The morphosyntax of Jejuan –ko clause linkages

Abstract

While clause linkage is a relatively understudied area within Koreanic linguistics, the Korean –ko clause linkage has been studied more extensively. Authors have deemed it interesting since depending on the successive/non-successive interpretation of its events, a –ko clause linkage exhibits all or no properties of what is traditionally known as coordination or subordination. Jejuan –ko clauses may look fairly similar to Korean on the surface and exhibit a similar lack of semantic specification. This study shows that the traditional, dichotomous coordination-subordination opposition is not applicable to Jejuan –ko clauses. As a consequence, I propose that instead of applying a-priori categories to the exploration of clause linkage in Koreanic varieties, one should apply a multidimensional model that lets patterns emerge in an inductive way.
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1. Introduction

Koreanic language varieties are well-known for their richness in manifestations of clause linkage, much of which is realised by means of specialised verb forms. Connecting to an ever-growing body of research in functional-typological studies (cf. Haspelmath and König 1995), a number of authors in Koreanic linguistics have adopted the term converb for these forms (Jendraschek and Shin 2011, 2018; Kwon NY et al. 2006 among others). Languages such as Jejuan (Song S-J 2011) or Korean (Sohn H-M 2009) make extensive use of an unusually high number of converbs, connecting clauses in a larger sentence structure that may correspond to entire paragraphs in languages such as English (cf. Longacre 2007).

(1) Jejuan, Pear Story, Kim S-U (2018a: jeju0060-05, 93)

\[ \text{namu=esʰə} \text{ t̖a-ku, t̖a-məŋ, alɛ n̪liə ola-ŋ=i, t̖o } \]
\[ \text{tree=ABL pick-AND pick-WHILE down move\_down come-AND=RIGHT? again } \]
\[ \text{piup-ko i=kə jo=ti ka-min ñc̪e t̖'ol̂tɕiə pu-n-ta } \]
\[ \text{empty-AND THIS=THING THIS=PLACE go-IF now fall\_down AUX-PRS-DECL } \]

‘He picks it from the tree, and while picking it, he comes down, right? And then again he empties [the fruit into the basket] and while moving along [on the bicycle], it will all spill for sure.’

Henceforth, I use ‘converb’ as a working notion referring to those clause linking verb forms with a roughly adverbial function — that is, those forms not primarily heading complement clauses or adnominal clauses. Thus the forms piup-ko, empty-AND, t̖a-məŋ, pick-WHILE etc. encountered in example (1) above are all converbs; some have more specialised meanings such as conditional (-min), whereas those of others are more generic, such as –ko converbs (with its frequent variant –ku), the focus of this paper. Only the final verb in (1) bears tense and illocutionary force information, which is typical for such clause linkages. Korean final also has a –ko converb, which belongs to the best studied ones in that language:

1 Abbreviations: 1=first person, 3=third person, ABL=ablative, ACC=accusative, ADD=additive, ADN=adnominal, AT=attributive, AUX=auxiliary, COM=comitative, COP=copy, DAT=utive, DECL=declarative, DS=different subject, DSC=discourse particle, EGO=egophoric, EP=epenthetic element, EV=evidential, EXIST=existential, FC/FIN=final clause, FOC=focus, FUT=future, GEN=genitive, HOD=hodiernal tense, HON=honofric, ILLOC=illocutionary force, IMP=imperative, IND=indicative, INF=infinitive, (IF)=imperfective, IRR=irrealis, LOC=locative, MED=medial, NMLZ=nominalizer, NOM=nominative, NON-SUCC=non-successive, PL=plural, PLR=polar, POL=politeness, PROG=progressive, PR(E)=present tense, PST=past tense, PURP=purposive, Q=question, QUOT=quotative, RETR=retrospective, SG=singular, SS=same subject, STN=stance, SUCC=succesive, TOP=topic
(2) Korean –ko linkages

  
  John-i chayk-ul ilk(-ess)-ko, Mary-ka tibi-lul po-ass-ta
  
  ‘John read a book, and Mary watched TV.’

  
  Kim-i pap-ul mek(-ess)-ko kulus-ul chiu-ess-ta
  
  ‘Kim ate the rice and cleaned the dihes.’

As shown above, Korean –ko converbs occur with both different and same-subject reference, and interclausal semantics expressed by this linkage type are among the widest and least specific, ranging from ‘asynthetic, listing’ semantics to temporal simultaneity, temporal succession or cause-effect. The –ko clause linkage has received a lot of attention due to the fact that sometimes it was demonstrated to exhibit prototypically coordinate properties, whereas in other cases its properties are subordinate (Yoon J-M 1996, Yoon J 1997, Rudnitskaya 1998, Cho SY 2004, Kwon NY 2004, Kwon and Polinsky 2008, Pak D-H 2013, Lee J S 2014). In a nutshell, non-successive event interpretations were found to correlate with coordinate properties, whereas successive event interpretations usually go along with subordinate properties. This finding intersects with –ko converbs and their tense inflection, since tense marking on converbs is said to be possible only in coordinate –ko linkages, with tense traditionally regarded crucial for finite clauses. Most studies adopt or confirm some or all of these findings.

As the study of Koreanic varieties other than Standard Korean has been gaining more attention, the question is whether synchronically more distant varieties such as Jejuan exhibit the same characteristics. As shown in (1), Jejuan seems to have –ko clause linkages as well, yet the traditional, dialectological focus has largely left their properties unexplored. Indeed, it is the goal of this paper to show that conventional, binary understandings of clause linkage cannot be applied to the grammar of Jejuan –ko linkages. Instead, I argue that the properties of Jejuan –ko linkages, and consequently, that of Koreanic varieties in general, are best described employing a multidimensional model which does not presuppose bundlings of parameters into pre-set categories.

In the next subsection 1.1, I give a contextualisation of Jejuan –ko converbs, and in section 1.2, I present the research methodology and some general remarks. In section 2, I very briefly summarise developments in functional-typological research on clause linkage (section 2.1) in order to show how the perspective argued for in this paper relates back to wider, recent discourses in the field. Subsection 2.2 gives a summary of the research on Korean –ko clause linkages, focusing on Rudnitskaya’s (1998) and especially Kwon and Polinsky’s (2008) work, whose influential findings I use as points of comparison. Section 3 presents the criteria applied to Jejuan –ko clause linkages, and then proceeds with the data description. Section 4 summarises the findings on Jejuan –ko linkages and discusses the patterns in relation to the wider literature. Section 5 concludes this paper.

1.1. Jejuan and –ko converbs

It is only in recent times that Jejuan (also known as Jejueo, Ceycwu[wo][s]mal) has been gaining the attention of researchers outside (South) Korean dialectology, especially since its classification as a critically endangered language by Moseley (2010). Traditionally, most research treats Jejuan as one of six traditional dialect areas (called Ceycwupangen, ‘Jeju dialect’ cf. Pangenyenkwuhoy 2001, Sohn H-M 1999, Yeon JH 2012, Kim J-H 2014, 2017), albeit as one of the most conservative ones. Novel views classifying Jejuan as an independent Koreanic language have focused on the great lack of mutual intelligibility, as well as clearly attestable lexical distance between Korean and Jejuan (O’Grady 2014; Long and Yim 2002; Brown and Yeon 2015; Barnes-Sadler 2017 and Lee S 2015). As Korean dialectology tends to emphasise the shared diachrony between Jejuan and Korean, there is still work to be done on elucidating synchronic differences between the two varieties, together with sociolinguistic

---

2 This is a conflation of several examples; Cho SY (2004) distinguishes different Korean –ko linkage types.
variation (the same being true for other Koreanic varieties, cf. Silva 2010, Brown and Yeon 2015).

Due to its close relationship to Korean, it is not surprising to see that the two languages are similar in many areas such as SOV constituent order and suffixing preference, the existence of PRO-drop, largely agglutinative morphology that includes information-structural encoding, as well as the distinction between a highly inflectional verb system inflecting for tense, aspect, mood, evidentiality, politeness and illocutionary force, and a nominal system where nouns and pronominals often do not inflect, but rather employ a rich system of particles. At the same time, many phenomena have developed that are not found in other regions of the Korean-speaking realm.

