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4 Formal Properties

This chapter consists of three parts. In Section 4.1 I discuss general issues concerning clauses and sentences, focusing on non-finite constructions and consequently on inflectional and derivational morphology. In Section 4.2 I address the coordination–subordination continuum and in Section 4.3, finally, I will discuss different linking strategies and the criteria by which these strategies may be distinguished from each other.

4.1. Sentences and clauses

4.1.1. Simple and multiple sentences

Sentences are either simple or multiple. While a simple sentence consists of a single independent clause, a multiple sentence contains more than one clause. Multiple sentences are either compound or complex (Quirk et al. 1985: 719). A compound sentence is made up by two or more coordinate clauses, but in a complex sentence one or more of its constituents are realized as a subordinate clause. Following Halliday (1985a: 193), we could state that a sentence is ‘the orthographic unit that is contained between full stops’, rather than a grammatical unit, and that a combination of clauses is the grammatical equivalent of a sentence. As Halliday (1985b: 66) argues, the clause is ‘the grammatical unit in which semantic constructs of different kinds are brought together and integrated into a whole’.

4.1.2. Clauses

Elaborating on Halliday’s definition of a clause as given above, we first have to determine which grammatical units are to be considered clauses.

Parting from a functional perspective, a clause is primarily a predication in which the relation between a predicate and its argument(s) is expressed. In the literature clauses have sometimes been considered grammatical units which are based on a finite verb. However, I agree with Quirk et al. (1985: 992) that clauses may be described in terms of finite, non-finite and verbless clauses. Non-finite and verbless structures may be recognized as clauses, because their internal structure can be analyzed into the same functional elements that are distinguished in finite clauses. Thus the verbless clause although always helpful in (1a) is as capable of being analyzed into clause elements as the corresponding finite clause (1b): whereas (1b) contains the conjunction although, the subject he, the finite verb form was, the
adverbial *always* and the subject complement *helpful*, (1a) manifests a sort of downgraded version of (1b) where the subject and the verb have been omitted, but all other clause elements are still present.

(1)  
(a) Although always helpful, he was not much liked
(b) Although he was always helpful, he was not much liked

### 4.1.3. Non-finite constructions

Non-finite verbal structures form a more complicated category, since they constitute the common ground in between the concepts of syntactic complexity and lexical density. Many languages use non-finite verb forms in, for instance, nominalized constructions. Mackenzie (1996) argues that languages that have the possibility to nominalize tend to do so because nominalization induces a reduction in syntactic complexity, and that from the point of view of semantics nominalization is employed for purposes of abstraction; on a pragmatic level, finally, nominalization may be regarded as a tool to produce more condensed information.

The problem which presents itself at this point is to determine to what extent non-finite verbal structures are to be considered clauses. In the following sections I will discuss two recent approaches to this domain (Haspelmath 1996, Mackenzie 1996), and subsequently I will try to reach a plausible solution of the this issue.

#### 4.1.3.1. Inflectional versus derivational morphology

The claim that word-class-changing morphology is restricted to the domain of derivation has been made over and again in the literature. It has been stressed that the difference between inflection and derivation is precisely the fact that derivational affixes change the word-class of their base, while inflectional affixes do not change the word-class.

Haspelmath (1996) argues against this claim and makes a strong point in favour of word-class-changing inflection. Counter-examples demonstrating the evidence of inflectional word-class-changing affixes include the German participle, the Lezgian masdar, the Turkish attributivizer and the Blackfoot predicativizer as shown in the examples (2a) through (2d):

(2)  
(a) $V \rightarrow \text{Adj (participle)}$

German (Indo-European; Haspelmath 1996: 44)

der im Wald laut sing_{V-ende}Adj Wanderer
the in:the forest loud sing-PTCL Adj hiker
‘the hiker (who is) singing loud in the forest’
(b)  \( V \rightarrow N \) (masdar)'

Lezgian (Caucasian; Haspelmath 1993: 153)

\[ wun \ fad \ qaraq_y\cdot un_N\cdot i \ c\text{um} \ tazub \ iji\cdot zw. \]

[you:ABS early get.up-MA
d-ERG] we:ABS surprise do-IMPF

'That you are getting up early surprises us.'

(c)  \( Adv \rightarrow Adj \) (attributivizer)

Turkish (Altaic; Haspelmath 1996: 44)

\[ \text{simdi}_{\text{ADV}}
\text{-ki}_{\text{ADJ}} \text{kriz} \]

now-ATTR crisis

'the present crisis'

(d)  \( N \rightarrow V \) (predicativizer)

Blackfoot (Amerind; Frantz 1991: 23)

\[ \text{nit-aakii}_{\text{N}}\cdot yi_{\text{V}}\cdot hpinnaan \]

1-woman-PRED-PL:EXCL

'We (excl.) are women.' (aakii 'woman')

In Haspelmath's view, the most basic property of inflectional forms is that they are described exclusively in grammatical paradigms, whereas derivational formations are described by listing them individually in the lexicon. The reason for this distinctive description of these morphological formations is that some have quite different properties from others. On the basis of the foregoing Haspelmath (1996: 47) proposes the following definitions of inflection and derivation:

\[ (3) \]

(a)  Formations are inflectional to the extent that they are regular, general and productive.

(b)  Formations are derivational to the extent that they are irregular, defective and unproductive.

Words can only be described by abstract paradigms if their formation is productive, regular and general. On the other hand, if a rule is unproductive, irregular and defective, an abstract paradigm is not sufficient for the description, and each form must be listed individually in the lexicon. By this definition there is no doubt that the formations in (2a) through (2d) are indeed inflectional forms. The German participle can be formed from any verb, and its forms and meanings show almost no idiosyncrasies, i.e. it is very regular, and of course it is also highly productive. The same applies to the Lezgian masdar, the Turkish attributivizer and the Blackfoot predicativizer.

