Subordination in cross-linguistic perspective

(1) Some traditional assumptions about subordination (Cristofaro 2003: chap. 2, 2014):

- Subordination is a **syntactic feature** of particular clause types, typically those identified as adverbia1, complement, and relative clauses in the descriptive tradition of European languages ((2)).
- Subordinate clauses are a syntactically distinct class of clauses in the grammar of particular languages, in the sense of a **syntactically defined class** that is somehow relevant to the speakers of the language.
- This class can be identified based on particular syntactic properties of the relevant clauses, and these properties make it possible to identify classes of subordinate clauses in different languages.

(2) (a) *To combine the mix*, use a paddle attachment
(b) *If you have always thought* *that cauliflower can’t be exciting*, here is a dish *that will make you* *want to reconsider*
(c) *My aunt* *...* _makes the most heavenly leek fritters._ *...* _I believe my leek fritters come quite close_

(Yotam Ottolenghi, *The New Vegetarian*, www.guardian.co.uk)

(3) Some standard criteria used to define subordinate clauses (Cristofaro 2003: chap. 2, 2014):

- **Structural dependency**: A subordinate clause is one that cannot be used independently: the clause is inflectionally reduced or displays special morphology (e.g. nominalizers, case marking/adpositions, conjunctions) that makes it impossible to use it in isolation ((2a, b)).
- **Syntactic embedding**: A subordinate clause is one that functions as constituent of another clause (figure 1).
- In a more general sense, this means that the clause combines with a specific element within another clause (a noun or a verb), rather than with another clauses as a whole. In this view, complement and relative clauses ((2b, c)) are embedded, adverbial clauses ((2a)) are not.
- In a more specific sense, syntactic embedding is revealed by several different phenomena, which are regarded as evidence for a syntactic structure of the type in (i) (as opposed to (ii)) in figure 1. These include:
  - clause internal word order: the embedded clause can occur inside another clause, which becomes discontinuous ((4));
– clause extraposition (tense iconicity): the embedded clause can be moved either before or after another clause ((5a-d); (6));
– backwards pronominal anaphora: a pronoun in an embedded clause can refer to a full NP in a following clause ((5b, f); (7));
– the Coordinate Structure Constraint: material can be extracted from one of two linked clauses (for example through relativization) only if the other clause is embedded (if neither clause is embedded in the other, extraction can only take place across the board, that is, from both clauses simultaneously: (8)).

(5) Clause extraposition, backward anaphora: English (adapted from Comrie 2008: 2-3):

(a) John left the room because he was feeling unwell
(b) Because he, was feeling unwell, John, left the room
(c) The road was slippery and the car began to skid
(d) * and the car began to skid the road was slippery
(e) ? the car began to skid and the road was slippery
(f) * it, began to skid and the car, eventually stopped

Clause extraposition: Amele (Roberts 1988: 55-6)

(6) (a) Ija ja hud-ig-en fi uqa sab man-igi-an
    1SG fire open-1SG-FUT if 3SG food roast-3SG-FUT
    ‘If I light the fire she will cook the food’
(b) *Uqa* sab man-igi-an ija ja hud-ig-en fi
3SG food roast-3SG-FUT 1SG fire open-1SG-FUT if
‘If I light the fire she will cook the food’

(c) *Ho* busale-i-a qa dana age qo-ig-a
pig run.out-3s-TODP but man 3PL hit-3PL-TODP
‘The pig ran out but the men killed it’

(d) *Dana* age qo-ig-a qa ho busale-ce-b
man 3PL hit-3PL-TODP but pig run.out-DS-3SG
‘The pig ran out but the men killed it’

Backward anaphora: Amele (Roberts 1988: 56)

(7) (a) *(Uqa,)* sab j-igi-an nu Fred, ho-i-a
3SG food eat-SG-FUT for Fred come-3SG-TODP
‘Fred came to eat the food (Lit. ‘(He,) to eat the food, Fred, came’

(b) * *(Uqa,)* ho-i-a qa Fred, sab qee je-l
3SG come-3SG-TODP but Fred food not eat-NEG.PAST
‘He, came but Fred, did not eat the food’

(8) The Coordinate Structure Constraint: English (adapted from Comrie 2008: 2-3):

(a) The car began to skid because the road was slippery
(b) the car which began to skid because the road was slippery
(c) The car began to skid and eventually stopped
(d) The car which began to skid and eventually stopped
(e) John plays the flute and Mary sings madrigals
(f) *the madrigals that John plays the flute and Mary sings*

(9) But do traditional criteria for subordination make it possible to identify specific syntactic classes that

(i) play a role in the grammar of particular languages, in the sense that they are somehow relevant for speakers of those languages?

