Head parameterization at the multiclausal level: clause-chaining as episodic macroevents in Altaic-area[1] languages

1. Introduction

(1) Grønbech 1997 [1979] on Turkic clause structure:

> And thus one can build up a clause as long as one wishes until reaching a verbal form; either the clause is terminated completely by that, specifically if the verb is finite in form, or the period is brought to a temporary conclusion by a gerund or similar formation, in order then to be arrayed as a whole under a viewpoint, made more precise by a gerund, to the following event. (p. 135)

- Altaic-area "endless sentences" (Longacre 1985:282) are due to the availability of converbs, medials, gerund(ive)s, etc. (Here adopting more or less neutral term "subordinator")

- Previous literature: focuses on clause-internal and clause-embedding properties (Nakatani 2004, Bowern 2003, Lewis 2000; Kornfilt 1997, Johanson 1995); multiple clause-chaining (Haspelmath 1995, Longacre 1985) discussions primarily typological/semantic/pragmatic (Soper 1996, Johanson 1995); but some attempt to unify the two (Hasegawa 1996)

- This paper is a preliminary/pre-formal look at how the syntax of multiclausal chaining, in creating extended sentence-level constituents,[2] creates substantial discourse-level effects.

Evidence: Interpretation of pseudo-coordination and extended narrative chaining

Proposal: "Fused-event"/ "episodic" discourse-organizational effects achieved by **C/T-level syntactic reanalysis**---homologous to reanalysis at the argument-structure level

Suggests that: Syntax and discourse are not qualitatively distinct domains, but a cumulative development of one same underlying iterative/additive process.

2. "Episodes" and head-parameterization

(2) Head-final Altaic-area "**episode**" (= extended sentence) schematization:

….Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-**Indep**

"**Indep**" = *independent* element, the head of this "episode" = finite C/T element, or other (e.g. imperative)

Core feature: **only one (unembedded) Indep allowed per "episode" constituent**

< *[doubly-headed constituents] (empirical evidence against?)

"**Dep**" = *dependent* element = theoretically unlimited in number within single "episode"

(3) Schema in (2), applied to 4 Altaic-area languages (Indep= **FIN**; Dep="contextual"[3] subordinators):

...-ip, ...-ip , ...-ip , ...-ip , ...-ip , ...-ip , ...-ip , ...-ip , ...-ip , ...**-di.** (Turkish)

…-j_, …-j_, …-j_, …-j_, …-j_, …-j_, …-j_, …-j_ …-j_, …**-n_.** (Khalka Mongolian)
...-te, ...-te , ...-te , ...-te , ...-te , ...-te , ...-te , ...-te , ...-te , ...**-ta.** (Japanese)
...-se, ...-se , ...-se , ...-se , ...-se , ...-se , ...-se , ...-se , ...-se , ...**-ta.** (Korean)

These are syntactic and semantic/discourse constituents:

- Korean "serial predicate constructions" "…denote sequential actions or states that denote a single coextensive or extended event" whose subparts are each perceived as elements of that single extended event, which thus "…may be treated as a single syntactic and semantic constituent in relation to other constituents in the sentence." (Sohn 1999:380)

- Johanson 1995 labels extended sentences "packages" or "periodic sentences"

Here then (following Sohn 1999), "episode" not just a trivial renaming of the "sentence" constituent (CP/TP):

- "Episode" represents a derivation (C/T-level reanalysis) combining multiple clauses in a way that gives them special interpretational properties

Johanson 1995: informal term "sentence head" for Indep

Here: Indep formally taken as head of constituent ("episode" obeys *[doubly-headed constituents])
Predicts: Both head-initial and head-final parameterizations should be possible

Head-final: **Altaic-area subordinator constructions**
Head-initial: **E. Algonquian subordinative paradigm** (will discuss extensively as a comparison)

3. Head-initial "episodes": the Eastern Algonquian subordinative

McAllister 2001: Penobscot (E. Alg.) subordinative similar to Japanese *-te* construction
Quinn 2004: Pb and Jp explicitly the same, just head parameterized, hence E. Algonquian:

(4) **IndepIndic,** ...-Subord, ...-Subord, ...-Subord, ...-Subord, ...-Subord, ...-Subord....

= head-***initial*** version of (2), repeated as (5):

(5) ….Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-**Indep**

=

(6) **Indep**-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep-Dep.…

E. Alg.: Indep can be main/subord/imper/etc. (like Altaic-area); here mostly major main clause forms:
= Independent Indicative (IndepIndic)

Notation: **Indep** vs. <u>Subord</u>
E. Algonquian subordinative collocations = Altaic-area subordinator patterns (only a PF difference!)

Shared syntax/semantics/discourse function:

(i) Indirect "polite" imperatives and statements
(ii) Additional verb(s) in a multiple imperative

(iii) "Pseudo-coordination" (and "logical" sequentiality)
(iv) Extended clausal chaining in narrative

Parallels not coincidental: all from the same **clause-level reanalysis** available from each's Dep morphology.