Let us now have a further look at the Lezgian masdar in (2b) as represented in (4):

---

1 Since verbal nouns are generally derivational in European languages, Haspelmath prefers to use the term masdar for the inflectional verbal noun from Lezgian in (2b).
Lezgian (Caucasian; Haspelmath 1993: 153)

\[\text{wun } \text{fad } \text{qaraqun}-i \text{ cum tažub } iji\text{-zwu}.\]

\[\text{[you:abs early get-up-masd-erg] we:abs surprise do-impf}\]

'That you are getting up early surprises us.'

The Lezgian masdar has certain morphological and syntactic properties which make it behave just like other nouns, taking all sixteen cases that other nouns have, and appearing in any argument position, like other nouns. On the other hand the Lezgian masdar cannot form a plural, but, as Haspelmath (1996: 63) argues, there are also other nouns that have no plural. This is due to purely semantic factors that are present in madors as well. Haspelmath concludes from these facts that the Lezgian masdar is indeed an inflectional form resulting from word-class-changing inflection.

4.1.3.2. External versus internal syntax

Words derived by word-class-changing inflection generally have only part of the syntactic properties of their derived word-class, namely those that concern the combination with the head that governs them or that they modify. Haspelmath (1996: 52) calls these properties external syntax, because they concern an element outside their phrase. Their internal syntax, on the other hand, i.e. their combination with dependents inside their phrase, is mostly identical to that of their base word-class. Of course this does not imply that inflectional word-class-changing affixes invariably fully preserve internal syntax; sometimes they force a slight change in internal syntax and part of it may be preserved even with derivational word-class-changing affixes. This does imply that the distinction between inflection and derivation on the one hand, and the distinction between preservation and non-preservation on the other hand, may be represented as two covarying continua as represented in Haspelmath (1996: 59):

(5) \[\text{more inflectional} \quad \text{more derivational} \]
\[\text{more preservation} \quad \text{less preservation} \]
\[\text{of internal syntax} \quad \text{of internal syntax}\]

On the basis of the foregoing it is now possible to formulate two more continua, representing on the one hand the distinction between fully finite constructions and derivational action nominals\(^1\) and, on the other hand, syntactic intricacy and lexical density:

(6) \[\text{Finite verbal constructions} \quad \text{Non-finiteness} \quad \text{Action nominals}\]
\[\text{Syntactic intricacy} \quad \text{Non-finiteness} \quad \text{Lexical density}\]

\(^1\) Haspelmath (1996: 44) divides the category of verbal nouns into action nominals, which are generally derivational in European languages, and madors, which are inflectional verbal nouns.
Languages differ considerably in the extent to which they develop from non-nominal to nominal (Mackenzie 1985, Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993), but also it is often found that within one and the same language various constructions co-exist at different points on the nominalization cline. Thus, the forementioned may be illustrated on the basis of Mackenzie’s (1996) nouniness squish (cf. also Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1993, Crevels 1993). Parting from Ross (1973), Mackenzie exemplifies a nouniness squish for English, which leads from fully verbal to fully nominal expression, passing through three kinds of gerund (V-ing) with a partially verbal, partially nominal character. This nouniness gradient may also be applied to concessive clauses as exemplified in (8) on the basis of the well-known example of nominalization constructions in English:

(8) (a)  
Finite clause
Although the enemy destroyed the city, the inhabitants did not flee.

(b)  
Inflectional gerund
Despite the enemy destroying the city, the inhabitants did not flee.

(c)  
Inflectional genitive gerund
Despite the enemy’s destroying the city, the inhabitants did not flee.

(d)  
Productive nominalization
Despite the enemy’s destroying of the city, the inhabitants did not flee.

(e)  
(Derivational) action nominal
Despite the enemy’s destruction of the city, the inhabitants did not flee.

The examples (8a) through (8e) show a gradual loss of verbal categories such as tense and agreement morphology, modal auxiliaries, aspectual distinctions, voice and negation. In example (8b) the subject and direct object are expressed in more or less the same way as in the fully finite clause in (8a), and thus the internal syntax of the verbal base is preserved, although the non-finiteness of the verb demonstrates partial deverbalization. Consequently a transition takes place from full verbal valency in (8a) and (8b) to the total absence of valency as in (8d) and (8e); In (8c) we are confronted with partial valency reduction, since the subject of destroy genitivizes and can only be expressed as a possessor, while the direct object is retained. In this case the internal syntax is not preserved completely, but still to a greater extent than in (8d) and (8e) where there is a total absence of valency and thus no preservation of internal syntax.

In the foregoing sections we have seen that Haspelmath (1996) would most probably classify the predicate in (8b) through (8d) (destroying) as verbal nouns resulting from word-class-changing inflection, and that he would consequently name them masdars, as opposed to predicates such as in (8e) (destruction) which are action nominals and therefore derived verbal nouns.
4.1.3.3. Conclusion

Returning to the question of which grammatical units are to be considered clauses (cf. 4.1.2), I would say that in order for a construction to be recognized as clausal, it should retain minimal internal syntax. This can now be illustrated on the basis of the previous examples in (8); thus (8a) and (8b) show examples of a subordinate concessive clause with respectively a finite and a non-finite predicate, while (8c) is an instance of how the same subordinate clause may be downgraded to a clausal construction with partial valency reduction, (8d) shows total loss of valency and (8e), finally, is an instance of an action nominal where all signs of internal syntax are absent as well. Since (8c) still shows a partial retention of internal syntax and (8d) shows a total absence of valency, I consider the grammatical unit in (8c) to be a clause, while (8d) and, obviously, the derived action nominal in (8e) do not qualify as clauses in my approach.

