blekksprut og skalldyr, mens en og annen svartkledd kvinne skyndsomt sikret seg noen skiver hai, et par blåmakrell eller en flyndre for noen få drakmer, før det var for sent. (FC1)

(29) Han ble en glad og vilter gutt, og sammen med andre barn sprang han omkring mellom hyttene i leiren. (SH1)

(30) Frankrike selv var delt i sin holdning, Tysklands plass var problematisk og Storbritannia var bare måtelig interessert når det kom til stykket. (GL1)

Men may also coordinate words, phrases and clauses, but not of all types. Like its English correspondent but, men also differs from og and eller in that it normally only links two conjuncts.

Norwegian og, eller and men correspond to English and, or and but. Norwegian has two additional coordinators - the causal coordinators for and så. For and så differ from og, eller and men in that they only link clauses. They also differ from og and eller, but not men, in that they do not coordinate more than two conjuncts.

A clause introduced by for expresses the cause of the state of affairs described in the clause to which it is coordinated:
Clauses introduced by the coordinator så normally express the result of the action or the state depicted in the previous clause:

(32) Hun var et uvitende barn, så hun hadde naturligvis ingen forestillinger om disse øyenes kulturelle betydning, men …

Both for and så are closely related to certain subordinating linking items. Clauses introduced by for to a large extent resemble subordinate clauses introduced by subordinators like ettersom, siden and fordi (33) (Faarlund et al.1997:1139):

(33) Jeg tror Usen sendte soldaten opp i fjellene fordi han ville redde Tordensønnen.

For is nevertheless regarded as a coordinator rather than a subordinator, because it differs from these subordinators in several respects. For one thing, the constituent order in the clause introduced by for is that of a main clause (34a), rather than a subordinate clause (35a), and secondly, as opposed to subordinate clauses (35b), the for-clause cannot be moved in front of the clause to which it is linked (34b). Thirdly, the information conveyed in the for-clause is not presupposed, as is often, but not always, the case with subordinate clauses.

(34) a. Noe motiv hadde man heller ikke funnet, for det lot ikke til å være fjernet noe fra den fattigslige leiligheten, og…

b. * For det lot ikke til å være fjernet noe fra den fattigslige leiligheten, noe motiv hadde man heller ikke funnet.
(35) a. Det hersket spenning før forlovelsen ble kunngjort fordi Sonja Haraldsen ikke var kongelig.  
(TG1)

b. Fordi Sonja Haraldsen ikke var kongelig, hersket det spenning før forlovelsen ble kunngjort.

The coordinator så is related to the subordinator så. The coordinator expresses the result or consequence of some state or some action (36), whereas clauses introduced by the subordinator så express the intended result, or the purpose, of some action (37). The two also differ in that the coordinator introduces a clause with main clause constituent order (36), whereas the subordinator introduces a clause with subordinate clause constituent order (37):

(36) Hun hadde inngått den samme avtalen som De gikk med på, om hensynsløs oppriktighet, så jeg forstår ikke hvorfor De spør.  
(FC1)

(37) Blindehunden sikker meg i øret og stopper foran første trinn så jeg ikke skal falle.  
(CL1)

In addition to these central coordinators there are a few less common coordinators such as samt, pluss and skjønt (Faarlund 1997:1116). As in English, certain words often combine with some of the coordinators. Og often combines with både, as in både X og Y, and eller may combine with verken or enten, giving structures like verken X eller Y and enten X eller Y. In contrast to Quirk et al. (see 2.3.2), Faarlund et al. recognise these structures as compound coordinators (1997:1116). The combination så vel ... som ... is also included among the compound coordinators.
2.3.4 Summary: the English and the Norwegian systems of linking items

The discussion above is summed up in table 2.2. We may note that the superficially similar så (resultative) and for in Norwegian and so, so that (resultative) and for in English are classified differently. There is a syntactic criterion which places så and for unquestionably among the coordinators: the word order distinguishes between main and subordinate clauses. In the absence of such a clear criterion, the balance tips over in English to the subordinator category for items like for and so that and to the linking adverbial category for an item like so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic relation</th>
<th>English linking items (Quirk et al.)</th>
<th>Norwegian linking items (Faarlund et al.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>and subordinator linking adv.</td>
<td>og subordinator linking adv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjunctive</td>
<td>or subordinator linking adv.</td>
<td>eller linking adv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversative</td>
<td>but subordinator linking adv.</td>
<td>men linking adv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>a) result so that so</td>
<td>så</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) purpose so that</td>
<td>så</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) cause for</td>
<td>for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.5 Coordination with and and og - a comparison: syntactic aspects

In the discussion of the English coordinators six syntactic characteristics of coordinators were examined. All of these applied to and. Not surprisingly, the Norwegian correspondent og exhibits the same syntactic features. It has already been noted that og may coordinate clause constituents, or smaller constituents, as well as clauses, and that it may coordinate more than two conjuncts (2.3.3). Another characteristic of and is its ability to coordinate subordinate clauses. Og similarly links subordinate clauses:
(38) Sjøl om det var køl på holmene og sjøl om John Bull i London kalte Svalbard et 'arktisk Gibraltar', så var ikke de store røverne i Europa interessert i å utgyte blod oppe i isen.

(JM1)

(39) Nettopp fordi vi ikke kjenner hverandre, og fordi vi aldri vil utvikle noe vennskap, skulle det være fullt mulig.

(FC1)

(40) Da syntes han at det rynkede ansiktet ble enda spissere, og at blikket lyste enda grødigere enn før.

(FC1)

Likewise, like *and, og* does not allow another conjunction to precede it (41b), it is restricted to clause-initial position (41c), and it does not allow the clause which it introduces to move up front of the clause to which it is linked (41d):

(41) a. Separasjonsperioden er snart utløpt, og jeg regner med at saken vil gå sin gang uten kluss.

(KF1)

b. *Separasjonsperioden er snart utløpt, eller/men/så og jeg regner med at saken vil gå sin gang uten kluss.

c. * Separasjonsperioden er snart utløpt, jeg og regner med at saken vil gå sin gang uten kluss.

To sum up, *and* and *og* are alike syntactically. To what extent does this apply to their semantics?

2.3.6 The semantics of coordinate structures with *and* and *og*

In this section I will examine some of the different semantic relations that hold between conjuncts linked by *and* and *og*. From the point of view of the present thesis, the most interesting aspect is whether coordination with *and* in English and *og* in Norwegian entail the
same types of semantic relations between the coordinated units. Are the semantic relations 
that hold between conjuncts linked by *and* also found to hold between conjuncts linked by *og*, 
and vice versa?

A distinction is traditionally made between ‘asymmetric’ and ‘symmetric’ coordination 
(Johansson and Lysvåg 1986:133, Faarlund et al. 1997:1118). This distinction is found with 
both *and* and *og*. In symmetric coordination the conjuncts may be switched around without 
altering the semantic relation between them:

(42)  a. Greg plays football twice a week and Jim attends an acting class once a week.  
     b. Jim attends an acting class once a week and Greg plays football twice a week.

(43)  a. Vi skal feire julen hjemme og tante og onkel skal være hos bestemor og bestefar. 
     b. Tante og onkel skal være hos bestemor og bestefar og vi skal feire julen hjemme.

In examples of asymmetric coordination, on the other hand, the conjuncts cannot be reordered 
without altering the relationship. The order of the conjuncts often reflects a certain temporal, 
(44), (45), or causal, (46), (47), order. Both *og* and *and* may signal such relations:

(44)    He gave a couple of his Hmms and off we went.                 
        <ICE-GB:W2B-004 #127:1>

(45)    Sofie låste seg inn i huset og la fra seg skolesekken og posten til moren.  
        (JG1)

(46)    It was cold and he went to grab his pullover, but his father pushed him round 
        towards the door.                                                
        <ICE-GB:W2F-001 #23:1>

(47)    For hun var ingen ting, følte hun, og hvordan kunne hun da ha noen rett til å 
        bestemme?                                                            
        (FC1)

Another type of asymmetric coordination is found when the second clause provides a
comment on, or an explanation of, the content of the first clause (Quirk et al. 1985:932, Johansson and Lysvåg 1986:133). This type of coordination also occurs in both English (48) and Norwegian (49):

(48) I’ve got another number and I don’t like it very much

(49) Trollene har nå makt over gudenes viktigste forsvarsåpen, og dette er en helt umulig situasjon.

In other cases the first clause expresses a condition for the situation in the second clause (Quirk et al. 1985:931, Johansson and Lysvåg 1986:133-134). For English, van Oirsouw observes that in these ‘conditional coordinations’ usually the antecedent will be in the imperative and the consequent will be in the future (1987:206). Again, coordination with both og and and may convey this semantic relation:

(50) Couple that with the ability to entertain, and I don’t think you’ve got a bad bunch but, just as children need parents, so actors would be lost without their agents.

(51) You play this back and I’ll kill you <,>

(52) ‘Pass deg så du ikke blir våt i håret og får hodepine,’ sier Louise prosaisk når jeg glir nærmere.

Sometimes the second conjunct may be surprising in view of what has been expressed in the

10 Schachter (1977:93-94) argues that structures such as these are not coordinate constructions. Discussing the example

Come any closer and I’ll scream

he argues that the constituents connected by and are not coordinate. In his opinion and does not function as a coordinating conjunction, but as ‘one of the markers of a conditional structure’ (1977:94).
first conjunct, i.e. the first conjunct has a concessive force with respect to the second (Quirk et al. 1985:931). Both *and* and *og* may be used in this way:

(53) She tried hard and *yet* she failed.  (Example from Quirk et al. 1985:931)
(54) Den smarte broren som forstår alt, og ikke er utvalgt til å gjøre noe?  (KH1)

Typical instances of symmetric coordination are where one piece of information is added to another without there being additional semantic relations implied. In (55) and (56) the second clause is simply added to the first without any signals of a causal, temporal, conditional or concessive relationship between the clauses. This applies to both *and* and *og*:

(55) His handshake was dry and firm and his smile reached his clear grey eyes.  
    <ICE-GB:W2F-004 #61:1>
(56) Han ble en glad og vilter gutt, og sammen med andre barn sprang han omkring mellom hyttene i leiren.  (SH1)

For *and*, Quirk et al. (1985:931-932) distinguish between structures where the second clause is a ‘pure’ addition to the first, like (55) and (56) above, structures where the second clause introduces a contrast to the first clause (57), and structures where the second clause makes a point similar to the first clause (58):

(57) Robert is secretive and *in contrast* David is candid.  (Example from Quirk et al. 1985:931)
(58) A trade agreement should be no problem, and *similarly* a cultural exchange could be easily arranged.  (Example from Quirk et al. 1985:932)

A similar distinction could be made for *og*. As in (57), the Norwegian sentence in (59)
illustrates the contrastive use of *og*. Example (60) is parallel to (58) in that the second clause makes a point similar to the clause to which it is linked:

(59) Kari har langt hår og Nina har kort hår.
(60) Hvis det aldri var krig, ville vi ikke sette pris på freden, og hvis det aldri var vinter, ville vi ikke se at det ble vår.

Another distinction, which applies to coordination of phrases in particular, is that between ‘combinatory’ and ‘segregatory’ coordination. (Quirk et al. 1985:953-57, Faarlund et al. 1997:1123-1125). This distinction is found in both English and Norwegian. The difference has to do with whether the two coordinated entities are seen as one or two semantic units with respect to the rest of the clause. One talks about combinatory coordination when the two conjuncts together function as one semantic unit with respect to the rest of the clause. Sentences like (61a) and (62a) have been used to illustrate typical cases of combinatory coordination. It is easy to see that each conjunct cannot function on its own in relation to the rest of the clause, (61b) and (62b):

(61) a. Hugh and Sue make a nice couple.

(61) b. * Hugh make a nice couple and Sue make a nice couple.
(62) b. * Nina er gift med hverandre og Bent er gift med hverandre.

With segregatory coordination, on the other hand, the two conjuncts are treated as separate entities, each relating to the rest of the clause in its own right, (63) and (64). (63a) and (64a) may be paraphrased as (63b) and (64b):
(63)  a. Sarah and her brother enjoyed the holiday.
b. Sarah enjoyed the holiday and her brother enjoyed the holiday.

(64)  a. Hunder og katter er vanlige husdyr.
b. Hunder er vanlige husdyr og katter er vanlige husdyr.

The discussion above suggests that there is a high degree of similarity in the semantic relations that may obtain between conjuncts linked by *and* on the one hand, and *og* on the other hand. All of the semantic relations discussed above were found with both *and* and *og*. Examples have been presented, in both languages, where the relationship between the coordinated units was shown to be temporal, causal, conditional, concessive or contrastive, as well as the more typical additive function of *and* and *og*. Similarly, with both coordinators there was a distinction between asymmetric and symmetric coordination and between combinatory and segregatory coordination.

2.3.7 Pseudocoordination

In both English and Norwegian there are a number of coordinate constructions with *and* and *og* which are of a more idiomatic nature than the examples discussed so far. Consider some of these constructions:

(65)  They *sat and talked* about the good old times.

(66)  I’ll *try and come* tomorrow.

(67)  They’ve *gone and upset* her again.  

(68)  This room is *nice and warm*.

(69)  It was *lovely and cool* in there.
(70) De satt og snakket om vær og vind.
(71) Hun stod og lo av han.
(72) De kom og hentet sakene sine.
(73) Han er og handler.
(74) Det var godt og varmt der inne.

In Norwegian, coordinate structures like those exemplified in (70)-(73) are quite common, and many of the Norwegian examples discussed in the main analysis are of this type. A separate chapter, chapter 6, is devoted to examples of this type, including a more detailed introduction to the different structures and a discussion of their English correspondences as found in the material.

2.3.8 Summing up: and vs. og

The previous discussion has shown that og and and are alike syntactically and that coordinate structures linked by og and and, respectively, may convey similar types of semantic relations. We have also seen that the coordinators in both languages enter into constructions of a more idiomatic character. There are, thus, a lot of similarities between the two languages in this area. Yet, findings in the ENPC show that og and and do not correspond in all contexts. Before entering into that discussion, I will present some theoretical issues in the literature on coordination. Besides giving general insight into the nature of coordination, the discussion will further illustrate the already observed similarity between coordination with og and coordination with and. The areas discussed are relevant to coordination in both languages.
2.4 Some theoretical issues in the literature on coordination

In this section I will briefly present some of the much discussed issues in the literature on coordination, focusing on three areas. The first has to do with the nature of the coordinated units: What linguistic units may be coordinated? What are the constraints on coordination? Secondly, I will discuss two opposing ways of accounting for coordination: one claiming all coordination to be derivable from sentential coordination and one which takes coordination to be the linking of single constituents directly. Thirdly, the relationship between coordination and subordination will be discussed.

2.4.1 What can be coordinated?

Some of the writers on coordination have dealt with aspects of the fundamental questions: What linguistic units may be coordinated? What are the constraints on coordination? What may be coordinated and form acceptable structures and what may not? Linguists have tried to account for the fact that linking of certain linguistic expressions is acceptable, whereas it is not in other cases. Above we noted that linguistic units on all levels may be coordinated (2.2). Both single words, phrases, combination of phrases and clauses may be coordinated. However, there seem to be certain restrictions as to what may be coordinated with what. It is generally said that the coordinated elements must have something in common. If so, what is it that they must have in common? In 1957 Chomsky wrote:
If $S_1$ and $S_2$ are grammatical sentences, and $S_1$ differs from $S_2$ only in that $X$ appears in $S_1$ where $Y$ appears in $S_2$ (i.e., $S_1 = \ldots X \ldots$ and $S_2 = \ldots Y \ldots$), and $X$ and $Y$ are constituents of the same type in $S_1$ and $S_2$, respectively [my italics], then $S_3$ is a sentence, where $S_3$ is the result of replacing $X$ by $X + and + Y$ in $S_1$ (i.e., $S_3 = \ldots X + and + Y \ldots$). (1957:36)

This generalisation assumes that the coordinated conjuncts are of the same type. Schachter (1977) suggests that coordinate structures must obey ‘The Coördinate Constituent Constraint’:

The constituents of a coördinate construction must belong to the same syntactic category and have the same semantic function. (1977:90)

Williams’ ‘Law of the Coordination of Likes’ (1981:646) has a similar content. Although far from all writers assume the syntactic constraint to be as strict as indicated above, general treatments of coordination tend to present coordinate structures as always comprising conjuncts of the same categorial status. The majority of coordinate structures are indeed composed of conjuncts of the same category. There are, however, in both Norwegian and English, numerous examples of structures where the conjuncts differ in this respect. This phenomenon has been referred to as ‘mixed coordination’ (Bache & Davidsen-Nielsen 1997:169). Consider some examples:

(75)  Mora skar [AdvP langsomt] og [PP i passe biter].  

(HW1)


(EG2)

(77)  Resten av søndagen tilbragte han hjemme sammen med Magda, men han var [AdjP rastløs] og [PP i tankene langt andre steder enn hos henne].

(EG2)

(78)  I mean I might still come up to London between [AdvP now] and [NP next week]

<ICE-GB:S1A-097 #230:1:A>

11 Williams’ ‘Law of the Coordination of Likes’ states that ‘only likes and likes can coordinate’ (1981:646).
Saint Jerome one might have thought would have been more appropriate and he was also of course [PP from this part of the world] and [NP a friend a friend of Saint uhm Heliodorus].

Al Jamoria bridge is [AdvP down in two places] and [AdjP impassible].
The show-business style spotlight put on it these days is [NP something new] and [PP not necessarily to the benefit of the monarchy].

First of all it characterises conversion as a tort that protects against interference with [AdjP possessory] and [NP ownership] interests in personal property.

Many of the coordinate structures involving unlike syntactic categories are found as adverbials or predicative expressions. An examination of mixed coordination in the ICE-GB showed that such coordinate structures were also found in other syntactic functions. Two of these are illustrated above: the coordinate structure in (82) functions as a noun phrase premodifier and the structure in (78) functions as a prepositional complement.

All the above examples are authentic examples of spoken or written English and Norwegian. There is thus no doubt that unlike categories may be coordinated. There is, however, the possibility of arguing that the traditional view of categorisation may need some modification. Schachter claims that the conjuncts must belong to the same syntactic category, but he recognises that the relevant syntactic categories may not have to be the traditionally recognised categories, and that our assumptions about categorisation may require some refinement (1977:89, 102). Indeed, if one is to uphold the syntactic identity requirement, this will have implications for our whole view of categorisation. Sag et al. (1985) argue for a different view of categorisation than has been traditionally assumed. They adopt the view that

---

12 This is an abbreviation for The International Corpus of English - Great Britain (cf. note 3 above). The research referred to was a study of coordinate structures comprising conjuncts of different syntactic categories involving combinations of noun phrases, adjective phrases, adverb phrases and prepositional phrases in the ICE-GB. The study resulted in an MA thesis: Engen, Janne Hagen. 1999. Aspects of mixed coordination. MA dissertation. University College London.
syntactic categories are feature bundles, and further, that categories are classified ‘in ways that allow grammatical principles to make reference to certain subsets’ (1985:123). Syntactic categories should not be taken as unanalysable objects, but seen as sets of feature-value pairs. Coordination can be based on partial feature specification. What is relevant for the possibility of coordination is not whether the conjuncts have identical feature specification, but whether they share some of the same features. Sag et al. invoke the notion of an ‘archicategory’.

Phrases of different types may be coordinated as long as they belong to the same archicategory: ‘Such a category, if coordinated, is required only to be a subset of each of its conjuncts’ (1985:119). The notion of an ‘archicategory’ is also discussed in Goodall (1987:43-46). In their paper Sag et al. discuss predicatively used coordinate structures composed of different syntactic categories. The verb be subcategorises for the archicategory ‘predicate’. All phrases which are able to function as such may be conjuncts in a coordinate structure functioning as complement of be. Also Radford (1988) discusses the advantage of a feature-based analysis as a way to deal with coordination which seems to violate the ‘identical categories’ condition: ‘we might then assume that a partial identity in the feature composition of conjoined categories is sufficient to ensure grammaticality’ (1988:155).

The debate has also been concerned with whether the conjuncts must have the same semantic function or thematic properties (Schachter 1977, Johannessen 1998:251-267). Schachter explains the ungrammaticality of (83) and (84) by their failure to comply with the semantic identity requirement of ‘The Coördinate Constituent Constraint’ (1977:89). Though the conjuncts belong to similar syntactic categories, they differ in their semantic function:

(83)  *What are you doing and shut the door.  
(84)  *John probably and unwillingly went to bed.  
(Examples from Schachter 1977:89)
It is, however, possible to produce coordinate structures where the conjuncts both belong to the same syntactic category and perform the same semantic function, but which, nevertheless, sound odd:

(85) I like strawberry jam and my grandmother always snores.
(86) Jenny liker julekake og broren min har akkurat sett en dokumentar om krigen.

The coordinated units in (85) and (86) are finite clauses and they function as statements, but still the coordination seems odd somehow. I think this might be because we fail to see the reason why the two statements are coordinated. What do the conjuncts have in common that justifies them being coordinated? The examples are not totally unacceptable. In a special context one might be able to see why these clauses are coordinated the way they are. Conjuncts may have the same semantic function and be composed of syntactically identical categories, but in addition to that, they must be seen as having some other relation in common. The same applies to mixed coordination. Compare examples (87) and (88) below. They are structurally similar, and both involve the linking of a noun phrase and an adjective phrase, yet (87) seems perfectly acceptable, whereas (88) sounds odd. In (88) one does not necessarily see the reason why the two conjuncts are put together.

(87) He was a s obviously had been a strong man and well built <.,>
(88) He had been a strong man and Polish.

It seems as if the coordinate construction requires that there should be some relation between the conjuncts. One intuitively tries to see the link between two conjuncts. Consider the example below:
But as he will know uh I must only consider that in the period between now and the budget.

Why is it that we interpret the budget as an entity denoting a point in time? It must be because it is coordinated with another temporal expression. It is as if, when one comes across a coordinate structures, the mind tries to work out what this thing is that the conjuncts have in common or what justifies them being coordinated. The pragmatic aspect of coordination seems to be important when considering what may and may not be coordinated. There must be a reason why the conjuncts are coordinated. As for the syntactic and semantic identity requirement, I think Bache and Davidsen-Nielsen more accurately describe the relation between conjuncts in a coordinate structure when they say that:

the units which can be coordinated always have the same function, nearly always express the same type of meaning and frequently have the same form. (1997:171)

2.4.2 Phrase structure-rule or deletion-rule

Much of the literature on coordination has been concerned with whether coordinate structures should essentially be taken to involve coordination of single constituents directly or whether all coordinate structures can be derived transformationally from coordination of full clauses by means of some sort of deletion-rule. The two points of view can be illustrated with reference to (90) and (91) below:

a. Tim and his sister thought the performance was boring.

b. [Tim thought the performance was boring] and [his sister thought the performance was boring].

c. [Tim] and [his sister] thought the performance was boring.
In (90b) and (91b) the coordinate structure in (90a) and (91a), respectively, is considered to be derived from coordination of two full clauses. Adherents to this theory take all coordination to be essentially coordination of full clauses. The reduced surface forms, such as (90a) and (91a), are the results of a deletion process whereby identical material in the two clauses has been deleted in one of the conjuncts. The approach illustrated by (90c) and (91c), on the other hand, takes coordination to be the linking of single phrases directly. Within this line of thinking and og link two NPs, rather than two full clauses. The two ways of accounting for coordinate structures both have long traditions in the literature. Van Oirsouw (1987) gives a good account of the arguments, the development and the various versions of both approaches from 1957-1985. The various accounts involving sentence coordination and deletion may be grouped under the label ‘deletion-based accounts’, and the term ‘PS- rule accounts’ (phrase-structure rule) may be used as a general term for the approaches that take coordination to be the linking of single constituents directly.

Both approaches handle coordinate structures like (90a) and (91a). There are, however, problems with both approaches. Well-known problems for the various deletion-based accounts are posed by sentences like (92) and (93). Here the coordinate structures cannot be said to be derived from coordination of grammatical sentences.

(90) a. Sue and Laurence love each other.
   b. *Sue love each other and Laurence love each other.

(93) a. Kari og Ola er et fint par.
b. *Kari er et fint par og Ola er et fint par.

Nor can this approach be said to capture the ambiguity expressed in a structure like (94)

(94) Jim and Martha bought a new book.

where Jim and Martha may have bought a book each (segregatory reading) or they may have bought one together (combinatory reading). A deletion-based account will only reflect the former interpretation. A further problem concerns the meaning relationship between the unreduced and the reduced coordinate structure. In some examples the two versions do not imply the same meaning. The semantic implication in (95a) is not the same as in (95b):

(95) a. Someone bought the red dress and someone bought the pink dress.
    b. Someone bought the red dress and the pink dress.

Other challenges facing the deletion approach are formulating appropriate rules to describe the deletion processes and also accounting for the notion of identity. What is identity for the purpose of deletion in coordinate structures? The verb forms in (96a) are not identical in form; nevertheless, deletion is allowed:

(96) a. John likes cakes and I like cakes.
    b. John and I like cakes.

The great advantage with the deletion-based approaches, however, is their explanatory potential regarding a special group of coordinate structures involving non-constituent coordination. There are a number of coordinate structures where the coordinated units do not
form single constituents, but rather a sequence of constituents. (97) and (98) are examples of ‘gapping’ constructions. In gapped constructions the verb alone or the verb and adjacent material are deleted in all but the first conjunct:

(97) Simon likes fish and Daniel _ meat.
(98) Greta ga en bok til Susanne og _ _ et tegneseriehefte til hennes bror.

The deletion-based accounts are well suited to account for gapped constructions. By allowing deletion of shared material, provided that the theory comprises accurate descriptions for what may be deleted under which circumstances, the accounts may explain the grammaticality of examples such as (97) and (98). It may similarly explain the grammaticality of other types of non-constituent coordination, such as ‘Right-node Raising’ constructions like (99) and (100):

(99) Simon appreciates_ and Daniel dislikes his grandmother’s frequent visits.
(100) Greta malte_ og Susanne tegnet et bilde av det falleferdige huset.

