Contrastive Linguistics as Pilot Typology:
the Case of Concessive Conditionals

While contrastive linguistics and linguistic typology are distinct disciplines (König 2012), one potential purpose of contrastive linguistics is to serve as pilot typology (van der Auwera 2012). In our contribution, we demonstrate how the contrastive comparison of a small sample of genetically unrelated languages generates testable hypotheses for a large-scale typological study of concessive conditionals (= CCs). CCs are a variety of conditionals in which the consequent is presented as true under a whole set of antecedent conditions: if $\{p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n\}$, then q (König 1986). Since the set needs to be quantified, concessive conditionals both within and across languages display an unusual diversity of forms which can be grouped into three types of strategies (Haspelmath/König 1998): a single, contextually extreme value that implies a scale of other, less extreme values (English *even if*); a disjunction of maximally distinct values along some semantic parameter (English *whether … or*); and free-choice quantification over instantiations of a variable (English *wh-ever*, *no matter wh-*).

Our paper begins with a survey of the methodology of contrastive linguistics as pilot typology (including the preference for three rather than two languages, van der Auwera 2012) and an introduction to CCs. Next, we offer a contrastive comparison of CCs in three genetically unrelated languages: English, Japanese and Samoan (cf. data below). It gives rise to three working hypotheses: (a) the marking of CCs in the languages of the world varies along a scale between uniform marking of the three strategies (Japanese, Samoan) and differential marking (English), with English representing the Standard Average European pattern; (b) actual marking strategies are the result of competing motivations such that they reflect either the basic meaning of CCs, i.e. conditionality (Japanese *-te*, English *if*), or the quantificational feature that distinguishes CCs from 'if'-conditionals, with quantification often expressed by interrogative-like forms (cf. the Samoan interrogative particle *pe/po* and the various *wh*-expressions of English); (c) the marking of CCs reflects a distinction between primary and secondary marking strategies and an associated typological asymmetry such that primary conditional marking tends to combine with secondary quantificational marking (cf. Japanese *-te mo*, English *even if*) whereas quantificational marking does not require secondary marking for conditionality to serve its purpose of expressing concessive conditionality (Samoan *tusa ... pe/po* 'be.the.same ... INT', English *whether ... or*, *wh-ever*, *no matter wh-*).

We then present preliminary results, taken from the grammars and other descriptive studies of an original worldwide sample of 55 languages, of an on-going typological research project designed to test these hypotheses. They largely confirm hypotheses (a)-(c), but they also lead to important refinements. As to (a), if in a given languages only two of the three strategies are marked uniformly (as e.g. in English), they tend to be 'even if' and 'whether …or' strategies or the 'whether … or' and 'wh-ever/no matter wh-' strategies. The resulting semantic map is matched by the observation, relevant for hypothesis (b), that the 'wh-ever/no matter wh-' strategy is least often marked for conditionality crosslinguistically. As to (c), we find that languages like Japanese and also e.g. Turkish which mark CCs uniformly for conditionality also tend to have alternative, quantification-based CC constructions, whereas the reverse is rarely ever the case. (English, e.g., does not have conditionally marked alternatives for 'whether … or' and 'wh-ever/no matter wh-' CCs.) This is in turn matched by the observation that conditional marking is optional in the 'even if' strategy in some languages like Buwal, whereas quantificational marking ('even') is mandatory. However, there are also languages like Mauwake where this type of CC has the form of a single-antecedent conditional and any quantification must be inferred from scalarity effects in the respective context.

Our paper ends with a survey of methodological challenges and the overall role of fine-grained comparisons of pilot samples of languages in our project. Consequences for the status of pilot typology vis-à-vis other applications of contrastive linguistics are also highlighted.

<u>Examples</u>

English – maximally differential marking
(1)   ***Even if*** *it rains, we'll go outside.* (primary conditional, secondary quantificational marking)
(2)   ***Whether*** *it rains* ***or*** *not, we'll go outside.* (interrogative-like quantificational marking)
(3)   ***Whatever*** *the weather is like, we'll go outside.* (interrogative-like quantificational marking)

Japanese – uniform, primary conditional marking with secondary quantificational *-te mo*
(4)   *Benkyoo   si-**te**   **mo**   doose   dame   daroo.*
      study   do-COND   even   anyway bad   MOD
      'Even if we report this, there will be no result.' (Fujii 1994: 196)
(5)   *Benkyoo   si-**te**   **mo**   si-naku-**te**   **mo**   onazi   daroo.*
      study   do-COND   even   do-NEG-COND   even   same   MOD
      'Whether I study or not, it will be the same.' (ibid.)
(6)   ***Doko***   *o   sagasi-**te**   **mo**   mitukara-na-i   yo.*
      where   ACC   Look-COND   even   find-NEG-NPST   PTL
      'No matter where you look, you won't find it.' (ibid.: 199)

Samoan – uniform quantificational marking with *tusa … pe/po*
(7)   *E   leai   se   ala   e   tatau   ai   ona*
      GENR   not.exist   ART   reason   GENR   appropriate   ANAPH   CONJ
      *ma   le   ola   filemu   e   **tusa***   *lava   **pe***
      1.EXCL.DU   not   live   peaceful   GENR   be.the.same   PTL   INT
      na   te   soli   l-o-u   togalaau
      3SG   GENR   tresspass   ART-POSS-1SG   garden
      'There is no good reason why we shouldn't live in peace, even if he steps into my garden.' (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992: 664)
(8)   *'Ole'ā   fai-a   e   **tusa***   *lava   **pe***   *timu   **pe***   *leai*
      FUT   do-ERG   GENR   be.the.same   PTL   INT   rain   INT   not.exist
      'It will be done whether it rains or not.' (ibid.)
(9)   ***Tusa***   *lava   **po***   *o   **a***   *ni   faafiafianga*
      be.the.same   PTL   INT   PRS   what   ART   entertainment
      malie   e   le   ata
      funny   GENR   not   laugh
      'Whatever funny entertainment is done, she does not laugh.' (ibid.: 665)

<u>References</u>

Fujii, Seiko Y. (1994): A family of constructions: Japanese *TEMO* and other concessive conditionals. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 20, 194–207.
Haspelmath, Martin & Ekkehard König (1998): Concessive conditionals in the languages of Europe. In Johan van der Auwera (ed.): *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 563–640.
König, Ekkehard (1986): Conditionals, concessive conditionals and concessives: Areas of contrast, overlap and neutralization. In Elizabeth C. Traugott et al. (eds.): *On conditionals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 229–246.
König, Ekkehard (2012): Contrastive linguistics and language comparison. *Languages in Contrast* 12, 3–26.
Mosel, Ulrike & Hovdhaugen, Even (1992): *Samoan reference grammar*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
van der Auwera, Johan (2012): From contrastive linguistics to linguistic typology. *Languages in Contrast* 12, 69–86.