4.2. Coordination versus subordination

4.2.1. Parataxis and hypotaxis

Coordination and subordination are special cases of two types of syntactic arrangement traditionally known as parataxis and hypotaxis. Thus, to take an example within a phrase as given by Quirk et al. (1985: 919), in his first and best novel, the coordinate adjective phrase first and best functions as a premodifier of novel, and in that phrase first and best are equal constituents. On the other hand, in his first successful novel, the adjective first does not modify novel directly; it modifies successful novel, and successful in turn modifies novel. Thus there is a hierarchy in relationships, and first and successful are in a hypotactic rather than paratactic relation.

The opposition between coordination and subordination, and that between parataxis and hypotaxis, are often treated as equivalent. However, we may distinguish them as follows. Parataxis not only applies to coordinate constructions, but also to other cases where two units of equivalent status are juxtaposed. In (11), for instance, we have an example of what Quirk et al. (1985: 911) call an appended clause; an appended clause can be regarded as an elliptical clause (usually parenthetical or an afterthought) for which the whole or part of the preceding or interrupted clause constitutes the antecedent:

(11) (a) I caught the train—just.
(b) I caught the train—I just caught the train.

In order to explain the unusual word order in (11a) we suppose it to be an elliptical version of (11b). Thus we can state that just in (11a) is in a paratactic relation to the clause preceding it. A tag question is also considered to be in a paratactic relation to the statement preceding it. But, as Quirk et al. (1985: 919) argue, in neither of these cases could we insert an overt coordinator. Likewise, there are other hypo-
tactic relations, such as the embedding of one phrase in another, quite apart from the relation between a subordinate clause and the clause of which it is a part.

4.2.2. Coordination and subordination

Two clauses in the same sentence may be related either by coordination or subordination. Both coordination and subordination may involve the linking of units of the same rank; however, whereas in coordination the units are constituents at the same level of constituent structure, they form a hierarchy in subordination, the subordinate unit being a constituent of the superordinate unit. Although, strictly speaking, coordination can also occur between other grammatical units like clause elements or words, I would still like to consider this type of linking for the sake of transparency as a special case of parataxis at clause-level, or in other words between clauses.

4.2.2.1. Coordination

Linking words that explicitly indicate coordination are termed coordinating conjunctions, or more simply coordinators. In English the overt signals of coordination are and, or and but. And and or are so-called central coordinators, but but differs from them in some respects as we will see in Section 4.3.3.

Sometimes clauses are simply juxtaposed without any overt signal of coordination. This type of unlinked coordination is called asyndetic coordination as opposed to syndetic or linked coordination. Not all juxtaposed clauses are manifestations of asyndetic coordination. Quirk et al. (1985: 918) state that the possibility of inserting the coordinator and with little alteration of meaning is evidence that a construction is one of asyndetic coordination. It is this that distinguishes such a clause from other types of construction like, for example, the appended clause in (11) which, as we have seen, gives an instance of a paratactic relation.

4.2.2.2. Subordination

Subordinate versus main clauses There is a hierarchical relation between subordinate clauses and their corresponding superordinate or main clauses, in so far as the subordinate clause forms a constituent of the main clause on which it depends for its occurrence. A subordinate clause may also contain another subordinate clause inside it, which means that the first subordinate clause behaves as a superordinate clause with respect to the second subordinate clause:

(12)  (a) I know_{main clause} that you can't do it_{subclause}, even though you try_{subclause}

(b) You can't do it_{main clause}, even though you try_{subclause}

Functional-syntactic classes of subordinate clauses Thompson and Longacre (1985: 172) distinguish three types of subordinate clauses: those which function as noun phrases (complements), those which function as modifiers of nouns (relative
Concession clauses), and those which function as modifiers of verb phrases or entire propositions (adverbial clauses). Quirk et al. (1985) distinguish an additional category of subordinate clauses, which leads to the following functional classification: nominal, adverbial, relative and comparative. Hengeveld (1996: 121) distinguishes yet another type of subordinate construction: the predicate clause. On the basis of Hengeveld (1996: 121) all these different construction types are exemplified as follows in (13):

(13) (a) Main clause
    John is ill

(b) Relative clause
    The boy that is ill is John

(c) Comparative clause
    John is more ill than I thought

(d) Predicate clause
    It may be that John is ill

(e) Complement clause
    I don’t believe that John is ill

(f) Adverbial clause
    I will go, although John is ill

Since concessive clauses form the topic of this book, I will restrict myself in the following to adverbial clauses.

Adverbial clauses As Thompson and Longacre (1985: 171) argue, it seems that all languages have biclausal constructions in which one clause modifies the other in a way similar to the way in which an adverb modifies a proposition. Adverbial clauses resemble adverb phrases, but they are potentially more explicit and, therefore, they are more often like prepositional phrases. Consider the following example from Quirk et al. (1985: 1048):

(14) (a) We left after the speeches ended.
    (b) We left after the end of the speeches.
    (c) We left afterwards.

Following Thompson and Longacre's (1985) classification, an adverbial subordinate clause thus is one which modifies a verb phrase or a clause. An additional characteristic of adverbial clauses is that they can be omitted without affecting the grammaticality of the main clause (cf. Hengeveld 1998: 335).