(ii) exist in the grammar of different languages?

(10) The mismatch problem:

- Many languages do not seem to have equivalents of at least some of the clause types usually identified as subordinate under traditional syntactic criteria ((11)-(16)).
- Instead, the semantic and pragmatic situations usually associated with combinations of main and subordinate clauses are encoded through combinations of juxtaposed clauses, either of which could stand independently.
• These clauses are usually in a semantic, pragmatic, and prosodic relationship, rather than a syntactic relationship.

Cape Verdean Creole

(11) (a) *Nu ta bá la Práia, ka tem arós, ka*  
1PL INACC aller là-bas Praïa NEG y'avoir riz NEG  
*tem asukri*  
y'avoir sucre  
‘Nous allions à Praïa, il n’y avait pas de riz, il n’y avait pas de sucre’  
(Quint 2008: 42)

(b) *pàsa kel otu dià, e torna fla*  
passer.ACC DEM autre jour 3SG faire.à.nouveau.ACC dire  
‘Le jour suivant passa, elle dit à nouveau’ (Quint 2008: 42)

(12) ‘Cette première proposition est finalement ici une sorte de cadre que l’on pose préalablement et à partir duquel est valide l’assertion contenue dans la proposition principale. En l’absence de toute marque de subordination morpho-syntaxique au sens large, je parlerai ici de subordination discursive.’  
(Quint 2008: 42)

(18th century) Sranan

(13) *Ningre findi bun, dem weri langa kamissa*  
negro find well/good 3PL wear long loinclothes  
‘Slaves who have a good life, they wear long loinclothes’ (Bruyn 1995: 159)

West Makian (Indo-Pacific, West Papuan)

(14) (a) *ni-i ta pasar no-poli namu de esi lo iña*  
you-go to the.market you-buy chicken eggs and canarium nuts  
‘Go to the market and buy eggs and canarium nuts’ (Voorhoeve 1982: 32)

(b) *de ti-i to-tobo*  
I 1-go 1-bathe  
‘I go bathing’ (Voorhoeve 1982: 32)

Jingulu (Australian)

(15) *Nginda wurur-wardu kuna bunungkurru-ngka kuna wamb*  
that 3PL-go ANAPH billabong-ALL ANAPH snappygum  
yambala lurnkurru ngaba-ju  
DEM middle have-do  
‘They are going to the lake that has the snappy gum in the middle of it/ They are going to the lake; that has the snappy gum in the middle of it’ (Pensalfini 2003: 123)
Mohawk (Iroquian, Canada)

(16) (a) *toka’ ki’ nè:’ne ki: iako-ia’t-a-karen-i-e’s*
    maybe just it.is this INDEF.PAT-body-JR-transport-DISTR
    *t-hoti-ia’t-enha’*
    CISL-M.PL.PAT-body-carry TAG this M.PL-be.a.child=DISTR
    *wahi’ ki: rati-ksa’=okon’a*
    CISL-M.PL.PAT-go-DIR-STAT here
    ‘Maybe the bus brought them, didn’t it, the children, they came/that came here’ (Mithun 2009: 56)

(b) *Sok nè:’e ta-ha-at-ahsawen’-
    so it.is CISLOC-FACT-M.SG.AGT-MID-begin-PRF
    *wa’-t-ha-ahsento’-
    FACT-DV-M.SG.AGT-cry-PRF
    ‘And then he started to cry (Lit. ‘So it is, he started it, he cried’)’
    (Mithun 2009: 54)

(17) So how should cases like the ones in (11)-(16) be treated in terms of subordination?

   • One possibility would be not to count them as instances of subordination: the language does not have subordination, or at least does not use subordinate clauses in these particular contexts.

   • But this would obscure the fact that these clauses perform the same function as clauses classified as subordinate in other languages (cf. the notion of ‘subordination discursive’: Caron 2008, Quint 2008).


   • Clauses classified as subordinate on traditional grounds (complement, adverbial, and relative clauses) usually encode non-asserted information, that is, information that is not open to challenge, and is presented in the perspective of the information encoded by another clause ((19)).

   • This property is shared by clauses encoding the same semantic situation but displaying different formal properties, such as the ones in (11)-(16) (cf. (12) above).