The main objection to a PS-rule account is its failure to explain the examples above. The approach being grounded on the view that coordination takes place between single constituents directly, a PS-rule account cannot handle non-constituent coordination. The second conjunct Daniel meat in (97) and et tegneseriehefte til hennes bror in (98) do not form single constituents, but rather sequences of constituents. Likewise, such an approach will face problems accounting for (99) and (100) where the verbal complement in the first conjunct is ellipted.

Both the deletion-based account and the PS-rule account have their advantages and
disadvantages. Both approaches are able to explain some, but not all coordinate structures. The debate does, however, bring up interesting aspects of the coordinate structure as a grammatical structure. The limited space devoted to the issue here does not do full justice to the two approaches discussed nor all the specialities of coordinate structures as grammatical structures. The section has, however, brought to attention some of the main issues dealt with in the literature.

2.4.3 Coordination and subordination

‘coordination is related by gradience to subordination’

(Quirk et al. 1985:983)

Clauses may be related through coordination and subordination. With coordination the clauses are at the same level, whereas with subordination one clause is dependent on the other. Clauses linked by coordination are in a paratactic relationship, whereas clauses linked by subordination are in a hypotactic relationship. In 2.3 we discussed the similarities and the differences between prototypical coordinators and prototypical subordinators. It was noted that with some items the coordinator-subordinator distinction is not clear-cut and that we have to recognize an area of gradience between the two groups of linkers. In this section we will look at some other factors pointing at a gradient rather than a hard and fast distinction between coordination and subordination.

In 2.3.6 the semantic relations holding between the conjuncts in a coordinate structure were discussed and exemplified. Many of the same semantic relations expressed by andlog

13 The term is taken from van Oirsouw (1987:111).
may also be expressed by clauses in a hypotactic relationship. Quirk et al. list a number of such examples:

(101) a. He reached for the phone and (then) asked for the operator.
    b. Reaching for the phone, he asked for the operator.

(102) a. I lent my bicycle to Robert, and he (then) lent it to David.
    b. I lent my bicycle to Robert, who lent it to David.

(103) a. The ship arrived at Naples, and the sailors were (then) given shore leave for twelve hours.
    b. When the ship arrived at Naples, the sailors were given shore leave for twelve hours.

(104) a. Push the door hard, and (then) it will open.
    b. If you push the door hard, it will open.

(105) a. Jane was the eldest, and (so) she looked after the others.
    b. As Jane was the eldest, she looked after the others.

(Examples from Quirk et al. 1985:1041)

In Halliday’s (1994) treatment of clauses in combination, the ‘clause complex’, he describes the clause combinations in relation to two systemic dimensions: the type of interdependency (parataxis/hypotaxis) and the type of logico-semantic relation. The logico-semantic relation is grouped into two relationships: a) ‘expansion’ where a clause expands on another by ‘elaborating’ it, ‘extending’ it or ‘enchancing’ it and b) ‘projection’ where a clause is projected through another clause as a ‘locution’ or as an ‘idea’ (ibid:219). The various logico-semantic relations may be realized either by clauses in a relation of parataxis or in a relation of
hypotaxis. His model, thus, captures the fact that the two types of grammatical relations may express similar logical and semantic relations.

Though coordination and subordination may convey similar semantic relations, there are important differences between the structures. One of the differences can be observed in examples (102)-(105) above. In the clauses related by subordination the semantic relation between them is explicitly signalled by the subordinator, whereas in the coordinate structures the semantic relation has to be inferred. Another difference between coordination and subordination is related to the level of importance assigned to the two clauses involved. Clauses linked by coordination are on the same level syntactically and informationally. The information conveyed by one of the clauses is presented as equally important as the information presented in the other. In subordinate structures, the syntactic hierarchization brings with it semantic inequality. The subordinate clause is semantically as well as syntactically subordinate to the main clause: ‘the information in a subordinate clause is often placed in the background with respect to the superordinate clause’ (Quirk et al. 1985:919). With certain adverbial clauses there is also a difference between the subordinate structure and its corresponding coordinate structure in that the adverbial clause presents information ‘as if it is presupposed as given [...] rather than asserted as new’ (ibid.):

(106)  a. He has quarrelled with the chairman and has resigned.
       b. Since he quarrelled with the chairman, he has resigned.

(Example from Quirk et al. 1985:919)

A second factor providing an argument in favour of a gradient rather than a clear-cut distinction between coordination and subordination has to do with varying degrees of subordinateness with different subordinate structures. There are differences as to how
subordinate a subordinate clause is, and one may argue that some clauses are more subordinate than others. One distinction can be made between finite and non-finite subordinate clauses. Non-finite clauses lack tense specification and frequently occur without their own subject. When they occur without a subject, they are dependent on the matrix clause for the identification of the subject. Finite clauses are more self-contained, being marked for tense and having their own subject. A distinction has also been made between embedded subordination and non-embedded subordination. Huddleston (1984:378-380) discusses examples like *He knows he is dying* where the clause *he is dying* is embedded in the superordinate clause, i.e. it is a constituent of the superordinate clause, and *Ed liked it*, *whereas Max thought it appalling*, where the subordinate clause does not form a constituent of the superordinate clause. As Huddleston sees it, the subordinate clause in the latter example is an immediate constituent of the sentence; it is not embedded in the superordinate clause. He illustrates the two kinds of constituent structures schematically:

While i) represents embedding, where clause Y is a constituent of clause X, ii) represents structures where both clause X and clause Y are immediate constituents of the sentence. The
relationship illustrated in i) is subordination, but the relationship illustrated in ii) can cover both subordination and coordination. The embedding kind of subordination, i) a, is more clearly distinct from coordination, ii) c, than the subordination in ii) b (Huddleston 1984:380).

The gradience may be illustrated on a scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Subordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-embedding</td>
<td>Embedding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite - Non-finite</td>
<td>Finite - Non-finite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2

The traditional view of coordinate structures takes the coordinated units to be on an equal level, and, as observed in 2.4.1, often also to be composed of syntactically similar categories. Johannessen (1998) takes a different view of the coordinate structure, arguing that the coordinate phrase is a basically asymmetric structure, where the two coordinated units have different positions in the phrase. She argues that the conjuncts do not have equal status, and that, in this respect, coordinate structures are similar to subordinate structures:

The conjunction phrase suggested in this book shows that the conjuncts do not have equal status; only one is a complement of the conjunction (although both conjuncts are arguments). This makes coordinated structures more like subordinated structures. (1998:250)

There is no principled difference between a coordinated and a subordinated structure in the theory presented here. (ibid.:238)

Pseudocoordinated structures may give evidence in support of the view presented in Johannessen (1998). In pseudocoordinated structures the first verb is lexically reduced and
semantically subordinate to the second verb (See 2.3.7 and chapter 6).

The arguments presented above support the view which takes the distinction between coordination and subordination to be gradient rather than clear-cut. In addition to the linguistically theoretical aspect, the above observations are interesting in relation to the general topic of the thesis as a whole. Considering the arguments that have been presented above, it is not unexpected that coordinated structures may correspond crosslinguistically to structures of subordination.

2.5 Concluding remarks

This chapter has explored the relation between the Norwegian coordinator *og* and the English coordinator *and*. It has been shown that the two coordinators are syntactically alike and that they may convey similar types of semantic relations. One would, therefore, generally expect the two to correspond. Findings in the ENPC show that *og* and *and* do not correspond in all contexts. The following chapter presents the results of a pilot study of non-correspondence between *og* and *and* in the ENPC, giving an overall picture of the extent of non-correspondence in the corpus as a whole and the results of a closer study of 400 of the non-correspondence examples.
Chapter 3 Pilot study: Non-correspondence of *og* and *and* in the ENPC

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the main findings of a pilot study undertaken prior to the main study of this thesis. The aim of the pilot study was to study cases of non-correspondence between *og* and *and* in English and Norwegian texts in the ENPC. The study gives a general overview of the relation between *og* and *and* in the corpus as a whole, as well as a closer study of 400 of the examples where *og* and *and* do not correspond. The findings presented place the main study of the thesis within the broader picture of the relation between *og* and *and* in the ENPC. The results presented provide an important background against which the findings of the main study should be considered.

The ENPC allows a variety of searches, both regarding the items searched for and defining in what parts of the corpus to perform the search. In the pilot study the patterns ‘*x NOT y*’ and ‘*x AND y*’ were used. The search ‘*x NOT y*’ finds all instances where *x* in a text in one language does not match *y* in the parallel text in the other language, whereas a search like ‘*x AND y*’ finds examples where *x* and *y* correspond. An ‘*x NOT y*’ search across English original texts yields examples where *x* in English original texts is translated with something else than *y* in the Norwegian translations. The same search across English translated texts will find all instances where *x* in the translated English texts has a source other than *y* in the Norwegian originals. These patterns are well suited to study the relation between *og* and *and*. The search string ‘*og NOT and*’ produces all the occurrences of *og* in Norwegian texts which
have not been translated with or translated from *and* in the parallel English texts. Likewise, the search ‘*and* NOT *og*’ produces all the instances of *and* that have not been translated with or translated from *og*. The ‘*og* AND *and*’ and the ‘*and* AND *og*’ searches, on the other hand, yield examples where *og* is translated with or translated from *and*, and likewise, where *and* is translated with or translated from *og*.

In contrast to the main study of the thesis, the pilot study is concerned with the relation between *og* and *and* in the corpus as a whole, including both fiction and non-fiction texts. Further, the figures given in this chapter include all cases of *og* and *and* in the corpus; not only verb phrase or clause coordination as in the main study, but coordination of all syntactic categories.

### 3.2 Corpus findings: an overview

In this section I will present some general figures for the non-correspondence between *og* and *and* in the corpus. Firstly, I address the issue of how much non-correspondence there is in the corpus, and whether there is any difference depending on the direction - going from English to Norwegian or going from Norwegian to English. Then, I look at the relative frequency of non-correspondence compared to the number of times *og* and *and* actually do correspond. Lastly, I examine whether there are any differences between the figures holding for original texts versus translated texts in the two languages.
3.2.1 ‘x NOT y’ in original English and original Norwegian texts and differences between English and Norwegian

Table 3.1 below shows the number times *and* in original English texts has been translated with something else than *og* in the Norwegian translations, and likewise, the number of times *og* in Norwegian original texts corresponds to something else than *and* in the English translations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of text</th>
<th>In English original texts not translated with <em>og</em></th>
<th>In Norwegian original texts not translated with <em>and</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>and</em> Number <em>and</em> Number per text</td>
<td><em>og</em> Number <em>og</em> Number per text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>730 24.33</td>
<td>1708 56.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-fiction</td>
<td>501 25.05</td>
<td>873 43.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>2581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As regards English original texts, there are 1231 instances of the coordinator *and* not being translated with the corresponding Norwegian coordinator *og*. 730 of these are found in fiction texts and 501 in non-fiction texts. Turning to Norwegian original texts, we note that the number of times *og* is translated with something else than *and* is almost twice as high as in the opposite direction. In as many as 2581 structures, 1708 in fiction and 873 in non-fiction, the translators have chosen something else than a construction with *and* to correspond to Norwegian coordination with *og*. These findings suggest that it is much more common for *og* to be translated with something else than *and* than for *and* to be translated by something other than *og*. There is thus a higher frequency of change of structure or change of linking item when translating from Norwegian into English than vice versa.

The figures in table 3.1 reveal some other interesting trends in the ENPC material,
notably differences between fiction and non-fiction texts. There are two interesting trends to take note of. Firstly, there is the fact that og in Norwegian original texts is translated with something else than and more often in fiction texts than in non-fiction texts. There are approximately 57 instances of ‘og NOT and’ per text in the fiction texts, as against about 44 per text in the non-fiction material. Secondly, it is interesting to note the difference between English and Norwegian in this area. Whereas there is a marked difference between type of text, fiction and non-fiction, in the case of ‘og NOT and’, there seems to be little difference related to text type in the case of ‘and NOT og’. We find almost the same number of non-correspondences per text in the English fiction and non-fiction material.

One might wonder why the Norwegian material exhibits a difference between fiction and non-fiction. The lack of a similar difference in the English material makes this question even more interesting. One might similarly wonder why there is a difference between English and Norwegian in this area.

A study of all instances of og in Norwegian original texts, irrespective of whether og is translated with and or something else, shows that there is generally more use of og in Norwegian fiction than in non-fiction. Interestingly, no difference related to text type occurs with and in English original texts. These findings parallel the findings shown in table 3.1.

---

14 All cases of and in English original texts: a) fiction: 12,171 = 405.70 per text  b) non-fiction: 8,134 = 406.70 per text
All cases of og in Norwegian original texts: a) fiction: 14,750 = 491.67 per text  b) non-fiction: 8,196 = 409.80 per text
3.2.2 How common is non-correspondence of og and and?

Table 3.1 above presented the figures for how many times og was not translated with and and vice versa. These numbers are only interesting when seen against the number of times og and and actually correspond, i.e. the really interesting issue is the frequency of non-correspondence relative to the frequency of correspondence. Table 3.2 below illustrates this. Still basing the figures on English and Norwegian original texts and their translations, the table shows how many times og and and, respectively, have been translated or not translated with the corresponding coordinator in the other language.

Table 3.2: And/og translated with the corresponding coordinator compared to and/og not translated with the corresponding coordinator (original texts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>And in English original texts</th>
<th>Og in Norwegian original texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translated with</td>
<td>19,074</td>
<td>93.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the corresponding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not translated with</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the corresponding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,305</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And has been translated with og in 93.94% of all occurrences of and in English original texts. The 1231 examples where the Norwegian translation has something other than og account for 6.06%. In comparison, the number of occurrences where og is translated with something other than and amounts to 11.25% of the total number of og in Norwegian original texts. One might argue that 6.06% non-correspondence, as is the case when going from English to Norwegian, is not all that much. 11.25% non-correspondence, on the other hand, is worth noting. It is interesting to note that as many as eleven out of a hundred structures involving the Norwegian
coordinator *og* have been translated with a structure not including *and*.

Table 3.2 also shows that there is generally more coordination with *og* in Norwegian original texts (22,945) than there is coordination with *and* in English original texts (20,305). As the size of the English material equals the size of the Norwegian material, the comparison should be legitimate. This indicates a difference between English and Norwegian in the relative frequency of coordination with *and*/*og* respectively. Again one might ask why this should be the case. One reason may be found in the English *-ing* construction. English has an alternative coordinating device, *-ing* coordination (see 5.1.2), for which Norwegian has no equivalent. In English this structure is quite frequently used, and this may be one explanation why there is less coordination with *og*/*and* in English texts than in Norwegian texts. English has the possibility to vary between *-ing* coordination and coordination with *and*.

### 3.2.3 Original texts versus translated texts

So far the discussion has been concerned with occurrences of *and* and *og* in original texts and their translation. We have seen that it is more common for *og* be translated with something other than *and*, than for *and* to be translated with something other than *og*. Turning to translated texts, one expects these texts to show the same pattern as the original texts. If there are examples of *and* in English original texts not being translated with *og*, one similarly expects there to be cases of *and* in translated English texts which have a source other than *og* in the Norwegian original.

Table 3.3 presents the results of the search ‘*og* NOT *and*’ performed across Norwegian *translated* texts and the search ‘*and* NOT *og*’ performed across English *translated* texts compared to the same searches across the original texts.
As can be seen from the table, the trends observed with the original texts are confirmed with the translated texts. It is more frequent for *og* in translated Norwegian texts to stem from something other than *and*, than it is for *and* in English translated texts to originate from something other than *og*. When comparing translated and original texts, one notes that the number of times *og* in original Norwegian texts has an English translation not involving *and* is proportional to the number of times *og* in Norwegian translated texts has a source other than *and*. Likewise, the number of *ands* in English original texts not being translated with *og* is proportional to the number of times *and* in translated texts has an origin other than *og*. This trend may suggest that there are differences between English and Norwegian as regards the choice of structures available as alternatives to coordination with *and* and *og*. The figures may indicate that there are more choices in English than in Norwegian. In the last section we noted that English has an alternative coordinating device in the *-ing* coordination structure. This may explain why translators into English use structures other than *and* coordination to render Norwegian coordination with *og*, and likewise, why translators into Norwegian use coordination with *og* also where there is no *and* coordination in the English original.

The trend observed with the original texts as regards differences between fiction and non-fiction also seems to be confirmed by the figures for the translated texts. Whereas there is hardly any difference with the English translated texts, there is a marked difference between

---

Table 3.3: Comparing original texts and translated texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Og in Norwegian original texts not translated with and</th>
<th>Og in Norwegian translated texts not translated from and</th>
<th>And in English original texts not translated with og</th>
<th>And in English translated texts not translated from og</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number per text</td>
<td>Number per text</td>
<td>Number per text</td>
<td>Number per text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>1708 56.93</td>
<td>1965 65.50</td>
<td>730 24.33</td>
<td>886 29.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-fiction</td>
<td>873 43.65</td>
<td>754 37.70</td>
<td>501 25.05</td>
<td>607 30.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2581 2719</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fiction and non-fiction with the Norwegian translated texts, and the difference is even more marked here than in the original texts. The number of cases of non-correspondence per text is close to twice as high in Norwegian translated fiction texts as in Norwegian translated non-fiction texts.

3.3 If not correspondence, what then?

To get an idea of what kind of translations and og might have when not rendered by the corresponding coordinator, I did a closer study of the first 200 ‘og NOT and’ examples (100 fiction and 100 non-fiction) and the first 200 ‘and NOT og’ examples (100 fiction and 100 non-fiction). I was interested to see what the alternative correspondences were and also whether such a study would provide any clues to an explanation of the difference noted between English and Norwegian. The searches were performed on original English and Norwegian texts. Thus, the ‘og NOT and’ search yielded examples where og in an original Norwegian text was rendered by something other than and in the English translation. Likewise, the ‘and NOT og’ search came up with those sentence pairs where and in an original English text was translated with something other than og.

The translations may be divided into several categories. In one set of examples the source structures comprise set expressions with og/and, for which there are no equivalent set expressions with the corresponding coordinator in the other language. Examples of some of these phrases are: gudsjelov og takk, til og med, rett og slett, i og for seg, alt og ingenting, every now and then, time and time again, hard and fast, years and years ago and so on.

In another group of examples the original sentence has a sentence-initial og or and, which is either left out or replaced by another coordinator in the translation:
In a third category *og* and *and* link two clauses, but in the translation the original sentence is split into two separate sentences. One might distinguish between examples where there is a clause-initial coordinator in the second sentence, and those without a clause-initial coordinator:

(1)  
   a. *Og* utbyttet varierer, men under to-tre hundre kroner pr. dag alt i alt, blir det sjelden.  
      (KF1)  
   b. The proceeds vary, but I seldom gross less than two or three hundred kroner per day.

Further, there are examples where *og* and *and* are replaced by a punctuation mark, such as a comma, a semicolon or a dash, and the structures are asyndetically linked:

(2)  
   a. But unless you do something like turn in your licence, you won’t be able to run him, *and* he’s not worth turning in your licence for.  
      (DF1)  
   b. Men hvis du ikke gjør noe sånt som å levere inn lisensen, vil du ikke kunne stille ham i løp. *Og* det ville ikke være noen mening i å levere fra seg lisensen for hans skyld, så mye er han ikke verd.

A fifth category comprises examples where *og* and *and* have been replaced by other linking items, such as other coordinators, subordinators or linking adverbials:

(3)  
   a. Orange juice fresh *and* canned *and* frozen.  
      (AT1)  
   b. Frisk appelsinsaft, hermetisk, frosset.

(4)  
   a. Hun gav det en innvielse som ikke kunne ha vært vankere *og* finere.  
      (TG1)  
   b. She gave it a beginning which could not have been finer *or* more beautiful.
Then, there are different categories of rephrasing. In several translations the content of one of the original conjuncts is rendered by an -ing clause (English translations only), a relative clause or a with/med phrase:

(5) a. For hun var ingen ting, følte hun, og hvordan kunne hun da ha noen rett til å bestemme?

b. For she was nothing, she felt, so how could she then have any right to make decisions?


b. With political liberalization ethno-national demands began to erupt, reaching a climax in 1990 when Russia itself threatened to secede from the Soviet Union.

(7) a. --- Det var bestemt tidligere at kroning ville man ikke ha denne gang, og det forstår jeg godt.

b. It had, of course, been determined earlier that a coronation was not desirable this time, which I find understandable.

(8) a. The woman waited, facing him and wearing a perky smile, with her fingers laced together on the counter.

b. Piken ventet, så på ham med et nebbete smil, med fingrene foldet på disken.

Other translations are rephrased such that only the content of one of the conjuncts is retained in the translation, or they are altered such that the question of coordination or what the coordinate structure has been changed to is no longer relevant:

(9) a. Men enda nærmere har vi av historiske og geografiske årsaker stått dansk kirkeliv.
b. But for *historical* reasons, we have had an even closer contact with Danish church life.

(10) a. Herman ser seg omkring, ingen mennesker, bare statuer, svære *grå og knudrete* statuer som stirrer på ham med hovne øyne.

   (LSC1)

b. Herman looks around, no people, just statues that stare at him with swollen eyes.

There are also some examples of other kinds of rephrasing strategies, as in example (11), where the first of the coordinated clauses has been nominalized and made the subject of the following clause in the translation:

(11) a. *I 1957 døde kong Haakon*, og dette skapte store forandringer i kongefamilien, selv om Kronprinsen allerede hadde overtatt mange representasjonsoppgaver under farens sykdom.

   (TG1)

b. *The death of King Haakon in 1957* brought about great changes in the life of the Royal Family, although the Crown Prince had taken over many representational duties during his father’s illness.

The distribution of the different types of categories, with their differences in frequency depending on the direction of the translation, is set out in table 3.4.
### Table 3.4: Correspondences of *and* and *og* when ‘*and NOT og*’ and when ‘*og NOT and*’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘<em>og NOT and</em>’</th>
<th>‘<em>and NOT og</em>’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norwegian original texts</td>
<td>English original texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fiction</td>
<td>non-fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set expression in orig.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>og/and</em> initially in original text, but not in translation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One sentence in original is split into two in translation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) new sentence without <em>og/and</em> initially</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) new sentence opens with <em>og/and</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semicolon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Orelær</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nor</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>But/men</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>As well as</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pluss</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>So</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Så</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) main clause structure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) subordinate clause structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>While</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>-Ing-construction</em></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The translation involves a relative clause</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The translation involves a <em>with/med</em> phrase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation rephrased:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) only the content of one of the conjuncts retained in the translation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) rephrased such that coordination is irrelevant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discarded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the types of correspondences are found as translations of both *og* and *and*. One of the striking differences to be noted is the high frequency of set expressions with *og* in the Norwegian originals as compared to set expressions with *and* in the English originals. There seems to be a larger variety of set expressions with the coordinator *og* in Norwegian than with *and* in English, and these expressions seem to be more frequently used. This may be one explanatory factor accounting for the difference in frequency between coordination with *og* and coordination with *and* in the ENPC. Note also the many -*ing* clause translations of Norwegian coordination with *og*. This confirms the suggestion made in 3.2.2 that complex clauses with -*ing* constructions may fill a similar function to that of coordinate structures, which may be another reason for the difference in frequency between *og* and *and*.

The many ‘discarded’ examples among the ‘*and NOT og*’ examples may be explained with reference to one particular text in which there are a number of missing translations as well as some mismatches between the originals and the translations.

### 3.4 From coordination to subordination

Some of the translations cause a more fundamental change of structure than others. In some examples the changes involve merely a shift from syndetic to asyndetic coordination, or a change of coordinator. In other cases, such as the examples where there is a loss or change of the sentence-initial coordinator and the examples where there is a sentence split, the change affects the textual organisation, but not the syntactic structure. However, some of the translations bring about more fundamental structural changes, as in the examples where there is a change from coordination in the original to subordination in the translation. In several examples the content of one of the original conjuncts is incorporated as a subordinate clause.
or as a phrase in the translation. This is especially notable among the ‘og NOT and’ examples, where complex clauses involving -ing constructions alone account for 35 of the 200 cases of non-correspondence.

The examples where one of the original conjuncts is rendered by a subordinate clause or a phrase in the translation are interesting not only from a syntactic point of view, but also from a semantic viewpoint. The syntactic downgrading brings with it a semantic hierarchization. The study of such examples brought up interesting questions to do with how the information was presented in the translation as compared to the originals, to what extent the translations were true to the originals and differences and similarities between the translations and the originals. The findings in the pilot study prompted an interest in the relation between coordination and subordination as found in these examples. However, a larger material than that used for the pilot study seemed necessary to get a better picture of the relation between coordination and subordination as found here.
Chapter 4 Overview and minor categories

4.1 Introduction

The present chapter is the first of three chapters in which the main study of the thesis will be presented and discussed. In this chapter I give a general overview of the results and discuss the minor categories of correspondences, in addition to some introductory comments on the material and method used in this study. Section 4.2 deals with issues related to material and method. A general overview of the results is presented in 4.3, comprising sections on: the type of coordination in the Norwegian originals (4.3.1), the English correspondences (4.3.2), a discussion of which of the original conjuncts the change affects (4.3.3) and the nature of the coordinated elements (4.3.4). Section 4.4 comprises a more thorough discussion of the minor categories, and a brief summary with some concluding remarks is given in 4.5.

4.2 Material and method

The pilot study presented in the preceding chapter gave a general overview of the non-correspondence between og and and in the ENPC. The main study of this thesis deals more specifically with some of the ‘og NOT and’ examples. As set out in the introductory chapter, I will study examples where the Norwegian original texts involve clause coordination or coordination of verbal elements using the coordinator og, but where one of the conjuncts has
been made into a subordinate clause or incorporated as a phrase into the main clause in the English translation.

The examples on which the study is based are all taken from the Norwegian original fiction texts in the ENPC. The examples were selected manually from among the 1708 ‘og NOT and’ examples in this part of the corpus (see 3.2.1). After sifting the material for the purposes of the present study I was left with 481 examples. In all of these the English translations involve subordination or some kind of incorporation strategy as translations of Norwegian clausal or verbal coordination. One of the conjuncts in the Norwegian original has been incorporated as a subordinate clause or as a phrase in the English translation.