4.3. Linking clauses and sentences

Following the reasoning in Section 4.1.1, we can think of a clause as the basic
unit of meaning in discourse. Leech and Svartvik (1994: 180) signal three main ways provided by grammar of putting such units together:

A. **Coordination**: Clauses can be coordinated by the conjunctions *and*, *or*, *but*, *both* . . . *and*, etc.

B. **Subordination**: One clause can be subordinated to another, using conjunctions such as *when*, *if*, *because* or *although*.

C. **Adverbial linking**: Two ideas can be connected by using a linking sentence adverbial, such as *yet*, *moreover* or *meanwhile*.

For concessive relations Leech and Svartvik (1994: 180) illustrate the three methods mentioned above as follows:

A. The conversation went on, *but* Rebecca stopped listening.

B. *Although* Quebec did not break its ties with the rest of Canada, it did not feel itself part of the Confederation.

C. In theory, most companies would like to double their profits in a year. *However*, few could really handle it, and most companies wouldn't even try.

A stronger and more emphatic way of linking is brought about by the combination of a sentence adverbial (conjunct) in combination with coordination or subordination:

(15) He was extremely tired, *but* he was nevertheless unable to sleep until after midnight.

(16) *Although* he was suffering from fatigue as a result of the long journey, *yet* because of the noise, he lay awake in his bed, thinking over the events of the day until the early hours of the morning.

The choice between coordination, subordination, or an adverbial linking depends of course on the degree of 'closeness' of linking. Coordination, for instance, forms often a 'looser' connection than the other two types, because it is more vague and less emphatic. It is more characteristic of spoken language than of written language. In the case of subordination, on the other hand, a clause usually conveys information that is less important than the information of the main clause. As Leech and Svartvik (1994: 181) argue, an adverbial clause is often used when the

---

3 Following Olson (1981), Foley and Van Valin (1984: 240) take into account still another linking strategy: *co-subordination*. In a co-subordinated construction which consists of, for instance, two clauses, neither is embedded in the other, but one is dependent upon the other for some feature, e.g. tense or inflection. Prototypical instances of co-subordination are serial verb and chaining constructions. Since I have not found any traces of co-subordination in my data, this linking strategy will not be taken into account in the following.
information in that clause is already wholly or partly known by the hearer. Adverbial linkers usually connect longer stretches of discourse consisting of one or more sentences which themselves may contain coordinate or subordinate clauses.

4.3.1. **Signals of adverbial subordination**

As noted in Section 4.2.2.2, a subordinate clause depends for its occurrence on its main clause and is not usually capable of standing alone as the main clause of a sentence.\(^4\) Usually subordinate clauses are marked by some signal of subordination. Thompson and Longacre (1985: 172) name three devices that are typically found among the languages of the world for marking subordinate clauses, all of which are found with adverbial clauses: subordinating morphemes, special verb forms, and word order.

4.3.1.1. **Subordinating morphemes**

Concessive clauses may be marked by free morphemes as in English (17) or Kayardild (18), or by bound morphemes as in Kannada (19) or Lezgian (20). In Kannada concessive clauses are formed by suffixing the emphatic particle -ude to the conditional mood form of the verb, while in Lezgian the additive focus particle -ni 'also', 'even' is suffixed to the conditional mood form.

(17) **Although** he hates The Stones, he agreed to go to their concert.

(18) Kayardild (Australian; Nick Evans p.c.)

\[ \text{nginja ngumu-wa-th, nginja kamburi-ja muma-th, ja-warri.} \]

FRUST black-INCH-ACT FRUST speak-ACT thunder-ACT rain-PRIV

'Even though the sky blackened and the thunder spoke, there was no rain.'

(19) Kannada (Elamo-Dravidian; D.N.S. Bhat p.c.)

\[ \text{avA ja:sti ka:N-add-ar-ude kannaDka} \]

he much see-NEG-COND-EMPH spectacles

\[ \text{maDi-kko-tt-A:y-ille.} \]

keep-REFL-PRES-3SG:M-NEG

'He does not wear glasses although he does not see much.'

(20) Lezgian (Caucasian; Haspelmath 1993: 396)

\[ \text{za } \text{šeker qʰiweh-na-t’a-ni, } \text{i } \text{čaj.di-qʰ dad gala-č.} \]

lŠEMG sugar throw-AOR-COND-even this tea-POESS taste be.behind-NEG

'Although I added sugar, this tea is not tasty.'

\(^4\) Of course there are some exceptions to be made; in Section 4.3.3 I will demonstrate that some conjunctions which in the literature have always been treated as subordinating conjunctions, may appear as adverbial linkers which connect longer stretches of text.
4.3.1.2. Special verb-forms

In Japanese the concessive subordinating particle noni follows the attributive form of the copula, while the coordinating particle ga follows the conclusive form of the copula:

(21) Japanese (Korean-Japanese; Shibatani 1990: 229)

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) & \quad kirei \ n_1 \ noni \\
& \quad \text{pretty COP:ATTR although} \\
& \quad \text{‘although it is pretty’} \\
(b) & \quad kirei \ da \ ga \\
& \quad \text{pretty COP:CONCL but} \\
& \quad \text{‘it is pretty but’}
\end{align*}
\]

Likewise, Basque has a special subordinate conditional marker ba- (‘if’) which in combination with a finite verb form and the focus particle ere produces concessive clauses:

(22) Basque (Isolate; Arantzazu Elordieta p.c.)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Zure arazo-ak ulert-zen ba-ditut ere,} \\
& \quad \text{your problem-DEF:PL understand-PART COND-I.have.them even} \\
& \quad \text{lan-a biharko egina egon behar da!} \\
& \quad \text{work-DEF for.tomorrow done be must it.is} \\
& \quad \text{‘Although I understand your problems, get the work done tomorrow!’}
\end{align*}
\]

4.3.1.3. Word order

Instead of the V-2 word order of main clauses, languages like Dutch, Mestreechs and German exhibit a special V-final word order for subordinate clauses:

(23) Mestreechs (Indo-European; Ineke Jongen and Elisabeth Jongen-Köbben p.c.)