4. The form of the E. Algonquian subordinative paradigm[4]

Two major features of E. Alg. subordinative:

(a) **Absence of "peripheral endings"**
(b) Presence of N-morpheme (|-ənel|) and "transitive/possessor agreement" (e.g. |wə-...-əwɑ| in (22c)), *in all morphologically compatible forms*

- Traits in (b) hold for majority of subordinative verbal forms, but synchronic status unclear.[5]
- Intransitive verbs with arguments of the IN nominal class cannot do (b), only (a):

(7) Penobscot: absence of "peripheral endings" in subordinative (underlined)

kàmɑč àkw**a** **kwənáhkwatol** wkɑ̀tal, nɑ̀kɑ piwáhkwsəssən, nɑ̀kɑ àkwa kàmɑč **kwənáhkwatol** wpətináhkwemal.

|kamɑč	akwa	kwən-ɑhkw.at-[w]-al	w-əhkɑt-al	nɑkɑ
very	QT	long-stick.rflx$_{IN}$-W-INpl	3-leg-INpl	and

piw-ɑhkw-əhs-əhs.ən-(?)	nɑkɑ	akwa	kamɑč
small-stick-DIM-DIM.LV$_{IN}$-(SUB?)	and	QT	very

kwən-ɑhkw-at-[w]-al	w-əhpətin-ɑhkwem-al|
long-stick.rflx$_{IN}$-W-INpl	3-hand-branch-INpl

'His legs were very long and of small circumference, and his arms were very long.'
(pɑ̀mole nɑ̀kɑ nɑksk**w**éhsisak:10)

- Plural arg wkɑ̀tal 'his legs' for piwáhkwsəssən, 'they (IN) are of small circumference'…
- …but "peripheral ending" agreement---INpl |-al|---is blocked in this context, hence:

***piwáhkwsəssənol**

Peripheral endings (Bruening and Rachowski 2001; Goddard 1983) disambiguate only in Independent Indicative:

(8) Independent Indicative: peripherals present, morphologically unambiguous

wənámihɑl	|wə-namihw.ɑ-[w]-al|
's/he sees **h/her**(obv)'	3-see.DIR$_{AN}$-W-obv
wənámihɑ	|wə-namihw.ɑ-[w]-a|
's/he sees **them**(obv)'	3-see.DIR$_{AN}$ -W-obv.pl

(9) Subordinative: peripherals absent, morphologically ambiguous

wənámihɑn	|wə-namihw.ɑ-ənе|
's/he sees **h/her/them**(obv) (subord)'	3-see.DIR$_{AN}$ -N(=SUB)

CORE POINT: lack of peripheral agreement is the primary sign of the subordinative

- Reduction of tense, argument agreement in dependent clausal forms is cross-linguistically common (and especially so (and interesting) in Altaic-area languages)

5. A parallel that isn't to be: no infinitives in E. Algonquian

- E. Algonquian: like Balkan *na/da/sa_/tə̀*[6] systems, unlike Altaic-area: **no infinitive**
- E. Alg. subord: complements embedded under control (10) and attitude/judgement (11) predicates:

(10) Control predicate subordinative (Speck 16:219); S:60:102)

a. nihkwɑp nəya **nətahčəwelətamən** kəya kkələləwewin.

|nihkwɑp	nəya	nət-ahčo-eləm-t.am-ənе	kəya	kə-kəlol-əw.e-w.i-ənе|
now	1s	1-must-feel-T.LV$_{AN}$-N	2s	2-speak.to-impers.DO$_{AN}$-FOR.LV$_{I}$-SUB

'**I want** you to propose [marriage] for me.'

b. **wəsíkɑtamən**, wətálətonkɑn. |wə-sikɑl/m-t.am-ənе wət-ətal-əton-əhk.e-ənе|
'**He hates** to talk [in public]' 3-dislike-T.LV$_{AN}$-N 3-there-mouth-do.DO$_{AN}$ -SUB

(11) Attitude/judgment predicate subordinative (ɑpəlíhkəməwe#1:6; k. nɑ̀kɑ tò̀ləpe#2:21)

a. **nɑ̀kɑmat**=te nəčawahpíkətahin. |nəkɑm-at-[w]=tte nə-čawahp-kətɑh.i-ənе|
'I **had better** jump into the water.' better-rflx$_{IN}$ -W=INT 1-into.water-jump.LV$_{AN}$-SUB

b. ...**alı-péčıhle** kətəlátahkɑn. [7] |əl-pet-hl.ɑ-[w] kət-əl-atɑ-əhk.e-ənе|
'...**the time has come** for you to act.' thus-arrive-go.LV$_{IN}$ -W 2-thus-act-do.DO$_{AN}$ -SUB

- Subordinative is **the** basic syntactic option for embedded/dependent clauses in these languages[8]
- All other uses of the subordinative thus predicted to involve some sort of matrix predicate
- These other uses = the phenomena shared in common with Altaic-area subordinators:

(12) Altaic-area and E. Algonquian subordinators: shared characteristics

(i) Indirect "polite" imperatives and statements
(ii) Additional verb(s) in a multiple imperative
(iii) "Pseudo-coordination" (and "logical" sequentiality)
(iv) Extended clausal chaining in narrative

6. Indirect "polite" imperatives (and statements)

(13) Japanese (*Nihongo jaanaru* 11 (1988), citedin Alpatov and Podlesskaya 1995:475)

Kyoo	no	tokoro	wa	kangae-sase-te.
today	ATTR	around	TOP	think.over-CAUS-CONV

'Let me think [it] over for today.'