   • Hence subordination can be defined as a situation where a clause encodes non-asserted information. Any clause encoding this type of information can be regarded as an instance of subordination regardless of its formal properties.

   • This makes it possible to compare clauses encoding the same semantic and pragmatic situations cross-linguistically despite that they display different formal properties.
In this way, some principled generalizations can be made about the strategies used to encode these situations in the world’s languages ((20)).

(19) Subordination and non-assertiveness:

- Langacker (1991: 435-7): a subordinate clause is one whose profile is overridden by that of a main clause. For instance, a typical complement construction like ‘I know she left’ designates the process of knowing, not of leaving. Likewise, ‘Alarms ringing, the burglar fled’ profiles the act of fleeing, and ‘The skirts she bought was too tight’ designates the skirt. On the other hand, in a coordinate structure like ‘The Cubs won and the Padres lost’ neither clausal profile overrides the other.

- Lambrecht (1994: 51): by uttering the sentence ‘I finally met the woman who moved in downstairs’ the speaker assumes that the addressee already knows that someone moved in downstairs, and wishes to inform the addressee that s/he finally met this person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal verbs, Phasal verbs</th>
<th>Purpose clauses, Desiderative verbs, Manipulative verbs</th>
<th>Perception verbs, ‘Before’ clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘After’, ‘When’ clauses</td>
<td>S/A relativization</td>
<td>O relativization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge, Propositional attitude, Utterance verbs, Indirect object relativization, oblique relativization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The subordination hierarchy (Cristofaro 2003)

(20) The subordination hierarchy (Cristofaro 2003):

- The hierarchy encompasses several types of subordination relations (complements of different types of main predicate, different types of adverbial and relative clauses).

- Cross-linguistically, If a construction that cannot be used in an independent declarative clause (deranking constructions: inflectionally reduced verb forms, special TAM morphology, nominal morphology on verbs, possessor marking on verb arguments) is used for any subordination relation on the hierarchy, then it is used for all subordination relations to the left. Conversely, if a construction that can be used in an independent declarative clause (balanced constructions) is used for any subordination relation on the hierarchy, then it is used for all subordination relations to the right.

- This is at least partly due to the semantic relationship between main and subordinate clause (for example, whether this relationship implies that the time reference or participants of the subordinate clause are predetermined).
### Table 2: Balanced and deranked constructions in complement clauses in different languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Arabic</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Egyptian</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacalten</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lezgian</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B = balanced; D = deranked; B/D = both balanced and deranked; blank = no information available

### Table 3: Balanced and deranked constructions in adverbial clauses in different languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenlandic (West)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjarayi</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td></td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian (Ancient)</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
<td>D/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banda Linda</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B = balanced; D = deranked; D/B = both deranked and balanced; blank = no information available

(21) In the conceptual approach to subordination, several formally different clause types are treated in the same way on the grounds that they encode the same pragmatic situation:

- This does not make it possible to identify a syntactically defined class of subordinate clauses within individual languages.
- But can such a class actually be identified?

(22) The continuum problem (Cristofaro 2003: chap. 2): Individual clauses usually do not display all of the properties that are regarded as distinctive for subordination, and different clauses display different such properties. Thus, traditional criteria for subordination do not make it possible to establish a clear-cut distinction between subordinate clauses and other clauses. Rather, individual clause types can be considered as either subordinate or non-subordinate (or more or less subordinate) depending on the criteria taken into account. For example:
• Some clauses are embedded and dependent ((4))
• Some clauses are embedded, for example in the sense they function as arguments of a main verb, but could stand independently ((2c)).
• Some clauses couldn’t stand independently, but they are not embedded (clause-chaining: (6d), (23)).
• Some clauses react differently to different tests for embedding ((24)-(25)).

Kobon (Indo-Pacific, Trans-New Guinea)

(23) **Yad ma rib-em dokta wös uyán g-ay a**

1.SG foot cut-SS:1:SG doctor sore parcel do-IMP:3:SG QUOTE
g-em ausik ar-bin
do-SS:1:SG aidpost go-PERF:1:SG

‘Because I cut my foot, I went to the aidpost so that the doctor could bandage the sore’ (Davies 1981: 38)

(24) (a) **To combine the mix, use a paddle attachment**
(b) **Use a paddle attachment to combine the mix**
(c) * **Use to combine the mix a paddle attachment**

(25) (a) **The book that I am reading is very interesting**
(b) * **That I am reading the book is very interesting**
(c) * **The book is very interesting that I am reading**

(26) The facts in (22)-(25) pose no particular problems from the descriptive point of view:

• At the descriptive level, ‘subordination’ is a descriptive label that can be used for clauses displaying particular properties, and these properties can be selected arbitrarily (as long as one is clear as to what properties are selected).