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) & \quad Ze \ kin \ good \ koke. \\
& \quad \text{she can:3SG well cook:INF} \\
& \quad \text{‘She can cook well.’} \\
(b) & \quad Allewel \ ze \ good \ koke \ kin, \ hêlt \ ze \ neet \ vaan \\
& \quad \text{although she NEG cook:INF can:3SG like:3SG she NEG PREP} \\
& \quad \text{lekker ete.} \\
& \quad \text{nice food} \\
& \quad \text{‘Although she can cook well, she doesn’t like nice food.’}
\end{align*}
\]

4.3.2. Syntactic features of linkers

When having a closer look at the various clause linkers, it is important to understand the syntactic basis of the distinctions between them. In this section I will try
to establish differences in syntactic behaviour between coordinators, subordinators and adverbial linkers. First I will show that they represent three different classes of linkers by presenting the criteria to distinguish between them given in Quirk et al. (1985: 921 ff.).

4.3.2.1. Syntactic behaviour of coordinators, subordinators and adverbial linkers in English

Quirk et al. examine six syntactic features which apply to the so-called central coordinators and or and up till a certain extent to the adversative coordinator but. In extending these features to the field of adverbial linkers and subordinators, it will be possible to get a clearer picture of the differences between the domains of coordination, subordination and adverbial linkage.

(i) Clause coordinators and subordinators are restricted to clause-initial position
This is generally true of both coordinators and subordinators, but it is not true of most adverbial linkers or conjuncts as they are labelled by Quirk et al.:

\[(24) \qquad (a) \quad \text{John plays the guitar, and his sister plays the piano.} \\
(b) \quad \text{*John plays the guitar, his sister and plays the piano.} \\
(c) \quad \text{John plays the guitar although he misses three fingers.} \\
(d) \quad \text{*John plays the guitar he although misses three fingers.} \\
(e) \quad \text{John plays the guitar; however, his sister plays the piano.} \\
(f) \quad \text{John plays the guitar; his sister, however, plays the piano.}\]

(ii) Coordinated clauses are sequentially fixed
Coordinated clauses are sequentially fixed in relation to the previous clause, and therefore cannot be transposed without producing unacceptable sentences, or at least changing the relationship between the clauses:

\[(25) \qquad (a) \quad \text{They are living in England, or they are spending a vacation there.} \\
(b) \quad \text{*Or they are spending a vacation there, they are living in England.}\]

This is true for coordinators and conjuncts, but not for most subordinators, as is contrasted in (26a) and (26b) by respectively the conjunct nevertheless and the subordinator although:

\[(26) \qquad (a) \quad \text{*Nevertheless John gave it away, Mary wanted it.} \\
(b) \quad \text{Although Mary wanted it, John gave it away.} \\
(c) \quad \text{John gave it away, although Mary wanted it.}\]

(iii) Coordinators are not preceded by a conjunction
Coordinators do not allow another conjunction to precede them. Subordinators

5 Quirk et al. mention that a few subordinators are exceptional in that they can occur non-initially:

(i) Though he is poor, he is happy.
(ii) Poor though he is, he is happy.
as well as conjuncts, on the other hand, can usually be preceded by coordinators:

(27) He was unhappy about it, *and yet* he did as he was told.

In (28) two subordinate clauses are linked by *and*, which precedes the second subordinator *although*:

(28) He was feeling terribly down, *although* he was happily married *and although* he was making loads of money.

(iv) Coordinators can link clause constituents

*And*, *or* and less frequently *but* may link constituents smaller than a clause; for example, they may link predicates, thus allowing ellipsis of a second or subsequent subject:

(29) (a) [I may see you tomorrow] or [I may phone later in the day]

(b) I [may see you tomorrow] or [may phone later in the day]

However, this feature does not apply to conjuncts with the exception of *yet*:

(30) (a) *They didn't like it, nevertheless said nothing.*

(b) They didn't like it, *yet* (they) said nothing.

A subordinator, on the other hand, does not allow ellipsis of the subject even when its clause is linked by a coordinator:

(31) *She didn't say anything about it, although he smelled like hell and although hadn't had a decent haircut in ages.*

If the second subordinator of (31) is omitted, ellipsis is possible:

(32) She didn't say anything about it, *although* he smelled like hell and hadn't had a decent haircut in ages.

(v) Coordinators can link subordinated clauses

As well as linking two main clauses, *and or*, as shown previously in (25), can link subordinate clauses:

(33) He was feeling terribly down, *although* he was happily married, (*although* he) had three beautiful children *and* (*although* he) was making loads of money.

Such linking is not possible for conjuncts or for other conjunctions except *but*. *But*, however, is restricted to linking a maximum of two clauses and can only link complement and temporal adverbal clauses. Concessive clauses obviously do not enter into this category:
Concession

(34)  
(a) I spoke to him after the conference was over, but before he started work.

(b) *They didn't stay although they were happy, but although they were bored.

(vi) Coordinators can link more than two clauses

And and or can link more than two clauses, and the construction may then be called one of multiple coordination. All but the final instance of the conjunctions can be omitted. Thus:

(35) The battery may be disconnected, (or) the connection may be loose, or the bulb may be faulty.

In this respect and or differ from subordinators, conjuncts and even from but, since semantically speaking but can only link two conjoints at the same level.