Especially the verb system shows differences from Korean. Above, I show question markers that distinguish polar and content questions, a different system of politeness expression, speaker-centred marking (-kʷa- above), particles that partake in knowledge management in discourse (=ke above; Yang and Kim 2013), as well as a system of quotative formation that interacts with mood and evidentiality in the final clause (cf. Kim J-H 2014, Song S-J 2011). Due to ongoing language shift, speech patterns become more and more similar to Standard Korean as we move down the age groups, down to a level where only a few Jejuan traces remain in the colloquial code used by the youngest generation.

As mentioned, Koreanic varieties are known for their high number of clause linking devices (Jendraschek and Shin 2011, Sohn H-M 2009). Jejuan equally shows a great number of different suffixes which can be identified as converbs. Table 1 shows an excerpt from a multiplicity of such suffixes attested in the literature (see Song S-J 2011, Kim J-H 2014, Hyun and Kang 2011, or Kim S-U 2018b for more exhaustive lists and detailed discussions).

Without going into much detail, above I illustrate how converbs vary in the range of meanings they express (for example, –kəni converbs describe a seamless or immediate succession of events), and in the range of inflectional affixes they can take. The –nti converb form, for example, is among the converbs with the greatest range of inflectional possibilities (PAST, PROGRESSIVE, PRESENT, IMPERFECTIVE-EVIDENTIAL), while some do not inflect at all. Compared to morphologically finite verbs, however, the inflectional range of converbs is generally restricted. Some converbs are formally similar, yet have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantics</th>
<th>Converb</th>
<th>PST</th>
<th>PROG</th>
<th>PROG.IMP</th>
<th>PRS</th>
<th>EV.IPF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘generic’</td>
<td>-ko</td>
<td>-η</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-sʰ-ko</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-sʰ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-msʰ-ko</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-msʰ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-msʰi-ko</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-msʰi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imm. succession</td>
<td>-kəni</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simultaneous</td>
<td>-məŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrative change</td>
<td>-nən</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causal</td>
<td>-nən</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-sʰi-nən</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-məŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-sʰi-məŋ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-nti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-sʰi-nti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-ni-nti</td>
<td>-ə-nke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: A selection of Jejuan converbs and their inflectional range
different meaning and behave differently with respect to inflectability, for example the –nan form which
inflects in causal meaning, but does not when used in contexts expressing changes in narrative. Note that
there is no consensus on how many converbs Jejuan has, which ones are ‘genuinely Jejuan’ and not
borrowings from Korean, and even what their inflectional range in fact is.

Jejuan –ko converbs are among the least specifed with respect to the kind of meaning relationship
they create between linked clausal events (the ‘generic’ group above). As observed for Korean, however,
two events linked by a –ko convert can either be temporally unrelated or simultaneous (henceforth ‘non-
successive –ko linkage’), or temporally successive (henceforth ‘successive –ko linkage’): 3

(6) Non-successive –ko linkage

Non-successive –ko linkage

(7) Successive –ko linkage

(8) Progressive-imperative marking

As shown in table 1 above, Jejuan –ko converbs inflect for past tense, progressive aspect and a still
somewhat mysterious combination that is interpreted by speakers as ‘progressive-imperative’. 4 See also ex.

(6), and (8) below:

Korean –ko converbs only allow for past tense or irrealis mood marking (the latter has not been attested
in my research yet for Jejuan). Not only does the Jejuan –ko convert show inflectional properties

3 Reviewer 2 suggests looking at the semantic difference between successive and non-successive –ko linkages not as a
temporal relation between events per se, yet rather with respect to overall event coherence: non-successive linkages may
be understood as those where events are separate, and successive linkages as those where ‘two events must be part of the
same larger situation’. While I agree that the temporality of events may be part of some larger area of event structure (cf.
Jendraschek and Shin’s 2011, 2018 work), I do not have enough data at present, and hope to be able to give a more
dedicated answer in the future. I thank the reviewer for these enriching ideas.

4 Both Reviewers 1 and 3 have questioned the analysis of the \textit{–msʰi–} string of the final verb clause as underlyingly different structures. Speakers clearly interpret these forms
differently: the \textit{–msʰi–} string of the imperative-convert verb form is understood to express a command (see also recording jeju0140,
00:30:50). Without such meaning, the suffix would not be \textit{–msʰi–}, but just \textit{–msʰ–}, as in ex. (6). In the final clause, the
imperative component is the suffix \textit{–la}. While the \textit{–i–} part of the imperative-convert verb form is meaningful, the
\textit{–i–} of the final verb is the result of phonotactic apertion. Reviewer 1 suggests that \textit{teilemsʰiko} is in fact \textit{teile–m sʰ–ko},
fry-NMLZ EXIST,COP, a construction with a nominaliser and an existential copula. Neither does this account for the
difference between \textit{teilemsʰko} and \textit{teilemsʰko} synchronically, nor does it consider the fact that the Jejuan nominaliser \textit{–m}
suffixes to a verb root directly (\textit{teileim}, with etpetic \textit{–i–}, instead of suffixing using the stem vowel \textit{–i–} (\textit{*teileim}), a
pattern that reaches as far back as Late Middle Korean (15th century, see Lee and Ramsey 2011: 176). For various
different from Korean, but also, elicitation with native speakers did not show any signs of impossibility of tense inflection on a –ko converb irrespective of different contexts such as different/same subjecthood, non-successive/successive semantics or particular syntactic tests such as relativisation (see section 3, ex. (29a), for example). During elicitation, consultants expressed a preference for untensed converbs, yet did not reject examples with tense marking on converbs in contexts which in Korean are reported to lead to ungrammaticality. This stands in contrast with the findings of most research on Korean –ko linkages, where the possibility of tense marking is seen as one criterion for the coordinate status of a –ko clause linkage, and where the impossibility of it is said to be a characteristic of a subordinate linkage.

(9) Kim S-J (2010: 210), glossing mine

That person=TOP carry:EP-AND thither thither cross-AND thither cross-AND

While all flip_over put

‘That person takes it into his hands, and hopping thither and thither, back and forth, leaves everything flipped over.’

Reviewer 3 has remarked that solely looking at the –ko converb would be reductionist, as one may regard a –ko clause linkage as an elision of a more complex structure, shown in (9) above: in such a structure, which often links repetitively patterned (and structurally parallel) events, one will find one or more clauses with verbs suffixed by –kok, often (yet not always) followed by an auxiliary verb ho-/ha-, ‘do’ (henceforth ‘–ko(k) ...–ko(k) ho-’ constructions). The reviewer points out that –kok forms as above are ubiquitous in Jejuan. In utterances such as (9), –kok forms are claimed to be interchangeable with –ko forms, and that such cases typically describe separate events with different-subject reference, whereas –ŋ converbs such as in (1) describe conflated events with same-subject reference. Data taken from other sources such as ex. (9) shows that this is not forcibly true, which points towards the need for more dedicated research of its own.


Is that the person who you witnessed talking on and on like that?’

There are a number of reasons for considering the Jejuan –ko converb in isolation. One reason is that so far, there is very little research on Jejuan –ko linkages in ways comparable to Korean. At the same time, while Reviewer 3 questions the authenticity of –ko converbs as ‘genuinely Jejuan’, I have shown that these converbs are inflectable, largely following patterns observable elsewhere within the Jejuan converb system. Furthermore, regarding each occurrence of a Jejuan –ko converb as the elision of an entire morphosyntactic complex would be unsatisfactory, as we have many occurrences of –ko converbs which link clauses on their own, and which do not show the typical, repetitive narration semantics of ‘...–ko(k)...–ko(k) ho-’ constructions. Moreover, one can also find cases such as (10) where one finds ‘...–k ...–k ho-’ constructions. Both morphosyntactically and semantically, the structure is similar to that of ‘...–kok ...–kok ho-’
constructions. Given that the ‘-k’ components do not occur consistently on –ko converbs (even with one and the same speaker, e.g., HJG1 in jeju0135), one wonders whether they are inseparably part of a ‘-kok’ suffix, or are morphological elements of their own. Undoubtedly, examining a wider range of Jejuan linkage constructions across monoclausal and multicausal contexts, and looking at both their synchronic and diachronic inter-relationships would be valuable, yet would greatly exceed the scope of a single paper. For now, I would like to thank Reviewer 3 for sparking this discussion and refer to Kang Y-B (2007), Kim J-H (2014, 2017), Hyun and Kang (2011) or Song S-J (2011) for examples and more.