- Dropping matrix predicate *kudasai* said to shift imperative from addressive [= honorific? CQ] interpretation to neutral one
- ***Syntactically*** omitting the main clause allows one to ***discursively*** skirt around it.
- Sohn 1999: Korean omission of main clauses serves to elide the speaker's assertion
- Siebert (p.c., 1996): Penobscot subordinative said to soften the command, or render it less direct:

(14) Penobscot (pə̀mole nə̀kɑ nɑkskw̆éhsisak:11)

ɑn ni, nìhkw̆ɑp kətehkw̆i-wəsikítəhɑsin wəsə̀mɑskw̆e **kkatı-mɑ́čephol** wə̀hka ktátənoke.

|ɑn ni	nihkwɑp	kət-ehkw-wəsik-təhɑ-əs.i-əne	wəsɑm	=ɑskwe
well then	now	2-stop-sad-think-rflx.LV_{AN}-SUB	because	TC

kə-katw-mɑče-phw.əl	wɑhka	kəht-atənw-ək-e|
2-IRREALIS-start.away-grab.LV_2	far.away	great-mountain-LOC-ABS

'Well then, you are to[9] cease being sad now, because **I am going to take you far away** to Mt. Katahdin.'

Leavitt 1996: Passamaquoddy: subordinative "can serve as a mild or polite imperative"
Sherwood 1986: Maliseet: "the subordinative may be used as a polite imperative, to convey a suggestion or a request."[10]

(15) a. Passamaquoddy (Leavitt 1996:42)

ktankeyasin	|kt-ankeya.s.i-əne|
'Take care of yourself'	2-take.care.of.rflx.LV_{AN}-SUB

b. Maliseet (Sherwood 1986:135)

kpečiphan kitapennok	|k-pet-phw.a-əne	k-it-ape-ənəw-ək|
'Bring our friends.'	2-arrive-grab.DIR_{AN}-SUB	2-fellow-man-1pl-ANpl

Politeness effect < indirectness effect < embedding clause under implied matrix predicate (as in (10, 11)?)

7. Multiple imperatives

- Altaic-area "contextual" subordinators: seem often to pick up a temporal/logical sequencing reading.

- Hence likely source of multiple imperatives use in all three?
- Again, head-parameterized….
- Multiple imperative: one true imperative "head" ([stem]-ela in Korean; bare stem in Penobscot and Passamaquoddy-Maliseet); then **Dep**s for remaining subordinated commands:

(16) Korean (Soo-Yeon Jeong, p.c.)

kakey-ey	ka-se	ssal-ul	sa-se	cip-ey	wa-se	pap-ul	**ci-ela**
store-to	go-SE	rice-ACC	buy-SE	house-to	come-SE	rice-ACC	**cook-IMPER**

'Go to the store, buy rice, come home, and **cook** the meal/rice.'

(17) Penobscot (mətéwələnəwak kəyáhsopik:20; S.D.:167)

(a) **wə̀lihto** wìkəwɑm nɑ̀kɑ kəmátotawɑn.

|wəl-h-taw	wikəwɑm	nɑkɑ	kə-matotaw.e-əne|
good-cause-T.LV$_{AN}$	house	and	2-kindle.fire.DO$_{AN}$-SUB

'**Put** the wigwam **in good order** and you are to kindle a fire.'

(b) **nótesse** nɑ̀kɑ kənɑ́tahəyɑn. \|note-ohs.e nɑkɑ kə-nɑt-ahəy.ɑ-əne\|

'**Go outside** and play.' outside-walk.DO$_{AN}$ and 2-go.in.order.to-play.DO$_{AN}$-SUB

(18) Passamaquoddy -Maliseet (Leavitt 1996:42, 55)

ksaha naka ktəpin	|kəhsa-h.a	naka	kt-əp.i-əne|
'**Come in** and sit down.'	enter-go.LV$_{AN}$	and	2-sit.LV$_{AN}$-SUB

- Multiple imper. quite often necessarily assoc. with sequentiality of events: *Do this, and then do that...*
- Speaker clearly indicates (16) has a strong sequentiality reading
- E. Alg. sequential conjunctions *nɑkɑ* (Penobscot) and *naka* (Passamaquoddy-Maliseet) 'and'.
- But there is a problem for a purely sequentiality-based account: pseudo-coordination.