Table 5 now displays the gradient from coordination to subordination. The six features that have been tested have provided six criteria that have been used in constructing the matrix. To summarize, the six criteria that have been applied to each linker are:

(i) It is immobile in front or at the end of its clause.

(ii) A clause beginning with it is sequentially fixed in relation to the previous clause or following clause, and hence cannot be moved to a position in front of or after that clause.

(iii) It does not allow a conjunction to precede it.

(iv) It links not only clauses, but predicates and other clause constituents.

(v) It can link subordinate clauses.

(vi) It can link more than two clauses, and when it does so all but the final instance of the linking item can be omitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Coordinators–adverbial linkers–subordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial linkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.2 Criteria

The forementioned syntactic criteria have been formulated on the basis of familiar Indo-European strategies, and therefore may be considered more or less languagespecific criteria. In this study, however, the criteria will have to be applicable to the domain of concessive and adversative constructions in the languages of the world.
In view of these facts, the first criterium, for instance, would not hold for languages such as Cantonese and Motu, in which concessive constructions are marked by correlatives which mark the concessive subordinate clause and its subsequent main clause. Thus, in Cantonese (36) "sêuiyihn 'although' is matched in the main clause by either *daahnhaih* 'but' or *dōu* 'still'. Moreover, note that *sêuiyihn* may also come after the subject of the clause. Likewise, in Motu (37) the *although* concept is always rendered by *ena be* introducing the concessive clause, an *to* introducing the main clause.

(36) Cantonese (Tibeto-Burmese; Matthews and Yip 1994: 300)

\[Ngôh sêuiyihn mh tühngy kéuih gông ge yēh,\]
\[I although not agree s/he speak LP things\]
\[daahnhaih juhng hōu jyûnjuhng kéuih.\]
\[but still much respect him\]

'Although I disagree with what he says, I still respect him.'

(37) Motu (Austric; Stephen Wurm p.c.)

\[ena be asina ura-mu gwaugwau-mu,\]
\[although PRES:1SG:NEG WANT-CONT scold-SG:OBJ\]
\[to oï o tau dubuna.\]
\[LP you:SG are man bad\]

'Although I should be minding my own business, your behaviour is a disgrace.'

Other examples are provided by Hungarian and Ket, languages in which the concessive linkers *ugyan* and *qaj*, respectively, do not necessarily occupy the first or last position within the concessive clause:

(38) Hungarian (Uralic-Yukaghir; Erszébet Beöthy p.c.)

\[Ez ugyan nem rám tartóz-ik, de botránynos a\]
\[this although NEG me concern-it but scandalous DET\]
\[viselkedés-ed.\]
\[behaviour-2SG:POSS\]

'Although I should be minding my own business, your behaviour is a disgrace.'

(39) Ket (Isolate; Heinrich Werner p.c.)

\[Bu q̃mat qaj dutŋ, budąŋta x̕kaŋ bən'-s'ąŋ.\]
\[he little although sees with.him glasses NEG-is\]

'Although he sees little, he doesn’t wear glasses.'

Contrary to Indo-European languages, in many languages of the world subordinated clauses are obligatorily preposed. This automatically excludes criterium (ii) as a viable criterium. Consider the examples from Kiwaï (40) and Kannada (41):
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(40) Kiwai (Indo-Pacific; Stephen Wurm p.c.)

*Nanie* *nou orobora-gido ra meremere-gido nirimagare koiti,* although his wife-for and children-for strong.love having *aime g-imeser-ai-bi.*

then 3SG:PAST-leave.many-SUACT-3:OBJ

‘He left his wife and children, although he loved them very much.’

(41) Kannada (Elamo-Dravidian; D.N.S. Bhat p.c.)

*avana ka:ru mane eduru nilsi-goND-i-dd-ar-ude,* avâ

his car house front stand-REFL-be-PRES-COND-EMPHE  he *mane-li ille.*

house-LOC NEG

‘He’s not at home, although his car is parked in front of the house.’

Criterium (iii) does not hold for standard Arabic in which the adversative forms *lakin* and ‘amma may both co-occur with the unmarked coordinating conjunction *wa:*

(42) Arabic (Afroasiatic; Payne 1985:11)

*vaadara jon wa lakin meri lam tuvaadir.*

left John and but Mary not left

‘John left but Mary didn’t leave.’

Criterium (iv) does not hold for a language such as Fijian, in which the sentential coordinator *ka* is used for some, but not all phrasal levels. Coordination at the NP level is expressed by the preposition *kei* ‘with’:

(43) Fijian (Austronesian; Payne 1985: 28)

(a) *E a raici Mere ko Jone ka raici Raijieli ko Bili.*

DECL PAST see Mere ART Jone and see Raijieli ART Bili

‘Jone saw Mere and Bili saw Raijieli.’

(b) *Au a raica na turaga kei na marama.*

I PAST see ART chief with PAST lady

‘I saw the chief and the lady.’

Criterium (v) seems to be a valid cross-linguistic criterium. Consider the San example in (44) and the Japanese one in (45):

(44) San (Niger-Kordofanian; Moïse Pare p.c.)

*má bôo dâ nê bè kâlâsi-pé bè à*

1SG:PAST:AFF speech SOW:PF POSTP CONJ class-say CONJ 3SG:PF:AFF

*gâ à nà, sinî bè à tô wôò piè wà.*

CONJ 3SG:PF:AFF finish:PF but CONJ 3SG AUX go home NEG

‘I spoke to him after the class had finished, but before he went home.’
Criterium (vi), finally, does not hold, since semantically speaking the coordinator but can only link two conjoints at the same level.