When sifting the material, I included only those examples where both conjuncts in the Norwegian original contained a verb, so that the coordination is one between full clauses, predicates, predications or single verb phrases (see 4.3.4 below). Sentence pairs in which the English translation involved asyndetic coordination, with or without a linking adverb, or coordination with other coordinators, were discarded from the material. I further left out examples where only the information represented in one of the conjuncts was retained in the translation. The overriding principle being used was that the information conveyed in both conjuncts should somehow be represented in the translation. I have generally also left out examples where the English translation is rewritten to such an extent that it is pointless to talk about one of the conjuncts being subordinated or incorporated in the English version. Further, I have discarded instances where there are significant meaning differences between the source text and the translation. It should also be noted that when sifting the material, and later, when analysing the remaining material, I did not take into account the linguistic context surrounding

---

15 Consequently, quite a few so-clauses and then-clauses were left out of the material.
each example. Including contextual factors would undeniably have provided useful insights, but given the focus of this thesis, i.e. the change of syntactic structures within orthographic sentences, and given the size of the material and the limits of a ‘hovedfag’ thesis, contextual factors have not been given priority.

Sifting the material was not altogether unproblematic and it sometimes proved difficult to determine which examples to include and which to leave out. The objective of this study is to examine the change from one syntactic structure, that of coordination, into other syntactic structures. This naturally involves some kind of rewriting. Yet it would not be right to see all kinds of restructuring as general English correspondences of Norwegian coordination. In some cases the translator has chosen to include more information and at other times less information within the boundary of one sentence than what was done in the original. Some of the rewriting strategies may also be idiosyncrasies due to a particular translator’s style of writing, or they may be explained on contextual grounds. I may have left out more examples than strictly necessary, but priority has been given to obtaining a certain degree of homogeneity, thus giving a more manageable material, especially with regard to the categorisation of the correspondences.

The material naturally divides in two parts, one comprising Norwegian examples with pseudocoordination (see 2.3.7 and chapter 6) and another involving ordinary coordination. For both groups the various English correspondences have been registered. For the examples containing ordinary coordination I have also registered the type of coordination, i.e. whether the coordinated units are full clauses, predicates, predications and so on, and also whether it is the first or the second conjunct that has been subordinated or incorporated in the English translation.
4.3 Overview of results

4.3.1 Pseudocoordination vs. ordinary coordination

The distribution between pseudocoordination and ordinary coordination in the Norwegian originals is set out in table 4.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of coordination in Norwegian original</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudocoordination</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary coordination</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 225 instances of pseudocoordination and 256 examples of ordinary coordination in the material. The two groups are best treated separately, although, as we will see, they do have similarities when it comes to their English correspondences. A separate chapter, chapter 6, is devoted to the Norwegian pseudocoordination examples and their English correspondences. The remaining part of the present chapter and the next chapter deal exclusively with the 256 examples of ordinary coordination.

4.3.2 Correspondences of Norwegian ordinary coordination

Table 4.2 shows the various categories of correspondences of Norwegian ordinary coordination. These are not correspondences in the ordinary sense, i.e. forms where the whole Norwegian coordinate structure is rendered by an -\textit{ing} clause, a PP, a \textit{to}-infinitive clause etc.,
but rather cases where one of the coordinated units in the original structure has been made subordinate, taking the form of -\textit{ing} clauses, PPs, to-infinitive clauses and so on in the translation.

Table 4.2: Correspondences of Norwegian ordinary coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of correspondences</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-\textit{ing} clauses</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-infinitive clauses</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finite adverbial clauses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative clauses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbless clauses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-\textit{ed} clauses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other structures</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>256</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the English translations involve -\textit{ing} clauses as renderings of Norwegian \textit{og} coordination. With its 150 examples this is by far the largest category of correspondences. The second largest category is prepositional phrases. In twenty-seven examples the content of one of the Norwegian conjuncts is represented by a prepositional phrase in the translation. To-infinitive clauses are only slightly behind, totalling twenty-five examples. Finite adverbial clauses are found in fifteen translations, while relative clauses have been used in fourteen of the English versions. Verbless clauses have also been used, figuring in nine translations. Non-finite -\textit{ed} clauses are only encountered twice. Fourteen translations have been grouped as ‘other structures’, a category comprising a mixture of structures not covered by the other categories.

The frequency of -\textit{ing} clauses calls for a more thorough discussion than the other categories. Chapter 5 is devoted to these examples, while examples and discussions of the
other categories will be given below, in section 4.4.

4.3.3 Subordinated or incorporated element: first vs. second conjunct

The previous section gave a brief overview of the structures found in the English translations. In all of the translations one of the Norwegian coordinated units was changed into a subordinate clause or reduced to a phrase. So far nothing has been said about whether it is the first or the second conjunct that has been subject to this subordinating or incorporating strategy. Table 4.3 displays the relative distribution between first and second conjunct subordination or incorporation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incorporated element</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conjunct 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunct 2</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>256</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures reveal an unequivocal trend. In 92.2% of the material the second conjunct has been changed in the English translation, whereas the first conjunct has been rephrased in as few as twenty of the 256 examples. Examples (1) and (2) illustrate the two types:

1. a. Men da er doktoren allerede på beina, og kommer mot ham med en sprøyte i hånden.   
   b. By then the doctor is on his feet, coming toward him with a syringe in his hand.  

   (LSC1)

2. a. Hun loftet hånden og strøk noen våte hårtufser vekk fra pannen.  

   (TTH1)
b. *Lifting one hand*, she stroked a few wet hairs back from her forehead.

Finite adverbial clauses, *-ing* clauses and the two *-ed* clauses account for fourteen of the twenty examples involving some kind of rewriting of the first conjunct. In the majority of these examples the subordinate clause is placed in front of the main clauses, as in (2b) above. The positional relation between the conjuncts in the original is thus maintained in the translation.

### 4.3.4 The coordinated units: what has been coordinated?

In analysing the Norwegian material a distinction was made according to the nature of the coordinated units. Following Quirk et al. (1985:946-50), a distinction was drawn between coordination of full clauses, where each conjunct has its own subject (3), coordination of predicates, where the conjuncts share the same subject (4), and coordination of predications, where the conjoined predications share both the subject and any auxiliaries preceding the main verb (5):

(3) [Mannen reiste seg fra høgsetet], og [øynene hans lynte som hardt stål].

(4) Herman [ser fra faren til moren] og [tenker seg om].

(5) Nå ville hun [sende opp røyksignaler] og [varsle at hun var underveis].

A further distinction can be made between verb phrase coordination (6), coordination of main
verbs with shared auxiliary verb(s) (7), and coordination of auxiliary verbs (8) (ibid.:967):

(6) Yesterday we [bought] and [sold] ten paintings.

(7) I have [washed] and [dried] the dishes.

(8) The country [can] and [must] recover from its present crisis.

(Examples from Quirk et al. 1985:967)

Table 4.4 shows how these different types of coordination were distributed in my material:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of coordination</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause coordination</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicate coordination</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predication coordination</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP coordination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main verb coordination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auxiliary coordination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other coordination</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>256</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By far the largest group of examples exhibits predicate coordination, accounting for about 75% of the total coordinate structures. Both conjuncts contain a verb phrase and its complements, but they share the same subject. The second largest group, accounting for 16.4% of the material, involves coordination of full clauses. Of the remaining examples there are fifteen instances of predication coordination and six structures grouped under ‘other coordination’. The latter structures in some way or other fall outside the other categories.
Three of them are coordinated infinitive constructions. There were no examples of verb phrase, main verb or auxiliary coordination in the material.

The large proportion of predicate coordination does not come as a total surprise. Coordination of predicates is generally very common. In coordinate structures the coordinated units generally tend to have something in common, or be related to each other in a particular way. Clauses in a coordinate relationship often relate something about the same topic and, therefore, commonly have identical subjects. When the subject of coordinated clauses is the same in the two clauses, it is preferably ellipted in the second clause, giving predicate coordination. It is, therefore, natural to find more predicate coordination than clause coordination. Moreover, the criteria according to which the material has been sifted probably play a part in explaining the frequency of the various coordination types in the material. Only those examples where one of the conjuncts had been rewritten as a subordinate clause or an incorporated phrase were retained. For one thing, clauses, predicates and predications are more likely to be rewritten as subordinate clauses or reduced to phrases, than coordinated verb phrases, main verbs or auxiliaries. Secondly, the many coordinated predicates compared to for example coordinated clauses may be explained on the grounds that predicates may be more inclined to be rewritten in this manner than full clauses. Coordinated predicates share subjects. Many subordinate clauses, the non-finite clauses, commonly occur without a subject, and the understood subject is that of the matrix clause. Non-finite clauses are, as such, likely renderings of predicate coordination. The material shows that non-finite clauses do indeed account for a large part of the structures figuring in the English material. In total, 177 of the 256 correspondences are non-finite clauses. As many as 159 of the non-finite clauses correspond to predicates in the Norwegian original. The figures, then, indicate a strong correlation between predicate coordination and non-finite correspondences.
In example (3) above the coordinated clauses were finite independent clauses. Among the 42 examples of clause coordination there are also instances of coordinated subordinate clauses, as in (9) and (10):

(9) *Når utelyset var tent og det glitret i det hvittoppede, bråsinte havet, så hele glassverandaen ut som et blindet øye.*

(HW1)

(10) *Digralde måtte være som den guden de trodde på her i landet; han som het Tor, og som kunne bli så sint at han slo gnister i lufta med hammeren sin.*

(TTH1)

Likewise, many of the predicates that have been coordinated are part of subordinate clauses. Finally, two additional comments should be made concerning the predicate coordinations. Firstly, some of the examples with predicate coordination contain adverbial elements that may have scope over both conjuncts:

(11) *Vi åpner vinduene og lager gjennomtrekk for ikke å kveles av varme.*

(TB1)

(12) *Ansiktet hans var som en uttørket myr, men øynene skinte og var klare mellom alle rynkene.*

(SH1)

At first glance these may be confused with structures of verb phrase coordination. They are, however, analysed as predicate coordinations, as the shared element is an adverbial element, not a complement of the verb. Secondly, many of the examples in this group differ from example (4) above in that they contain elements that cause subject-predicate inversion affecting the first predicate, but not the second:
4 Overview and minor categories

4.4 Discussion of minor categories

4.4.1 Finite clauses

4.4.1.1 Finite adverbial clauses

a. Uten å snu seg en eneste gang gikk han bortover kaien, og til slutt ble han vekk bak murene rundt korsfarernes gamle borg.

b. Without even once turning round, he walked along the quay until at last he disappeared behind the walls of the Crusaders’ old castle.

In fifteen translations one of the original conjuncts has been changed to a finite adverbial clause, as in (15) above. As many as 13 of these clauses are time adverbials, while two are clauses of comparison. In all but two instances, the adverbial clauses are sentence-final.

Without exception, the information ordering of the original has been kept in the translation.

All the sentence-final adverbial clauses are renderings of the second conjunct in the original structure, and the two sentence-initial adverbial clauses are renderings of the first conjunct in the source structure. In nine of the examples the coordinated units are predicates and in five of the examples they are clauses.
The clauses of time comprise ten *as*-clauses, one *before*-clause, one *while*-clause and one introduced by *until*. The many occurrences of *as*-clauses are interesting. The sheer number of this single construction seems to suggest that the *as*-construction is considered to be a possible correspondence of Norwegian *og* coordination. As discussed in 2.3.6, coordination with *og* often signals a temporal relation between the conjuncts. The order of the conjuncts reflects the succession of events. The *as*-clauses, however, signal simultaneity of events, not succession. Consider the temporal relation in the Norwegian originals and their translations in the following examples:

(16) a. ‘De er kunstnere,’ sa Hildegun andektig og kastet det krøllete håret bakover med en ny bevegelse.

       (BV1) b. ‘They’re artists,’ said Hildegun solemnly *as she tossed back her curly hair in a newly-acquired gesture.*

(17) a. Da ble Una tankefull *og* strøk over den runde magen sin.

       (TTH1) b. Una fell into thought for a moment *as she stroked her own round stomach.*

(18) a. Han ble slik i ansiktet som han var på de store høytidsdagene, *og* tok til å stryke folen over nakken: Det er nå en alt for gild gave du kommer med, broder Cormac.

       (TTH1) b. His face looked exactly as it used to on holidays, *as he patted the colt’s neck.* ‘No, this gift is just too precious, brother Cormac.’

We may ask whether or not the type of temporal relation involved is the same in the translation and in the original. The *as*-clauses signal that the event described in the subordinate clause goes on at the same time as that of the main clause. The question is whether also the coordinate structures signal simultaneity of events. Does Hildegun in (16a) say something first and then toss her heir back, or does she toss her hair back while she
speaks? Similarly, does Una become thoughtful first and then stroke her stomach, or does she fall into thought while she strokes her stomach? I would argue that the Norwegian examples prompt a successive reading. If this is the case, the English translations are slightly misleading representations of the original.

In other examples the simultaneity expressed in the English as-clauses seems a more appropriate interpretation of the Norwegian original. In (19) and (20) one might well read the Norwegian versions as if the two things went on at the same time:

(19)  a. Selv husfrua lo hjertelig og holdt seg over den runde magen. (TTH1)
    b. Even the man’s wife laughed heartily as she held her round stomach.

(20)  a. Hun gråter og skremt hører hun lyden av sin egen gråt, tynne kvink med hese underlyder, en dyregråt. (BV2)
    b. As she cries, she listens frightened to the sound of her own crying; stifled sobs with hoarse noises in her throat, an animal’s crying.

The translations of (19) and (20) seem more in accordance with the original than (16), (17) and (18) above. The simultaneity expressed by the as-clauses feels more justified here. The as-clauses do, however, bring about a change of focus compared to the originals. In the English translations the temporal relation is more emphasised than in the Norwegian examples. The temporal relation and the nature of the temporal relation are explicitly marked, giving this aspect much more prominence than in the og coordinated structures. The focus in the Norwegian examples is not on the fact that the two things happened at the same time, but rather that the two things took place. In (21) and (22) this is even more evident. The temporal aspect is less important:
The coordinate structures do not stress the temporal aspect at all. They simply state that there were two circumstances. Whether the circumstances happened one after another, or at the same time, is of less importance. The semantic relation between the conjuncts is arguably the strictly additive function (2.3.6); one piece of information is added to another without any additional relations implied. The as-clauses, then, stress the temporal aspect compared to its importance in the original.

The shift from parataxis to hypotaxis brings with it another type of change of focus. In the coordinate structures the events described come across as equally important. They are on the same level both syntactically and semantically. In the translations one of the events is presented as more important, or more in focus, than the other. The situation portrayed in the subordinate clause serves as a background for the event described in the matrix clause.

4.4.1.2 Relative clauses

(23) a. Dina var nettopp blitt fem år, og løftet det lysegrå blikket sitt når han kom inn i rommet, som om hun ville komme ham i forkjøpet.  

b. Dina, who had just turned five, raised her gray eyes when he entered the room, as if wanting to forestall him.

In fourteen translations one of the conjuncts has been rendered by a relative clause. In (23),

(21) a. Helen var like demonstrativt ubekymret og ventet på Olesen med fyrstekaken.  

b. Helen was as demonstratively unconcerned as ever as she waited for Olesen to bring her macaroon cake.

(22) a. Ved middagen skjenket jeg vinen og fortalte min kone om dens historie.  

b. As I poured out the wine at dinner I told my wife about its history.
the first conjunct, *var nettopp blitt fem år*, has been changed to a non-restrictive relative clause, *who had just turned five*, modifying the subject *Dina*. The translations in this group agree with the overall trend as regards the units being subordinated. Only one other example is like (23) in subordinating the first of the conjuncts. In the remaining twelve examples the change affects the second conjunct. Contrary to the general trend, most of the coordinated units are clauses. Nine of the 42 clause coordinated structures in my material are found here.

Four of the translations are like (23b) in that the relative clauses are non-restrictive. The translation in (23b) seems to function well as a correspondence of the Norwegian coordinate structure. The conjuncts in the original structure predicate two things about the subject *Dina*, and the semantic relation between the conjuncts is the strictly additive function (2.3.6). One piece of information is added to another, both predicing something about *Dina*. The translation similarly expresses two things about *Dina*, only here one of the properties is expressed in the relative clause and the other in the main clause. The information presented in the two versions is the same, and the semantic relation between the conjuncts in the original is preserved in the translation. There seems to be a relationship between *and/og* coordination and constructions involving a non-restrictive relative clause. Non-restrictive relative clauses provide additional information about a person or a thing, and this may well be the information conveyed by one of the conjuncts in predicate coordinated structures. Quirk et al. note the similarity between non-restrictive relationship and coordination: ‘Nonrestrictive relative clauses have also been considered semantically equivalent to coordinated clauses’ (1985:983) and also the similarity with adverbial subordination: ‘Nonrestrictive relationship is often semantically very similar to coordination, with or without conjunction […], or adverbial

16 This figure does not include the three non-restrictive ‘sentential relative clauses’ discussed later in this section.
subordination [...]’ (1985:1258). Some of their examples are:

(24)  
   a. My brother, who has lived in America since boyhood, can still speak fluent Italian.
   b. My brother can still speak fluent Italian, and he has lived in America since boyhood.
   c. My brother can still speak Italian although he has lived in America since boyhood.

(25)  
   a. Then he met Mary, who invited him to a party.
   b. Then he met Mary, and she invited him to a party.

(Examples from Quirk et al. 1985:1258-59)

In the examples taken from my material the semantic relation between the conjuncts was of a strictly additive type. The coordinate structures in (24) and (25) imply other relations as well as the additive. In the first example there is a concessive relationship. This is most evident in (24c), where the relation is explicitly marked by although, but it is also present in the coordinate structure and in the relative construction. The coordinate structure in (25b) implies a temporal succession of the events described in the conjuncts. Still there seems to be no problem in expressing the message in the form of (25a), using a non-restrictive relative clause. The non-restrictive relation, then, seems capable of expressing similar semantic relations to those of the coordinated structures. There is, however, an important difference between the two structures; this is a difference in focus. In coordinated structures the two conjuncts are at the same level. They enjoy the same status both syntactically and semantically, and neither is presented as more important than the other. The relative clause, on the other hand, is subordinate syntactically and semantically. It is down-ranked and thus informationally less prominent. The information is still there, but it is presented as of less importance, and the main focus is on the predication made in the main clause.
In seven translations one of the conjuncts is rendered by a restrictive relative clause, as in (26), (27) and (28):

(26) a. Han ble en glad og vilter gutt, og sammen med andre barn sprang han omkring mellom hyttene i leiren.  
    (SH1)

b. He grew into a happy, lively boy who ran around with the other children among the cabins in the settlement.

(27) a. Jeg var midt i et kaos og skjønte ingenting.  
    (LSC2)

b. I was in the middle of some sort of chaos I didn’t understand.

(28) a. ‘Jada, skoene er der de,’ svarte stemmen og hørtes virkelig ut.  
    (THA1)

b. ‘Yes, yes, they’re there,’ answered the voice that sounded real.

In these examples the relative clauses play a part in defining a person or an entity, and do not merely provide additional information about them, as in the non-restrictive constructions. In this sense the translations involving restricted clauses seem less suitable as correspondences of coordinate structures. With restrictive relative clauses, as opposed to non-restrictive, the focus is not simply on providing some piece of information, but rather on using the information in defining a certain entity. This defining aspect does not have a parallel in coordinate structures. Translations with restrictive relative clauses, then, involve changes that go beyond merely the change of focus.

Three of the examples in my material are like (29) in that the coordinated elements in the original are themselves relative clauses:
4 Overview and minor categories

(29)  
  a. Han la ut om en ny oppfinnelse han hadde gjort og som ville revolusjonere verden.  
      (JW1)  
  b. He was expatiating on a new invention he’d made that would revolutionise the world.

The English versions are structurally similar to their original, only without coordination of the relative elements.

Three translations contain a non-restrictive ‘sentential relative clause’ (Quirk et al. 1985:1118), as in (30) and (31):

(30)  
  a. Hadde nevnt det for henne, og da hadde hun rødmet uten å si et ord.  
      (FC1)  
  b. Had mentioned it to her, at which she had blushed, but hadn’t said a word.

(31)  
  a. Han ville selvsagt ha det siste ordet, og det fikk han jo, men han hadde nok ønsket å si mer.  
      (KA1)  
  b. He obviously wanted to have the last word, as he did of course, but he would probably have liked to say more.

In sentential relative clauses the relative element refers back to the predicate or predication of a clause or the whole of the preceding clause, not just a nominal element. In (30b) the antecedent of which is the predicate Had mentioned it to her, and in (31b) the antecedent for as is to have the last word. The relative clause comments on the content of the main clause. In 2.3.6 we saw that certain coordinate structures linked by and og function in much the same way. The second clause provides a comment on, or explanation of, the content of the first clause. The sentential relative construction and coordinate structures have a similarity in meaning, as has been observed in the literature. When discussing sentential relative clauses, Hasselgård et al. comment on their similarity in meaning to coordinated clauses (1998:343). Discussing this particular type of coordinate structure, Quirk et al. note the possibility of
replacing the second conjunct with a sentential relative clause (1985:932). In mentioning that
the non-restrictive relative clauses have been considered semantically equivalent to
coordinated clauses, they make the comment that the classification ‘seems particularly
appropriate in the case of sentential relative clauses’ (1985:983).

4.4.2 Non-finite clauses

4.4.2.1 To-infinitive clauses

(32) a. Hvorfor kunne ikke de fremmede klatre ned og se på kajakkene? tenkte Osuqo
redd. (MN1)

b. Why couldn’t the foreigners climb down to look at the kayaks? Osuqo thought
fearfully.

(33) a. Da han var blitt alene, åpnet han alle tre vinduene og luftet ut røyken som Karsten
hadde fyld kontoret hans med. (EG2)

b. As soon as he was alone Rudolf opened all three windows to get rid of the tobacco
smoke with which his brother had filled the room.

In twenty-five translations one of the conjuncts has been turned into a to-infinitive clause, as
in (32) and (33) above. These translations account for about 10% of the English
correspondences in my material (see table 4.2). All the to-infinitive clauses are renderings of
the second conjunct in the original structure, and in all the examples the to-infinitive clause
follows the matrix clause. The information ordering of the original has thus been maintained.
Most of the translations are renderings of predicate coordination, more precisely in seventeen
of the Norwegian examples. The proportion of predication coordination is relatively high
compared to the other groups of correspondences. Six of fifteen instances of predication
coordination in the material are found in this group. Two of the original structures involve coordination of infinitive constructions and are grouped under the category ‘other coordination’. There are no examples of coordinated clauses. Two of the to-infinitive clauses are introduced by subordinators, *in order to* and *for*, but the rest are like (32) and (33) in that they occur without a subordinator. Similarly, all except one translation are like (32) and (33) in that the to-infinitive clause contains no overt subject.

With two exceptions, the to-infinitive clauses are adverbial clauses. Twenty of these are *purpose* clauses, like (34) and (35), and examples (32) and (33) above. The to-infinitive clause expresses the purpose of the event described in the matrix clause:

(34)  

a.  
Han ville slå det *og finne ut om han hadde rett.*  
  
  (KA1)  

b.  
He was about to dial it, *to find out if he was right.*

(35)  

a.  
Nå ville hun sende opp røyksignaler *og varsle at hun var underveis.*  
  
  (SH1)  

b.  
She was going to send up smoke signals *to tell them she was coming*, but even before she had lit the fire she knew they had discovered her.

The purposive aspect has its source in the original version, where there is an implied purposive relation between the conjuncts. Although it is not explicitly stated that one thing is done in order to achieve something else, the circumstance described in the second conjunct may well come about as the result of the action portrayed in the first conjunct. The presence of the modal auxiliary *ville* also adds to the purposive aspect of the Norwegian examples. In (34) and (35) the to-infinitive translations seem to express very much the same as their originals, only with more emphasis on the purposive aspect. Not all of the coordinate structures necessarily prompt a purposive reading, however. In several of the examples the to-infinitive
translational equivalents imply meanings that go beyond what is there in the original. Consider some more examples:

    (BV1) b. Brita climbed unwillingly onto a stool to help her mother.

(37) a. Her samlet gamle sjauere seg og snakket om dengang mesteparten av arbeidet på havnen gikk med handemakt.  
    (GS1) b. Here old salts got together in order to reminisce about the days when most of the work in the port was done by hand.

(38) a. Etter noen dager ringte De og sa at De ikke ville fortsette samlivet.  
    (KA1) b. After a few days you called to say you didn’t want to continue living together.

The Norwegian coordinate structures might lend themselves to a purposive reading, but this is not primarily the semantic relation one is aware of when reading the examples. Again, I feel that the emphasis in the Norwegian version is on the two things happening rather than on any specific relations between the two circumstances. There are also other differences. The purposive to-infinitive clauses imply the notion of an intended effect. Something is done in order to achieve or do something else, or somebody does something because he or she thinks it will bring about a desired effect. In the English version of (36) Brita climbs onto a stool in order to help her mother, and in (37b) the old salts meet with the purpose of talking about the past. This intentional aspect, that $x$ does something in order to do $y$ or achieve $y$, is not so much part of the coordinate structures. In the Norwegian version of (37) the old salts do not necessarily get together in order to reminisce about the past. They get together and they talk about the past. Talking about the past may be a natural result of them meeting, not necessarily
the reason why they go there. There is a difference between (chance) result and intended or expected result. The Norwegian and the English examples also differ in another respect. In the Norwegian versions we are told that Brita actually helps her mother, that the old salts do talk about the past, and that the person calling in (38) actually delivered his or her message. In the English translations, on the other hand, we do not know whether the action described in the to-infinitive clause actually comes about. We know that Brita climbed onto the stool in order to help her mother, but we do not know whether she actually ended up helping her mother. Similarly, in (37b) the old salts may meet with the intention of reminiscing about the past, but they might have ended up talking about something else. In the Norwegian version of (38) we are told that the person said what he or she wanted to say, but the translation lacks any reference as to whether the message was actually uttered or not. Purposive constructions, ‘p in order that q’, entail that ‘the agent wants q to be the case rather than simply q’ (Sæbø 1991:625). In contrast to purpose constructions, the Norwegian coordinate structure signals that q is accomplished. When the examples occur in their respective contexts, these differences may not be a problem, as there may be factors in the surrounding text balancing the problems raised here. The issues discussed do, however, represent important differences between the structures involved in the Norwegian and the English versions.