8. "Pseudo-coordination" and multiclausal (C/T-level) reanalysis

Pseudo-coordination: a descriptive term for cases in (19):

(19) Japanese (Nakatani 2004:124:(10))

hana-no	inoti-wa	[mizikaku-te]	**hakana-i**.
flower-GEN	life-TOP	short-TE	fragile-PRES

'The life of a flower is short and **fragile**.' (interpretation: **fragile** and short?)

= when two elements that seem to have no particularly strong relative dependency (let alone sequentiality) are nonetheless asymmetrically related in syntax, by means of a "contextual" subordinator (here *-te*)

- Similar observations reported for Korean (Chang 1996); same found with Penobscot subordinative:

(20) Penobscot (αpəlíhkəməwe#1:1)

ὰnsα èləwe **pətəkw̆áhpskəso**, nὰkα wαpáčəssin, nὰkα àkw̆a pὸskəle áwaskw̆em.

|αnsα eləwe pətəkw-αhpəsk-əs.i-[w] nαkα [wə]-wαp-ačəhs.i-əne
truly nearly round-rock-rflx.LV_{AN}-W and [3]-white-colored.LV_{AN}-SUB

nαkα=akwa poskəl-e-[w?] [11] a-waskwe-əm|
and QT soft-STATE.$_{IN}$ -W? 3-carapace-POSS

'Indeed **he was almost round in shape** and he was colored white, and it is said his shell was soft.'

Pseudo-coordinating subordination:
- NOT: to show that Dep element is (discourse-wise) dependent on Indep[12]
- INSTEAD: to produce a syntactic structure that can undergo **clause-level reanalysis**

Hence: Crops up primarily when the syntactically **independent** eventuality and syntactically dependent one(s) are to be perceived as a unified whole (cf. Sohn 1999)

- Dep and Indep status can readily alternate between the pseudo-coordinatees:

(21) Passamaquoddy (LeSourd 1993:22)

a. **čílk-ensk-ə́so** náka h-kín-apsk-ə́si-n. |čilk-ensk-əs.i-[w] naka w-kin-apsk-ə́si-əne|
'**He is short** and fat.' short-body-rflx.LV_{AN}-W and 3-big-rock-rflx.LV_{AN}-SUB

b. **kín-apsk-ə́so** náka h-čílk-ensk-ə́si-n. |kin-apsk-əs.i-[w] naka w-čilk-ensk-əs.i-əne|
'**He is fat** and short.' big-rock-rflx.LV_{AN}-W and 3-short-body-rflx.LV_{AN}-SUB

- No logical or temporal link btw being fat and being short, so both orders available
- BUT: in both, **IndepIndic** used for just one (**first** = head-initial param), then Subord for remainder
- Semantics crucial: [*short and fat*] "semi-canonical" = easily perceptually unified whole
- English: monomorphemic *stout*, but no *blork = [*tall and purple-spotted*]
- Occurrence of pseudo-coordination seems to center around such natural confluences of meaning

Penobscot: 3 comparable cases of canonically "fused" or tightly associated subevents:

(22) Penobscot (k. nὰkα tὸləpe#2:15, 2:1, 2:3)

a. **kətahčəwɪč-awə́ssɪsəwɪ**, nὰkα kolí-təpαpayin.

|kət-ahčo=č-awαssis-w.i-əp nαkα kə-wəl-təp-αpe-w.i-əne|
2-must=FUT-child-be.LV_{AN} and 2-good-assay-man-be.LV_{AN}-SUB

'**You will have to be young** and handsome.'

b. àhtαmα ípi, **mačɪnə́kw̆əsɪwɪ**, nὰkα kὰmač wəkətəmə́keyin.

|ahtαmα ip-iwi mač-naw.əkw-əs.i-w.i nαkα kamač wə-kətəmαk-ey.i-əne|
not only-IWI bad-view.INV$_{AN}$ -rflx.LV_{AN} -NEG.W and very 3-pitiful-condition.LV_{AN} -SUB

'Not only **was he ugly**, but <u>he was very poor</u>.'

c. ni, owa ótenapit sɑ̀kəmɑ, nìsəwa wə̀tosa, tákʷi àkʷatte **awɑssísowak**, nɑ̀kɑ kámɑč <u>oli-təpinɑ́kʷəsinɑ</u>.

	ni	owa	[e]-otene-ap.i-t	sɑkəmɑ	nis.i-[w]-a	wə-tos-a
	then	this$_{AN}$	C-town-sit.LV$_{AN}$-3cj	leader	two.LV$_{AN}$-W-obv.pl	3-daughter-obv.pl

takw-iwi=akwa=tte
both-IWI=QT=INT

awɑssis-w.i-[w]-ak nɑkɑ kamɑč wə-wəl-təp-naw.əkw-əs.i-əne-əwɑ|
child-be.LV$_{AN}$-W-ANpl and very 3-good-assay-view.INV$_{AN}$-rflx.LV$_{AN}$-SUB-≠1ANpl

'Now the chief of the village had[13] two daughters, both of whom **were young** and very <u>beautiful</u>.'

