

A qualitative typology of floating coordinators and its implications for theories of clitics

Overview: In this talk, I present some findings of an ongoing research project about instances of non-canonical placement of clausal coordinators. Based on a number of in-depth case studies of coordinator placement in these languages I argue that despite the apparent rarity of the phenomenon, it presents an ideal testing ground for our typology and theory of clitic placement patterns in the world's languages. Unlike previous studies of clitic patterns, the present study keeps the morphosyntactic category of the cliticizing element constant across languages and therefore allows for a better comparison and a clear typology of which cliticizing patterns are attested in a given morphosyntactic configuration and which are not.

Background: Using the term *floating coordinator*, I refer to cases where the element coordinating two complex constituents *A* and *B* does not appear in between *A* and *B* but rather embedded into one of them. In ex. (1), we see the coordinator =*lu* following the first phonological word of the second conjunct. In (2), the coordinator *sì* follows the first prosodic phrase of the second conjunct. In (3), the coordinator *ni* follows the first syntactic phrase of the second conjunct. Note that, for all cases, independent tests have been used to identify the respective patterns.

Methodology: For each case study, it is first established that the element in question is a coordinator (and not e.g. a connective adverb). Diagnostics involve e.g. (i) the cooccurrence with other coordinators, (ii) the ability to license coordination-specific processes (ATB-movement, gapping), (iii) word-order restrictions on adverbs, (iv) syntacto-semantic scope (see also Dik 1968, Zhang 2006, Bodanyi 2013, Libert 2017). If an element passes the tests for coordinators, its distribution is tested in a variety of different configurations to identify its placement pattern. Finally, further tests are employed to see if the placement obeys different syntactic islands. For these reasons, this research project employs a qualitative method as the necessary language-specific details cannot be accommodated in a quantitative project. Currently, the data from this project come from 19 languages from 8 different language families with many more languages, in which the phenomenon is attested and which, at least on the basis of the published data, seem to confirm the findings of the languages studied in more detail. Table 1 gives an excerpt of the current database including a subset of the variables controlled for.

Findings: In this talk, I will highlight the following findings: ❶ We find that coordinators always float into the second conjunct. The database contains no cases of a coordinator that is found linearly inside the first conjunct. ❷ The established types of 2nd-position clitics found in other domains are also found with coordinators. Clitic appearing after the first phonological word (1st ω) or after the first syntactic phrase (1st XP) are widely attested but even rarer patterns (i.e. the clitic surfacing after the first phonological phrase (1st ϕ), see Chung 2003) are found in the data. ❸ There is no correlation between the phonological shape of the clitic and its positioning (see e.g. the Kalallisuut clitics), which strengthens the claim in Klavans (1995), Anderson (2005) that the phonological shape and the placement of the clitic are independent of each other. ❹ There is a correlation between the placement pattern and the sensitivity to syntactic islands. Clitics that appear after a phonological constituent (1st ω or 1st ϕ) will freely appear inside strong syntactic islands. In Yorùbá, in (5), the second conjunct of the conjunction starts with a conditional adjunct clause and the conjunction will appear inside the adjunct clause. In Mandarin, in a similar configuration, the conditional clause is skipped for clitic placement. ❺ Finally, I show that there is a correlation between the monosyndetic vs polysyndetic nature of the coordinator (see Haspelmath 2007) and the available clitic patterns. Polysyndetic coordinators (such as Latin, Kalaallisut, Ancient Greek or Khwarshi) have different cliticization patterns from monosyndetic ones: E.g. polysyndetic patterns that are sensitive to phonological phrasing pick out phonological words rather than phonological phrases. This indicates a difference in clausal integration between the types of coordinators (cf. Mitrović 2014).

Examples:

- (1) [Tului(t)-nunaan-nuka-nngil-aq] [ikinngun-ni=**lu** tikiraar-nagu].
 England-go.to-not-3SG.IND friend.3SG.REFL-AND visit-3SG-NEG-CONT
 ‘He didn’t go to England and visit his friend.’ Kalaallisuut, Fortescue 1997:123
- (2) [Adé ra àpò] [Olú kò **sì** mò].
 Ade buy bag Olu NEG AND know
 ‘Ade bought a bag and Olu did not know.’ Yorùbá, Niger-Congo
- (3) [Wiš jis.u-z jašamiš ŋu-ŋ] [wiš jis.u-z-**ni** dünja.di-n sir-er čir-a] ...
 hundred year-DAT living be-IMPV hundred year-DAT-AND world-GEN secret know-IMPV
 ‘Live a hundred years and know the world’s secrets for a hundred years ...’
 Lezgian, Haspelmath (1993)
- (4) [Baoyu yao huijia], [[ruguo ni shuofu-le ta], women **keshi** jiu neng liu zai zheli].
 Baoyu want return, if you persuade-ASP he, we but then can stay at here
 ‘Baoyu wants to go home but if you persuade him, then we can stay here.’
 Mandarin
- (5) [Ade yòd lọ sí Èkó] [[tí òjò ba **sì** rọ], Olú yòd lọ sí Ibàdàn].
 Ade will go to Lagos if rain may COORD fall Olú will go to Ibàdàn
 ‘Ade will go to Lagos and if it rains, Olú will go to Ibàdàn.’ Yorùbá, Niger-Congo

| Language | Family | Sem Type | Form | Pattern | Ignoring Islands? | Type |
|--------------|----------|--------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|------|
| Latin | Indo-Eu | AND, OR | <i>que,ve</i> | 1st ω | ✓ | Poly |
| Polish | Indo-Eu | BUT | <i>zas</i> | 1st ϕ | ✓ | Mono |
| Yorùbá | Ni-Congo | AND | <i>sì</i> | 1st ϕ | ✓ | Mono |
| Nupe | Ni-Congo | AND | <i>ma</i> | 1st XP | (✗) | Mono |
| Kalaallisuut | Inuit | AND, OR, BUT | <i>lu,li,luuniit</i> | 1st ω | ✓ | Poly |
| Yavapai | Yuman | AND | <i>pe:</i> | 1st XP | (✗) | Mono |
| Rangi | Bantu | BUT | <i>maa</i> | 1st XP | ? | Mono |
| Lezgian | NE-Cauc | AND | <i>ni</i> | 1st XP | ? | Mono |
| Khwarshi | NE-Cauc | AND | <i>in</i> | ABSXP / 1st XP | ✗ | Poly |
| Mandarin | Sino-Tib | BUT | <i>keshì</i> | 1st XP | ✗ | Mono |

Table 1: Languages showing non-canonical placement of coordinators

References: Anderson, S. R., 2005. Aspects of the theory of clitics, OUP. • Bodányi, Á., 2013. Az úgynevezett jobbról csatolt kötőszók, in: Lingdok 12 Nyelvészdoktoranduszok Dolgozatai. • Dik, S., 1968. Coordination. Its implications for the theory of general linguistics. Amsterdam. • Fortescue, M., 1997. West Greenlandic. Croon Helm, London. • Haspelmath, M., 1993. A Grammar of Lezgian. de Gruyter. • Haspelmath, M., 2007. Coordination, in: Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–51. • Klavans, J., 1995. On Clitics and Cliticization: The Interaction of Morphology, Phonology, and Syntax. New York Garland. • Libert, A.R., 2017. Conjunctions and other parts of speech. Peter Lang. • Mitrović, M., 2014. Morphosyntactic Atoms of Propositional Logic. University of Cambridge. • Zhang, N., 2006. On the Configuration Issue of Coordination. Language and Linguistics pp.175–223 .