1.2. Research background and methodological concerns

This research employs a linguistic fieldwork methodology combining conventional practices of linguistic elicitation (see Crowley 2007, or Matthewson 2004) and complementary practices from Language Documentation (Gippert et al. 2006, Jones and Ogilvie 2013). The author is not a native speaker of Jejuan (L1: Korean and German), yet language skills were acquired during fieldwork up to a level where Korean language use could be reduced as much as possible during elicitation, enabling a so-called a monolingual data collection method (see Everett 2001 for more, and more elaborate explanations in Kim S-U 2018b: 45).

Much of the data found in this paper is a re-examination of data analysed in Kim S-U (2018b), a larger study that compares the finiteness properties of a number of different Jejuan clause linkage types with each other. Data was collected audio-visually, during two field trips in 2015/2016, for a total of nine months, to the Northeast of Jeju Island, in Sukkun (Sinchon-Ri, Jocheon-Eup), and Jimnyeong (Gimnyeong-Ri, Gujwa-Eup), two villages about 8.5 miles apart. Alongside the recording of more naturalistic interactions, elicitations were done with an elderly couple in Sukkun (HJG1, mid-70s and JOS1, late 60s), as well as two female friends in Jimnyeong (HGS1, late 80s and HYJ1, early 80s). The current paper focuses on the Sukkun data elicited from HJG1 and JOS1. While there are some lexical and minor grammatical differences between the two varieties, no significant differences were attested in the area of adverbial clause linkage.

Based on personal native speaker judgments, anonymous Reviewers 1 and 3 have questioned the grammaticality or ungrammaticality, as well as the cultural appropriateness/intelligibility of a number of examples in this paper. Following the format of the relevant clause linkage literature, examples were constructed by the author in order to keep some factors in check such as overtess of argument NPs or the length of a sentence. Preferably, they were inspired by data from witnessed interactions in order to ensure actual attestation, relatability and comprehension of examples. They were presented verbally with elaborate (content-related, contextual) explanations that ‘set the scene’ in order not to lest the wording or other extralinguistic issues interfered with judgment – in fact, consultants sometimes suggested alternatives in case examples were deemed unnatural or implausible, and elicitation was based on those examples instead. Of course, if judgments were suspected to be made with considerable Korean interference, examples were abandoned. As an example for such a negotiation, I recommend a passage in jeju0153, from 00:45:00 onwards in the on-line repository. Almost all Jejuan examples are accompanied by recording numbers and timestamps, in the format of [jeju0000, hr:mm:ss]. I thank reviewers for their watchful commentary. See footnotes for reviewers’ diverging judgments.

Note that throughout the discussion of clause linkage in this paper, I use the terms ‘converb clause’ (CC) and ‘final clause’ (FC). Reviewer 2 remarks that the notion of ‘final clause’ may be problematic in cases where a converb clause is used in insubordinated or desubordinated contexts. In this paper, I do not have such examples, and these notions serve to linearly distinguish between different parts of a –ko clause linkage, which in relevant examples are biclausal, in the order of [CC FC]. This way, I want to avoid rather loaded terms such as ‘subordinate’, ‘main’ or ‘matrix’ clause which may conventionally presuppose bundlings of properties that are not born out consistently by the Jejuan data. I thank Reviewer 2 for terminological suggestions, and sparking this discussion. For greater convenience, I refer to –ko clause linkages as ‘–ko linkages’. I employ an IPA system for Jejuan
Clause linkage research: an overview of relevant themes

Before I proceed to the Jejuan data description, I give an overview of the relevant literature. I first summarise important developments in the functional-typological literature in section 2.1, and then delve into a brief overview of Koreanic linguistics literature on the Korean –ko linkage in section 2.2.

2.1. Clause linkage in functional-typological approaches


1. Subordinate clauses may disrupt the clause-internal, linear word order of the matrix clause.
2. Only subordinate clauses may precede or follow their main clause.
3. Backwards pronominal anaphora is only allowed into subordinate structures.
4. Only subordinate clauses can narrow down the reference of the main clause.
5. Only subordinate clauses can be focused.
6. Extraction of constituents is possible only from subordinate clauses.

In such an approach, diagnostics focus on showing that a particular clause linkage is not coordinate. Point (1) is often referred to as a centre embedding or nesting test:

1. Max happily strolled around the streets of London while whistling his favourite song.
2. *Max, while whistling his favourite song, happily strolled around the streets of London.

Coordinate clauses, are regarded exocentric and symmetrical where none of the clauses dominates the other, and no clause is embedded in another (Haspelmath 2007a: 46). Point (6) follows J. R. Ross’s well-known Coordinate Structure Constraint which stipulates that “[i]n a coordinate structure, no conjunct may be moved, nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct” (Ross 1967: 98f.). Many languages do not allow extraction of constituents out of only one clause in a clause linkage, and if they do, they may show asymmetries between non-final and final clauses (see Haspelmath 2004; Kazenin and Testelets 2004, Kwon NY 2004).
(14) Extraction out of one linked clause in English
   a. After I had sold my house, I moved to a new place.
   b. The place that I moved to _____ after I had sold my house, was much smaller.
   c. *The house which after I had sold ______ I moved to a new place...

Note that the dichotomous opposition between subordination and coordination is intimately connected to traditional views on finiteness, where non-finite verbs occur in subordinate clauses, and finite verbs occur in coordinate, main clauses (such simplistic views have now been revisited, cf. Nikolaeva 2007, 2010, 2013). It is through this link that the correlation between tense inflection on a Korean –ko converb and other traditionally coordinate properties is regarded so meaningful.

Researchers have found that even in languages believed to exhibit a clear coordination-subordination distinction, cases can be found where such a distinction is less clear (see Culicover and Jackendoff 1997 for English; and Yuasa and Sadock 2002). Increasingly, authors have acknowledged a theoretical separation between syntactic embedding and dependence (Foley and Van Valin 1984), with some suggesting a third category called ‘cosubordination’: this term stands for those cases where a clause is not embedded in another, but nevertheless shows a scope dependence under another clause with respect to “illocutionary force, evidentials, status and tense” (Foley and Van Valin 1984: 243, also 257; as well as Olson 1981). Such clauses were first described as ‘medial clauses’ in languages of Papua New Guinea, and entire clause linkages are often called ‘clause chains’ (Longacre 2007: 398ff.). Clause chains show properties ascribed to both of traditional ‘subordination—coordination’ oppositions, summarised below:

   a. Medial clauses cannot be centre-embedded in final clauses; subordinate clauses can.
   b. Medial clauses must precede final clauses; subordinate ones can precede or follow them.
   c. Order reversal is possible for coordinate clauses but not for medial clauses.
   d. Cataphoric reference (‘backwards anaphora’) cannot be established into medial clauses, while this is possible with subordinate clauses.

To give one example relevant for the present analysis, Roberts (1988) describes how in Amele, subordinate clauses can be centre-embedded in final clauses. Medial clauses do not allow this:

   a. Clause chain
      [Ho busale-ce-b] dana age qo-i-ga.
      pig run.out-MED.DS-3SG man they hit-3PL-HOD
      ‘The pig ran out and the man killed it.’
   b. Subordinate clause
      man they pig kill-3PL-FUT PURP come-3PL-HOD
      ‘The men came to kill the pig.’
   c. Clause chain
      *Dana age [ho busale-ce-b] qo-i-ga.
      man they pig run.out-MED.DS-3SG hit-3PL-HOD
      ‘The men, the pig having run out, killed it.’