- Pseudo-coordination offers a "whole-package" sense of the (un)attractiveness of the referent

C/T-level "reanalysis" model prediction:

- Replace **Indep**-<u>Dep</u> with **Indep**-**Indep**, then forms should interpret as very separate, mutually independent propositions not seen as fused/related
- Testing: E Alg.? Altaic?

Subordination at this smallest (bi)clausal level introduces a ***discourse***-interpretational cohesion effect, here attributed to ***syntactic*** clausal reanalysis. Expanding outwards: **extended narrative chaining**

9. Extended narrative chaining: more multiclausal reanalysis

(23) Extended narrative chaining using "contextual" subordinators -IB and *-te*

a. Kirghiz (Johanson 1995:329:(25))

Men	erteN	menen	<u>tur-up</u>,	zaryadka	<u>Zas-ap</u>,
I	morning	with	stand.up-CONV	gymnastics	do-CONV
<u>kiy-in-ip</u>,			<u>Zu:-n-up</u>,	Cay <u>iC-ip</u>,	mektep-ke
dress-PASS-CONV			wash-PASS-CONV	tea drink-CONV	school-DAT

bar-a-Zat-am.
go-[PRES]-1.SG

'In the morning I <u>stand up</u>, <u>do</u> gymnastics, <u>dress</u>, <u>wash myself</u>, <u>drink</u> tea, and **go** to school.'

b. Japanese[14] (Masakazu Kuno, p.c.)

Kyoo-wa	9-ji-kurai-ni	<u>oki-te</u>,
today-TOP	9-o'clock-around-DAT	wake.up-TE

asa-gohan-o	tabe-te,	*shower*-o	abi-te,
[breakfast]-ACC	eat-TE	shower-ACC	"take"-TE

C.-no	*Language and Cognition*-no	*class*-ni	ki-te,
C.-GEN	L&C-GEN	class-DAT	come-TE

sono-ato,	*J.*-no	*Intro to Syntax*-no	*class*-ni	de-te,
that-after,	J.-GEN	I.to.S.-GEN	class-DAT	attend-TE

J.-to	S.-Y.-to	issyo-ni	hiru-gohan-o	tabe-te,
J.-and/with	S.Y.-with	(to)gether-DAT	[lunch]-ACC	eat-TE

J.-no	*semantics*-no	*class*-ni	de-te,
J.-GEN	semantics-GEN	class-DAT	attend-TE

sono-ato,	kutsu-o	kat-te,	*department*-ni	modot-te ki-te,
that-after,	shoes-ACC	buy-TE	dept.-DAT	return-TE come-TE

H.-to	o-cha-o	non-de,
H.-with	[tead]-ACC	drink-TE

C.-ni	jikkendai-ni	nat-te kure-to	tanom-are-te,
C.-DAT	research.subject-DAT	become-TE give-C	ask-PASS-TE

ima	kou-shi-te	syabet-te **i-masu**.
now	this-do-TE	speak-TE **be-POLITE**

'Today I woke up at around 9 o'clock, ate breakfast, took a shower, came to C.'s Language and Cognition class, after that attended J.'s Intro to Syntax class, ate lunch together with J. and S.Y., attended J.'s Semantics class, after that bought shoes, came back here to the department, drank tea with H., was asked to become C.'s research subject, (and) **am now speaking** this way.'

- E. Algonquian: homologous head-initial clause-chaining pattern[15]
- Subord in fact predominant clause type in Penobscot traditional narrative texts (Altaic-area parallel)[16]

(24) Penobscot (k. nɑ̀kɑ tòləpe#2:13)

nɨ tòləpe **wəmenənɑ́mɨhkɨn**, nɑ̀kɑ awapénɑkʷəsɨn. nɨ wəmátotawɑn, nɑ̀kɑ wətə̀lɑkkʷɑn. nɑnɑkáyɨ, nɨ wəmemíhpɨnɑ. nɨ wətalətónkɑnɑ.

|nɨ	toləpe	wə-menən-ɑmɨhk.ɨ-əne	nɑkɑ	a-wape-naw-əkw-əs.ɨ-əne
then	turtle	3-slow-arise.LV$_{AN}$-SUB	and	3-busy-view.INV$_{AN}$-rflx.LV$_{AN}$-SUB

nɨ	wə-matotaw.e-əne	nɑkɑ	wət-əl-ɑkw-əhk.e-əne	nɑnɑke-ɨwɨ
then	3-kindle.fire.DO$_{AN}$ -SUB	and	3-thus-cook-do.DO.LV$_{AN}$-SUB	short.time-IWI

nɨ	wə-mem-ɨhp.ɨ-əne-əwɑ	nɨ	wə-ətal-əton-əhk.e-əne-əwɑ|
then	3-enough-eat.LV$_{AN}$-SUB-≠1ANpl	then	3-there-mouth-do.DO.LV$_{AN}$-SUB-≠1ANpl

'Then Turtle **got up slowly**[17] and was busy about. Then he kindled a fire and cooked. Presently they

had enough to eat. Then they talked.'

- Tightly chained successive dependency of the events
- Conjunction **ni** 'then'[18] makes temporal relationship explicit
- Sound recordings: Subord forms can indeed be pronounced with substantial pauses, i.e. with a phonological independence comparable to that of English main clause sentences.