The many to-infinitive purpose clauses as renderings of og coordinated predicates are interesting. There must be something about the Norwegian coordinate structures that triggers this particular translation. It is possible to see the source of the English purpose construction in the Norwegian originals, but coordinate structures are not generally the structures used to convey this relation in Norwegian. Like English, Norwegian has a purpose construction using the infinitive clause. To express this semantic relation one often uses the preposition for and an infinitive clause, as in the paraphrases:
Why, then, do the translators into English sometimes use a purpose construction when it is not used in the original? Even if recognising that the coordinate structures carry aspects of purposive meaning, why do the translators choose to make this relation explicit? One may ask why they do not use coordination with *and*, as in (36d), (37d) and (38d):

(36) d. Brita climbed unwillingly onto a stool and helped her mother.
(37) d. Here old salts got together and reminisced about the days when most of the work in the port was done by hand.
(38) d. After a few days you called and said you didn’t want to continue living together.

In the discussion (2.3.6) of the semantic relations that may obtain between units linked by *og* and *and*, no mention was made of any purposive relation. Yet the examples above, and the translations which they have triggered, show that certain coordinate structures with *og* carry a purposive aspect. In 2.3.6 we saw that coordinate structures with *og* and *and* may signal a causal relation between the conjuncts. The first conjunct provides a reason for the situation described in the second, as in *Han falt ned trappen og slo seg kraftig* and *She had worked all night and was tired*. Purposive clauses are related to causal clauses, in that both answer the question *why* and in that purposive constructions can be taken to represent reversals of causal constructions (Sæbø 1991:627). *Because* is the reverse of *in order that*.

Below we see that two of the coordinate structures discussed above, the two conveying the most purposive meaning, may be reversed, signalling a causal relation between the conjuncts:
Because he, in (39b), wanted to find out if he was right, he dialled the number, and because she, in (40b), wanted to tell them she was coming, she sent up smoke signals.

Three of the adverbial to-infinitive clauses are different from the purpose clauses described above:

(41) a. Mannen til Rose som kommer hjem igjen og finner det underlige skjelettet av et nytt hus på tunet. (TB1)

b. Rose’s husband who comes home to find the strange skeleton of a new house on his ground.

(42) a. Et par maur falt av teppet og forsvant bak noen løvetann som selvsagt også burde vært fjernet. (EG1)

b. A couple of ants fell out, to disappear into the depths of a clump of dandelions nearby. She ought to have done something about those, too.

(43) a. Jonassen tasset ut på kjøkkenet og kom straks tilbake med to nøkler holdt sammen med en hyssingstump. (EG2)

b. Johansen padded out to the kitchen, to return almost immediately with two keys hanging on a loop of greasy-looking string.

The adverbial clauses found in the English versions are examples of what Quirk et al. describe as to-infinitive clauses that ‘blend the meanings of time and outcome’ (1985:1109): ‘To-
infinitive clauses without a subordinator or a subject may have a temporal function, expressing the outcome of the situation’ (1985:1079).

4.4.2.2 *Past participle clauses*

(44)  

(a) *Du er i vide blå klær og forveksles lett med en fugl som leter, sarte vingledame.*  

(CL1)

(b) *Dressed in loose blue clothing, you can easily be mistaken for a searching bird, delicate darting-woman.*

(45)  

(a) *Carl Lange gikk i egne tanker og ble overrumplet.*  

(KA1)

(b) *Carl Lange, engrossed in his own thoughts, was caught off guard.*

In the examples above one of the conjuncts has been rendered by a past participle clause in the translation. In both examples it is the first conjunct that has been made subordinate, and both coordinate structures are examples of predicate coordination. The two examples are the only examples of this type in the material.

The *-ed* clauses in both (44b) and (45b) are subjectless and are not introduced by a subordinator. Past participle clauses can be adjectival or adverbial. The past participle clause in (44b), with its initial position, is adverbial. The status of the participle clause in (45b) is more ambiguous. It is positioned immediately after the noun phrase in the superordinate clause. In this position the *-ed* clause is very similar to non-restrictive relative clauses. Quirk et al. discuss the equivocal nature of these constructions (1985:1125, 1271), arguing that it is impossible to decide whether the clause is to be regarded as functionally equivalent to
non-restrictive clauses or subjectless supplementive clauses\textsuperscript{17} (ibid.:1125). The participle clause in (45b) could be seen as a reduction of the relative clause in (45c), or it could be seen as a reduced version of the finite adverbial clause in (45d):

(45) c. Carl Lange, who was engrossed in his own thoughts, was caught off guard.
(45) d. Carl Lange, since/because he was engrossed in his own thoughts, was caught off guard.

However, the possibility of moving the participle clause up front in the sentence without a change of meaning gives evidence of its adverbial nature:

(45) e. Engrossed in his own thoughts, Carl Lange was caught off guard.

The past participle translations are similar to the coordinated structures in that the semantic relation between the two propositions is indeterminate. In both versions one might read a causal relation into it, but it is not explicitly marked.

4.4.3 Verbless clauses

(46) a. Det satt allerede tre menn i kupéen, i full samtale, og luften var blå av tobakksrøk. \textsuperscript{(EFH1)}
   b. Three men were already seated there, all talking, the air blue with tobacco smoke.

(47) a. Av og til våknet han midt på natta, og mente at Dina var i rommet. \textsuperscript{(HW2)}
   b. Sometimes he awoke in the middle of the night, certain that Dina was in the room.

\textsuperscript{17} Supplementive clauses are adverbial participle clauses and verbless clauses without a subordinator (Quirk et al. 1985:1124).
In the examples above the last conjunct in the original is represented as a verbless clause in the translation. The material contains nine translations of this kind. As in (46) and (47), the verbless clauses are all renderings of the second conjunct and they are all sentence-final. Again we see that the information ordering of the original is maintained in the translation.

Five of the Norwegian source structures have coordination of clauses, as (46a) above, and four involve coordination of predicates, as in (47a).

Verbless clauses may or may not be introduced by a subordinator, and they may occur with or without an overt subject. As many as six of the verbless clauses have an overt subject, like (46b), but none of them are introduced by a subordinator. The verbless clauses are simply added to the matrix clause as in the examples above. The translations generally seem to function well as renderings of the Norwegian structures. As can be seen in (46) and (47), and in the examples below, the relationship between the conjuncts in the Norwegian source structures is arguably of the strictly additive type, where one piece of information is added to another (2.3.6). The verbless clauses in the translations seem to fill very much the same function. Their relationship to the matrix clause resembles that of the coordinated structures:

\[
\begin{align*}
(48) & \quad a. \quad \text{Men hun lå der, og øynene hennes var fulle av et spørsmål.} \quad \text{(EFH1)} \\
& \quad b. \quad \text{But she lay there, her eyes all questions.} \\
(49) & \quad a. \quad \text{‘En hjort!’ hylte han, og stemmen var hes av opphisselse.} \quad \text{(TTH1)} \\
& \quad b. \quad \text{‘A deer!’ he screamed, his voice hoarse in excitement.}
\end{align*}
\]
4.4.4 Prepositional phrases

(50)   a. ‘Bare forsyn dere,’ sa hun og gjorde et spesielt kast med hodet som Brita syntes hun hadde sett før.

       (BV1)

   b. ‘Just help yourselves,’ she said, with a special gesture of her head which Brita felt she had seen somewhere before.

(51)   a. Ola var en skrønemaker, og liknet på farfaren, som hadde skrønt gården vekk, eller kanskje det var brennevinet som hadde narret ham?

       (KAL1)

   b. Ole was a liar, like the grandfather who had lied away the farm. Or was it perhaps the liquor that had tricked him?

In a number of the English translations one of the conjuncts is incorporated as a prepositional phrase into the rest of the sentence, as in (50) and (51). There are twenty-seven such translations, accounting for 10.5% of the total examples. As with the groups of correspondences discussed earlier, it is the second conjunct that most frequently undergoes this kind of rewriting. In twenty-five of the translations the prepositional phrase conveys the information expressed in the second conjunct in the source structure. Only two of them are renderings of the first conjunct. With one exception, the prepositional phrases are positioned in the same place as the conjunct they represent, occurring last in the sentence when they are renderings of the second conjunct and positioned initially when they represent the first conjunct. In the Norwegian originals all the different types of coordination are represented. As many as eleven of the examples involve clause coordination, ten have predicate coordination, four have predication coordination, and two of the coordinate structures are categorised as ‘other coordination’. As in (50) and (51) above, the prepositional phrases generally function as adverbials in the clause.

Twelve different prepositions are represented in the material. As many as thirteen of
the phrases are introduced by *with*, which is almost half of the prepositional phrases in the material. Of the remaining fourteen examples, three phrases are introduced by *to*, two are headed by *like*, while the rest are single examples of a preposition.

In the examples above the prepositional complements are noun phrases, which is also the most common type of prepositional complement. Among my twenty-seven sentence pairs there are also examples of -*ing* clauses (52b), -*ed* clauses (53b) and verbless clauses (54b) as complements.

(52) a. Det gikk stort sett like greit som om jeg skulle ha rappa et par høns og ikke drept en representant for naboen i øst.

    (JM1)

b. On the whole it went well, as if I'd pinched a couple of chickens *instead of killing a representative of our Eastern neighbour*.

(53) a. Tvers over rommet henger ei snor og på snora henger klær.

    (TB1)

b. A cord hangs from the ceiling across the room, *with clothes draped over it*.

(54) a. Herman ligger i sengen og har kakao ved siden av seg.

    (LSC1)

b. Herman lies in bed *with a cup of cocoa next to him*.

---

18 The prepositions with one occurrence of each are: *as, upon, in, about, on account of, by, through, into* and *instead of*.

19 Traditionally a distinction between the class of prepositions and the class of subordinating conjunctions is drawn on the basis of the element they introduce; prepositions normally introduce nominal elements while subordinating conjunctions introduce subordinate clauses. There is, however, an area of overlap between the two classes, as prepositions may take –*ing* clauses as complements and several words may be analysed as belonging to both classes, i.e. *after, before* (Huddleston 1984:338-341, Quirk et al. 1985:660). Strictly speaking, some of the examples I have included within this group of correspondences might have been analysed as non-finite subordinate clauses introduced by conjunctions, e.g. –*ing* clauses, -*ed* clauses and verbless clauses introduced by *with*, but considering the gradience in this area, and the advantage of discussing related examples in the same place, I have included certain examples where also –*ing* clauses, -*ed* clauses and verbless clauses are introduced, as in (52b), (53b) and (54b).
The *-ing* clauses and the *-ed* clauses allow the verbal element of the source structure to be represented in the translation, along with any verbal arguments. Very much of the information expressed in the original is thus also represented in the translation. In the verbless clauses the verbal element is lost, but the other informational elements may still be represented, as they are in (54b). All of the verbless clauses are introduced by *with*.

In several of the noun phrase complements the head noun is pre- or postmodified, allowing more of the source structure content to be represented in the translation. In (55b) the noun phrase is postmodified by a relative clause which conveys the content of the coordinated predicate in the original, and in (56b) the premodification of *smile* maintains the original information about who was smiling and also the manner in which the smile was given:

(55) a. På pressekonferansen ble jeg presentert for journalistene og skulle svare på deres spørsmål.  
   (JW1)  
   b. I was introduced to the journalists at the press conference as the expert who would be answering their questions.

(56) a. Da hun våknet var det langt på dag, og Lille Bever smilte vennlig til henne.  
   (SH1)  
   b. She woke up late in the day to Little Beaver’s friendly smile.

Example (56) illustrates another trend in the material. In four examples the source verb is nominalized in the translation. In (56) the Norwegian verb *smile* (‘to smile’) has become the noun *smile* in the English version. In the other examples *beundre* (‘admire’) has changed to *admiration*, *bukke* (‘to bow’) has become the noun *bow* and *komme* (‘come’) has been changed into the noun *return*. A similar interesting pattern occurs in eight examples where the preposition itself can somehow be linked to the meaning of the verb in the original. In example (51) above we see a link between the Norwegian verb *likne* (‘to be like’) and the
English preposition *like*. This happens twice in the material. Another example can be seen in (57), where *bli* (*til*) becomes the preposition *into*:

(57)  
   a. Men hvordan kunne et stoff plutselig forandre seg og *bli til noe helt annet*?  
   b. But how could one substance suddenly change *into something else*?

Other examples are *høre* (*hear*) which becomes *on account of* and *ha* (*have*) which becomes *with* in as many as four examples. The relation between *ha*, or English *have*, and *with* is not intuitively as clear as the other relations, but when considering some of the examples, we see that *have* and *with* are very much linked indeed. Consider example (54) above, and examples (58) and (59):

(58)  
   a. For skilt er hun, *og to lømler av noen guttunger har hun også*, som hverken hilser eller åpner døren for et gammelt menneske.  
   b. For she’s divorced, the hussy, *with two louts of sons* who can neither give a civil good morning nor open the door for an old lady.

(59)  
   a. Tåneglene var utrolig lange *og hadde inngrodde render av skitt*.  
   b. Her toenails were incredibly long, *with ingrained strips of dirt*.

The English sentences with their adverbial *with* phrases function well as translations of the Norwegian coordinated structures. *With* and constructions with *have* seem to be linked semantically. Quirk et al. discuss the notion of ‘having’ contained in *with* (1985:704-705), exemplifying it by noun phrase postmodification such as:

(60)    
   a man *with a red nose* (*‘who has a red nose’*)
(61) an industrialist with a house on the Costa Brava (‘who has a house...’)

and adverbial structures like:

(62) a. With so many essays to write, I won’t have time to go out tonight.
    b. Having so many essays to write, I won’t have time to go out tonight.

(Examples from Quirk et al. 18985:704-705)

The many prepositional phrases introduced by with are interesting. As can be observed in some of the examples already quoted, with takes as complements both noun phrases (58), verbless clauses (54) and -ed clauses (53), along with -ing clauses (63):

(63) a. Tir hoppet over steingjerdet, og Reim fulgte like etter.
    b. Tir jumped over the rock fence, with Reim following close behind.

(TTH1)

We have already seen that four of the with phrases are renderings of conjuncts where the main verb is the Norwegian equivalent of have, and that this kind of rewriting may be explained with reference to the notion of ‘having’ signalled by with. The notion of ‘having’ is also present in example (53) (above), even though ‘ha’ does not occur in the original. But this explains only some of the examples. There must be other reasons why so many translations involve with. The number of with phrases may indicate that prepositional phrases headed by with relate to the rest of the clause in a similar manner to the way the two conjuncts relate to each other. The overall relation between the conjuncts in the originals is that of pure ‘addition’, and the translations generally seem to work well as representations of the source structures. Except for the loss of the verbal element in several examples, none of the with translations deviate much in content from the original. Generally the same information is
presented. There is, however, again the difference in focus. While the coordinate structure presents the information as two equally important information units, the content of the *with* phrase is informationally subordinate to that which is expressed in the core of the sentence.

Quirk et al. discuss the various uses of *with*, one of them being accompaniment, i.e. ‘in company with’ or ‘together with’, as in *Jack, with several of his noisy friends, was drinking till after 2 in the morning* (1985:702). In this use, they observe, the *with* phrase is similar in function to coordination with *and*: *Jack and several of his noisy friends were...* A similar observation is made by Johannessen who discusses examples like *Mary with Peter went to town vs. Mary and Peter went to town* (1998:46-48). The examples in my material are different from the examples discussed by Quirk et al. and Johannessen, in that the coordinated units are not noun phrase subjects, but coordinated clauses or predicates. Nevertheless, I think the notion of accompaniment is somehow present in many of the examples. Consider example (63) above and examples (64), (65) and (66):

(64) a. Det ender med at Tor kles opp som brud, *og Loke skal følge med som brudepike.*

   (JG1)

   b. So Thor allows himself to be attired in bridal costume, *with Loki as his bridesmaid.*

(65) a. En Bibel lå oppslått under lyset fra lampen, *og et bokmerke av sølv skinte nypusset mot dem.*

   (EG2)

   b. Within the circle of light cast by the lamp lay an open bible,* with an ornate bookmark alongside it.*

(66) a. Våkne og kjenne Eva puste rolig ved sida av seg, mye roligere enn hun gjør på hybelen på Buret i Longyearbyen der folka på naborommet kan høre hvert sengeknirk.

   (JM1)
b. Waking up with Eva breathing quietly next to me, much more quietly than she does in her one-room apartment in The Cage at Longyear City, where the next-door neighbours hear every creak of the bed.

In some of the examples the with phrase introduces a manner element, but the sense of accompaniment is arguably still part of it (see also example (50)):

(67) a. ‘Hva er vakkert?’ sa han, og noe ved ham virket skuffet. (EFH1)
b. ‘What’s beautiful?’ he said with an air of disappointment.

Some of the with phrases are fully integrated into the main clause, while others are separated from the rest of the sentence by a comma:

(68) a. ‘Takk!’ sa mannen og Bukket for henne. (HW2)
b. ‘Thank you,’ said the tutor with a slight bow.

(69) a. Tvers over rommet henger ei snor og på snora henger klær. (TB1)
b. A cord hangs from the ceiling across the room, with clothes draped over it.

As pointed out above, the with translations work well as renderings of the original. Generally this is true also of phrases with the other prepositions, but there are exceptions, as has been exemplified below. In (70b) the prepositional phrase introduces a causal element that is not there in the original, and in (71b) the prepositional phrase unsolicitedly specifies the incident spatially:
Earlier in this chapter we discussed examples where one of the conjuncts was made subordinate, either as a finite or non-finite clause, in the translations. With their lack of finiteness and their reduced forms generally, the non-finite clauses are syntactically more subordinate than the finite structures. The examples discussed in this section, where one of the conjuncts is rendered by a phrase, represent an even further syntactic downgrading. A coordinated clause, predicate or predication is reduced to a phrase in the translation. Interestingly, however, it has been argued that prepositional phrases are more clause-like than other phrases. Halliday discusses the difference between prepositional phrases and other phrases, which he calls groups, arguing that a group is an ‘expansion of a word’ while a phrase is a ‘contraction of a clause’ (1994:180). He talks about nominal, verbal and adverbial groups, but of prepositional phrases. Prepositional phrases are clause-like in that they have no head-modifier relationship and in that they cannot be reduced to a single element. Halliday views prepositional phrases as a ‘minor clause’ (1994:213), where the preposition functions as a ‘minor verb’ (1994:212), having a nominal group as its complement. Unlike clauses proper, however, prepositional phrases are not fully clause-like in that they cannot be expanded to include other elements of clause structure (1994:213). Nevertheless, the occurrence of
4 Overview and minor categories

prepositional phrases as correspondences of clauses provides evidence in support of Halliday’s claim.

4.4.5 Other structures

Fourteen examples in the material have been grouped as ‘other structures’, a category in which the translations represent a number of different rewriting strategies and the only things they have in common are that they are different from the categories discussed so far and that most of them are one-off examples of their kind. For example, we find that one of the conjuncts is represented as a comparative clause, or as a nominal that-clause, and there are examples where the conjunct is represented in the translation as a noun phrase, an adverb phrase or, as in (72), an adjective phrase:

(72) a. De få møblene var billige og bar preg av å stamme fra forskjellige steder.  

b. The few tawdry pieces of furniture looked as if they had come from different places.

The only type of rewriting that is represented in several of the translations is the one exemplified in (73), where the original conjunct is represented by a structure which is in apposition to the rest of the sentence:

(73) a. Faren sier at dette skjer med nesten alle, det er kjent som månesvimmelhet og er et velkjent fenomen blant astronomer.

b. His father says that happens to almost everyone; it’s called lunar dizziness, a well-known phenomenon among astronomers.
In all except two examples it is the second conjunct that has been changed. Most of the originals exhibit predicate coordination, totalling eight examples, while five of them have clause coordination and one has predication coordination.

4.5 Summary and concluding remarks

The material examined in the main study divides in two parts, one comprising 225 examples of pseudocoordination, to be dealt with in chapter 6, and another comprising 256 examples of ordinary coordination. The types of correspondences of Norwegian ordinary coordination were set out in table 4.2, with the largest category being -ing clauses, accounting for 58.6 % of the English translations. Other categories were: finite adverbial clauses, relative clauses, to-infinitive clauses, past participle clauses, verbless clauses, prepositional phrases and the miscellaneous ‘other structures’.

In the material comprising ordinary coordination, it is the second conjunct that is most frequently subordinated in the English translations. In 92.2 % of the examples the second conjunct is subordinated, the change affecting the first conjunct in as few as twenty translations. Interestingly, the information ordering of the original seems to be maintained in the translations. Generally the subordinate clauses are positioned sentence-finally when representing the second conjunct, and placed initially when they are renderings of the first conjunct.

The coordinate structures in the Norwegian material were distinguished according to the nature of the coordinated units. In the majority of examples, accounting for 75.4 % of the material, the coordinated units are predicates. In 16.4 % of the material the coordination is between full clauses, in 5.9 % we find predication coordination, and the remaining 2.3 % are
examples of ‘other coordination’. The large proportion of predicate coordinated structures may reflect the frequency of this type of coordination generally. Most of the predicate coordinations are rendered by non-finite clauses in the English translations.

The main bulk of this chapter was devoted to a discussion of the minor categories of correspondences, comprising finite adverbial clauses, relative clauses, to-infinitive clauses, past participle clauses, verbless clauses, prepositional phrases and the miscellaneous ‘other structures’. In total, these categories amount to 106 examples. Except for the relative clauses, the subordinate clauses and the prepositional phrases function almost exclusively as adverbial elements in the sentence. Interestingly, many of the translations within each group of correspondences are of the same type: As many as thirteen of the fifteen finite adverbial clauses are clauses of time, of which ten are introduced by as. Twenty of the twenty-three adverbial to-infinitive clauses are purpose clauses, and close to half of the prepositional phrases are headed by with. Thus, there seem to be clusterings of meanings connected with the different types of rewriting strategies. The finite adverbial clauses express a temporal relation, the to-infinitive clauses express purpose and the many with phrases signal some kind of accompaniment. As there are several examples of each type of semantic category, the semantic relations must have some source in the original texts. There must be something in the source structures which triggers these types of translations. The with phrase translations generally work well as renderings of the original structures. The conjuncts in the originals are primarily in a relationship of pure addition, and accompaniment, as is signalled by the with phrases, is related in meaning to addition. In the cases of the finite adverbial clauses and the to-infinitive clauses, however, a number of the English translations seem to imply readings not unquestionably licensed by the original. The adverbial as-clauses signal simultaneity of the events described in the subordinate clause and the matrix clause, but it is questionable
whether this interpretation always has a grounding in the Norwegian source structure. In the case of the purposive infinitive clauses, one might observe differences between the purposive constructions and the Norwegian coordinate structures when it comes to whether or not something was done in order to achieve something else, and whether or not this something was accomplished. These differences notwithstanding, the translations are there for a reason, and the frequency with which they occur suggests that the meanings they express can be traced to the source structures. In contrast to the translations, however, the coordinate structures are indeterminate as to the semantic relation between the conjuncts. Whereas the semantic relation is hinted at, or weakly indicated, in the coordinate structures, the relation is made explicit in the translations.

Some of the structures discussed in this chapter have been noted for their similarity with coordinate structures. In 4.4.1.2 we touched on the similarity between coordinate structures and non-restrictive relative clauses. The non-restrictive relationship is similar to both coordination and adverbial subordination. In the literature, also some of the other structures figuring in my material have been noted for their similarity with coordinate structures. Quirk et al. comment on the relationship between supplementive clauses, i.e. adverbial participle clauses and verbless clauses without a subordinator, non-restrictive relative clauses and coordination with and:

When adverbial participle clauses and adverbial verbless clauses are not introduced by a subordinator, there may be considerable indeterminacy as to the semantic relationship to be inferred.[…] In their indeterminacy, adverbial participle and verbless clauses resemble the versatile relationships expressed by nonrestrictive relative clauses [...] and the connective function of the coordinator and […]. (Quirk et al. 1985:1123)
The similarity may be observed in the following examples:

(74) a. John, knowing that his wife was expecting a baby, started to take a course on baby care.
    b. John, who knew that his wife was expecting a baby, started to take a course on baby care.
    c. John knew that his wife was expecting a baby and he started to take a course on baby care.

(Examples from Quirk et al. 1985:1123-24)

The type of clause connection is not made explicit, but in all of them we infer a causal connection. Considering the similarity in semantic relationship, it is perhaps not incidental that both non-restrictive relative clauses and supplementive clauses, exemplified in this chapter by the past participle clauses and the verbless clauses, have been used in translations of Norwegian coordination with og. In the following chapter we will discuss some of the other supplementive clauses in the material: the -ing participle clauses.
Chapter 5  -*Ing* clause correspondences

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is devoted to examples where one of the Norwegian conjuncts is rendered by an -*ing* clause in the English translation. -*Ing* clauses form a large group of correspondences, accounting for 150 of the 256 translations of ordinary coordination (see table 4.2). The first section (5.1.1) comprises a general introduction to -*ing* participle clauses in English, while the corpus findings will be presented in section 5.2. Finally, a short summary and concluding remarks will be given in 5.3.

5.1.1 Characteristics of -*ing* clauses

The -*ing* participle clause is the most versatile of the non-finite clauses in English (Johansson and Lysvåg 1986:181). The structure is quite frequent and it exhibits a high degree of syntactic flexibility, occurring in both nominal (1), adjectival (2) and adverbial functions (3), and it may also be found as complement of adjectives (4):

(1) a. *Getting there* took an hour and a half. (subject)
    b. I couldn’t risk *missing the train*. (object)
    c. The problem is *finding a strong enough cap to seal the hole*. (subject complement)
    d. I object to *their leaving before we take a vote*. (complement of preposition)

(2) She telephoned all the other women *drying clothes on the line*. (NP postmodifier)
Having looked at it with some care, he felt in a position to discuss it. (adverbial)

The children were busy building castles in the sand. (complement of adjective)

The examples in my material are mainly adverbial -ing clauses, like (3) above, or even more frequently, examples of the type of -ing clauses which in Johansson and Lysvåg are referred to as ‘non-integrated’ -ing clauses (1986:176-78, 1987:285-86):

‘I’m not easy in mind,’ said Mary, watching Nellie picking at the ham.