As we have seen above, criterium (v) is the only one which may be applied in typological testing, since the other criteria provided by Quirk et al. (1985) have all proved to be language specific criteria. Criterium (v) serves to distinguish coordinators on the one hand, from subordinators and adverbial linkers on the other hand. The data of my research, however, show that the classification of linkers which seem to have multiple functions, constitutes a problem. Subordinating concessive linkers like English although or though, which may be expressed at all four semantic levels discussed in Chapter 3, lose their subordinating status at the text level. Moreover, they may cross sentence boundaries and, as in the case of English though, they may lose their fixed position within the concessive clause, properties which are typical of adverbial linkers. Consider (46) through (48):

(46) (Greenbaum 1969: 68)
My favourite poster is, I think, a French one for Nesquik, which shows a sophisticated-looking small boy leaning nonchalantly against something and saying that thanks to Nesquik he went back on to milk. He really looks a nice child. Though there are some Adchildren that one would feel quite ashamed to have around the house.

(47) Singapore must now be one of the most enviably prosperous cities in the world. There is no reason, though, to suppose that the people of Singapore would want to spend as much money on defense as Britain used to spend.

(48) Quirk et al. (1985: 641)
His food is quite a problem. He looks fit, though.

An illustration of the multiple functions that concessive linkers may have is to be found in Quirk et al. (1985: 641) who distinguish two types of though: the conjunction though and the conjunct though. The conjunct though is considered to be an informal equivalent of an abbreviated subordinate clause with the conjunction though functioning as subordinator. Thus (48) is interpreted as (49):

(49) His food is rather a problem. He looks fit, though his food is rather a problem.

Consider also the following examples from Wolaitta:
(50) Wolaitta (Afro-Asiatic; Azeb Amha p.c.)

(a) Content concessive

\[ \text{tohooy me?i?-iya-kko-kka  ŋi ba soo wot't'-iisi.} \]
\[ \text{foot:SBj break-REL-CND-INCL he his house run-3SG:M:PF} \]
\[ \text{'He ran all the way home although he had broken his foot.'} \]

(b) Epistemic concessive

\[ ŋi ba-macc-iyo-mne ba-naata daro dos-iya-kko-kka, \]
\[ \text{he LOG-wife-OBJ-and LOG-children very like-REL-COND-INCL} \]
\[ īagg-idi b-iisi. \]
\[ \text{give.up-CONV go-3SG:M} \]
\[ \text{'He left his wife and children, although he loved them very much.'} \]

(c) Speech-act concessive

\[ ne met-oy t-aw ār-ett-esi \]
\[ \text{your problem-SBJ me-DAT know-PASS-3SG:M:IMP} \]
\[ gidd-ikko-kka, ha āos-uwa wonto-s wurs-a! \]
\[ \text{happen-COND-INCL this work-OBJ tomorrow-DAT finish-IMP:SG} \]
\[ \text{'Although I understand your problems, get the work done tomorrow!'} \]

(d) Textual concessive

\[ taani amarratt-uwa haasayoga-nne s'aaafiyoga ār-aissi \]
\[ \text{I Amharic-OBJ speaking-and writing know-1SG:IMP} \]
\[ gidd-in-ka ta k'opa wolaittattuw-appe hara \]
\[ \text{happen-TEMP-INCL my thought Wolaitta-source another} \]
\[ k'aala-n loyta ūd-an-aw danda'ikke. \]
\[ \text{language-LOC good tell-IMPF-DAT can-NEG:1SG:IMP} \]
\[ gidd-ikko-kka ha'īti ta k'oppa ūekkiyo-de ta hega \]
\[ \text{happen-COND-INCL now I think take-time I that:OBJ} \]
\[ daro wode ūoot-t-aasi. \]
\[ \text{many time do-1SG:PF} \]
\[ \text{'I speak Amharic, and I write it, but I cannot express my true feelings} \]
\[ \text{in any other language than Wolaitta. Although, now that I come to} \]
\[ \text{think of it, I have done it many times...'} \]

The examples in (50) show us how in Wolaittte the same combination of a conditional and an inclusive suffix renders concessive at the four relevant semantic levels. Whereas (50a) through (50c) show instances of subordinate concessive clauses, (50d) shows a different, non-subordinate as well as non-coordinate use of -kko-kka.

In order to be able to generalize across cases like the aforementioned I will make an overall distinction in the following between non-coordinators (NC) and coordinators (C). As Figure 5 shows, this implies that subordinators (S) and adverbial
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linkers (AL) will be labelled as non-coordinators as opposed to coordinators. Concessive linkers such as English *although* and *though* may hence be classified as non-coordinators at the four relevant semantic levels.

At this point it is still necessary to formulate another criterium with cross-linguistic validity in order to be able to make a more precise distinction between subordinators and adverbial linkers. It has become clear from the examples given earlier, that adverbial linkers, being adverbials, are constituents of the sentence they form part of. We expect these sentences therefore to be capable of occurring on their own. Consider, for instance, the following example from Turkish:

(51) Turkish (Altaic; Hüseyin Demirel p.c.)

A: Ömer, kızım birşey içmek iste-r-mi?
   Omar girl-POSS:2SG something drink-INF need-AOR INT

B: Teşekkürler, Ahmet. Yalanız bir kola.
   many.thanks Ahmed just a Coke
   Zaten o çok iç-miştir.
   anyhow she much drink-PLUPF

A: ‘Would your daughter like a drink, Ömer?’
B: ‘Thanks, Ahmet. Just a Coca-Cola. Although she’s had enough to drink anyway.’

This observation has led to the formulation of the following criterium (II) which may be tested on coordinators, subordinators and adverbial linkers. For the sake of presentation I have relabelled criterium (v) as criterium I:

- **Criterium I**
  It can link subordinate clauses.