• Thus, linguist can decide to regard only particular properties as distinctive for subordination, and rule out the clauses that do not display these properties (in Van Valin and LaPolla 1997, for example, only embedded dependent clauses count as subordinate).

• Alternatively, linguists can decide that different properties are all distinctive for subordination, so any clause displaying any of these properties counts as a subordinate one, and individual clauses may be more or less subordinate-like depending on how many such properties they display (Lehmann (1988), Haiman and Thompson (1984)).

But is there really evidence that subordinate clauses form a syntactic class, in the sense of a specific grammatical class that is somehow relevant to the speakers of the language?
• If different clauses that are classified as subordinate actually display non-overlapping syntactic properties (for example, ability vs. inability to occur clause internally, as in (24) and (25), then there is no evidence that speakers perceive those clauses as members of the same syntactic class.

• If different clauses that are classified as subordinate and non-subordinate share some property (e.g. no clause extraposition, as for (2e) and (25b-c), ), then there is no evidence that speakers perceive those clauses as members of different syntactic classes.

(27) In fact, a number of phenomena suggest that the properties that are traditionally regarded as distinctive for subordination do not reflect the syntactic status of the relevant clauses, but are rather motivated in semantic and pragmatic terms, or in terms of the properties of particular source constructions (Cristofaro 2014).

• The same clauses react differently to the same tests for embedding depending on the semantic and pragmatic context ((24a-b), (28)-(30)). This suggests that the properties revealed by these tests are motivated in semantic and pragmatic, not syntactic terms.

• Different clauses may or may not react differently to the same tests for embedding depending on the pragmatic contexts (cf. (2f) vs. (31) and (2b) vs. (32a)). This suggests that the differences between these clauses (which lead linguists to classify them as subordinate and non-subordinate) depend on pragmatic factors, not factors related to the syntactic status of these clauses in the grammar of the language.

• Sometimes, particular properties that are regarded as evidence for subordination (such as clause-internal word order) are actually an epiphenomenal result of the properties of particular source constructions, rather than the syntactic status of the relevant clauses in the grammar of the language (in terms, for example, of these clauses being a syntactic constituent of another clause).

Clause extraction in Mandarin Chinese

(28) (a) Nǐ guì-xialai qiú Zhāng-ān
     You kneel-down beg Zhang-san
     ‘You knelt down in order to beg Zhang-san/ and (then) begged Zhang-san.’ (Li and Thompson 1973: 98)

     (b) Zhāng-ān, nǐ guì-xialai qiú
     Zhang-san, you kneel-down beg
     ‘Zhang-san, you kneel down to beg’ [NOT ‘Zhang-san, you kneel down and beg’] (Li and Thompson 1973: 98)

(29) (a) ‘There’s another chunk just ahead’ George said. We all lined up to watch
To watch we all lined up (Thompson 1985: 70)

‘Brendan was rushing madly farther and farther out to sea. To slow her down we streamed a heavy rope in a loop from the stern and let it trail in the water behind us to act as a brake ... From the stern also dangled a metal bucket; only twenty-four hours earlier we had been using it to cook an excellent meal of Irish crabs’ (Thompson 1985: 62)

(a) What did Harry go to the store and buy?
(b) Which problem did he get bored and give up on?
(c) Sam is not the sort of guy you can just sit there and listen to (Deane 1991: 23-4)

(a) *Who did you lisp that John believes you saw?*
(b) Who did you say that John believes you saw? (Deane 1991: 37)

Mojave (Hokan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hatćcq</th>
<th>ʔ-uːtaːv-y-č</th>
<th>ʔn-yʔiːl̃-pč</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dog</td>
<td>1-hit-DEM-SUBJ</td>
<td>black-TNS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The dog I hit is black.’ (Munro 1976: 194)

Clause internal word order in Mojave relative clauses:

- Mojave relative clauses have clause internal word order, e.g. ‘dog that I hit is black’ for ‘the dog I hit is black’), which is a standard criterion for embedding.
- The relative clause, however, is a nominalized one where the verb is marked by a demonstrative affix and a case affix. Given the SOV order of the language, the original structure of the construction was plausibly something like ‘dog I hit, that was black’ (for ‘I hit the dog, that was black’), with two juxtaposed clauses. The relative clause, then, evolved as the demonstrative was combined with the preceding verb.
- This means that the fact that the relative clause is clause internal is an epiphenomenal result of the relative clause develops from the combination of adjacent elements originally belonging to two different clauses, not the syntactic status of the relative clause in itself.