As I will show later, Jejuan –ko clauses cannot be centre-embedded, even though they are dependent in terms of their syntactic distribution. In many languages, it is adverbial clauses that now are often recognised as exhibiting lesser degrees of syntactic integration into their final clauses (Diessel 2013: 342; Mathiessen and Thompson 1988). This is to say that typological research on clause linkage has seen a “stepwise movement away from “major” categories like “adverbial clause” or “complement
clause" to more specific categories or subtypes. In other words, research on complex sentences has increasingly been parametricized” (Gast and Diessel 2012: 9). With some authors even suggesting the abandonment of ‘subordination’ as a cross-linguistic category (Haiman and Thompson 1984, Cristofaro 2003), others have developed models where clause linkage phenomena are described in terms of intersecting, gradual continua representing a range of grammaticalisation clines and functional motivations (Lehmann 1988, see its application onto Korean in Jendraschek and Shin 2018). This development has been accompanied by larger discourses in linguistic typology that debate whether and how cross-linguistic categories relate to language-specific phenomena, and whether therefore, cross-linguistic concepts can be applied to individual language phenomena at all (see discussions in Plank 2016, as well as Haspelmath 2007b). Accordingly, some authors have suggested decomposing clause linkage (Bickel 2010) or finiteness-related categories (Nikolaeva 2013) into theoretically independent dimensions which do not necessarily assume a-priori configurations with respect to how these dimensions bundle into larger categories. Evidently, the ideas presented in this paper have been inspired by this development on a larger scale.

2.2. Previous research on clause linkage in Korean

Clause linkage is relatively understudied within Koreanic linguistics. For Jejuan, there are only a few studies which look at clause linkage-related matters, located within the limits of South Korean dialectology (Hong J-R 2001, Song S-J 2011). Unsurprisingly, clause linkage has been explored more in Korean, although even here, most studies focus on the –ko linkage (Yoon J-M 1996, Yoon J 1997, Rudnitskaya 1998, Cho SY 2004, Kwon NY 2004, Kwon and Polinsky 2008, Pak D-H 2013, Lee J S 2014), with only a handful of studies looking at other clause linkage types and/or a wider range of them (Jendraschek and Shin 2011, 2018; Hong J 2012, Sohn H-M 2009).

Almost all studies on the Korean –ko linkage have a Chomskyan background, within which the authors have adopted the traditional, dichotomous views on clause linkage as described in the previous section. Whereas all of them observe correlations between the presence or absence of tense marking on –ko converbs, syntactic properties such as embedding or extraction behaviour, and the interpretation of event semantics in a –ko linkage, studies differ in the variety of properties considered valid, the variety of semantically motivated subtypes of a –ko linkage, whether a –ko linkage is underlyingly coordinate or subordinate, or whether syntactic properties are seen as instantiating particular semantic interpretations or vice versa. In the following, I limit the present discussion to two influential papers, namely Rudnitskaya (1998) and Kwon and Polinsky (2008).

Authors such as Rudnitskaya (1998) were among the first to observe that Korean –ko linkages show properties that are either associated with traditional coordination, or subordination. This, they state, is mediated by three inter-related factors:

(17) after Rudnitskaya (1998: 184), [factor names mine]

a. **tense marker factor**: presence or absence of tense inflection on the –ko converb

b. **subject reference factor**: same-subject or different-subject reference

c. **semantic interpretation factor**: successive or non-successive interpretation of event relation

Rudnitskaya suggests that these three factors give rise to coordinate or subordinate properties, in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUCCESSIVE</th>
<th>NON-SUCCESSIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+TENSE</td>
<td>-TENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS n/a</td>
<td>¬SUBORD COORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS n/a</td>
<td>SUBORD COORD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Rudnitskaya’s (1998: 196) study of Korean –ko linkages

Similar to other work on Korean –ko linkages, Rudnitskaya concludes that the semantic
interpretation of two linked events “determines the coordinate/subordinate status directly, while the tense affix and same/different subject factors can influence the status only indirectly, via the interpretation factor” (Rudnitskaya 1998: 196). Non-successively interpreted –ko linkages exhibit typical properties of clausal coordination, whereas successive interpretation yields subordinate properties. Successive interpretations are said to occur more with same-subject reference, and different-subject reference is claimed to “normally disallow successive interpretation” (hence the indication ‘✓ subordinate’ in Table 2 above). If they do, it is only in the absence of tense marking that subordinate properties can be observed (Rudnitskaya 1998: 188). The same is true in same-subject contexts, where subordinate properties are said to correlate with successive event interpretation, and the absence of tense:

(18) Rudnitskaya (1998: 185)

a. Base example 1
   *Swun Mi-nun caki aphatu-lul phal(-ass)-ko cohun cip-ul sa-ss-ta.
   Swun Mi-TOP own apartment-ACC sell-PST-AND good house-ACC buy-PST-DECL
   ‘Sun Mi sold her apartment and bought a good house.’

b. Base example 2
   *sonnim-tul-un achim-ul mek(-ess)-ko nokcha-lul masy-ess-ta
   guest-PL-TOP breakfast-ACC eat-PST-AND green tea-ACC drink-PST-DECL
   ‘Guests ate breakfast and drank green tea.’

c. Scrambling
   cohun cip-ul Swun Mi-nun caki aphatu-lul phal(*-ass)-ko sa-ss-ta.
   good house-ACC Sun Mi-TOP own apartment-ACC sell(-PST)-AND buy-PST-DECL
   ‘Sun Mi sold her apartment and bought a good house.’

d. Nesting
   Swun Mi-nun cohun cip-ul caki aphatu-lul phal(*-ass)-ko sa-ss-ta.
   Sun Mi-TOP good house-ACC own apartment-ACC sell(-PST)-AND buy-PST-DECL
   ‘Sun Mi, after she had sold her apartment, bought a good house.’

e. Wh-question
   *sonnim-tul-un achim-ul mek(*-ess)-ko mwusun cha-lul masy-ess-ni
   guest-PL-TOP breakfast-ACC eat(-PST)-AND what tea-ACC drink-PST-Q
   ‘The guests had breakfast and drank what tea?’

For different-subject examples and further discussions, see Rudnitskaya (1998: 187ff.). As mentioned, the importance of tense marking in the correlation between syntactic properties and semantic interpretation of a Korean –ko linkage is a common theme in many papers on this linkage type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinate (non-successive)</th>
<th>Subordinate (successive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre embedding</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicalisation</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativisation</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backwards pronominalisation</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permutation without meaning change</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense marking</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Kwon and Polinsky’s (2008) properties of Korean –ko linkages

Kwon and Polinsky (2008) add complementary analyses, although their focus lies more on the
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456 semantic interpretation factor rather than the subject reference factor. They argue that the presence or absence of morphosyntactic properties stands in direct correlation to successive or non-successive semantics of -ko clause linkages, further differentiating non-successive interpretations into distinctions of independent, simultaneous, or co-extensive event relationships. Their conclusion is such that the Korean -ko linkage, depending on non-sequential or sequential interpretation of their inter-clausal event semantics, either shows ‘all’ signs of subordination or ‘all’ signs of coordination (cf. Kwon and Polinsky 2008: 103), which has been illustrated in Table 3.

Non-successive (different-subject) -ko linkages are found to confirm with all properties associated with clausal coordination outlined in Table 3:

(19) Korean -ko linkages with coordinate properties, Kwon and Polinsky (2008: 91/92)

   John-NOM Jane-ACC like-AND Mary-ACC love-PST-DECL
   ‘John likes Jane and loves Mary.’

b. Permutation possible without meaning change
   John-i Mary-lul salangha-ko Jane-ul cohaha-ess-ta
   John-NOM Mary-ACC love-AND Jane-ACC like-PST-DECL
   ‘John loves Mary and likes Jane.’

c. Backwards pronominalisation (=cataphoric reference) impossible
   *caki-ka Sue-lul cohaha-ko Tom-i John-ul silhehay-ss-ta
   self-NOM Sue-ACC like-AND Tom-NOM John-ACC like-PST-DECL
   ('He liked Sue and Tom disliked John. ')

d. Topicalisation in only one clause impossible
   *Mary-nun John-i Jane-ul cohaha-ko Tom-i _____i cohaha-n-ta
   Mary-TOP John-NOM Jane-ACC like-AND Tom-NOM like-PRS-DECL
   ('Mary, John likes Jane and Tom likes. ')

e. Relativisation out of only one clause impossible
   *John-i Jane-ul cohaha-ko Tom-i _____i cohaha-n Mary
   John-NOM Jane-ACC like-AND Tom-NOM like-REL Mary
   ('Mary, who John likes Jane and Tom likes ______. ')

f. Centre embedding impossible
   Mary-NOM John-NOM baseball-ACC like-AND basketball-ACC hate-PST-DECL
   ('John liked baseball and Mary disliked basketball. ')