- Again: subordinative as syntactic means to multiclausal reanalysis with discourse-packaging effect
- Phonologically "free" subordinatives combine under Indep form (overt or not) to create an overall interpretational effect, each verbal eventuality being taken as just a subpart of single fused episodic "package"
- This "episode" of extended narrative chaining is just a large-scale extension of pseudo-coordination

- Found little in Altaic literature to prove/disprove this view empirically;[19] none in E. Alg. literature
- Suggestive anecdote: consultant reports that "desubordinating" made an eventuality embedded in narrative seem "more vivid" (Siebert, p.c., 1996)
- "Vivid" is vague, but fits well with nascent model: partially confirms prediction that Indep morphosyntactic status has the discourse consequences of independence and prominence
- Demands development of sharper tests for what this "vividness" intuition is getting at, to apply to both E. Alg. and Altaic-area languages

10. Discussion and applications

- Multiclausal reanalysis thus provides a consistent (if still incompletely formal) account for all uses of the Dep elements in E. Algonquian and Altaic-area languages discussed here
- E. Algonquian and Altaic-area patterns are comparable, varying only in head directionality
- "Pseudo-coordination" cases simply pick the element on one edge of the collocation as the Indep head according to head-parameterization, deriving an overall multiclausal "very complex predicate" that interprets as a single "fused" or reanalyzed clausal unit.
- Extended narrative chaining simply expands this effect to the narrative level, creating interpretationally single-unit "episodes" that constitute a type of reanalysis possible and exploitable at levels higher than just argument structure, with direct derivational effects on discourse meaning.
- Discourse-organizational effect over multiple clauses can thus be seen to derive directly from syntactic structures: "episodes" take the headed character of syntax to the discourse level.

Open question:

How much more and how much else in this area traditionally treated as discourse might be amenable to structural analysis/representation using simply the same algorithms that produce more familiar clause-, phrase-, and word-internal syntax?

Such a "more of the same" view would certainly make for a simpler grammar.

Remaining task:

Develop an explicit formal model for this type of reanalysis; and from there test the following questions:

(a) Are doubly-headed "episodes" impossible? Prediction: Yes.
(b) What, if any, is the nature of a "fused" interpretation stemming from multiclausal reanalysis?
(c) How can we distinguish it from strict coordination and strict subordination?
(d) Is making such a distinction even necessary?

- Suggestions on directions to go in developing the primary formalization (e.g. Tikkanen 1995's "scope integration" looks promising)?

ABBREVIATIONS

SUB	subordinative-associated morphology (primarily the N-morpheme)
N	N-morpheme: associated with subordinative paradigm and with marginal syntactic arguments
W	W-morpheme: associated with non-marginal 3rd person arguments
P	P-morpheme: appears when only verbal arguments are SAP
cj	conjunct mode (a type of subordinate C morphology)
C	initial change (associated with certain conjunct forms)
≠1ANpl	non-first person plural animate
LOC	locative
ABS	absentative/inacessible referent
PAN	(nondubitative) preterite/anterior
SAN	dubitative-evidential preterite/anterior
INT	intensifying enclitic
FUT	future/potential enclitic
QT	quotative/secondhand information evidential enclitic
TC	topic change enclitic
TOP	topic marker
GEN/ATTR	alternate glosses for Japanese *no*, according to cited source
CAUS	causative
CONV	converb (= subordinator, according to cited source)
AN	"animate" nominal gender/class
IN	"inanimate" nominal gender/class
LV	light verb (unspecified/undetermined)
rflx	reflexive light verb
DO	basic unergative light verb (AN)
STATE	light verb associated with spatial states (IN)
DIR	light verb, agreeing for AN patient (with "direct" featural configuration)
INV	light verb, agreeing for AN patient (with "inverse" featural configuration)
LV_1	light verb, agreeing for 1st person patient
LV_2	light verb, agreeing for 2nd person patient
FOR	rough gloss of dative/benefactive/malefactive element
T	detransitivizing/unergativizing/antipassivizing incorporated nominal element