He entered college in 1956, graduating 5 years later as a straight A student.

The press has given its verdict, conceding only that there might have been a few excesses.

Here the -ing clauses are appended to the matrix clause, adding more peripheral information.

In contrast to the purely adverbial clauses modifying their matrix clause, providing information on time, cause, condition and so on, the non-integrated constructions are more loosely connected to matrix clause, providing additional and more peripheral information.

Johansson and Lysvåg admit that the distinction between the two types is not always clear-cut observing that when there is no conjunction in the -ing clause, the adverbial type overlaps with the non-integrated type (1987:285).

-Ing clauses may occur with or without a subordinator indicating the semantic relation to the matrix clause:

a. Leaving the house, he forgot to lock the front door.
b. When leaving the house, he forgot to lock the front door.
As noted in the previous chapter, adverbial participle clauses and verbless clauses without a subordinator are termed ‘supplementive clauses’ (Quirk et al. 1985:1124). The term seems to cover not only Johansson and Lysvåg’s adverbial clauses, but also the non-integrated constructions, as in Quirk et al.’s example of a supplementive past participle clause:

(9) *Discovered almost by accident*, this substance has revolutionized medicine.

(1985:1125)

Supplementive clauses may occur with or without their own subject, as can be observed in the -ing clauses below:

(10) *Leaving the house*, he forgot to lock the front door.

(11) *His wife having left for work*, he set about preparing for her birthday.

In subjectless supplementive clauses the implied subject is normally taken to be the subject of the matrix clause: ‘When a subject is not present in a nonfinite or verbless clause, the normal ATTACHMENT RULE for identifying the subject is that it is assumed to be identical in reference to the subject of the superordinate clause’ (Quirk et al. 1985:1121). This is exemplified in (10), where the understood subject in the -ing clause is *he* of the matrix clause. Supplementive clauses with their own subject are called ‘absolute’ clauses (ibid.:1120), the term reflecting

20 There are certain -ing structures where the implied subject is not the same as the subject of the matrix clause. These are called ‘unattached’ clauses (Quirk et al. 1985:1121), a term covering this phenomenon with non-finite clauses and verbless clauses generally. Some such constructions yield downright unacceptable sentences, whereas others are more acceptable, because the subject identity is somehow easier arrived at:

*Reading the evening paper*, a dog started barking.
*Driving to Chicago that night*, a sudden thought struck me. [When *I* was driving ...]
*When dining in the restaurant*, a jacket and tie are required. [When *one* dines ...]

(Examples from Quirk et al. 1985:1121-1122)

None of the examples in the material are unattached clauses. For a discussion of unattached clauses and further examples, the reader is referred to Quirk et al. (1985:1121-1123).
that they are not syntactically bound to the matrix clause, as are other supplementive clauses which are dependent on the superordinate clause for the identification of their subject. For further discussion of the interpretation and identification of subjects in supplementive clauses the reader is referred to Kortmann (1991).

As shown by the examples above, supplementive -ing clauses may occur both sentence-initially and sentence-finally:

(12)  a.  Thinking he had done the only sensible thing, John walked away happily.
   b.  John walked away happily, thinking he had done the only sensible thing.

Occasionally, such clauses are also found in sentence-medial position, but in this position, it has been observed, the structure is difficult to distinguish from a postmodifying -ing clause. Functionally, the -ing clause is very similar to a non-restrictive relative clause (Quirk et al. 1985:1125):

c.  John, thinking he had done the only sensible thing, walked away happily.

Previous accounts of supplementive -ing clauses include Bernd Kortmann’s Free adjuncts and absolutes in English: Problems of control and interpretation (1991) and Bergljot Behrens’ Contrastive discourse: An interlingual approach to the interpretation and translation of free ING-participial adjuncts (1998). As the titles suggest, Kortmann discusses all types of free adjuncts and absolutes, not only -ing constructions, whereas Behrens deals exclusively with -ing clauses. Both Kortmann and Behrens use the term ‘free adjunct’ to refer to Quirk et al.’s subjectless supplementive clauses. The term ‘absolute’ in Kortmann’s title refers to supplementive clauses with a subject, as in Quirk et al.’s terminology. The terms
‘free adjunct’ and ‘subjectless supplementive clause’ will be used interchangeably in the rest of this discussion. Kortmann is especially concerned with two areas: the subject in free adjuncts and absolutes and the general interpretation of free adjuncts and absolutes, i.e. the semantic relation that holds between the *-ing* clause and the matrix clause. Behrens’ thesis is also concerned with the semantic relations holding between the two clauses, particularly examples involving a causal relation or an elaboration relation. She includes a good account of initial free -*ing* participle adjuncts, arguing for the need to take previous context into account for an adequate interpretation of these structures.

The semantic relation holding between a supplementive -*ing* clause and the matrix clause is often difficult to pin down, as it may be ambiguous or vague. Without the aid of a subordinator indicating the relation, the reader or hearer himself has to infer the relation. A structure may give rise to different interpretations, as in this example from Kortmann, which may have both a temporal (‘when’/’while’) and a causal (‘because’) reading:

(13) *Writing the final chapter of his thesis*, John happily whistled away.  
(Example from Kortmann 1991:2)

To interpret the -*ing* participle structures the reader or hearer must draw on semantic and pragmatic factors. Clues as to the interpretation may be given in the structures themselves, e.g. the types of verbs involved, or one might infer how things are to be related on the basis of one’s knowledge of the world, i.e. how things normally are connected.

Supplementive -*ing* clauses may occur in a variety of semantic relations to their matrix clause. One dimension concerns the temporal relation between the event in the matrix clause and the event described in the -*ing* clause. The usual interpretation is one of simultaneity; -*ing*
clauses as free adjuncts and absolutes usually signal that the two events go on at the same time:

(14) The children ran down to the gate, looking swell in their new outfits ('same time')
(Example from Behrens 1998:71)

However, -ing clauses may also express ‘time before’ and ‘time after’, as in (15) and (16), respectively:

(15) Opening the drawer he took out a revolver. (Example from Kortmann 1991:143)
(16) In the same instant the Negro’s own left fist snapped upward, landing with a hard, sharp crack at the side of his attacker’s face. (Example from Kortmann 1991:152)

The temporal relation seems to be reflected in the order of adjunct and matrix clause. The ‘time before’ relation is only possible with initial adjuncts (Behrens 1998:79) and the ‘time after’ interpretation seems to be reserved for sentence-final adjuncts. In Kortmann’s material all the present-participial free adjuncts with a ‘time after’ interpretation follow the matrix clause (1991:151). Some of the examples involving supplementive -ing clauses receive a purely temporal interpretation, whereas others involve additional semantic relations. Some of the typical adverbial relations exemplified in the literature are cause (17), condition (18), concession (19) and contingency (20):

(17) a. Knowing their tastes, she was able to bring a gift that they would like.
   (Example from Quirk et al. 1985:1105)
   b. A new aristocracy was emerging and more and more of the children of the rich married only into each other’s families, blending fortunes.
   (Example from Bergljot Behrens 1998:80)
Judging from his A-level results, he certainly seems to have the necessary ability.  
(Example from Johansson and Lysvåg 1986:179)

Not wanting to give offence, they did so all the same.  
(Example from Quirk et al. 1985:1097)

Driving at high speed, one may well miss direction signs.  
(Example from Quirk et al. 1985:1086)

Certain supplementive -ing clauses have also been noted for their similarity with ‘sentential relative clauses’ (Johansson and Lysvåg 1987:286), as can be observed in:

The Highway Department closed U.S. 79, forcing all motorists to make a long detour.  
(Example from Johansson and Lysvåg 1987:286)

Kortmann discusses -ing adjuncts and absolutes in a relationship of instrumentality (22) (adjuncts only), manner (23) and exemplification/specification (24), where the semantic relations hold between ‘propositions which relate to the same event or state’ [my italics] (1991:164):

Using a sharp knife, he managed to cut the bread.

a. ‘...’ said Litvak, speaking in a voice as soft as his smile.

b. The room clerk stiffened, straightening his shoulders.

Once they were lined up - banks, trust companies, all the rest - trying to lend their money, urging me to take it.

b. ..., Mr Nyerere again attacked the International Monetary Fund, calling it ‘an instrument of the capitalist powers’...

(Examples from Kortmann 1991:164-167)

These are to be distinguished from examples of accompanying circumstance where the -ing clauses denote an event or activity separate from the event or the state in the matrix clause,
and where they ‘do not provide details as to the specific circumstances (i.e. time, causes, causes, conditions, etc.) under which the matrix proposition obtains’ (Kortmann 1991:169). Some of his examples are:

(25)  a. ‘I protest,’ shouted the Senior Tutor, *half rising to his feet.*
     b. Next morning I woke at my usual hour, *feeling like a bottle of champagne.*
     c. The door opened and Skullion came in, *holding his bowler hat in one hand.*

(Examples from Kortmann 1991:170)

In examples of accompanying circumstance the situations described in the complex sentence are ‘two situations which hold true, side by side, with no constraints on the nature of these situations whatsoever’ (Kortmann 1991:169). The only condition, Kortmann observes, seems to be the unity of space and, particularly, time (ibid). In such examples the -ing clauses seem to be in a relationship of mere addition.

Behrens (1998) discusses in great detail examples where the propositions in the -ing clause and the matrix clause relate to the same event or state, i.e. Kortmann’s manner, instrument and exemplification.specification categories, treating all such examples as instances of *elaboration.* In examples where an elaboration relation holds, the event in the adjunct ‘makes up part of or is identical to the event in the matrix’ (Behrens 1998:151). This must be distinguished from cases where there are two separate, but simultaneous events, as in the case of accompanying circumstance. Compare (26) and (27) below:

(26)  Larval dragonflies hunt on the bottom of ponds, *grabbing worms and other small creatures with long protrusible mouth-parts.*

(27)  We walked slowly along the rows of trestle tables, *admiring the merciless French housewife at work.*

(Examples from Behrens 1998:152)
Halliday defines elaboration as follows:

In ELABORATION, one clause elaborates on the meaning of another by further specifying or describing it. The secondary clause does not introduce a new element into the picture but rather provides a further characterization of one that is already there, restating it, clarifying it, refining it, or adding a descriptive attribute or comment. The thing that is elaborated may be the primary clause as a whole, or it may be just some part of it - one or more of its constituents. (Halliday 1994:225)

In the present thesis, Halliday’s definition has been used as a basis for the classification of -ing adjuncts in a relationship of elaboration to their matrix clause (see section 5.2.3.3).

To sum up, the following semantic relations have been exemplified: time (alone or in addition to other semantic relations, ‘time before’, ‘same time’, ‘time after’), cause, condition, concession, contingency, elaboration (instrumentality, manner, exemplification/specification), accompanying circumstance and a relation similar to that of sentential relative clauses.

5.1.2 -ing clauses vs. coordination

Many of the same semantic relations holding between -ing clauses and their matrix clause were also observed, in chapter 2, to hold between conjuncts linked by and and og. Among other things, it was noted that clauses linked by and and og may be in a temporal (sequential), causal, concessive or conditional relationship, and examples were given where the second clause provided a comment on the first, as in a sentential relative clause. Most importantly, however, the strictly additive function of and and og has similarities with many of the free -ing adjuncts or absolutes. The accompanying circumstance relation is very similar to coordination with and/og. The similarity between the function of certain -ing clauses and coordination has been observed in the literature, as in Johansson and Lysvåg (1986:135-136)
and Hasselgård et al. (1998:368): ‘-ing participles can be combined with their matrix clauses in a way that resembles co-ordination’ (Hasselgård et al. 1998:368). The similarity can be observed in (28):

(28) a. He walks briskly to the underground station, stopping to buy a cappuccino and a croissant outside the block where his office is located.

b. He walks briskly to the underground station, and stops to buy a cappuccino and a croissant outside the block where his office is located.

(Examples from Hasselgård et al. 1998:368)

In both Johansson and Lysvåg, and Hasselgård et al. the term ‘-ing coordination’ is used to refer to the way such -ing clauses relate to the matrix clause. As Norwegian does not have a construction quite parallel to -ing coordination, translations of -ing coordination usually result in coordinated structures in Norwegian (Hasselgård et al. 1998:368). Though -ing coordination resembles coordination with and/og, there are, nevertheless, differences between the two structures, as is observed in Hasselgård et al.:

whereas co-ordination with and gives both clauses equal status syntactically and semantically, -ing co-ordination entails a certain backgrounder of the information in the -ing clause. (1998:368)

On the basis of the above observations, i.e. the similarities in semantic relations that may be conveyed, it is not wholly unexpected to find -ing participle clauses as translations of Norwegian coordination with og.
5.2 Corpus findings: results and discussion

In 150 examples one of the Norwegian conjuncts has been rendered by an -ing participle clause in the English translation. This accounts for 58.6% of all the translations of ordinary coordination in the material (see table 4.2). The main purpose of this section is to describe the circumstances under which a Norwegian og coordinated structure is translated by a complex sentence with an -ing clause in English. What are the characteristics of the Norwegian coordinate structures when this happens, and what are the characteristics of the English structures? In the previous section we saw that -ing participle clauses may occur in several different syntactic functions, and further, when functioning as adverbials or non-integrated structures, -ing clauses may be found in a variety of semantic relations to the superordinate clause. In my material, however, we shall see that many of the -ing clause examples are quite similar. Though there are exceptions, most of them are non-integrated constructions in a relationship of accompanying circumstance to the matrix clause. The typical characteristics of the Norwegian coordinate structures being translated by an -ing clause, along with the characteristics of the -ing clause correspondences, will be presented in section 5.2.1, while exceptions to the typical pattern which relate to syntax will be treated in 5.2.2. Semantic relations are discussed in 5.2.3. Over half of the examples comprise a direct speech construction, and these will be discussed more thoroughly in 5.2.4. Issues related to the temporal relation between the two propositions described in the Norwegian and the English structures, respectively, will be dealt with in section 5.2.5.
5.2.1 The typical pattern: Norwegian og coordination and English -ing clause correspondences

Most of the examples in this part of the material have the following characteristics:

The Norwegian source structures:
- coordination between predicates
- semantic relation: pure addition
- more than half involve a direct speech construction

The English -ing clauses:
- without subject
- follow the matrix clause
- without subordinator
- separated from the matrix clause by a comma
- semantic relation to the matrix clause: accompanying circumstance

The change:
- the second conjunct is subordinated in the translation

Examples (29) and (30) illustrate the typical pattern:

(29)    a.  Han myste ut i rommet med søvndrukne øyne og strevet seg opp på albuene. (TTH1)

       b.  His eyes squinted as he peered into the room, struggling to pull himself up on his elbow.
In both examples the coordination is between predicates. This is representative of 93.3% of the coordinate structures yielding an -ing clause translation in English, as can be seen from table 5.1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of coordination</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clause coordination</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicate coordination</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predication coordination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other coordination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only three coordinate structures have coordination of predications and seven have clause coordination. In other words, -ing clauses are almost exclusively renderings of a coordinated predicate in Norwegian.

In both (29) and (30) the second conjunct has been subordinated in the translation. In as many as 140 examples the -ing clause corresponds to the second conjunct; only ten -ing clauses are translations of the first conjunct:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incorporated element</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conjunct 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunct 2</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further, we may note that the semantic relation between the conjuncts in the original seems to be one of pure addition, one piece of information added to another. Example (30) is different from (29) in that it involves a direct speech structure. As many as eighty-two of the 150 examples involve a direct speech construction, as in (30) above. These structures will be discussed in greater detail in section 5.2.4 below.

The -ing clauses in (29) and (30) are representative in that they occur without their own subject, their subject being identical in reference to the matrix subject. Only seven of the -ing clauses in my material are absolute clauses. The many subjectless -ing clauses are, of course, a natural consequence of the many predicate coordinated source structures.

In both (29) and (30) the -ing clause follows the matrix clause, and this is representative of 141 of the -ing clauses in the material. Above we saw that the second conjunct almost exclusively was the one being reduced in the English versions. The second conjunct becomes a sentence-final -ing clause. As observed with other groups of correspondences as well (chapter 4), the information ordering of the original is kept in the translation.

All the -ing clauses in my material are like (29) and (30) in not being introduced by a subordinator. The semantic relation to the superordinate clause is thus not explicitly indicated. The semantic relationship holding between the two clauses is vague, and at times ambiguous between several interpretations. There is a certain similarity between the Norwegian source structures and the structures used in the English translations, in that both of them are inexplicit as to the semantic relation holding between the propositions expressed. Only two examples in the whole material explicitly indicate the semantic relation obtaining, and in both examples
the relation is signalled by a connective adverb.

The -ing clause in (29) and (30) is separated from its matrix clause by a comma. In this respect (29) and (30) are similar to 142 of the 150 -ing translations. The use of a comma in such constructions suggests that the -ing clause is only loosely connected to the matrix clause [my italics]:

a non-finite clause can be more or less integrated with the superordinate clause, with important consequences for its information value. A looser connection is manifested in writing by punctuation and in speech by the division into tone units.

(Johansson and Lysvåg 1986:283-84)

In their discussion of non-integrated constructions Johansson and Lysvåg identify as one of their characteristics their separation from the matrix clause by a comma (1986:177).

Kortmann discusses the term free adjunct and notes that the adjunct is ‘free in the sense that it is detached from the matrix clause, which more often than not is signalled by intonational breaking, or commas in writing’ (1991:22). (29) and (30) may be compared with (31) where there is no comma between the -ing clause and the matrix clause, and the -ing clause is more fully integrated into the superordinate clause:

---

21 The two examples are:

‘Du kan da skjønne det er bedre å ligge i en ordentlig seng,’ sa onkel Kristen og avgjorde saken.

‘It’s much better to sleep in a proper bed,’ said Uncle Kristen, thus deciding the matter.

(KF2)

Så av med skoene -- skritt høres godt nedover i etasjene, selv om de aller fleste legger vegg-til-vegg-tepper for tiden og gjør tyvens arbeid lettere.

Then off with your shoes -- steps can easily be heard on the lower floors, though most people nowadays put in wall-to-wall carpeting, thereby making the thief’s work easier.

(KF1)

In both examples the translations make explicit the relation which is felt to hold between the conjuncts in the original.
(31) a. Jeg våknet neste morgen og følte meg uvel. 

   (LSC2)

   b. I woke up the next morning not feeling well.

The semantic relation holding between the -ing clauses and their matrices in (29) and (30) is one of accompanying circumstance. For further discussion and exemplification of semantic relations see the section on semantic relations in 5.2.3.

5.2.2 Deviations from the typical pattern: syntax

5.2.2.1 Coordination of predications and clauses

Three of the Norwegian coordinate structures have coordination between predications, as in (32), and seven structures exhibit clause coordination, as in (33):

(32) a. Nå ville han la seg drive over polhavet slik hans forgjenger hadde gjort og prøve å nå selve polen. 

   (KH1)

   b. Now he wanted to drift across the Arctic Ocean as his predecessor had done, trying to reach the Pole itself.

(33) a. Mannen reiste seg fra høgsetet, og øynene hans lynte som hardt stål. 

   (TTH1)

   b. The man rose from his high seat, his eyes gleaming like cold steel.

In (33) the second clause is rendered by an absolute clause in English, keeping the subject of the original clause. Five of the clause coordinated Norwegian structures are like (33) in that the incorporated clause is rendered by an absolute clause in English. Absolute -ing clauses will be discussed in 5.2.2.5.
5.2.2.2 First conjunct incorporation

In ten translations the first conjunct has been rendered by an -ing clause. With two exceptions, these -ing clauses are positioned sentence-initially, keeping the information order:

(34) a. Han våknet og skimtet store skygger som lå borte i sengen, fremmede klær hang over benken.  
    (KAL1) 
    b. Waking up, he glimpsed huge shadows lying in the bed on the other side of the room. Unfamiliar clothing was hanging over the bench.

See further 5.2.2.4.

5.2.2.3 Non-adverbial -ing clauses

The vast majority of -ing clauses function as adverbial clauses or as Johansson and Lysvåg’s non-integrated type. However, some -ing clauses are found in other functions, such as the -ing clause in (35), which is an object of the matrix verb resist:

(35) a. Han griper inn fordi jeg ikke kan dy meg og plukker erter fra et fat.  
    (SL1) 
    b. He tells me off when I can’t resist taking a handful of peas from a dish.

In another example the -ing construction is used as a restrictive modifier of the NP subject in the superordinate clause:

(36) a. Hovedgården var størst og tilhørte den eldste av brødrene, hr. T.A. Brinch.  
    (HW1) 
    b. The estate belonging to the eldest brother, Mr. T. A. Brinch, was the largest.
In the next example the -ing clause is similar to the type discussed in 5.1.1, where a medial -ing clause functions like a non-restrictive postmodifier:

(37)  a. Vesle Kristine *stomlet bak faren* og tittet smilende opp på ham.  
     b. Little Kristine, *waddling behind her father*, gave Espen a big smile.

There are two medially positioned free -ing adjuncts in the material.

In the next two examples the -ing clauses similarly occur in a non-restrictive postmodifying function, only here the -ing constructions occur sentence-finally. The -ing clauses are translations of the last of two coordinated relative clauses in Norwegian:

(38)  a. Da skimtet han den svære skikkelsen til Digralde *som lutet seg inn mot veggen og lyttet årvåkent ut i natta.*  
     b. He caught a glimpse of Digralde, leaning against the wall, *listening intensely to the night.*

(39)  a. Han følte seg aldeles utkjørt av blikket *som sveipet over værelset og konstaterte at det var vakkert, kostbart, ikke særlig luksuriøst, men fylt av få og utsøkte gjenstander.*  
     b. He was exhausted observing the gaze that swept across the room, *asserting that it was beautiful, expensive, not especially luxurious, but full of a few exquisite objects.*

Four examples are like (38) and (39) in that the -ing clause is a translation of a coordinated relative structure in the original.
5.2.2.4 Sentence-initial -ing clauses

In seven translations the order of the -ing clause and the matrix clause is the reverse of the typical pattern; the -ing clause precedes the superordinate clause:

(40) a. *Han så alvorlig på meg og sa: ‘Kan du aldri gå ut?’*  
     b. *Looking gravely at me, he said, ‘Can’t you go out at all?’*

In all seven examples it is the first conjunct that is rendered by an -ing clause. The information ordering is therefore the same in the source text and the target text. Sentence-initial free adjuncts may denote an event which occurs prior to the event described in the matrix clause. This is clearly the case in three of the sentence-initial -ing adjuncts, illustrated here by (41). The translation adequately captures the sequential reading suggested by the coordinate source structure:

(41) a. *Hun løftet hånden og strøk noen våte hårtufser vekk fra pannen.*  
     b. *Lifting one hand, she stroked a few wet hairs back from her forehead.*

5.2.2.5 Absolute clauses: -ing clauses with an overt subject

In seven translations the -ing clause has an overt subject. As was observed in 5.2.2.1, five of these are translations of full clauses (42). In the other two examples, quoted here in (43) and (44), a subject has been inserted:

(42) a. *Vesten var åpen og skjortebryset manglet.*  
     (HW2)
b. His vest was unbuttoned, *his shirtfront missing*.

(43) a. *Hun spratt over søledammene og dasket med varene mot leggene.* (HW1)
b. *She jumped over mud puddles, the groceries bumping against her legs.*

(44) a. *Han grep seg til halsen og viftet med tunga som en gardsbikkje.* (TTH1)
b. *He held his throat with both hands, his tongue wiggling at them like some kind of a farm dog.*

The translations seem to work well in cases where the source structures are coordinated clauses. As with the coordinated clauses, one proposition is added to another, without there being additional semantic relations implied. The -*ing* clause enjoys a relatively free status in relation to its matrix clause. Compared with subjectless supplementive clauses, absolute clauses are less bound to their matrix clause syntactically, as they are not dependent on the matrix clause for the identification of their subject. The original and the translation are similar in that neither the coordinated clause in the source text nor the -*ing* clause in the target text are dependent on the preceding clause for their interpretation. There is, however, a difference between the coordinate structures and the English complex structures regarding the informational status of the last proposition presented in each example. In the coordinate structures the two situations portrayed are presented as equally important, but in the English versions the situation portrayed in the -*ing* clause comes across as informationally subordinate to the event or state described in the matrix clause, as may be observed in (45) and (46):

(45) a. *Mannen reiste seg fra høgsetet, og øynene hans lynte som hardt stål.* (TTH1)
b. *The man rose from his high seat, his eyes gleaming like cold steel.*
5 -Ing clause correspondences

(46)  
  a. Tora snek seg mellom karene og ansiktene deres fløt sammen høyt der oppe.  
      (HW1)  
  b. Tora sneaked among the men, their faces floating together high up there.

In the two examples where a subject has been inserted, (43) and (44), the translations are less true to the original. In the Norwegian predicate coordinated structures there is an understood agent causing the event expressed in the second conjunct, namely the deleted subject. In the translations, on the other hand, the object of the source structure has been made subject, and agentivity is lost. The translation in (43b) also deviates from the original in that it suggests a causal interpretation more clearly than the Norwegian structure.

5.2.3 Semantic relations: the typical pattern and other semantic relations

In the examples quoted in 5.2.1, (29) and (30), the semantic relation holding between the -ing clauses and their matrices is one of accompanying circumstance, and, as such, the -ing clauses are representative of a number of the English translations. 107 of the 150 -ing clauses have been analysed as being in a relationship of accompanying circumstance to the superordinate clause. Consider some more examples:

(47)  
  a. Kniven lå i hånden min og minte meg om alle mine aldre.  
      (KF2)  
  b. The knife lay there in my hand, reminding me of all my earlier selves.