Note that the properties shown above closely follow traditional criteria summarised by authors such as Haspelmath (1995) mentioned in section 2. Successively interpreted -ko linkages are shown to exhibit all properties of clausal subordination, allowing no tense marking on converbs. Below, only the relativisation example shows same-subject reference:

(20) Korean: -ko linkages with subordinate properties, Kwon and Polinsky (2008: 92/93)

a. Tom-i cip-ey o-ko Mary-ka tochakha-ess-ta
   Tom-NOM house-to come-AND Mary-NOM arrive-PST-DECL
   ‘After Tom came home, Mary arrived.’

b. Permutation changes meaning
   Mary-ka tochakha-ko Tom-i cip-ey o-ass-ta
   Mary-NOM arrive-AND Tom-NOM house-LOC come-PST-DECL
   ‘After Mary arrived, Tom got home.’
c. Backwards pronominalisation possible

\[
\text{caki-ka silswe-lul ha-ko Tom-i na-eykey hwa-lul nay-ss-ta}
\]
self-NOM error-ACC do-AND Tom-NOM 1SG-DAT anger-ACC give-PST-DECL

‘Tom got mad at me after he made an error.’ (‘He made a mistake and Tom got mad at me.’)

d. Topicalisation in one clause possible

\[
\text{Taycen-ulo-nun, John-i hankwuk-ey ipkwukha-ko(se) Daejeon-to-Korea-LOC enter-AND Tom-i isaha-ess-ta Tom-NOM move-PST-DECL}
\]

‘As for Daejeon, after John entered Korea, Tom moved (to it).’

e. Relativisation possible

\[
\text{[Mina-ka phyenci-lul ssu-ko(se) \_\_\_ ka-n] hakkyo_i Mina-NOM letter-ACC write-AND go-ADN school}
\]

‘The school that Mina went to after she wrote a letter.’

Several authors have remarked that in successive contexts, \(-ko\) converbs can be replaced with \(-kose\) forms, as shown above. Furthermore, centre embedding is possible in successive interpretations:

(21) Centre embedding in successive contexts (Kwon and Polinsky 2008: 93, 96)

a. \(\text{John-i hakkyo-ey ka-ko Mary-ka John-uy pang-ey}
\)

John-NOM school-to go-AND Mary-NOM John-GEN room-to

\(\text{mollay tule ka-ess-ta}
\)

sneak enter go-PST-DECL

‘John went to school and Mary sneaked into John’s house.’

b.\(\text{Mary-ka [John-i hakkyo-ey ka-ko] John-uy pang-ey}
\)

Mary-NOM John-NOM school-to go-AND John-GEN room-to

\(\text{mollay tule ka-ess-ta}
\)

sneak enter go-PST-DECL

‘Mary, after John went to school, sneaked into John’s house.’

c. \(\text{Inho-nun olaystongan TV-lul po-ko Mina-eykey malha-ess-ta}
\)

Inho-TOP long TV-ACC watch-AND Mina-DAT talk-PST-DECL

‘Inho watched TV and talked to Mina for a while.’

d. \(\text{Inho-nun Mina-eykey_i [olaystongan TV-lul po-ko] \_\_\_ malhay-ss-ta}
\)

Inho-TOP Mina-DAT long TV-ACC watch-AND talk-PST-DECL

‘Inho watched TV for a while and then talked to Mina.’

While Kwon and Polinsky (2008) largely focus on different-subject contexts, their data suggests that cross-clausal subject reference could be an additionally relevant factor. See the opposition between different- and same-subject reference contexts in successive interpretations below:

(22) Relativisation out of the converb clause, Kwon and Polinsky (2008: 95)

a. \(\text{*[Mina-ka \_\_\_] hakpyekha-ess-ko emeni-ka kippum-uy}
\)

Mina-NOM pass-PST-AND mother-NOM joy-GEN

\(\text{nvummwul-ul hulli-n\] tayhak}
\)

tear-ACC shed-ADN college

(‘The college that Mina got into and her mother shed tears of joy.’)

b. \(\text{[sonyen-i \_\_\_i namki-ko hakkyo-lo ttena-n] phyenci_i}
\)

boy-NOM leave-AND school-to leave-ADN letter

‘A letter that the boy left and went to school.’
In sum, these are the most central findings that research on Korean –ko clauses has reported on:

(23) Main findings on Korean –ko linkages

a. A non-successively interpreted event relationship in a –ko linkage correlates with ‘coordinate’ properties.

b. A successively interpreted relationship correlates with ‘subordinate’ properties.

c. ‘Coordinate’ –ko clauses allow for tense inflection, while ‘subordinate’ –ko clauses do not.

d. Properties only cluster into these two extremes.

Based on these findings, I now examine Jejuan –ko linkages with respect to whether they exhibit such clearly dichotomous behaviour or not.

3. Characteristics of Jejuan –ko clause linkages

Section 2.2 has focused on a discussion of Rudnitskaya’s (1998), and Kwon and Polinsky’s (2008) work, which has provided the frames for the current description of the syntactic properties of Jejuan. I first briefly discuss the tests applied in this paper in section 3.1, and delve into a description of syntactic properties of Jejuan –ko linkages in section 3.2. Morphological characteristics have been addressed in section 1.1.

3.1. Tests and criteria applied

As mentioned, Kwon and Polinsky’s (2008) pattern analysis shown in Table 3 will serve as a point of comparison. I employ the following tests.

(24) Tests applied in this section:

a. Centre embedding of a –ko clause in the final clause (henceforth ‘nesting’)

b. Topicalisation within a –ko clause

c. Relativisation of converb clause, or final-clause constituents

d. Cataphoric reference establishment from final clause into the –ko clause

e. Change of syntactic order of clausal events

The tests follow those applied in the literature described in section 2. As mentioned, the possibility or impossibility of tense was tested in each of the above conditions. The topicalisation test slightly differs from Kwon and Polinsky (2008), as structures tested in (19d) and (20d) run into a conflation of nesting and topicalisation: there, constituents are displaced to the left edge of the entire clause linkage. This is in spite of the possibility that both the final clause or converb clauses may retain their own positions for topicalisation, instead of having to resort to an extraposed topic position. A structure identical with (19d) for Jejuan –nti clauses in Kim S-U (2018b: 140, see Table 1) was judged ungrammatical by consultants.

Discussed in some detail in Kim S-U (2018b: 86), I solely examine the possibility of topicalisation within a –ko clause. Furthermore, I adopt Rudnitskaya’s (1998) factors of semantic interpretation, subject reference and tense marking (see Table 2) as contexts for syntactic tests. Note that I do not apply Across-the-Board topicalisation/relativisation tests. See Table 4 for a summary of results.
### 3.2. Syntactic characteristics of Jejuan –ko linkages

As mentioned, –ko linkages exhibit flexible subject reference. Nesting of –ko clauses leads to ungrammaticality, regardless of subject reference or successive/non-successive event interpretation. Below I link to non-nested counterparts shown earlier (note that final-clause verb morphology may differ; proper names have sometimes been amended from recordings to avoid confusion).

#### (25) Different-subject –ko clauses

a. successive, nesting of (7) [jeju0147, 00:30:32]

\[*sʰumi=ka \ [jəŋhɨi=ka \ \textit{t}^{k}ək=ɨl \ \textit{t}^{ək}=ɨl \ \textit{t}^{k}ə-ko\] Sumi=NOM Yeongheui=NOM rice:flour=ACC grind come-AND

\[tək=il \ \textit{teɨtə-ə-n} \ \textit{rice}_cake=\text{ACC \ fry-PST}\]

(‘Yeongheui, after Sumi bought the rice flour, fried the rice cake.’)

b. non-successive, nesting of (6) [jeju0135, 01:02:02]

\[*sʰumi=ka \ [jəŋhɨi=ka \ \textit{palɨsʰkʷeki}=ɨl \ \textit{t}^{ək}=ɨl \ \textit{t}^{ək}ə-ko\] Sumi=NOM Yeongheui=NOM fish=ACC prepare do-AND

\[teɨlimtək=il \ \textit{teɨtə-ə-la} \ \textit{rice}_cake=\text{ACC \ fry-PROG-EVF-DECL}\]

(‘Yeongheui, Sumi preparing the fish, was frying the rice cake.’)