REFERENCES

Alpatov, Vladimir M., and Vera Podlesskaya. 1995. Converbs in Japanese. In Haspelmath and König 1995: 465-486.
Bruening, Benjamin. 2004. On wh-indefinites and wh-in-situ: bare conditionals in Chinese and Passamaquoddy. Talk given at the Harvard GSAS Series in Syntax and Linguistic Theory.
Bruening, Benjamin, and Rackowski, A. 2001. Configurationality and Object Shift in Algonquian. In Suzanne Gessner, Sunyoung Oh, and Kayono Shiobara, eds., Proceedings of WSCLA 5. Vancouver: UBCWPL. 71 - 84.
Chang, Suk-jin. 1996. Korean. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Goddard, Yves. 1983. The Eastern Algonquian subordinative mode and the importance of morphology. IJAL 49:4: 351-87.
Grønbech, Kaare. 1997 [1979]. The structure of the Turkic languages. Krueger, John, transl. Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series 136. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies. 135. 1997 reprint: Chippenham, Wiltshire: Curzon Press Ltd.
Hale, Kenneth. 1991. Misumalpan verb sequencing constructions. In Claire Lefebvre, ed., Serial verbs: grammatical, comparative, and cognitive approaches. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Hasegawa, Yoko. 1996. A study of Japanese clause linkage. Stanford: CSLI.
Haspelmath, Martin. 1995. The converb as cross-linguistically valid category. In Haspelmath and König 1995: 1-56.
Haspelmath, Martin, and Ekkehard König. 1995. (Eds.). Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective: structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms - adverbial participles, gerunds. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Johanson, Lars. 1995. On Turkic converb clauses. In Haspelmath and König 1995: 313-348.
Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. Turkish. New York: Routledge.
Leavitt, Robert M. 1996. Passamaquoddy-Maliseet. München-Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
LeSourd, Philip S. 1993. Accent and syllable structure in Passamaquoddy. New York: Garland.
Lewis, Geoffrey L. 1985. Turkish grammar. New York: Oxford University Press.
Longacre, Robert E. 1985. Sentences as combinations of clauses. In Shopen, Timothy, ed., Language typology and syntactic description: vol. 2: complex constructions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 235-286.
Martin, Samuel J. 1975. A reference grammar of Japanese. Forge Village, MA: Yale University Press.
Matsumoto, Yo. 1996. Complex predicates in Japanese: a syntactic and semantic study of the notion 'word'. Stanford: CSLI.
McAllister, Tara. 2001. Student paper for Ling 97r: Structure of Penobscot and the N.E. Algonquian languages. Ms.: Harvard University.
Nakatani, Kentaro. 2004. Predicate concatentation: a study of the V-te-V predicate in Japanese. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Ph.D. thesis.
Ogihara, Toshiyuki. 1998. The ambiguity of the *-te iru* form in Japanese. Journal of East Asian Linguistics 7: 87-120.
Richards, Norvin. 2004. The syntax of the Conjunct and Independent orders in Wampanoag. Ms.: MIT.
S_amina, Ljudmila Alekseevna. 1987. Vremmenye polipredikativnye konstruksii tuvinskogo jazyka. [Temporal multipredicative constructions of the Tuvan language]. Novosibirsk: Nauka, Sibirskoe otdelenie. [cited in Johanson 1995].
Sherwood, David F. 1986. Maliseet-Passamaquoddy verb morphology. Ottawa: Canadian Museum of Civilization (Mercury Series).
Shirai, Yasuhiro. 2000. The semantics of Japanese imperfective *-teiru*: an integrative approach. Journal of Pragmatics 32:327-361.
Shopen, Timothy. 1985. (Ed.). Language typology and syntactic description, vol. 2: complex constructions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Siebert, Frank T., Jr. (n.d.). Field notes and unpublished manuscripts of Penobscot legends, and Penobscot dictionary.
Sohn, Ho-Min. 1999. The Korean language. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Soper, John David. 1996. Loan syntax in Turkish and Iranian. Andras J.E. Bodrogligeti, rev. and ed. Bloomington, Indiana: Eurolingua.
Speck, Frank T. 1918. Penobscot transformer tales. IJAL 1:3: 187-244. (Retranscription, 2004, C. Quinn).
Tikkanen, Bertil. 1995. Burushaski converbs in their areal context. In Haspelmath and König 1995: 487-528.
Valentine, J. R. 2001. Nishnaabemwin reference grammar. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

---

[1] From what literature I have seen, it seems that substantial controversy remains as to the status of Altaic as a genetic family. I lack the background to take a stand on the matter, and so in this paper just use the term "Altaic-area languages," since it seems clear at least that areal contact between these languages is uncontroversial.
[2] I will not try to argue whether this element is a TP or a CP; for present purposes, it suffices to treat it broadly as C/T complex of some kind.
[3] Altaic-area languages offer a very rich range of **subtypes** of subordinator (Hale 1991, Johanson 1995); in this paper I will focus not on such "specific" converbs (= subordinators), i.e. those marking explicit causation and sequencing

(anteriority, posteriority, simultaneity; arguably also distinguishing dependency-internal dependency (or nested dependency)) etc., but instead on the barer, less demonstrably specified subordinating elements that nonetheless often manifest the above range of interpretations as possible---but crucially not cannot be demonstrated to force them. I partially borrow Haspelmath and König 1995's term in referring to these as the "contextual" subordinators. A familiar example is the general Turkic -IB subordinator illustrated in Johanson 1995's analysis of the Tuvan sentence in (a):

(a) Tuvan (S_amina 1987:94, cited in Johanson 1995:(24))

A_d-ïm	*_it-käs_,*	*_ada_*	*qal-d-ïm.*
horse-POSS.1.SG	get lost-CONV	on foot	remain-TERM.PAST.1.SG

Johanson 1995:328 argues that the relation between the two propositions [my horse got lost] and [I had to walk] is "just as open [= underspecified; CQ] as European juxtapositions and coordinations such as *My horse got lost; [and] I had to walk.*" That is, the logical relation between the two is not overtly signaled by the subordinating element, but instead pragmatically recovered/created by the listener. This paper draws its examples and discussion primarily from these "contextual" subordinators, since the core issue here is that of basic dependency relations.