(48)  
  a. Men på klare, kalde dager lå røken enda storkarslig over det lappete taket og kom fra tre skørsteiner samtidig.  
      (HW1)  
  b. But on clear, cold days the smoke still hung grandly over the patched roof, rising from three chimneys at once.
The proposition in the -ing clauses is added to the matrix proposition seemingly without any additional semantic relations being implied. The two states or events described may hold true side by side and may take place simultaneously. The same interpretation can be read from the coordinate structure in the Norwegian source structures. There is a difference between the two versions, however, in that the information expressed in the -ing clauses is backgrounded compared to the matrix propositions, whereas in the Norwegian coordinate structures the two propositions are on the same level of importance.

Although -ing clauses of accompanying circumstance account for most of the -ing clauses in the material, several of the other possible semantic relations are represented, as will be exemplified in the sections below.

5.2.3.1 Cause

Six of the -ing clauses may be said to be in a causal relationship to their matrices. In most of these the causal relation reflects the relationship signalled by the coordinate structures:

(50) a. Frøken Borg åpnet døren med det samme han ringte på og ga ham en følelse av at hun hadde stått i entreen helt siden hun la på røret. (EG2)

b. Miss Borg opened the door as soon as he rang, giving him the impression that she’d been standing in the hall waiting ever since she phoned.

(51) a. Osuqo tvang hodet opp, tidsnok til å se kølla som traff Poqs bakhode og sendte han blødende i dekket. (MN1)
b. Osuqo forced her head up, in time to see a club strike the back of Poq’s head, sending him bleeding to the deck.

5.2.3.2 Time

In -ing clauses which are in a relationship of accompanying circumstance the -ing clause event or state takes place at the same time as the state or event described in the matrix clause. As noted, most of the -ing clauses in the material are of this type. However, some examples signal ‘time before’ (52) and ‘time after’ (53):

(52) a. Hun løftet hånden og strøk noen våte hårtufser vekk fra pannen. (TTH1)
    b. Lifting one hand, she stroked a few wet hairs back from her forehead.

(53) a. Og den ble ikke revet plutselig løs fra meg, etterlot intet blodig sår, men løste seg varsomt til slutt og seilte bort som en stor, skimrende såpeboble. (EHA1)
    b. It wasn’t torn away from me either, leaving an open wound; it let go gently, sailing away at last like a large shimmering soap bubble.

In (52) and (53) the coordinate structures and the English translations are in agreement as to the temporal relation conveyed. Based on our general knowledge of the world we know that the hand is generally lifted before it strokes hair back from the forehead and, similarly, that something must let go before it can sail away. The nature of the events described prompts a sequential reading, whether portrayed by a coordinate structure or a complex structure with an -ing clause. Two examples have been analysed as denoting ‘time before’ and nine as ‘time after’.

Three examples signalling simultaneity are different from the accompanying circumstance examples. The -ing clauses do not simply add something about another event or
state happening simultaneously with the event in the matrix clause, but rather, function as adverbial clauses of time. Two of the -ing clauses are more integrated into the matrix clause than the other. The -ing clause in (54b) may be paraphrased as (54c). Note that the -ing clause is not separated from the main clause by a comma, which signals that it is more integrated into the matrix clause.

(54) a. Jeg spiste sviskegrøt og så på onkel Kristen som satte et melkespann i kjøleskapet mens han lot det andre stå på kjøkkenbenken.  

(KF2)

b. I ate the stewed plums watching Uncle Kristen, who placed a can of milk in the fridge, leaving the other on the kitchen worktop.

c. I ate the stewed plums while I was watching Uncle Kirsten, …

5.2.3.3 Elaboration

-ing clauses in a relationship of elaboration may sometimes be difficult to distinguish from accompanying circumstance, as it may be difficult to determine whether the two propositions should be analysed as relating to one and the same event, or whether we have to do with two separate, but simultaneous events. However, ten of the -ing clauses have been categorised as elaborating structures, including two examples of Kortmann’s manner category, as in (56), and one of Kortmann’s instrument, in (57):

(55) a. Da de tre politikonstablene ville ta den berusede piken med seg, protesterte De og sa at hun skulle være med Dem hjem.  

(KA1)

b. When the three patrolmen wanted to take the intoxicated girl along with them, you protested, saying she was going to your place.

(56) a. ‘Tja,’ seier Selmer Høysand og dreg på det, som han har for vane.  

(KFL1)
b. Well, says Selmer, *drawing out the word as he has a habit of doing*, I ain’t really the right person to say nothing about such things, but that hell-fire-and-damnation preacher, Hallesby, in Oslo, he sure wouldn't have no doubt about where it is.

(57) a. Noen ganger var det som om han hentet kraft fra de forventningsfulle ansiktene rundt seg, slik at han fikk heist opp skulderen og støttet den opp på den kraftløse albuen et øyeblikk.

   (HW1)

b. Sometimes, it was as if he drew strength from the expectant faces around him, so that he could get his shoulder up for a moment, *using his weak elbow for support*.

In most of the examples the coordinate source structures have the same reading as the translations, but in three examples, including (57) above, the second conjunct does not necessarily elaborate on the first. In (57a) it is more natural to see the two propositions as describing two separate events.

5.2.3.4 Condition

(58) a. ‘Ingen skal få meg til å tro at en person -- la oss kalle personen X -- helt tilfeldig valgte Hansdals tomme leilighet til å skjule sin forbrytelse, mordet i, og la oss nå et øyeblikk gå ut fra at det var mord, -- mer eller mindre samtidig som en helt annen person, Y, kom seg inn i leiligheten antakelig for å lete etter noe av avgjørende betydning for ham selv.’

   (EG1)

b. ‘No one’s going to tell me that someone -- let’s call him X, assuming it was a he -- chose the Hansdals’ empty house quite by chance to conceal his crime -- to dump the body of his victim in, I mean, *again assuming that it was a murder* -- more or less at the same time as someone else, Y, gets in to look for something, something pretty important.’

The *-ing* clause in (58) has a special type of conditional interpretation. Its function in the sentence is similar to its coordinated equivalent in the Norwegian source structure. This is the only one of its kind in the material.
5.2.3.5 ‘Wake up...ing’

(59)  a. Even våknet og hutret.  
      (KAL1)  
   b. Espen woke up shivering. 

(60)  a. Jeg våknet neste morgen og følte meg uvel.  
      (LSC2)  
   b. I woke up the next morning not feeling well. 

In the two examples above the relationship between the matrix clause and the -ing clause is slightly different from what we have seen in other examples. The -ing clauses are more integrated into the superordinate clause; note that they are not separated from their matrices by a comma. If spoken, the sentences are likely to be said with one intonation contour with the main accent at the end. The main focus of the sentences seems to be on the information conveyed by the -ing clauses. ‘Waking up’ does not seem to be as informationally prominent as ‘shivering’/‘not feeling well’. A paraphrase like ‘someone was shivering/not feeling well when he/she woke up’ captures, I think, the natural reading of (59) and (60).

5.2.4 Examples with direct speech

Eighty-two of the examples rendered by an -ing clause construction are like (61) and (62), involving direct speech (or thought):

(61)  a. ‘Her var det han datt,’ sa Malvin og pekte på et lavt gjerde som nesten var dekket av snø.  
       (LSC2)  
   b. ‘Here’s where he fell,’ said Malvin, pointing at a low fence almost buried in snow.
(62)  

a. Nå er jeg ikke her lenger, tenkte han på ny og satte seg på sofaen.  

b. Now I’m no longer here, he thought once more, sitting down on the sofa.

A direct speech construction, comprising an initial ‘reported clause’ followed by a ‘reporting clause’ (Quirk et al. 1985:1020), is coordinated with a second clause. The second half of the coordinate structure is rendered by an -ing clause in English. In all except one example the direct speech construction precedes the other clause, as in (61) and (62). Seventy-five of the structures are like (61), with a verb of speaking, and seven are like (62), with a verb of thinking. The distribution of the verbs in the reporting clauses is set out in table 5.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of verbs</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si ('say')</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spørre ('ask')</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svare ('answer')</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other verbs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs of thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenke ('think')</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undre ('wonder')</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not surprisingly, si (‘to say’) and tenke (‘to think’) are the most common verbs in the two groups.

---

22The verbs represented here, with one occurrence of each, are the following: legge til, fortsette, opplyse, stamme, hilse, flire, skjenne, erklære, rope and hviske.
All the coordinate structures in these examples are predicate coordinations. The person uttering something or thinking something is also the person about which the proposition in the second conjunct holds. Many of the direct speech structures are coordinated with predicates signalling facial expressions, (63) and (64), or gestures and bodily postures, (65) and (66):

(63) a. ‘Liddelig kjekk jente,’ sa Bente og så etter Gro.  
    (EHA1)
   
b. ‘Really nice girl,’ said Bente, looking after Gro.

(64) a. ‘Du får fire pund i måneden,’ sa den yngre Black, og smilete vennlig, ytterst vennlig.  
    (EFH1)
   
b. ‘You’ll get four pounds a month,’ said the younger Black, smiling in a friendly, very friendly way.

(65) a. ‘Du juger,’ sier Herman og peker rett på doktoren.  
    (LSC1)
   
b. ‘You lied,’ says Herman, pointing right at the doctor.

(66) a. ‘Jeg synes det høres brukbart,’ sa tjeneren og trakk på skuldrene.  
    (EFH1)
   
b. ‘I think it sounds quite passable,’ said the steward, shrugging his shoulders.

*Looking*, as in (63), occurs in as many as sixteen of the -ing clauses. In addition, there are other similar verbs like *glancing* which occurs twice, *casting a glance* which appears in three examples and *scrutinizing* found in one example. *Smiling* and *laughing* occur in eight -ing clauses, with *smiling* accounting for six of them and *laughing* for two. Of the verbs signalling bodily postures, *pointing* is the most frequent, occurring in eight examples. Other verbs include *shrugging* (2), *nodding* (1), *laying one’s arm/hand* (2), *holding out one’s hand* (1), *sitting* (1), *rising* (2), and *getting to one’s feet* (1). A third subgroup of verbs, notably smaller
than the other two, comprises verbs of mental states, such as *hesitating*, *wondering*, *deciding*, *meaning*, *trying* and *thinking*, as in (67):

\[(67)\]  
\[\begin{array}{ll}
a. & ‘Nydelig,’ stammet jeg, *og tenkte hardt på calvadosen min.* 
\quad \text{(LSC2)} \\
b. & ‘Delicious,’ I stammered, *thinking hard about my calvados.* 
\end{array}\]

The *-ing* clauses in seventy-five of the eighty-two direct speech examples have been analysed as being in a relationship of accompanying circumstance to their matrices. Interestingly, the types of verbal activities denoted by these *-ing* clauses, some of which are discussed above, are noted by Kortmann as typical of clauses in a relationship of accompanying circumstance:

The accompanying circumstances that free adjuncts and absolutes typically identify are postures, facial expressions, thoughts/feelings, details of dressing, or relate to perception, sound production, holding in one’s hand, or any kind of movement. (Kortmann 1991:169)

Except for the change from a coordinated structure to a complex structure with an *-ing* clause, the English translations in this group are generally true to the originals, and without additional changes or rewriting strategies. Differences between the original and the translations are related to general differences between coordination and subordination, such as what is syntactically and semantically most prominent, in addition to differences related to the temporal relation between the two propositions involved in each construction. Differences in the temporal relation will be discussed in section 5.2.5 below.
5.2.5 The temporal relation: the Norwegian source structures and the English translations

The events denoted by -ing clauses in a relationship of accompanying circumstance take place at the same time as the event described in the superordinate clause. For many of the -ing translations which have been given this interpretation in my material, the temporal relation in the translation is a reflection of the temporal relation holding between the conjuncts in the source structure. The coordinate structures are naturally interpreted as if the two events or states described take place at the same time. This can be observed in (68) and (69):

(68)  a. De befinner seg under en lyktestolpe og holder hardt rundt hverandre og tror kanskje at ingen kan se dem.
       (LSC1)

       b. They’re discovered under a lamp post, holding each other tightly, thinking maybe that no one can see them.

(69)  a. Sunniva supte i seg den friske luften og syntes visst aldri hun fikk nok.
       (TTH1)

       b. Sunniva drew in the fresh air, feeling that she would never get enough.

However, in some of the examples with an -ing clause of accompanying circumstance there seems to be a difference between the original and the translation as regards the temporal relation holding between the two propositions. The -ing clauses indicate simultaneity of events, and the question is whether the Norwegian coordinate structures as well signal simultaneity. This question seems particularly relevant in connection with some of the examples involving direct speech. Some of the coordinate structures are difficult to classify with respect to the simultaneous/sequential distinction, as something may be said and done at the same time, or in a sequential order. Consider an example like (70):
5 -ing clause correspondences

(70)  a. ‘Neivel,’ sa jeg og reiste meg.                                    (LSC2)
      b. ‘I guess not,’ I said, rising.

Does the person say something first and then rise, or does he/she say something and rise at the same time? Is there a difference in interpretation between the Norwegian and the English versions? My intuition suggests that there is a difference: I think Norwegian speakers are likely to give the coordinate structure in (70) a sequential reading, whereas the -ing clause expresses simultaneity of events. A simultaneous reading of the Norwegian example is not impossible, but, I think, less likely. Consider some more examples:

(71)  a. ‘Skal du på Olsok-festen?’ spurte Jo med ett og så oppmerksomt på meg. (KF2)
      b. ‘Are you going to the summer fête?’ asked Jo out of the blue, scrutinizing me.

(72)  a. ‘Jo,’ sa moren og smilte.                                          (EFH1)
      b. ‘Yes,’ said his mother, smiling.

(73)  a. ‘Ikke bløff,’ sier Glenn og kommer nærmere.                     (LSC1)
      b. ‘Don’t lie,’ says Glenn, coming closer.

In the examples above the nature of the events described does not prompt a specific reading. Somebody may say something and do something at the same time, or he/she may say something and do something in a sequential order. The default interpretation of -ing clauses is simultaneity of time (Kortmann 1991:142). Unless specific semantic, pragmatic or contextual factors prompt a sequential reading, the two propositions are taken to hold true at the same time. The coordinate structures, however, are more indeterminate and seem to be more apt to
invite both a sequential and a simultaneous reading. In the examples above the -ing clauses receive a simultaneous interpretation, whereas the Norwegian coordinate structures may receive either a sequential or a simultaneous reading, probably with a preference for the former.

Factors such as the nature of the events or states described, and the order in which the propositions are presented play a role in determining the temporal relation between the two propositions, and these factors are relevant to the interpretation of both the coordinate structures and the English complex structures. In (74) the types of events involved restrict the possible interpretations:

(74)  
   a. ‘Men hun er ikke noe fin,’ sa Jo og spyttet.  
   b. ‘But she’s not up to much,’ said Jo, spitting.

In (74) the English version as well receives a sequential reading. The default interpretation is ruled out because saying something and spitting are not likely to take place at the same time: ‘Events involving the same body parts necessarily follow each other […] , if different parts are involved, the two may overlap’ (Behrens 1998:240).

Johansson and Lysvåg note a difference in the temporal relation between -ing coordination and coordination with and (1986:135). Discussing examples like

(75)  
   a. The man looked about him slyly, pointing to the safe.  
   b. The man looked about him slyly, and pointed to the safe.  
   (Examples from Johansson and Lysvåg 1986:135)

they point out that the -ing clauses [my italics]
coordinate two propositions, but very often signal at the same time that the two actions are simultaneous. Thus they allow paraphrases like ‘and at the same time’ or ‘and in that process’ + the verb. In contrast, an explicit and coordination often suggests that the actions are sequential. (1986:135)

It seems as if, whereas coordination with og leaves the specific temporal relation uncertain, coordination with and more clearly suggests a sequential reading. This may be due to the possibility of signalling simultaneity using -ing coordination. Norwegian does not have a corresponding way of expressing simultaneity. To render such -ing clauses in Norwegian, Johansson and Lysvåg observe, Norwegian ‘must resort either to explicit coordination with og or to subordinated clauses introduced by idet’ (ibid:136). As we have seen, the material comprises many examples where coordination with og conveys simultaneity, but there are also examples where the simultaneity/sequential distinction is hard to draw, and where the -ing translations may be slightly misleading as renderings of the Norwegian source structures.

More work needs to be done in this area. The limited scope of this thesis does not permit a thorough analysis of the temporal relation in the two structures. I think, however, a close study of the temporal relation involved in Norwegian coordinate structures with og would be very interesting. Such a study would benefit from a contrastive perspective, using English and coordination and -ing coordination as a basis of comparison, as coordinate structures with og fulfil functions typical of both these English structures in Norwegian.

**5.3 Concluding remarks**

150 of the coordinate structures in my material are rendered by a complex sentence with an -ing clause in the English version. Most of the -ing clauses are non-integrated constructions, relating to their matrix clause in a way that resembles coordination. The term -ing
coordination has been used to capture the characteristics of such structures. On the basis of the findings presented in this chapter we might outline the following pattern for the use of Norwegian *og* coordinated structures corresponding to complex sentences with *-ing* clauses in English: The coordinated units are typically predicates and, though there are exceptions, the semantic relation between the conjuncts is typically one of pure addition. As a general rule it is the second conjunct that is incorporated in the translation. Most of the *-ing* clauses occur without their own subject, and all occur without a subordinator indicating the semantic relation to the matrix clause. The *-ing* clauses generally follow the superordinate clause and they are separated from the matrix clause by a comma. Although there are exceptions, they typically occur in a relation of accompanying circumstance to the matrix clause, reflecting the semantic relation holding between the conjuncts in the source structure. As many as eighty-two of the examples comprise a direct speech construction. The direct speech structure makes up one of the conjuncts in the coordinate structure, and in the translation it is the direct speech structure which constitutes the superordinate clause. The predicate which is coordinated with the direct speech construction is rendered by an *-ing* clause in the translation.

The various semantic relations that may obtain between clauses linked by *and/og* to some degree overlap with the semantic relations that may hold between an *-ing* clause and its matrix clause. However, though coordinate structures may signal cause, concession, condition and so on, this is by no means their primary function. Coordinate structures with *og/and* simply link linguistic units, signalling that the units are related somehow, without specifying further relations. In my material most of the *-ing* clauses are translations of coordinate structures where the two propositions are in a relationship of pure addition, and the way many of the *-ing* clauses relate to the superordinate clause, being loosely attached and without a subordinator indicating the semantic relation to the matrix clause, is very similar to
coordination. *-ing* coordination is as indeterminate as coordination with *og* as regards the
semantic relation between the two propositions. Two propositions are linked, but the exact
nature of the relationship between them is not specified.

As regards the frequency with which *-ing* clauses are used as translations of
Norwegian coordination a word of caution is in place. Kortmann’s study of free adjuncts and
absolutes shows that such structures occur far less frequently in spoken than in written
English, and that in the written material they are much more frequent in fiction than in other
genres (1991:39):

In written language, the frequency of their use decreases proportionately to an
increase of the formality of the text type. Thus, narrative texts are found to abound
in them, whereas scientific writing displays the lowest frequency rate of adjuncts
and absolutes. (ibid.:2)

Kortmann’s material comprises all types of free adjuncts and absolutes, not only *-ing* clauses,
but I think, nevertheless, this is a point worth noticing. All the texts in my material are fiction
texts, and the number of *-ing* clause correspondences may therefore be higher than would be
the case if other genres were represented as well. If *-ing* adjuncts are generally more frequent
in fiction texts than in other genres, it is also likely that structures involving *-ing* clauses will
be chosen as translations of Norwegian coordinate structures more often in fiction than in
other types of texts.

Norwegian does not have a structure quite equivalent to non-finite *-ing* clauses. To
render such *-ing* constructions Norwegian often has to resort to finite structures. This is
especially true of *-ing* constructions functioning as adverbials, restrictive postmodifiers of
nouns and non-integrated clauses (Johansson and Lysvåg 1986:181). Translations of *-ing*
coordinated structures usually result in coordinated main clauses (Hasselgård et al. 1998:368).
In the present study, however, the translations go the other way around. Coordinated finite clauses have been rendered by complex sentences in English; one of the coordinated sentences or predicates has been reduced to a non-finite -ing clause, resulting in informational as well as syntactic downgrading of the information in the -ing clause. This restructuring of the text is especially interesting because English has a structurally similar construction to that of the source text, namely coordination with *and*. In translating an adverbal or non-integrated -ing participle clause into Norwegian one has to change the structure, but when going from Norwegian *og* coordination to English, however, one should think the most likely translation would be to keep the source structure intact, and, as such, also maintain the equal status of the information units. Thus, when the structure is changed, it gives indications that there are differences in uses between coordination with *og* and coordination with *and*. One might ask whether the use of -ing clauses in the English translations is obligatory or whether coordination might have been used. The present study has contributed to some extent to specifying the circumstances under which Norwegian coordination with *og* is rendered by -ing coordination in English, but a more thorough contrastive study of *og* coordination and *and/-ing* coordination is needed to arrive at a more accurate description of the relation between *og* coordination and the two English alternatives. It would be interesting to compare examples where Norwegian coordinate structures with *og* have been translated with -ing coordination on the one hand, and coordinate structure with *and* on the other hand, trying to find a pattern for when the two structures are preferred. Such a study would naturally include an analysis of the temporal relations between the propositions linked in the three structures.
Chapter 6  Norwegian pseudocoordination and its English correspondences

6.1 Introduction

The examples discussed in this chapter are examples where one of the conjuncts in a Norwegian pseudocoordinated structure is incorporated as a phrase or as a subordinate clause in the English translations. As the thesis as a whole is concerned with Norwegian coordinate structures in which one of the conjuncts is made subordinate in the English translation, the present chapter does not discuss all possible English correspondences of Norwegian pseudocoordination, but only those where one of the conjuncts is incorporated as a phrase or as a subordinate clause in the translation (see further section 6.2.1).

Before the main presentation of corpus findings (6.2) there will be an introduction to the different types of pseudocoordination in the material (6.1.1), and a discussion of the differences between pseudocoordination and ordinary coordination (6.1.2).

6.1.1 Types of pseudocoordination in the material

Quite a number of the coordinate structures in the material are different from the examples discussed in the previous chapters. The coordinate structures discussed here, subsumed under
the category ‘pseudocoordination’, involve a type of asymmetric coordination where the first verb is one of a limited set of verbs, and where the coordinate structures are asymmetric in the sense that the first verb functions as a kind of copula with an aspectual meaning (Faarlund et al. 1997:1118-1119). Johannessen explains:

Structurally, it looks like VP coordination in which the first conjunct contains one of a limited number of verbs of (mostly) location or direction. Semantically, however, it clearly differs from other types of coordination in that the conjuncts do not simply create a group of any kind, but they create an aspectual interpretation determined to some extent by the meaning of the verb in the first conjunct. The original meaning of that verb is often reduced in these constructions. [...] Since verbs in the Scandinavian languages are not morphologically marked for aspect pseudocoordination is one way of expressing aspect syntactically. (1998:48-49)

The examples in my material naturally divide in three groups, one comprising verbs of position or location, one comprising verbs of movement and one containing verbs of other types. The first group of structures includes verbs like sitte (‘sit’), stå (‘stand’), ligge (‘lie’), henge (‘hang’) and være (‘be’):

(1) Jacob Grønelv satt og duppet i den store rokokkostolen ved kakkelovnen i rørerommet. (HW2)
(2) Men det er merkelig så lenge Tjukken står der og stirrer. (LSC1)
(3) Under meg i gresset ligger ungdanner og røyker marihuana. (TB1)
(4) Frå etasjen over luktar det middag, enda så seint det er, ei motbyeleg lukt av saus eller steikt kjøtt som heng og dirrar i den fuktige lufta. (EH1)

23 The term ‘pseudocoordination’ is used in Johannessen (1998:48-51) and Tonne (1999). In Svenska Akademiens grammatic (Teleman et al. 1999) the equivalent Swedish term, ‘pseudosamordning’, is used about Swedish constructions of this type.
Sitte, stå and ligge quite commonly occur in constructions like the ones above. When they do, their original meaning is reduced and the construction as a whole is given an aspectual interpretation of ongoingness. Faarlund et al. discuss such examples under constructions with ‘kursivt aspekt’: ‘Konstruksjoner med kursivt aspekt er slike som fokuserer på en handling eller situasjon utstrakt i tid uten tanke på noen form for avgrensning’ (1997:646). The construction with henge, in (4), is similar to the ones with sitte, stå and ligge, and although it occurs less frequently than examples with sitte, stå and ligge, henge is often mentioned together with the other verbs (Teleman et al. 1999:904, Vannebo 1969:46, Digranes 2000:12).

The verb være may also enter into constructions of an idiomatic character denoting ongoingness, as seen in (5). Faarlund et al. discuss such structures as ‘uttrykk for fjern-lokativ’, a term reflecting that the situation or the event referred to goes on somewhere different from where the utterance is given:

Denne konstruksjonen refererer til en handling som foregår på et annet sted enn stedet der ytringa sies. Er ikke stedet det refereres til, spesifisert i form av et adverbial, er det som regel mulig å sette inn av gårde, av sted eller et annet adverbial etter det første verbet. (1997:536-537)

A similar observation is made for the equivalent Swedish construction with vara:

Verbet vara kan pseudosamordnas med vanligtvis agentiva verb för att ange oavgränsad aktion. Användningen av vara innebär också att aktionen försiggår någon annanstans än på den i texten eller talsituationen aktuella platsen. (Teleman et al. 1999:905)
All the coordinate structures with *være* in my material include an intervening adverbial between *være* and the second verb, specifying where the subject is. This parallels the findings in Vannebo: ‘Ved durativet *vera* er det i korpus alltid mellomstilt adverbial’ (1969:46).

The second subgroup of pseudocoordinated structures contains verbs of movement; movement generally or towards some location. The most common of these is the one involving *gå* (‘go’/‘walk’):

(6) Karene *gikk* rundt romlukene og *sturte*.

(7) Jeg *går* bort til bilen og henter sigarettpakka jeg har liggende på dashbordet.