#### (26) Same-subject –ko clauses

a. successive [jeju0153, 00:04:42]

\[toŋsʰu=ka \ naŋ=ɨl \ âtə-ə-ŋ \ o(a-sʰ)-ko \ \textit{t}^{k}əlu=t^{k}ə-ko\] Dongsu=NOM tree=ACC pick_up-AND come(-PST)-AND Cheolsu=TOP together

\[keɨtəp=il \ \textit{teɨsʰ-ə-n} \ \textit{dog:house}=\text{ACC \ build-PST}\]

(‘Dongsu brought some wood and built a dog house together with Cheolsu.’)

b. successive, nested [jeju0153, 00:17:55]

\[*toŋsʰu=ka \ keɨtəp=il \ naŋ=ɨl \ âtə-ə-ŋ \ o-ko\] Dongsu=NOM dog:house=ACC wood=ACC pick_up-AND come-AND

\[\textit{t}^{k}əlu=t^{k}ə-ko \ \textit{teɨsʰ-ə-n} \ \textit{Cheolsu}=\text{TOP \ together \ build-PST}\]

(‘Dongsu built, bringing some wood, a dog house together with Cheolsu.’)

c. non-successive [jeju0153, 01:14:19]

\[\textit{t}^{k}əlu=t^{k}ə-ko \ \textit{wənsʰəŋ \ hə} \ \textit{hə} \ \textit{aka̱wə} \ \textit{hə-ntəa}\] Cheolsu=TOP son=ACC blame do(-PST)-AND daughter=ACC cherish do-PRS-DECL

(‘Yeongsu blames his son and cherished his daughter.’)

d. non-successive, nested [jeju0153, 01:16:03]

\[*\textit{t}^{k}əlu=t^{k}ə-ko \ \textit{aka̱wə} \ \textit{hə-ntəa}\] Cheolsu=TOP daughter=ACC son=ACC blame do-AND cherish do-PRS-DECL

(‘Yeongsu, blaming his son, cherished his daughter.’)

---

10 Reviewer 3 reports different grammaticality judgments for examples presented in this paper, judging ungrammatical
The above examples contrast with Korean as discussed by Rudnitskaya (1998) and Kwon and Polinsky (2008: 92, 93, 98), where nesting a –ko clause is said to be grammatical in successive interpretation contexts (see ex. (21)), and where tense marking was deemed impossible.

Topicalisation behaviour depends on subject reference. Different-subject contexts ((27a) and (27b)) allow for topicalisation within the –ko clause, whereas this is not possible in same-subject contexts (examples (28b) and (28c)).

(27) Different-subject

a. Successive, topicalisation of (7)  

\[
\text{tɕʰɔpsəkɔlul=ɨn jəŋhɨi=ka kɔla oа(-sʰ)-ko sʰumi=ka}
\]

rice:flour=TOP Yeongheui=NOM grind come(-PST)-AND Sumi=NOM

\[
\text{t̩ək=ɨl tɕitɕə-sʰ-tɕə}
\]

rice_cake=ACC fry-PST

‘As for the rice flour, Yeongheui bought it and Sumi fried the rice cake (made out of it).’

b. Non-successive, topicalisation of (6)  

\[
\text{palɨsʰkʰʷekɨ=nɨn jəŋhɨi=ka tɕaŋman hə(jə-sʰ)-ko sʰumi=ka t̩ək=ɨl tɕitɕə-sʰ-u-ta}
\]

fish=TOP Yeongheui=NOM prepare do(-PST)-AND Sumi=NOM rice_cake=ACC fry-PST

‘As for the fish, Cheolsu cleaned it and Yeongheui had fried the rice cake.’

(28) Same-subject

a. \[
\text{tɕʰəlsʰu=ka moɲə sʰɔsʰnekɨ=ɨl kə(o(a-sʰ))-ko sʰisʰmaŋtʰeŋi=ɨl tɕola-n}
\]

Cheolsu=NOM first cord=ACC braid(-PST)-AND seed:basket=ACC weave-PST

‘Cheolsu first braided the strap cord, and then wove the seed basket part.’

b. Successive, topicalisation of (28a)  

\[
\text{*sʰɔsʰnekɨ=nɨn tɕʰəlsʰu=ka moɲə ko-ko sʰisʰmaŋtʰeŋi=ɨl tɕola-n}
\]

cord=TOP Cheolsu=NOM first braid-AND seed:basket=ACC weave-PST

(‘As for the strap, Cheolsu braided it first and then he wove the seed basket.’)

(28c) Non-successive, topicalisation of (26c)  

\[
\text{*atəl=ɨn tɕʰəlsʰu=ka wənmaŋ hə-ko t̩əl=ɨl akawa hə-n-ta}
\]

son=TOP Cheolsu=NOM blame do-AND daughter=ACC cherish do-PRS

(‘Cheolsu blamed his son and cherished his daughter.’)

The above examples show how the topicalisation behaviour of Jejuan –ko clauses differs according to subject reference, yet not according to the semantic interpretation of a –ko linkage. This contrasts with the Korean findings from Kwon and Polinsky (2008, see ex. (19d) and (20d)), where topicalisation is said to be impossible in non-successive contexts, yet possible in successive ones.

Next I discuss relativisation tests. Successive contexts permit extraction only from the final clause, yet extraction out of the –ko clause is blocked. This is uniform across different-subject and same-subject contexts, as shown below.

---

11 Reviewer 3 claims that ‘the correct orthography would be to write -sʰu- in post-consonantal environments’ when it comes to the politeness marker –u-, suggesting the employment of Standard Korean orthographic rules. In the two villages from the Northeast of Jeju Island examined in this paper, such an allomorphy does not occur consistently among elderly speakers. The literature shows high variation in this regard. I suspect sociolinguistic variation, and I decidedly do not standardise orthographic representation.

12 Reviewer 2 proposes that the ungrammaticality of (28b) and (28c) could result from an ‘incompatibility of the topic marker on the first object NP with the accusative [marking] on the second’. I do not have further data on this matter, yet thank the reviewer for further inspirations.

13 Reviewer 1 opines that Korean –ko linkages would in fact behave not at all differently from Jejuan here, pace Kwon and Polinsky (2008) and Kwon (2004). While I thank Reviewer 1 for this contribution, I refer to footnote 10.
(29) Different-subject, successive

690 a. Relativisation of final-clause object in (7)
691 [jəŋhɨi=ka səlkɔlul=il kɔla o(a(-s))-ko sʰumi=ka tək=il təi-te-in]
692 Yeongheui=NOM rice:flour=ACC grind come(-PST)-AND Sumi=NOM fry-ADN
693 tək
694 rice_cake
695 ‘The rice cake that Sumi fried after Yeongheui bought the rice flour’
696 b. Relativisation of converb clause object
697 *ki [jəŋhɨi=ka səlkɔlul=il kɔla o(a(-s))-ko sʰumi=ka tək=il təi-te-in]
698 that Yeongheui=NOM grind come-AND Sumi=NOM rice_cake=ACC fry-ADN
699 təi-pəsəlkɔlul
700 rice:flour
701 (*That rice flour that Sumi fried rice cake with after Yeongheui bought it’)

(30) Same-subject, successive

702 a. Relativisation of final-clause object in (26a)
703 [toŋsʰu=ka naŋ=ɨl atəcən o(a(-s))-ko təi-pəsəlkɔlul]
704 Dongsu=NOM tree=ACC pick_up:AND come(-PST)-AND Cheolsu=COM together
705 təi-te-in]
706 keçiip=i mak kʰəla
707 build-ADN dog:house=NOM very be_big:EV.IPF:DECL
708 ‘The dog house, that Dongsu brought wood for and built together with Cheolsu, was very big.’
709 b. Relativisation of converb clause object
710 *[toŋsʰu=ka səlkɔlul=il kɔla o(a(-s))-ko təi-te-in]
711 Dongsu=NOM tree=ACC pick_up:AND come(-PST)-AND Cheolsu=COM together
712 keçiip=i mak kʰəla
713 dog:house build-ADN tree=ACC very be_big:EV.IPF:DECL
714 ‘Cheolsu who Sumi loves and Dongsu loves Yeongheui’s tree, was very thick.’