- **Criterium II**
  It may cross sentence boundaries.

On the basis of these two criteria concessive subordinators, adverbial linkers and coordinators may be distinguished as in Table 6.
In order to check the validity of these two criteria and to establish whether they provide sufficient evidence for the syntactic distinction that is to be made between concessive subordinators, adverbial linkers and coordinators in the languages of the world, I have tested them in my data on some concessive linkers of Pima, Japanese, Bahasa Indonesia and Basque. The results are listed in Table 7 (for the linkers not exemplified here, see the Appendix).

While (52) and (53) exemplify the fact that coordinators and adverbial linkers may cross sentence boundaries, examples (54) and (55) show us that coordinators may link subordinated clauses.

(52) Pima (Amerind; Earl ‘Lo:dac’ Ray p.c.)

\[
\text{maña milgan-kac } \text{ñeok c } \text{ñama } \text{ñe?p } \text{ño?ohan, haba mañ akimel}
\]

I do American-with speak and also do write but only Akimel

\[
\text{ño?odham-kac } \text{s-mac mañ hai} \text{cu } \text{ño?am has } \text{ño?elid. Haba } \text{ño?am}
\]

‘O’odham-with poss-know do things have great feelings but have

\[
\text{ñeceto mañtik } \text{muñiko heeko } \text{ñab } \text{n-ju.}
\]

remember that many long.time.ago against me-did

‘I speak American, and I write it, but I cannot express my true feelings in any other language than Akimel ‘O’odham. Although, now that I come to think of it, I have done it many times in the past . . .’

(53) Bahasa Indonesia (Austric; Melnie Tanudjaja p.c.)

\[
\text{Saya bisa berbicara bahasa Belanda, saya bisa menulis}
\]

I can speak language Dutch I can write

\[
\text{bahasa Belanda, tetapi saya hanya bisa mengungkapkan}
\]

language Dutch but I only can express

\[
\text{perasaan saya dalam bahasa Indonesia.}
\]

feeling my in language Indonesian

\[
\text{Namun, kalau pikir lagi, saya toh juga sering mengungkapkan}
\]

nevertheless if think EMPH I still also often express

\[
\text{perasaan saya dalam bahasa Belanda.}
\]

feeling my in language Dutch

‘I Speak Dutch, and I write it, but I cannot express my true feelings in any other language than Bahasa. Although, now that I come to think of it, I have done it many times . . .’

\[\text{Note that the Pima data do not play a role in the testing of Hypothesis 2, since Pima does not show an actual cut-off point between subordinating and adverbial linking strategies, but rather between adverbial linking and coordinating strategies.}\]

\[\text{Lit.: “Nevertheless, now that I come to think of it, I still often express my feelings in Dutch.”}\]
(54) Japanese (Korean-Japanese; Fubito Endo p.c.)

\[\text{watashi wa shigoto no ato da-ga} \]

I \text{TOP work GEN after COP-but}

\[\text{kare ga ie ni kaeru mae ni} \]

he \text{NOM home DAT/LOC go.back before DAT/LOC}

\[\text{kare ni hanashikake-ta.} \]

he \text{DAT/LOC speak.to-PAST}

'I spoke to him after work but before he went home.'

(55) Basque (Isolate; Miren Lourdes Oinederra p.c.)

\[\text{Lan-aren ondoren, baina etxe-ra joan zedin baino lehen,} \]

work-GEN after but \text{home-ALL go AUX than before,}

\[\text{ikusi nuen bera.} \]

see \text{AUX him}

'I saw him after work but before he went home.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Subordinators–adverbia l linkers–coordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| \begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline
| Subordinator & Adverbia l linker & Coordinator \\
| I & II & I & II & I & II \\
| \hline
| Pima & IRR & IRR & \text{\&e:da} & \text{\&e:da} & \text{haba} & \text{haba} \\
| Japanese & \text{noni} & \text{noni} & IRR & IRR & ga & ga \\
| Bahasa Indonesia & walaupun & walaupun & namun & namun & IRR & IRR \\
| Basque & nahiz eta & nahiz eta & \text{dena dela} & \text{dena dela} & baina & baina \\
| \hline
| \end{tabular} |

4.3.2.3. Conclusion

Table 7 has shown us that subordinators can neither link subordinated clauses nor cross sentence boundaries. Adverbia l linkers cannot link subordinated clauses, but, on the other hand, they may cross sentence boundaries. Coordinators can link subordinated clauses and they can cross sentence boundaries as well. The two criteria thus enable us to distinguish between three types of linkers and are, moreover, cross-linguistically applicable. However, the fact that concessive linkers may have multiple functions calls in the first place for a twofold distinction between non-coordinators and coordinators.

4.4. Conclusion

In this chapter I argued that a construction is clausal if it retains minimal internal syntax, or in other words, if within it some core grammatical relation is still expressed as would be in main clauses. Furthermore, I discussed three linking strate-
gies which I consider to be relevant for concessive constructions: subordination, adverbial linking and coordination. In order to test whether a linker is a subordinator, adverbial linker or coordinator, two language-independent criteria were formulated and tested on a number of concessive linkers from various sample languages. These criteria have proved to be valid parameters for the classification of linking strategies across the languages of the world.

With this chapter we have come to the end of the first part of this work. The second part will be dedicated to the results of the typological survey and the subsequent testing of a number of hypotheses. In the next chapter I will give a short overview of the hypotheses which are to be tested on the basis of the data drawn from the language sample. Furthermore, I will discuss the methodology which I have used to obtain the language data.
PART TWO

Typology