*Gå* enters into two different types of pseudocoordinated constructions, illustrated here by (6) and (7). While the interpretation of (6), *gikk*...*og sturte*, is similar to the interpretation of the constructions with *stå*, *sitte* and *ligge*, conveying a notion of ongoingness, the coordinate structure in (7) is less durative. Rather than denoting ongoingness of the event, the focus is on the initial state of the verbal activity. In Faarlund et al. constructions similar to (7), with coordination of a verb of movement and a main verb, such as *kjørte og handlet*, *gikk og kjøpte*, *dro og reparerte*, are discussed as ‘*uttrykk for fjern-lokativ*’ together with constructions with *være*:

Ved denne konstruksjonstypen foregår også handlinga som hovedverbet refererer til, på et annet sted enn stedet der ytringa sies. Som ved konstruksjonene med *være* er det mulig å sette inn adverbial av typen *av gårde, av sted* eller et annet retningsadverbial som spesifiserer stedet [...]. Men mens konstruksjonene med *være* beskriver en vedvarende situasjon, beskriver setningene med bevegelsesverb en begynnende handling eller noe som skal skje. (1997:537)
A number of examples in the material involve a construction with *komme* (‘come’). As with *gå* in (7) above, the aspectual interpretation is directed towards the initial state of the situation:

(8) Det spilte ingen rolle, for Martin *kom og frelste* henne.

(THA1)

Three examples are similar to (6) in that they involve a verb of movement, *fare* (‘scurry’), *løpe* (‘run’) and *stumpe rundt* (‘stumble around’), and in that they give rise to an aspectual interpretation of ongoingness, similar to (6):

(9) Han *før* rundt og *studerte* fugler, hva nå det kunne være godt for.

(HW2)

(10) *(Løp i en halv time og lette* etter et sted å kjøpe vin, holdt på å bli overkjørt da hun rotet seg inn i et fleretasjes parkeringshus, det var som i Detektimen) Kaffe, bananer, reker.

(CL1)

(11) Ute på terrassen *stumper* de blinde *rundt og let* etter blindehundene sine.

(CL1)

In the Swedish reference grammar *Svenska Akademiens grammatik* (Teleman et al. 1999) constructions such as (6) and other structures with verbs of movement denoting ongoingness, such as *springer och frågar* and *åkte runt och skrämde*, are grouped together with the structures involving positional verbs (*ligge, sitte, stå, henge*) (1999:905). These are distinguished from constructions in which the first verb indicates movement towards a certain place, such as *gå* in (7) and *komme* in (8):

Verb som anger förflyttning til en viss plats kan ingå som första led i pseudosamordning. Hit hör verb som *komma, gå* och andra rörelseverb med
adverbial som anger mål. Samordningen tolkas sekventiellt, dvs. först utför subjektsreferenten det första verbets avgränsade aktion, sedan påbörjas den vanligen agentiva aktion som anges med det andra verbet. (1999:906)

The verbs in the remaining set of examples do not form a uniform group, but the structures are similar to the examples discussed with verbs of position and movement. Consider the coordinate structures in (12) and (13), where holde på (‘be on the verge of’/‘be in the middle of’) and ta (‘take’) figure as the first conjunct:

(12)  ‘Held du på og misser taket, kanske?’

(13)  Eller kanske taterfolket som ville ta og spise ham?

Example (12) is similar to the constructions with sitte,stå and ligge, denoting ongoingness, while example (13) has more in common with the constructions with gå in (7) and komme in (8). Discussing examples like Vi tar og går ut and Ho tok og hoppa ned Faarlund et al. observe:

Verbet ta har fått avbleket betydning og tjener nærmest bare til å understreke et intensjonalt aspekt ved igangsettinga av handlinga. Konstruksjonene kan derfor lett få en slags ingressiv betydning. (1997:535)

In the last two examples a modal verb followed by an adverbial is coordinated with a bare infinitive:

(14)  ‘Vi skal opp og tegne,’ sier Benedikte.

(15)  ‘Ja, eg får bort og hjelpa dei nokre timar igjen.’
In both examples the understood main verb in the first conjunct is a verb of movement, such as gå, dra, reise, kjøre etc. Faarlund et al. discuss simple examples like Hun skal hjem and De bør ut for å se seg omkring, observing that modal verbs may occur without a main verb when used in connection with an adverbial or a question word denoting direction (1997:527).

Coordinated structures of the type exemplified in (14) and (15) are also used in Swedish, and the construction is noted in the discussion of pseudocoordination in Teleman et al. (1999:906).

6.1.2 Pseudocoordination vs. ordinary coordination

Formally, pseudocoordinated verb phrases are similar to ordinary coordinated verb phrases. Discussing examples like Barna sitter og skriver, De ligger og venter på vind, Faren stod og saga ved, Studentane dreiv og las til eksamen and Ho gjekk og song heile dagen Faarlund et al. note that, although being formally identical to ordinary coordination, such constructions do not denote two separate and equally important events. The verbs in the first conjunct have lost some of their original meaning and are developing towards auxiliary status:

Disse verbforbindelsene er formelt identiske med kombinasjoner av tokoordinerte verb som f.eks. Barna tegner og skriver. Men i verbforbindelsene ovenfor dreier det seg ikke om to adskilte og likeverdige aktiviteter; det første verbet har fått avbleket betydning og tjener her nærmest bare til å understreke varigheten av den aktiviteten som det andre verbet uttrykker. De innledende verbene står på overgangen til å bli hjelpeverb med grammatisk betydning. (1997:534)

The semantic difference between ordinary coordinated verb phrases and pseudocoordinated verb phrases is reflected in their syntactic behaviour. Faarlund et al. compare the sentences
Barna tegner og skriver and Barna sitter og skriver, illustrating differences in behaviour when they are negated or turned into a yes/no-question and differences in the acceptability of reversing the order of conjuncts (1997:534-35):

Negation: In verb phrases of ordinary coordination each verb may be negated, whereas with pseudocoordinated verb phrases the negating element is placed after the first verb:

(16) a. Barna tegner ikke og skriver ikke.
    b. Barna sitter ikke og skriver.

In this respect pseudocoordination is similar to constructions with auxiliary verbs:

d. Barna vil ikke skrive.

Yes/no-question: In constructions with pseudocoordination the subject is placed after the first verb when the structure is turned into a yes/no-question:

(17) a. Tegner og skriver barna?
    b. Sitter barna og skriver?
    c. * Sitter og skriver barna?

Also in this respect pseudocoordination is similar to constructions with auxiliary verbs:
d. Vil barna skrive?

_Reversibility:_ In constructions of ordinary coordination the order of the verb phrases may be reversed, whereas with pseudocoordination the two verb phrases cannot be reversed.25

(18)  

(a) Barna skriver og tegner.
(b) *Barna skriver og sitter.

Other writers on the subject have noted additional differences:

_Obligatory ellipsis of subject in pseudocoordination:_ Constructions with pseudocoordination have obligatory ellipsis of the subject in the second conjunct; structures with ordinary coordination do not (Teleman et al. 1999:903, Jørgensen 2000:123):

(19)  

(a) Barna skriver, og de/barna tegner.
(b) *Barna sitter og de/barna skriver.26

_Acceptability of både ... og:_ Pseudocoordinated verb phrases cannot be coordinated with the compound coordinator _både...og_ (see 2.3.3) (Teleman 1999:903, Jørgensen 2000:122):

(20)  

(a) Barna både skriver og tegner.
(b) *Barna både sitter og skriver.

---

24 The sentence is not unacceptable, but in this form it is no longer an example of pseudocoordination, but of ordinary coordination.

25 The order of the conjuncts in asymmetric ‘ordinary’ coordinate structures (see 2.3.6) may not be reversed, so the test will not distinguish between such examples and examples of pseudocoordination.

26 The sentence is not unacceptable as such, but in this form it is interpreted as ordinary coordination of two equal verb phrases and is thus no longer an example of pseudocoordination.
Despite all the tests, it is not always easy to draw the line between pseudocoordination and ordinary coordination. The problem arises in examples with one or more adverbials intervening between the first and the second verb phrase, as in (21), (22) and (23):

(21)  Det var dørgende fullt av mennesker, og alle storkarene som skulle lage lover, stod sammen i to rækker foran kirkedøra og hyllet Christian Frederik da han kom gående fra Verket.  

(KAL1)

(22)  Jackeline satt i en sofa med hvitt varetrekk med innadvendt blikk og blåste grå røyk ut i rommet.  

(TB1)

(23)  Han sitter på et hotellrom i New York og vet ikke om han skal ta telefonen.  

(KH1)

Do we have to do with asymmetric coordinated verb phrases with an aspectual interpretation or coordination of two separate and equally important verb phrases? In (21), (22) and (23) the lexical meaning of the first verb is not reduced in the same way as in *Hun sitter og leser en bok*. The gradience between pseudocoordination and other coordination has been noted in the literature (Digranes 2000:120-122, 126, Vannebo 1969:59, Teleman et al. 1999):

Gränsen mellan pseudosamordning och vanlig verbfrassamordning är flytande. Ju fler egna bestämningar som står omedelbart efter det första verbet, desto svagare är förbindelsens karaktär av pseudosamordning. (Teleman et al. 1999:903)

The observation is made for Swedish constructions of pseudocoordination, but it may also be said to hold true for the Norwegian constructions. Many of the examples treated in this chapter have one or more adverbials intervening between the first and the second conjunct and are, therefore, not as clear-cut examples of pseudocoordination as examples (1) - (15) above. Some of the examples treated here may even be said to favour a non-pseudocoordination
reading. Such examples are, nevertheless, treated here under pseudocoordination, as this thesis is not concerned with the phenomenon of pseudocoordination itself, but rather with differences between English and Norwegian in the area of *og*/*and* coordination. Moreover, as the borderline between ordinary coordination and pseudocoordination is not always easy to draw and several of the examples have proved difficult to categorise, I found it useful to treat related examples of coordinated verb phrases with *sitte, stå, ligge, gå, være* etc. together. Although there are some borderline examples, the great majority of the examples in the material are genuine examples of pseudocoordination.

### 6.2 Corpus findings and discussion

#### 6.2.1 Comments on the material

In section 6.1.1 the different types of pseudocoordination in the material were identified and illustrated with examples. Before embarking on a more thorough presentation of the distribution of these constructions and a discussion of their translations into English, the material itself needs commenting on. One of the principles according to which the material was selected was to include only sentence pairs where the information of both original conjuncts was retained in the translation (see 4.2). Following this principle, a number of pseudocoordination examples were discarded from the material, such as (24) and (25), where only the second verb is represented in the translation:

(24) a. *Alle stod og stirret spent etter ham.*

(THA1)
b. Everyone stared anxiously after him.

(25) a. ‘Nina, hva er det du sitter og smiler av?’

b. ‘Nina, what are you smiling about?’

As has been noted, pseudocoordination implies an asymmetric relation between the coordinated verbs, where the meaning of the first verb is often reduced and the verb serves to indicate an aspectual reading. Consequently, it is not unexpected to find translations in which only the second verb is represented. The notion of ongoingness in (25a) is adequately captured by the English progressive in (25b). Given the focus of this thesis, examples of Norwegian pseudocoordination (e.g. Hun satt og leste) being rendered by English pseudocoordination (She sat and read) (see 2.3.7) are also excluded from the material. With these two groups of possible correspondences left out, the discussion cannot give the whole picture of the relation between Norwegian and English in this area.

6.2.2 The distribution of the different Norwegian pseudocoordination constructions

Not all types of pseudocoordinated structures are equally frequent. Several of the types illustrated in 6.1.1 are one-off examples in the material, while others, such as constructions with sitte and stå, are numerous. The distribution of the different structures is set out in table 6.1:
Table 6.1: Distribution of the types of pseudocoordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of pseudocoordination</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbs of position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sitte og ...</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stå og ...</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ligge og ...</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>henge og ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>være og ...</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbs of movement</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gå og ...</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komme og ...</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fare og ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stumpe rundt og ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>løpe og ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other verbs</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holde på og ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta og ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skulle og ...</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>få og ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By far the largest group of constructions, with 185 examples in total, are those involving a positional verb. Structures with *sitte*, *stå*, *ligge*, *henge* and *være* account for 82.2% of the total number of examples. Within this group, constructions with *sitte* and *stå* are the most frequent, totalling 76 and 67 examples, respectively. *Ligge* occurs in 26 examples, *henge* in one, while constructions with *være* are found in 15 examples.

---

27 Subsumed under the verbs here are also forms of their ‘nynorsk’ equivalents.
Structures where the first verb denotes movement, such as with gå, komme, fare, stumpe rundt and løpe, are found in 31 examples, and this accounts for 13.8% of the total number of examples. Constructions with gå are most frequent, figuring in 19 examples, while pseudocoordination with komme occurs in nine examples and constructions with fare, stumpe rundt and løpe are found in one example each.

Of the other constructions, only the one with skulde and a coordinated main verb is found in more than one example. The examples with holde på og ..., ta og ... and få og ... are only one-off examples in the material.

6.2.3 English correspondences of Norwegian pseudocoordination

Table 6.2 gives an overview of the types of incorporating strategies found in the English translations. The translations divide into four groups; one comprising examples where one of the conjuncts is rendered by an -ing clause, one where one of the conjuncts is rendered by a to-infinitive clause, one where it is represented in the translation by a prepositional phrase and one comprising translations of other types.
Table 6.2: English translations of Norwegian pseudocoordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of verbs</th>
<th>-ing clause</th>
<th>to-infinitive clause</th>
<th>prep. phrase</th>
<th>other structures</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sitte og ...</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stå og ...</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ligge og ...</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>henge og ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>være og ...</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gå og ...</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komme og ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fare og ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stumpe rundt og</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>løpe og ...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holde på og ...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta og ...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skulle og ...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>få og ...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.3.1 -Ing clauses

In as many as 171 translations of Norwegian pseudocoordination one of the original conjuncts is rendered by an -ing clause. This accounts for 76% of the examples. In almost all of these

---

28 Subsumed under the verbs here are also forms of their ‘nynorsk’ equivalents.
examples it is the second verb that is represented by an \(-ing\) clause (26), but there are a few examples where the positional verb itself is rendered by an \(-ing\) clause, as in (27) and (28):

(26) a. Det var akkurat som om vi satt og ventet på et eller annet.  
     (LSC2)
     b. It was just as if we were sitting there waiting for something.

(27) a. Han bad dem ikke om å sette seg, enda de stod og ruvet over ham.  
     (KA1)
     b. He didn’t invite them to sit down, although they towered above him standing.

(28) a. Likevel satt hun på en ulveskinnspels som lensmannen hadde rusket til seg på russehandel og frøs.  
     (HW2)
     b. Nonetheless, sitting on a wolfskin the sheriff had bought in Russia, she shivered with cold.

Translations where one of the original conjuncts is rendered by an \(-ing\) clause are especially common in constructions with some of the positional verbs, such as sitte, stå and ligge, and constructions with gå:

(29) a. Lille Bever satt lenge og så på ham.  
     (SH1)
     b. Little Beaver sat looking at him for a long time.

(30) a. De står og småfryser i den spisse vårluften.  
     (BV1)
     b. They stood shivering in the sharp spring air.

(31) a. Systuen spredde seg på soverommet også, der inne lå den lille broren på gulvet og leste i en tykk bok med bibliotekbind på.  
     (BV1)
b. The sewing-room spread over into the bedroom, where Judith’s little brother lay on the floor reading out of a large library book.

(32) a. Skulle ikke hatt lov å gå rundt og si BÆ.

b. Shouldn’t be allowed to go around saying BAAA.

Sixty-eight of in total seventy-six constructions with sitte are translated this way. Of the constructions with stå, fifty-seven of sixty-seven examples have this type of translation, and among the constructions with ligge, the ratio is twenty-three to twenty-six. Of the constructions with gå, thirteen of in all nineteen examples have an -ing clause translation. With all of these constructions, then, the typical pattern is for one of the conjuncts to be rendered by an -ing clause in the English translation.

Also in some of the English renderings of constructions with være (+ adverbial) og... the second conjunct is represented by an -ing clause; five of in all fifteen translations are similar to (33):

(33) a. Og da aldri å kunne svare: ‘Å, hun er ute og danser,’ eller ‘Hun er i selskap!’

b. They were never able to answer, ‘Oh, she’s out dancing,’ or ‘She’s at a party!’

6.2.3.2 To-infinitive clauses

The second largest group of translations comprises examples where one of the original conjuncts is represented in the translation by a to-infinitive clause. This type of restructuring is found in twenty-nine translations and accounts for about 13% of the examples. Translations of this type are found with several of the pseudocoordination constructions, but taking into
account the percentage of the total occurrences of a certain construction, it is most commonly used with constructions involving være og ..., komme og ..., and skulle og ...:

(34) a. De kongelige *hadde vært* om bord og *bedt* farvel før han dro ut. 
   (KH1)

b. Royalty *had been* on board *to bid farewell* before Shackleton sailed.

(35) a. ‘*Du kom ikkje og henta* meg,’ seier ho, prøver å seie det lett, 
   (EH1)

b. ‘You didn’t *come to get me,*’ she says, attempting to say it casually,

(36) a. ‘*Vi skal opp og tegne,*’ sier Benedikte. 
   (BV2)

b. *We’re going upstairs to draw,* says Benedikte.

Translations of this type are found in seven of in total fifteen translations of være og ..., seven of the nine constructions with komme og ... and four of in total six constructions with skulle og ....

6.2.3.3 Prepositional phrases

In fourteen examples one of the conjuncts is rendered by a prepositional phrase in the English translation. Such translations are found as renderings of several of the different types of pseudocoordination constructions, and no construction in particular seems to be especially frequently translated in this manner. Consider some of the examples:

(37) a. Det eneste som var i veien med meg (etterat jeg fikk begynne med pillene), var at jeg *satt og brant* av lengsel etter å bli alene med mitt begjær.
   (KF1)
b. My only problem (after he decided to start me on the pills) was that I sat there with a fervent longing to be alone with my desire.

(38) a. Karene gikk rundt romluken og sturte. (HW1)
   b. The men walked around the boat hatches with long faces.

(39) a. Der satt jeg et kvarters tid og var elendig. (LSC2)
   b. I sat there in misery for fifteen minutes.

(40) a. Vi skulle ned og bade. (KF2)
   b. We had been on our way down for a swim.

(41) a. En havgående flåte skal til Vest-India og drive øvelser. (KH1)
   b. An ocean-going squadron was to go to the West Indies on manoeuvres.

Five of the prepositional phrases are like (37) and (38), being headed by the preposition with. The reoccurrence of with in these prepositional phrases mirrors the trend observed in similar translations of ordinary coordination (see 4.4.4).

6.2.3.4 Other structures

Not all the translations fit the categories described above; eleven of the translations are different and have been grouped together under ‘other structures’. Among other things, we find translations where one of the conjuncts is rendered by a finite clause (42), translations where one of the conjuncts is incorporated into the main clause as an adverb phrase (43) and an example where the second conjunct is rendered by a verbless clause (44):
(42) a. Jeg sto brydd og ble avkledd som en liten pike.  
    b. I stood there paralysed with embarrassment while she undressed me like a little girl.

(43) a. Hunden lå og sov i solskinnet på gulvteppet.  
    b. The dog lay asleep in the sunshine on the carpet.

(44) a. Men her sitter han og er kapellmester på en amerikabåt.  
    b. But here he is, a musician on a ship going to America.

6.2.3.5 -Ing clause vs. to-infinitive clause

If we take a closer look at the types of pseudocoordination constructions that have been translated with complex structures involving an -ing clause on the one hand and a to-infinitive clause on the other hand, we see that the types of constructions receiving one type of translation are different from the constructions receiving the other translation. The differences in the translations reflect differences in the originals. The constructions where one of the conjuncts is rendered by an -ing clause are primarily those with an aspectual interpretation of ongoingness (see 6.1.1):

(45) a. Kjersti sitter og sukker ned i kaffen.  
    b. Kersti sits sighing into her coffee.

    b. The doorman was helpfulness personified: he would point out the direction you should take, or stand there holding you upright until your taxi arrived.
Constructions where the focus is directed more towards the initial state of the verbal activity (see 6.1.1) have been translated with complex structures with an incorporated to-infinitive clause:

(49) a. En kelner kom og flyttet askebegrene bort før han spurte hva jeg ville ha.  
    (GS1)
b. A waiter came to remove the ashtrays before asking me what I would like.

(50) a. Hun skal opp til Judith og se på at fru Bendixen trykker på stoff.  
    (BV1)
b. She is going up to Judith’s to see how Mrs Bendixen does her printing on material.

(51) a. ‘Ja, eg får bort og hjelpa dei nokre timar igjen.’  
    (KFL1)
b. Yes, I’m going over to help them for a few hours again.

The two groups of constructions, with their different translations, can be illustrated by the two types of gå-constructions (see 6.1.1). The coordinate structure in (52) denotes ongoingness, and has an -ing clause translation, whereas (53), which is less durative and directs the focus rather on the initial state of the verbal activity, has a to-infinitive translation:
Three of the constructions with gå have a similar reading to that of (53), and they have all been given a to-infinitive translation.

The constructions with være (+ adverbial) og... may seem to contradict the observations above. In 6.1.1 the construction was said to denote ongoingness, as with the other verbs of position (see 6.1.1), yet in as many as seven of them one of the conjuncts has been rendered by a to-infinitive clause:

Although the coordinate structures convey the notion of ongoingness, the to-infinitive translations seem to work well. This is because, as Faarlund et al. observe, the constructions with være (+ adverbial) og ...express the purpose of the verbal activity and are semantically equivalent to constructions with ‘for å + infinitive’ (1997:537):
6.2.3.6 Adverbials

In many of the examples quoted above there were no adverbial elements between the first and the second verb. In the material generally, however, a lot of the examples are like (56), (57) and (58), in having one or more adverbial elements separating the two verbs:

(56)  a. Han gikk langsomm og viftet en avis foran ansiktet.  
      (OEL1)  
      b. He walked slowly, waving a newspaper in front of his face.

(57)  a. Jeg sitter i kjøkkenhytta til Rachel og ser på henne tilberede middagen.  
      (TB1)  
      b. I’m sitting in Rachel’s kitchen-hut watching her prepare dinner.

(58)  a. Han stod fremdeles bak stolen og ventet på at han skulle kommentere papirene.  
      (OEL1)  
      b. He continued to stand behind the chair, waiting for him to pass comment on the documents.

Only seventy-three of the 225 examples of pseudocoordination have no adverbial elements between the first verb and the second verb. This is about 32% of the examples, and examples (56), (57) and (58) are thus representative of about 68% of the material. As in the examples above, the adverbials provide information about where or how the sitting, the standing, the lying etc. take place. Some of the examples with intervening adverbials are, as noted in 6.1.2, intermediate between pseudocoordination and ordinary coordination.
In a number of examples an interesting change is made in the English translation compared to the original. In twenty-six translations the adverb *there* is inserted, without having any source in the original:

(59) a. Jeg ble sittende og se på mitt.  
    b. I sat *there* looking at mine.

(60) a. Han sto og mønstret rommet prøvende.  
    b. He stood *there* scrutinizing the room.

(61) a. De står en stund og utveksler vanskelige, britiske mynter, men ingen ord.  
    b. They stood *there* for a moment, exchanging difficult British coins, but no words.

This *there* insertion seems to strengthen the importance of the initial verb compared to the original. The sitting or the standing is given more prominence in the translations than in the Norwegian originals. Compare the translations above with one without *there*:

(62) a. De står og småfryser i den spisse vårluften.  
    b. They *stood shivering* in the sharp spring air.

In this example, the translation appears to be more in accordance with the original as regards the informational status of the first verb. In both the original and the translation the shivering comes across as informationally more prominent than the standing. *There* is inserted in constructions with positional verbs only, and is mainly found with *sitte* and *stå*. 
6.2.3.7 Comma

In as many as sixty-eight of the English -ing clause translations there is a comma between the -ing clause and the matrix clause. This accounts for 39.8% of all the -ing translations and 30.2% of all the English translations of Norwegian pseudocoordination. Consider some of the examples:

(63)  
  a. Den gamle skjelvande kjerringa sit i stolen ved ovnen og strikkar.  
  b. The quaking old woman sits in the chair by the stove, knitting.  

(64)  
  a. Han gikk fram og tilbake på gulvet og ventet på at pillen skulle virke.  
  b. He paced the floor, waiting for the pill to work.  

(65)  
  a. Jeg som står der i vinddraget på bruvingen og holder på den vesle hvalpe-stakkaren som snart skulle dø.  
  b. I stand in a current of air on the bridge, holding the little puppy who was soon to die.

The -ing clauses here resemble the -ing correspondences of ordinary coordination; two situations hold true side by side, taking place simultaneously. In some of the examples that have a comma between the -ing clause and the matrix clause the translations give a slightly different impression of the relationship between the verbal elements than that which exists in the original. Consider an example:

(66)  
  a. Han satt midt på golvet og gråt.  
  b. He was sitting in the middle of the floor, crying.
In the Norwegian original the main focus of information is the *crying*, not the *sitting*, whereas in the translation *was sitting* in the matrix clause is informationally more prominent than *crying* in the *-ing* clause. A similar change can be observed in the following examples:

(67)  
   a. I vinduskarmen *stod* en syk blomst og *skreik* etter vann.  
   b. On the windowsill *was* a sick flower, *screaming* for water.

(68)  
   a. Brødene *lå* ennå på benken og *dampet av seg*.  
   b. The loaves still *sat* on the counter, *steaming*.

(69)  
   a. De *står* en stund og *utveksler* vanskelige, britiske mynter, men ingen ord.  
   b. They *stood* there for a moment, *exchanging* difficult British coins, but no words.

In other examples the translations work better:

(70)  
   a. Rachel *sitter* bredbeint på en liten krakk og *lager* ugali, en slags maisgrøt.  
   b. Rachel *sits* on a stool with her legs apart, *making* ugali, a kind of maize porridge.

(71)  
   a. De *satt* sammen foran peisilden og *spiste* resten av tiursteika.  
   b. They *were sitting* by the hearth in front of the open fire, *eating* the rest of the meat from the wood grouse.

In these two examples the Norwegian originals appear to be less pseudocoordination-like than in the examples above. It seems as if *-ing* translations where the *-ing* clause is separated from the matrix clause by a comma work better with constructions that have a reading which is
closer to ordinary coordination. Most of the originals that have an -ing clause translation where the -ing clause is separated from the matrix by a comma have one or more intervening adverbial between the two verbs, and the coordinate structures may be interpreted either as pseudocoordination constructions or as ordinary coordination of two separate events. In such constructions the lexical meaning of the first verb is not reduced in the same way as in prototypical pseudocoordination. Examples (70) and (71) may be compared with (72) where the Norwegian coordinate structure is an example of genuine pseudocoordination:

(72) a. De står og småfryser i den spisse vårluften. (BV1)
    b. They stood shivering in the sharp spring air.