In non-successive contexts, extraction is blocked out of both the converb clause and final clause.

(31) Different-subject, non-successive

720 a. sʰumi=nɨn təi-pəsəlkɔlul=il sələŋ hə-ko toŋsʰu=nɨn jəŋhɨi=lɨl sələŋ
721 Sumi=TOP Cheolsu=ACC love do-AND Dongsu=TOP Yeongheui=ACC love
722 hə-nta
723 do-PRS:DECL
724 ‘Sumi loves Cheolsu and Dongsu loves Yeongheui.’
725 b. Relativisation of converb clause object
726 *[sʰumi=ka sələŋ hə-ko toŋsʰu=ka jəŋhɨi=lɨl]
727 Sumi=NOM love do-AND Dongsu=NOM Yeongheui=ACC
728 sələŋ hə-nɨn] təi-pəsəlkɔlul
729 love do-ADN Cheolsu
730 (*Cheolsu who Sumi loves and Dongsu loves Yeongheui’)

14Reviewer 1 judges both ex. (29b) and (30b) to be grammatical, both in Jejuan, as well as in Korean. This is parallel to Kwon and Polinsky (2008: 93, 95), who state that for successive, same-subject contexts, either the converb or final clause argument can be relativised (see section 2.2). While this may suggest conventional agreement in the literature, this is not so, as Kwon NY (2004: 106) states that extraction is possible only from final clauses. As shown above, my Jeju language teachers judged ex. (29b) and (30b) as ungrammatical, and I commit to their native speaker judgments.
c. Relativisation of final clause object

\[*sʰumi=ka \text{te̞olsʰu}=i1l \ sʰolaŋ hə-ko \ tonsʰu=ka \]

\begin{center}
Sumi=NOM Cheolsu=ACC love do-AND Dongsu=NOM
\end{center}

\(sʰolaŋ hə-nɨn\) jəŋhɨi

love do-AND Yeongheui

(‘Yeongheui who Sumi loves Cheolsu and Dongsu loves’)

(32) Same-subject, non-successive

a. Relativisation of converb clause object

\[*jəŋsʰu=ka \text{wənsʰəŋ hə-ko  t ̃ ọl=ɨl ak ̃ awa hə-nɨn} \]

\(Yeongsu=NOM \text{blame do-AND daughter=ACC cherish do-AND son}\)

(‘The son who Yeongsu blames and cherishes his daughter’)

b. Relativisation of final clause object

\[*[jəŋsʰu=ka \text{atəl=ɨl wənsʰəŋ hə-ko  } ____ ak ̃ awa hə-nɨn} \]

\(Yeongsu=NOM \text{son=ACC blame do-AND cherish do-ADN daughter}\)

(‘The daughter who Yeongsu blames his son and cherishes’)
Jejuan -ko linkages

c. Non-successive

\[iɲək=ɨn, \text{teip}it\text{eq}u=ɨn \text{t}ə\text{ms}ə \text{hə(jo-ms)\text{-ko} teip}\text{eq}u=ɨn \text{t}ə\text{ms}ə=ɨn \text{toŋ}=ɨl,\]

self=ACC landlord=ACC blame do(-PROG)-AND landlord=TOP Dongsu=ACC

akawa hems\text{ Hicks}a
cherish do:PROG:DECL

(‘Himself blames the landlord, and the landlord appreciates Dongsu.’)

Somewhat surprisingly, in (33c), consultants were able to construe \text{toŋ}=ɨl to be co-referential with \text{ipək}. Given that most cataphoric reference tests seem to prohibit reference establishment from the final clause into the -\(ko\) clause, this is slightly puzzling. Seen from the perspective of nesting tests, it would not be surprising to see that -\(ko\) linkages do not allow for cataphoric reference since -\(ko\) clauses are not embedded, parallel to the understanding of traditional coordination explained in section 2.1. However, as soon as a reference context was established in the wider discourse through the author’s explanations and repetitions of similar examples, consultants sometimes identified co-reference easily.

Thus the question is whether the reference behaviour of \text{ipək} is motivated by more than just syntactic factors, suggesting that reference establishment involving \text{ipək} may well be overridden by (presumably) discourse-pragmatic factors that need to be explored further. Indeed, what may be unusual from a Korean perspective is that speakers of Jejuan would frequently point at themselves or an imaginary addressee (or at the author in elicitations) when being asked who \text{ipək} refers to. While I therefore would like to advocate some caution in using \text{ipək} for anaphora tests, for now I conclude that cataphoric reference is not possible in Jejuan -\(ko\) clauses (at least in most cases).

Lastly, I discuss changing the order of events in a Jejuan -\(ko\) linkage, which relates to the concept of Haiman and Thompson’s (1984) ‘tense iconicity’. Exchanging the order of events is possible in non-successive contexts without a change in meaning interpretation and acceptability. In successive contexts however, switching the syntactic order of events is interpreted as a change in the temporal sequence of events. In the following, then, exchanging the order of events also renders the utterance unacceptable for ontological reasons.

(34) Same-subject, successive

a. \text{s}ə\text{umI}=k\text{a} \text{ʒəkəlul}=ɨl kə\text{lα o(a-s')}\text{-ko teilimtək teiteo-s'}-u-ta

Sumi=NOM rice:flour=ACC grind come(PST)-AND rice_cake fry(PST-POL)-DECL

‘Sumi brought the rice flour and fried the rice cake.’

b. #sə\text{umI}=k\text{a teilimtək teiteo-s'}-kə \text{ʒəkəlul}=ɨl kə\text{lα oa-s'}-u-ta

Sumi=NOM rice_cake fry(PST-AND rice:flour=ACC grind come(PST-POL)-DECL

#‘Sumi fried rice cake and brought the flour for it.’✓‘Sumi fried rice cake and brought rice flour for something else.’

It is commonly known that rice flour is needed in order to make rice cake, which is why it is necessary for the event of acquiring the ingredient to precede the event of using the ingredient for cooking. This is why (34b) would be considered unacceptable, were it intended to mean that the rice flour is used to make the rice cake. This test concludes the description section, and I now proceed to the discussion of overall findings.

4. Discussion of findings

The goal of this paper was to compare the patterns emerging from properties of Jejuan –\(ko\) linkage to those patterns described for Korean –\(ko\) linkages. Below, I summarise the patterns in Table 4, including those shown for Korean in Kwon and Polinsky (2008: 94):

final intonation (see Ko Y.-L 2009), whereas for the converb one will have one typical for linked clauses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic interpretation</th>
<th>NON-SUCCESSIVE</th>
<th>SUCCESSIVE</th>
<th>NON-SUCCESSIVE</th>
<th>SUCCESSIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject reference</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre embedding</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicalisation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativisation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>FIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataphora</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense marking</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned in section 3.2, there are some caveats regarding cataphora tests that I am simplifying at this place. While Kwon and Polinsky (2008) do not systematically differentiate between different-subject (DS) and same-subject (SS above) reference, their generalisation is such that correlating with non-successive and successive interpretation of events in a –ko linkage, syntactic properties will show clear-cut ‘coordinate’ or ‘subordinate’ behaviour. This view is shared by almost all authors working on the Korean –ko linkage, although those working in generative frameworks may differ in arguing whether a ‘coordinate’ or ‘subordinate’ structure is to be regarded the underlying one.

Theoretically speaking, ‘dichotomous behaviour’ means that definitorial properties as outlined in Table 4 above align neatly into two categories, with nothing ‘in between’. Seemingly trivially, the application of such a dichotomous categorial opposition can only be justified if properties represented through the data in fact correlate with each other consistently, which is precisely what authors such as Kwon and Polinsky (2008) argued. Yet conversely, this means: if Jejuan –ko linkages do not show dichotomous behaviour, we have no evidence to assume that ‘coordination’ and ‘subordination’ are valid categories for this clause type at all. Moreover, if properties do not consistently bundle into neat categories, this means that it may be better to conceive of them as independent dimensions that may or may not converge, without assuming the necessity of larger categories such as ‘coordination’ or ‘subordination’. This is what I aim to demonstrate in the following discussion.