Ewe (Niger-Congo)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nyɔːŋu</th>
<th>si</th>
<th>vá</th>
<th>ɛtsɔ</th>
<th>lá</th>
<th>mé-ga-le</th>
<th>o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>woman</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>yesterday</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>NEG-yet-be</td>
<td>NEG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The woman who came yesterday is no longer here’ (Heine and Reh 1984: 251)
(b) **me-bé me-wọ-e**  
I-say I-do-it  
‘I said “I did it”’ or ‘I said that I did it’ (Lord 1993: 185)

(c) **é-gblɔ ná é bé yé dyí ye gaké ye**  
he-tell give him say he-EMPH bear SRP but SRP  
kpe-dyí  
be-worthier  
‘He told him that he begot him but he was worthier’ (Lord 1993: 185)

(d) **me-dí bé máflɛ awua qewó**  
I-want say I-SUBJV-buy dress some  
‘I want to buy some dresses’ (Lord 1993: 186)

(36) **Clause internal word order in relative and complement clauses in Ewe:**

- If clause internal word order is taken as a criterion for embedding, relative clauses should count as embedded, while complement clauses shouldn’t (at least under this particular criterion).

- The position of relative clauses and complement clauses, however, is a result of several diachronic processes of grammaticalization. The two relative markers originated, respectively, from the demonstrative *si* ‘this’ and the definite article *lá* (Heine and Reh 1984). This suggests that the original structure of the sentence was ‘X this (for ‘This X), the one who *Verbs, (this one) *Verbs’, with a topical NP X with a postposed demonstrative, an appositional NP consisting of the definite article and a verb root used in modifying function, and a sentence describing an event in which the referent of the topical NP is involved (Heine and Reh 1984). The demonstrative element in the topical NP and the appositional NP were subsequently reanalyzed as a single relative construction. This yielded a pattern where the relative clause is in clause internal position, but this is because of the original position of the demonstrative and the appositional NP, not because of the syntactic structure of the relative clause in itself.

- Complement clauses in Ewe are introduced by a complementizer ultimately derived from the verb *bé* ‘say’ (Lord 1993: (35b-d)). The source construction is a serial verb construction of the type ‘X speaks say *Verb’, ‘X thinks say *Verb’, and the like, as illustrated in (35b). The ‘say’ verb was initially used to report direct speech, and was then reanalyzed as a complementizer. This means that the resulting complement clause occurs after the main clause because this is the original order of the ‘say’ verb in the serial verb construction, and this order reflects the sequence of the various events described by the construction. This too is independent of the syntactic status of the complement clause, and cannot be taken as evidence that complement and relative clauses have a different syntactic status.
(37) Concluding remarks: Subordination in language description and in linguistic theory:

- When describing particular languages, linguists usually wonder about what criteria should be considered as distinctive for subordinate clauses (e.g. syntactic vs. pragmatic criteria, or particular syntactic criteria as opposed to others, for example dependency as opposed to embedding).
- If subordination is just a descriptive category, however, this is largely a matter of convention, that is, linguists can select any criteria they want, as long as they are clear about these criteria.
- In most cases, on the other hand, there is an (usually implicit) assumption that subordinate clauses form a specific syntactic class in the grammar of the language, hence the linguist should try and capture the properties of this class.
- This assumption is not actually supported by cross-linguistic evidence:
  - The properties that are considered as distinctive for subordination usually do not combine in the same way from one clause type to another, both from one language to another and within individual languages.
  - These properties often appear to be motivated in semantic and pragmatic terms, or in terms of the properties of particular source constructions, rather than in syntactic terms.
- When describing clause linkage in particular languages, then, it would be important for linguists to concentrate not so much on what criteria should be used in order to classify particular clauses as subordinate or non-subordinate, but rather on
  - the full range of properties displayed by each clause type as opposed to others, and
  - possible motivations for these properties, in semantic, pragmatic, and diachronic terms.

**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accomplished (accompli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANAPH</td>
<td>anaphoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISL</td>
<td>cislocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTR</td>
<td>distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>duplicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMH</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>factual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INACC</td>
<td>inaccomplished (inaccompli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEF</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURP</td>
<td>purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOTE</td>
<td>quotative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>self-reporting pronoun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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