In (72a) stå is clearly informationally subordinate to småfryse and the coordinate structure as a whole has an aspectual interpretation of ongoingness. Here the -ing clause in the translation is more integrated into the main clause and is informationally more prominent than the -ing clauses in (70) and (71). In (72b) shivering is more prominent than stood, and the translation thus reflects the verbal relationship of the source structure.

### 6.3 Concluding remarks

This chapter has provided an overview of the English translations of Norwegian pseudocoordination in cases where one of the original conjuncts is incorporated as a subordinate clause or as a phrase in the translation. We have seen that the most common type of incorporation is for one of the conjuncts to be rendered by an -ing clause. In addition to translations with -ing clauses, there are translations where one of the conjuncts is incorporated
as a *to*-infinitive clause or as a prepositional phrase. In as many as 68% of the coordinate structures one or more adverbials are positioned between the first and the second verb, and it was noted that such coordinate structures are less pseudocoordination-like than structures without an intervening adverbial.

It is important to point out the limitations of this study as compared with a general study of English correspondences of Norwegian pseudocoordination. For one thing, we should note that parts of the material comprise examples which are less pseudocoordination-like than the most typical examples, having adverbial elements positioned between the first and the second verb, and, secondly, one should remember that three types of possible correspondences of Norwegian pseudocoordination have not been considered at all, i.e. English pseudocoordination (*sat* and *read*), simple verb forms (*read*) and the progressive (*was reading*) (see 6.2.1). It would, however, be an interesting extension of this project to study all English correspondences of Norwegian pseudocoordination. It is likely that English pseudocoordination, simple verb forms and the progressive construction would be among the correspondences, together with the constructions found in this material. If one takes the construction *sitte og ...* in an example like *Hun satt og leste*, there are several possible translations; the types found in my material (73a), (73b), (73c), English pseudocoordination (73d) or a progressive construction (73e).

(73)  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>She sat reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>She sat there reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>She was sitting there, reading. / She sat there, reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

29 In a case like this, where there is no complement after the second verb, it would be unlikely to find a simple verb form as a translation (cf. example (24) in 6.2.1).
d. She sat and read.

e. She was reading.

It would be interesting to find out under which circumstances the different structures are used. In (73b) and (73c) the positional verb is given more prominence than in the other translations, whereas in (73e) the lexical meaning of the positional verb is not represented at all; only the notion of ongoingness is maintained. The translation in (73a) seems quite similar to its original as far as the relationship between the verbs is concerned. The use of one construction rather than the other might be dependent on the degree to which the lexical meaning of first verb is reduced in the original. In translations of source structures where there is an adverbial immediately following the first verb, specifying where or how somebody sits, stands, lies etc, one is not likely to get a translation like (73e), since much of the original content would then be lost. To include the adverbial information, the positional verb itself has to be included. The progressive construction is expected to be found in translations of prototypical pseudocoordinated structures without intervening adverbials and with an aspectual interpretation of ongoingness. For a further study of pseudocoordination and its correspondences it seems, based on experiences in the present analysis, useful to operate with a clearer definition of what to regard as pseudocoordination, and also to group and discuss the various examples according to their position along the pseudocoordination-ordinary coordination gradient.

Finally, the number of pseudocoordination structures in the material needs commenting on. Pseudocoordination chiefly belongs to an oral and narrative style. The material discussed here is taken from fiction texts only, and there are, therefore, probably
more examples of pseudocoordination in this material than would have been the case if other
types of texts had been included as well.
Chapter 7  Conclusion

7.1 Research questions revisited

This thesis has been concerned with examples where Norwegian verbal or clausal coordination has been translated by subordinate structures in English; one of the original conjuncts has been rendered by a subordinate clause or by a phrase in the English translation. The main aim of the thesis was to answer the following questions: a) what kind of syntactic structures are found in the English translations, b) what are the characteristics of the Norwegian coordinate structures subject to this change, and c) does the shift from coordination to subordination cause any differences in meaning between the originals and the translations?

The types of subordinate clauses and phrases figuring as translations of one of the original conjuncts are: finite adverbial clauses, relative clauses, -ing clauses, to-infinitive clauses, -ed clauses, verbless clauses and prepositional phrases, and in addition some minor groups of correspondences grouped under ‘other structures’. Correspondences vary somewhat depending upon whether there is pseudocoordination or ordinary coordination in the Norwegian original text. Complex sentences with -ing clauses are the most common type of translation in the material, accounting for about 59% of the translations of ordinary coordination and 76% of the renderings of Norwegian pseudocoordination in the material.

Most of the subordinate clauses in the English translations are non-finite. They are usually sentence-final, and they typically occur without an explicit subject and without a
subordinator explicitly signalling the semantic relationship to the matrix clause. Though there are exceptions (the finite adverbial clauses, the to-infinitive clauses and the restrictive relative clauses), the semantic relation holding between the subordinate clauses and their matrix clause is as indeterminate as the relationship holding between the conjuncts in the coordinate structure.

The kind of structures found as translations of Norwegian pseudocoordination are more limited than the structures figuring as translations of ordinary coordination. The main groups of translations of pseudocoordination are -ing clauses, to-infinitive clause and prepositional phrases, with -ing clauses and to-infinitive clauses accounting for about 89% of the examples. The high number of -ing clauses and to-infinitive clauses and the absence of other types of translations may be explained with reference to the type of coordination involved. The pseudocoordinated verb phrases in the material convey aspectual meanings which seem to be captured by the -ing construction and the to-infinitive construction in English.

The two types of Norwegian coordinate structures were about equally common: ordinary coordination (53.2%) and pseudocoordination (46.8%). Most of the examples of ordinary coordination are predicate coordinated structures (75.4%). As many as eighty-two of the 256 examples of ordinary coordination comprise a direct speech construction (32%). The coordinate structures were not systematically classified for the semantic relation conveyed, but coordinate structures of the ordinary type were often observed to convey a strictly additive meaning. The pseudocoordination examples form a less heterogeneous group, as many types of structures are represented in the material. However, constructions with positional verbs are most frequent, accounting for 82.2% of the examples. The two constructions sitte og VP and
stå og VP account for 63.6% of the pseudocoordination examples alone. Typically, the pseudocoordination examples in my material have one or more adverbials intervening between the first and the second verb; only 32% of the examples occur without an adverbial. The many adverbials make these structures more similar to ordinary coordination than more prototypical pseudocoordination, and some of the examples were noted for their indeterminacy between pseudocoordination and ordinary coordination.

One of the recurrent trends in the material is that it is the second conjunct that is subordinated in the English translations. In the examples of ordinary coordination the second conjunct was subordinated in 92.2% of the material. With few exceptions, the information ordering of the translation is similar to the original; if the subordinate clause is a translation of the second conjunct, it is positioned sentence-finally, and if it is a rendering of the first conjunct, it is placed sentence-initially. Though the translators change the syntactic structure, they keep the order in which the information is presented.

As has been observed throughout the analysis, the shift from coordination to subordination brings with it a semantic downgrading of the information expressed in the subordinate clause. The equal status of the information conveyed by the conjuncts in the source structure is lost in the translations, and the proposition expressed in the subordinate clause is backgrounded compared to the matrix proposition. However, a distinction must be drawn between translations of ordinary coordination and pseudocoordination. Pseudocoordinated structures are themselves asymmetric, and the hypotactic relationship in the translations may be seen as a reflection of the hypotactic relationship in the original. Generally, the aspecual interpretation of the pseudocoordinated structures is reflected by the structures figuring in the translations.
Several of the syntactic structures in the translations of ordinary coordination were noted for their similarity in meaning to coordinate structures. In their indeterminacy as to the semantic relation implied, participle clauses and verbless clauses without a subordinator, and non-restrictive relative clauses resemble coordinate structures with _and/or_. Apart from differences to do with semantic downgrading of the information in the subordinate clause or the incorporated phrase, differences between originals and translations are most noticeable in translations with restrictive relative clauses, _to_-infinitive clauses, finite adverbial clauses introduced by _as_, and _-ing_ participle clauses. Restrictive relative clauses play a part in defining a person or an entity; they do not merely provide additional information as in the case of non-restrictive clauses, and this defining aspect does not have a parallel in the coordinate structure. Most of the _to_-infinitive clauses are purposive clauses, and, as was observed in the discussion, the purposive relation is not always unquestionably licensed by the original. Several of the coordinate structures in this group might lend themselves to a purposive reading, but this is not primarily the semantic relation one is aware of when reading them, and, as such, the _to_-infinitive translations stress the purposive aspect as compared to the originals. As regards the translations with finite adverbial _as_-clauses, they were said to emphasize the temporal aspect as compared to their source structures. It is questionable whether the co-temporality signalled by _as_ always reflects the temporal relation in the original structures. The same applies to the temporal relation in some of the _-ing_ clause translations. These translations suggest that the event described in the _-ing_ clause takes place at the same time as the event described in the matrix clause, but, as was noted in the discussion, it is questionable whether all the Norwegian coordinate structures translated in this way denote simultaneity of time. More research needs to be done in this area.
Generally, the study has confirmed the observation made in 2.4.3 that similar semantic relationships may be conveyed by coordination and subordination. In the discussion of the relationship between coordination and subordination it was noted that non-finite clauses might be seen as more subordinate than finite clauses. Interestingly, however, the material investigated here has shown that it is more common for coordinate structures to be translated with structures involving non-finite clauses than finite clauses. This may be because non-finite clauses often occur without a subordinator, and when they do, their relationship to their matrix clause resembles the relationship in the coordinate structures.

The English translations have brought to attention different aspects of the functions and meanings of Norwegian coordination with *og*. The different groups of translations cluster around certain meanings, viz. the purposive aspect in the *to*-infinitive translations, the temporal aspect in the translations with finite adverbial clauses, accompaniment in the many *with* phrases, and the pure additional meaning reflected in the many *-ing* clauses of accompanying circumstance. Though the purposive aspect is emphasized in the translations as compared to the originals, there must be something about the meaning conveyed by certain Norwegian coordinate structures which triggers this type of translation. In this connection, it is interesting to note that both ordinary coordination and pseudocoordination receive translations of this type. The study has further highlighted the question of the temporal aspect of coordinate structures with *og*, and it has brought to attention the area of overlap between ordinary coordination and pseudocoordination. The gradience between ordinary coordination and pseudocoordination is shown not only in the difficulty of categorising the material, but is also reflected in the similar types of translations the two groups of structures receive.

The findings presented in this thesis should be seen in relation to the figures presented
in chapter 3 concerning the overall relationship between *og* and *and* in the ENPC. Coordinate structures with *og* correspond to coordinate structures with *and* in 88.75% of the occurrences of *og* in Norwegian original texts in the ENPC, and the 481 examples analysed here account for only 28.2% of the 1708 ‘*og* NOT *and*’ examples in Norwegian original fiction texts. Thus, the material studied here accounts for a fairly small portion of all the occurrences of *og* in the corpus. However, the figures presented in chapter 3 include all types of coordination, not only verb phrase or clause coordination, so the relative proportion of the examples studied here to the total sum of verb phrase or clause coordination in the ENPC is considerably higher. In spite of the agreement in the majority of cases, the study has revealed a number of interesting features of coordination in Norwegian vs. English, including differences which could hardly be revealed without access to a bilingual corpus.

### 7.2 Suggestions for further work

A natural extension of the present investigation would be to study Norwegian translations of English coordination to see to what extent English coordinate structures are rendered by subordinate structures in Norwegian. The pilot study showed that the change from coordination to subordination was more frequent when translating into English than when translating into Norwegian, but a larger study would provide a more accurate picture of the cross-linguistic relation between coordination and subordination in English and Norwegian. It would also be interesting to compare the examples discussed here with examples where there is correspondence between *og* and *and* to see if there are any patterns for when the coordinate construction is maintained and when it is changed.
The study of -ing coordination as translations of Norwegian og coordinated structures raised interesting questions to do with the temporal relation involved in the two structures, and the discussion drew attention to the need for further studies into the relationship between og coordination and and coordination on the one hand, and og coordination and -ing coordination on the other hand (see 5.2.5 and 5.3).

As regards pseudocoordination, a natural extension of the present project would be to study all types of English correspondences to Norwegian pseudocoordination (see 6.3). As the limited scope of the thesis allowed an analysis only of some of the possible correspondences, more work is needed to gain a better understanding of the relation between Norwegian and English in this area.
References


## Appendix: Texts in the ENPC

### Fiction texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Title original</th>
<th>Title translation</th>
<th>Publisher original</th>
<th>Publisher translation</th>
<th>Place and Year orig./trans.</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atwood, Margaret</td>
<td>Gjelsvik, Inger</td>
<td><em>Cat’s Eye</em></td>
<td><em>Katteøyet</em></td>
<td>McClelland and Stewart Inc.</td>
<td>H. Aschehoug &amp; Co</td>
<td>Toronto, 1988/Oslo, 1989</td>
<td>MA1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brink, André</td>
<td>Malde, Per</td>
<td><em>The Wall of the Plague</em></td>
<td><em>Pestens mar</em></td>
<td>Faber and Faber Ltd</td>
<td>H. Aschehoug &amp; Co</td>
<td>London, 1984/Oslo, 1984</td>
<td>ABR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatwin, Bruce</td>
<td>Greiff, Aud</td>
<td><em>Utz</em></td>
<td><em>Utz</em></td>
<td>Jonathan Cape</td>
<td>H. Aschehoug &amp; Co</td>
<td>London, 1988/Oslo, 1989</td>
<td>BC1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, Robertson</td>
<td>Naishagen, Erik</td>
<td><em>What’s Bred in the Bone</em></td>
<td><em>Den gamle Adam</em></td>
<td>Penguin Books Ltd</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS</td>
<td>Harmondsw. ‘85/Oslo, 1987</td>
<td>RDA1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle, Roddy</td>
<td>Herrman, Bjørn A.</td>
<td><em>Paddy Clarke Ha Ha Ha</em></td>
<td><em>Paddy Clarke Ha ha ha</em></td>
<td>Secker and Warburg</td>
<td>J. W. Cappelens Forlag AS</td>
<td>London, 1993/Oslo, 1994</td>
<td>RDO1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsyth, Frederick</td>
<td>Hoff, Gerd</td>
<td><em>The Fourth Protocol</em></td>
<td><em>Den fjerde protokoll</em></td>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS</td>
<td>London, 1984/Oslo, 1984</td>
<td>FF1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton, Sue</td>
<td>Rogde, Isak</td>
<td><em>“D” is for Deadbeat</em></td>
<td><em>“D” for druknet</em></td>
<td>Pan Books Ltd</td>
<td>Tiden Norsk Forlag</td>
<td>London, 1990/Oslo, 1993</td>
<td>SG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden, Torey</td>
<td>Nergaard, Jan</td>
<td><em>The Sunflower Forest</em></td>
<td><em>Solsikkeskogen</em></td>
<td>Grafton Books</td>
<td>Hjemmets Bokforlag AS</td>
<td>London, 1984/Oslo, 1986</td>
<td>TH1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heller, Joseph</td>
<td>Kari &amp; Kjell</td>
<td><em>Picture This</em></td>
<td><em>Se det</em></td>
<td>G.P. Putnam's Sons</td>
<td>J. W. Cappelens Forlag AS</td>
<td>New York, 1988/Oslo, 1989</td>
<td>JH1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, P.D.</td>
<td>Greiff, Aud</td>
<td><em>Devices and Desires</em></td>
<td><em>Intriger og begjær</em></td>
<td>Faber and Faber Ltd</td>
<td>H. Aschehoug &amp; Co</td>
<td>London, 1989/Oslo, 1990</td>
<td>PDJ3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okri, Ben Lange, Mona</td>
<td>The Famished Road</td>
<td>Den sulme veien</td>
<td>Jonathan Cape</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS</td>
<td>London, 1991</td>
<td>Oslo, 1993</td>
<td>BO1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend, Sue Larsen, Dag Heyerdahl</td>
<td>The Queen and I</td>
<td>Dronninga og Jeg</td>
<td>Methuen</td>
<td>J. W. Cappelens Forlag AS</td>
<td>London, 1992</td>
<td>Oslo, 1993</td>
<td>ST1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler, Anne Roald, Bodil</td>
<td>The Accidental Tourist</td>
<td>Tilfeldig turist</td>
<td>Alfred A. Knopf Inc.</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS</td>
<td>New York, 1985</td>
<td>Oslo, 1986</td>
<td>AT1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Norwegian originals:**

<p>| Alnæs, Karsten Engebretsen, Rune | Even 1814 | The Boy From Duck River | Aventura Forlag AS | North Star Press | Oslo, 1989 | St. Cloud, 1995 | KAL1 |
| Askildsen, Kjell Lyngstad, Sverre | En plutselig frigjørende tanke | A Sudden Liberating Thought | Oktober Forlag AS | Norvik Press | Oslo, 1987 | Norwich, 1994 | KA1 |
| Brekke, Toril Born, Anne | Jakarandablomsten | The Jacaranda Flower | Oktober Forlag AS | Methuen | Oslo, 1985 | London, 1987 | TB1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Translator(s)</th>
<th>Publisher 1</th>
<th>Location 1</th>
<th>Publisher 2</th>
<th>Location 2</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faldbakken, Knut</td>
<td>Adams dagbok</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS</td>
<td>Oslo, 1978</td>
<td>Univ. of Nebraska Press</td>
<td>Lincoln, 1988</td>
<td>KF1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flogstad, Kjartan</td>
<td>Dalen Portland Dollar Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>Det Norske Samlaget</td>
<td>Oslo, 1978</td>
<td>Louisiana State Univ. Press</td>
<td>Baton Rouge, '89</td>
<td>KFL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauger, Torill Thorstad Paulsen, Marlys Wick</td>
<td>Røvet av vikinger Captured by the Vikings</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS Breakwater</td>
<td>Oslo, 1978</td>
<td>Newfoundland, 1991</td>
<td>TTH1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmås, Stig Born, Anne</td>
<td>Tordensønnen Son-of-Thunder</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS Spindlewood</td>
<td>Oslo, 1985</td>
<td>Barnstaple, 1990</td>
<td>SH1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt, Kåre Tate, Joan</td>
<td>Kappløpet The Race</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS Michael Joseph Ltd</td>
<td>Oslo, 1976</td>
<td>London, 1976</td>
<td>KH1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie, Sissel Born, Anne</td>
<td>Løvens hjerte Lion's Heart</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS Orkney Press Ltd</td>
<td>Oslo, 1988</td>
<td>Kirkwall, 1990</td>
<td>SL1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lønn, Øystein McDuff, David</td>
<td>Tom Rebers siste retrett Tom Reber's Last Retreat</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS Marion Boyars</td>
<td>Oslo, 1988</td>
<td>London, 1992</td>
<td>OEL1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveid, Cecilie Christensen, Nadia M.</td>
<td>Sug Sea Swell</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS Quartet Books</td>
<td>Oslo, 1979</td>
<td>London, 1986</td>
<td>CL1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Translator</td>
<td>Title original</td>
<td>Title translation</td>
<td>Publisher original</td>
<td>Publisher translation</td>
<td>Place and year orig./trans.</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staalene, Gunnar</td>
<td>McDuff, David</td>
<td>I mørket er alle ulver grå</td>
<td>At Night All Wolves Are Grey</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS</td>
<td>Quartet Books Ltd</td>
<td>Oslo, 1983</td>
<td>GS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vik, Bjørk</td>
<td>McDuff, David</td>
<td>En håndfull lengsel</td>
<td>Out of Seasons and Other Stories</td>
<td>J. W. Cappelens Forlag AS</td>
<td>Sinclair Browne</td>
<td>Oslo, 1979</td>
<td>BV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wassmo, Herbjørk</td>
<td>Simpson, Allen</td>
<td>Huset med den blinde glassveranda</td>
<td>The House With the Blind Glass Windows</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS</td>
<td>The Seal Press</td>
<td>Oslo, 1981</td>
<td>HW1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wassmo, Herbjørk</td>
<td>Christensen, Nadia M.</td>
<td>Dinas bok</td>
<td>Dina's Book</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS</td>
<td>Black Swan</td>
<td>Oslo, 1992</td>
<td>HW2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiese, Jan</td>
<td>Geddes, Tom</td>
<td>Kvinnen som kledte seg naken for sin elskede</td>
<td>The Naked Madonna</td>
<td>Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS</td>
<td>The Harvill Press</td>
<td>Oslo, 1990</td>
<td>JW1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>Agreement on the European Economic Area Avtale om det europeiske økonomiske samarbeidsområde</td>
<td>European Union The Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Brussels, Oslo</td>
<td>AEEA 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, Robert Herman, Bjørn A.</td>
<td>Henry Miller - A Life Henry Miller - en biografi</td>
<td>Hutchinson J. W. Cappelens Forlag AS</td>
<td>London, Oslo</td>
<td>RF1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould, Stephen Jay Johansen, Knut</td>
<td>Hen's teeth and Horse's Toes Hønsetenner og hesteter</td>
<td>W. W. Norton &amp; Company J. W. Cappelens Forlag AS</td>
<td>New York, New York; Otta, Oslo</td>
<td>SJG1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings, Max Ree, Egil Johan</td>
<td>Victory in Europe Veien til Berlin</td>
<td>George Weidenfeld &amp; Nicolson Ltd Gydendal Norsk Forlag AS</td>
<td>London, Oslo</td>
<td>MH1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert, Mark Oksefjell, Tormod</td>
<td>The All-Colour Book of Nature Naturens verden</td>
<td>Golden Press Faktum Forlag AS</td>
<td>Sydney, Oslo</td>
<td>ML1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayle, Peter Wold, Ragnar</td>
<td>A Year in Provence Et år i Provence</td>
<td>Hamish Hamilton Kolibri Forlag</td>
<td>London, Oslo</td>
<td>PM1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Desmond</td>
<td>Animalwatching Se på dyrene - om dyrenes atferd</td>
<td>Jonathan Cape Ltd. Gydendal Norsk Forlag AS</td>
<td>London, Oslo</td>
<td>DM1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacks, Oliver Gulliksen, Rolf Behn</td>
<td>The Man Who Mistook his Wife for a Hat Mannen som forvekslet kona med en hatt</td>
<td>Pan Books, Picador J. W. Cappelens Forlag AS</td>
<td>London, Oslo</td>
<td>OS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagan, Carl Larsen, Finn B.</td>
<td>Cosmos Kosmos</td>
<td>Wings Books Universitetsforlaget AS</td>
<td>Avenel, NJ; Oslo, Oslo</td>
<td>CSA1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanger, Clyde</td>
<td>Safe and Sound: Disarmament and Development in the Eighties Nedrustning og utvikling</td>
<td>The Ministry of Foreign Affairs Zedd Press</td>
<td>London, Oslo</td>
<td>CS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberlake, Lloyd Larsen, Finn B.</td>
<td>Only One Earth - Living for the Future Bare én jord - Å leve for fremtiden</td>
<td>BBC Books/Earthscan J. W. Cappelens Forlag AS</td>
<td>London, Oslo</td>
<td>LT1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timerlake, Lloyd &amp; Laura Thomas</td>
<td>When the Bough Breaks... Det gjelder våre barn</td>
<td>Earthscan Publications Ltd Tiden Norsk Forlag AS</td>
<td>London, Oslo</td>
<td>LTLT 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian originals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Pål Espolin Røyskund, Conrad</td>
<td>Alt for Norge For Love of Norway</td>
<td>J. W. Cappelens Forlag AS University of Nebraska Press</td>
<td>Oslo, 1975 Lincoln, 1984</td>
<td>PEJ1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kommunaldepartementet Chaffey, Patrick N.</td>
<td>Kommuneloven Act Concerning Municipalities and County Municipalities</td>
<td>Lovdata The Ministry of Local Government and Labour</td>
<td>Oslo, 1992 Oslo, 1993</td>
<td>KL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lundestad, Geir Kvam, Gail Adams</td>
<td>East, West, North, South</td>
<td>Universitetsforlaget AS Universitetsforlaget AS</td>
<td>Oslo, 1991 Oslo, 1991</td>
<td>GL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norees</td>
<td>Årsmelding 1993</td>
<td>Norges forskningsråd</td>
<td>Oslo, 1994</td>
<td>NFRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forskningsråd</td>
<td>Annual Report 1993</td>
<td>Norges forskningsråd</td>
<td>Oslo, 1994</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norges forskningsråd</td>
<td>Vedtekter</td>
<td>Norges forskningsråd</td>
<td>Oslo, 1993</td>
<td>NFRV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prytz, Kåre Myhre, Liv Irene</td>
<td>Vestover for Columbus</td>
<td>H. Aschehoug &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Oslo, 1990</td>
<td>KP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosstad, Anna Zwick, Ann Clay</td>
<td>Leonardo da Vinci - I gådens form</td>
<td>Solum Forlag AS</td>
<td>Oslo, 1993</td>
<td>ANR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandnes, Jørn ed. Meltzer, Suzanne</td>
<td>Trondheim - Olavs by i tusen år</td>
<td>Trondheim kommune &amp; Strindheim Trykkeri</td>
<td>Trondheim, 1992</td>
<td>JS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Lucy &amp; Peter Lødrup Nyquist, Gunvor</td>
<td>Barn og foreldre</td>
<td>AD Notam Gyldendal AS</td>
<td>Oslo, 1981</td>
<td>LSPL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statens informasjonstjene ste</td>
<td>Småbarnsforeldres rettigheter</td>
<td>Statens informasjonstjeneste</td>
<td>Oslo, 1994</td>
<td>SI1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utenriksdepartementet The Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Norge - informasjon</td>
<td>Nytt fra Norge</td>
<td>Oslo, 1995</td>
<td>UD1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aarseth, Bjørn Aase, Jean</td>
<td>Samene igår og i dag</td>
<td>Norsk folkemuseum</td>
<td>Oslo, 1991</td>
<td>BAA1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>