[4] This is just for descriptive purposes: a paradigm-free account is equally possible (and interesting), but it would require more of a detour than I have time for in this talk. Such an account would presumably base itself around the type of C/T complex that the subordinative represents, or better, the type of C/T complex that the only clause type permitting peripheral endings, namely, the Independent Indicative, has. See Richards 2004 for some relevant discussion.

[5] Their much clearer diachronic origins are detailed in Goddard 1983.

[6] Modern Greek / Bulgarian / Romanian / Albanian, respectively.

[7] This may in fact be better analyzed as a different sort of subordination, i.e. causal dependency; but the dividing line between this and attitude judgements is very thin, since the former is a more or less objective statement about event dependencies, the latter as statement about event dependencies as explicitly filtered through the speaker's attitude(s). One case not quite matching typical Balkan-area patterns at all is

(a)	**nolítəhɑsɪ** kəpéčɪhlɑn.	|nə-wəl-təhɑ-əs.ɪ-əp	kə-pet-hl.ɑ-əne|
	'I'm glad you came.' (S.D.:558)	1-good-think-rflx.LV_{AN}-P	2-arrive-go.LV_{AN} -SUB

Here Balkan-area languages would be more likely (I think) to use a different subordinator (*che* in Bulgarian, for example). But note that English has both *I'm glad that you came* and (weakly) ?*I'm glad for you to have come* (interestingly, much better with a different mood: *I'm glad for you to come*).

[8] See Bruening 2003 and Richards 2004 for discussion of the Conjunct, the other primary verbal subordination paradigm.

[9] Siebert's standard approach to translating such forms in to English was to use collocations of the quasi-idiom *be + to (infinitive)* to convey the sense of indirectness. Note that the raising/control syntax involved in the translating is in its broad outlines the same as that argued to here for the subordinative itself.

[10] Retranscription (where applicable) and morpheme glosses mine for these and all other Passamaquoddy-Maliseet forms cited.

[11] This verb may also in the subordinative mode, but being an IN intransitive form with a singular referent, one cannot tell for certain.

[12] At least not at this level of interpretation. I would not rule some degree of dependency interpretation out wholly: the choice of which to subordinate in cases where "it doesn't matter which one to subordinate" may well then depend on weaker sense of dependency that exploits sheer linearization sequence alone. Here I only assert that a strong effect, from morphology, is not necessarily implied.

[13] Also Independent Indicative, but not marked in boldface, for clarity.

[14] Note that here I have intentionally not underlined *-te* constructions that appear only to form parts of "tighter" complex predicates; see Nakatani 2004, Hasegawa 1996; and Ogihara 1998, Shirai 2000 (inter alia) for discussion of such forms.

[15] A comparable phenomenon may be the chaining of Classical Hebrew waw-consecu tives (Longacre 1985:285:ftn.6)

[16] This led to an early misidentification of the subordinator as an evidential, an indicator of "narrative mood". Hence Sherwood (1986:135) quotes Siebert as stating that the Penobscot subordinative (then termed the "indefinite mode") "is used in hearsay narrative and when relating 'indefinite past action not witnessed by the speaker,' as well as in other contexts." Sherwood further observes for Maliseet that "the subordinative is used as the predominate mode of main

clauses (except for direct quotations) in the extended narration of traditional tales and legends," and agrees that Siebert's characterization seems to be the case for the Maliseet subordinative, "at least for some of the older speakers." As near as I can tell, however, Siebert's statement is just plain not true for Penobscot. Nearly all the eventualities in narrative texts constitute past action not witnessed by the speaker, and yet indicative forms among them are not rare. Furthermore, what constitutes "indefinite" past action is vague, to say the least. Certainly it does not refer to habitual events or events that happened at an uncertain or undefined time. No other available evidence supports this view; and added to this is the observation that a rich set of evidentials already exist in these languages, in two quite distinct morphosyntactic slots: SAN-PAN anterior/evidentials, and evidential enclitics.

[17] This text follows from his companion first chiding Turtle about sleeping late, hence the first subordinative.

[18] Indeed, not surprisingly this *ni* (or variants thereof) opens the majority of sentences in Penobscot narrative texts. It is difficult to tell how much of its frequency is normal, and how much is simply an artifact of repeated restarting of a storyline, since most of these texts were taken as dictation, and not transcribed from free-flowing recordings. An alternate analysis could take these elements to be the actual matrix predicator of their associated subordinatives (see Valentine 2001).

[19] Nakatani 2004, Hasegawa 1996, and Matsumoto 1996 offer formal mechanisms by which to interpret Japanese *-te*-subordination at narrower syntactic levels, but I have yet to try to extend and apply them to the extended clause-chaining cases discussed here.