Let us first examine those properties which have shown no divergence across different conditions:

1. Jejuan –ko clauses resist syntactic embedding altogether, while Korean –ko clauses are reported to be embeddable in successive contexts, yet not in non-successive contexts.


3. Jejuan –ko clauses do not impose a syntactic ban on converbal tense marking, whereas Korean –ko clauses are said to disallow tense marking in successive contexts, while it is optional in non-successive contexts.

4. Extraction through relativisation is permitted in successive contexts, yet not in non-successive contexts. This largely confirms with findings on the Korean –ko linkage.

5. Order change is possible in non-successive contexts, yet not in successive contexts. The same has been observed for Korean –ko clauses.

6. Topicalisation is possible in different-subject contexts, yet not in same-subject contexts. In Korean –ko linkages, semantic interpretation is the decisive factor in this regard.
Now, points (4) and (5) above suggest that Jejuan –ko linkages do show some ‘subordinate’ properties, yet the two dimensions are issues independent of each other.

Linear order change effects in clause linkage have been observed widely under the topic of iconicity in grammar (Haiman 1980, Givón 1985), and named ‘tense iconicity’ by Haiman and Thompson (1984). Here, we are talking about how extra-linguistic, ontological conditions of temporality and cause-and-effect are iconically represented in linear ordering in syntax.

Restrictions on extraction, on the other hand, have to do with syntactic island effects now widely known through Ross’s (1967) seminal work on the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC). The Jejuan data suggests that quite similar to other languages such as Tsakhur (Kazenin and Testeltes 2004; cf. Haspelmath 2004), –ko clauses in successive –ko linkages are syntactic islands, where in non-successive contexts, the entire linkage constitutes a syntactic island similar to what we traditionally know under coordination.

(35) after Jendraschek and Shin (2018: 1119)

a. ‘coordinate’ construal

*minswu-ka wuyu-lul kacye o-ko nay-ka sa-ss-te-n

Minsu-NOM milk-ACC have:INF come-AND 1SG-NOM buy-PST-RETR-AT

ppang-i masiss-e-yo

bread-NOM taste-ILLOC-POL

(‘The bread I bought and Minsu bought milk is tasty.’)

b. ‘adverbial’ construal

✓minswu-ka wuyu-lul kacye o-ko (na-n twi-ey)

Minsu-NOM milk-ACC have:INFcome-AND exit-AT behind-LOC

nay-ka sa-ss-te-n ppang-i masiss-e-yo

1SG-NOM buy-PST-RETR-AT bread-NOM taste-ILLOC-POL

(‘The bread I bought after Minsu brought milk is tasty.’)

In Jendraschek and Shin’s (2018: 1119) functional take, the divergent relativisation behaviour of Korean –ko linkages is traced back to the ‘coordinate’ or ‘adverbial construal’ of event relationships. Similar to what other authors have observed, successive contexts allow for an addition of na-n twi-ey, exit-AT behind-LOC above. The evidence above is similar to various discussions found in Rudnitskaya (1998), Kwon and Polinsky (2008: 96ff.) or Cho SY (2004), although Jendraschek and Shin’s (2018) point out that if in a potentially ambiguous case such as above, a –ko linkage was construed as describing a situation with two semantically unrelated events, they state that such a clause linkage “is construed as coordinate rather than adverbial” (Jendraschek and Shin 2018: 1119), which then prohibits the relativisation out of the –ko clause. An adverbial construal of events linked in a –ko linkage enables relativisation, as shown in (35b).

As opposed to strictly dichotomous views, however, Jendraschek and Shin (2018: 1120) remark that different-subject –ko linkages construed ‘adverbially’ still may resist centre embedding, which is why the authors conclude that “a different-subject linkage with –ko allows only of adverbial inferences, but not adverbial syntax.” (Jendraschek and Shin 2018: 1120). As for the Jejuan results, this means that possibility of extraction out of a –ko linkage may be understandable in similar ways by relating the single dimension of relativisation behaviour back to functional-cognitive motivations. Yet this need not mean that a single dimension forcibly needs to correlate with others – in fact, there is no correlation with this dimension with centre embedding properties, as otherwise the relativisation behaviour would be expected to be uniform as well.

The topicalisation behaviour of Jejuan –ko clauses is the only one which is influenced by the subject reference of a –ko linkage. The data suggests that in Jejuan –ko clauses, the presence or absence of a subject argument also has consequences for the internal structure of a –ko clause: in those syntactic frameworks assuming dedicated positions for topicalised constituents, different-subject –ko clauses could be regarded as licensing a clause-internal topic position (example (27)), whereas same-subject –ko clauses do not (ex. (28)). In principle, the possibility or impossibility of topicalisation in adverbial clauses has been attested in the literature:
According to Haegeman (2003, 2010), English ‘Central adverbial clauses’ do not permit topicalisation while ‘peripheral adverbial clauses’ do, which within a cartographic framework is assumed to imply the presence or absence of a TopP position within the internal structure of an adverbial clause. On a typological level, authors such as Nikolaeva (2013:109) have mentioned that in clause linkage, non-final clauses may frequently show restrictions in the expressibility of information-structural processes (such as topicalisation) normally available to canonically finite clauses, yet this may vary. Back to our Jejuan analysis, what is interesting is that this sensitivity of topicalisation to cross-clausal subject reference seems to be largely independent of other properties.

In sum, I have shown how on the level of individual properties, Jejuan –ko linkages may behave the same way or not as their Korean counterparts. However, the overall, rigid distinction between coordination and subordination suggested for the understanding of Korean –ko linkages is not helpful for analysing the grammar of Jejuan –ko clause linkages, as the properties do not consistently align with each other.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that one cannot apply a consistent coordination-subordination distinction to Jejuan –ko clauses in the same way as done for Korean in approaches à la Kwon and Polinsky (2008) or Rudnitskaya (1998), as several properties (centre embedding, cataphoric reference, tense marking) do not show a dichotomous diversification pattern, subject to either semantic interpretation or subject reference. Those properties that in fact do diverge, do so independently of others: relativisation and order change behaviours both diverge along the lines of successive or non-successive semantic interpretation yet are motivated separately, and the possibility of topicalisation relates to possible structural consequences arising from different- or same-subject reference.

Clearly, one needs to find a way to accommodate the fact that Jejuan –ko clauses do not show all properties of either traditional coordination or subordination. Moreover, if Jejuan behaves differently from Korean, it may be that other Koreanic varieties may show some variation in this respect as well. Thus a less conflicting model of clause linkage should ensure for variety-specific peculiarities to be captured, without having to call into question major categorial distinctions that turn out to have been ill-conceived in the first place. Inspired by the typological literature that debates issues of cross-linguistic comparability (see section 2.1 cf. Plank 2016, Brown et al. 2013, Bickel 2010, Lehmann 1988), I would either suggest a more open approach such as Jendraschek and Shin’s (2018) that allows us to place individual linguistic phenomena on a continuum between subordination and coordination, or recommend decomposing the categories of ‘coordination’ and ‘subordination’ into a multidimensional array of defining properties (cf. Bickel 2010 or Haiman and Thompson 1984), each of which can operate theoretically independently.
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Appendix: Transliteration conventions


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Han</th>
<th>JIPA</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>Han</th>
<th>JIPA</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ㄱ</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>g/k</td>
<td>ㅗ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>(w)o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄴ</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ㅏ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄷ</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d/t</td>
<td>ㅓ</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㄹ</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>ㅏ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅁ</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b/p</td>
<td>ㅑ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>wu</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅂ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ㅕ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>eu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅅ</td>
<td>sʰ</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>ㅛ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅈ</td>
<td>t͡ɕ</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅊ</td>
<td>t̚</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>je</td>
<td>yay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅋ</td>
<td>kʰ</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>b/p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>je</td>
<td>yey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅌ</td>
<td>tʰ</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t/h</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>je</td>
<td>yey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅍ</td>
<td>pʰ</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>je</td>
<td>yey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅎ</td>
<td>sʰ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>je</td>
<td>yey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Initial)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Han</th>
<th>JIPA</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ㅏ</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅑ</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅓ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅕ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅗ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅜ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Final)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Han</th>
<th>JIPA</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ㅏ</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅑ</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅓ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅕ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅗ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅜ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Initial)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Han</th>
<th>JIPA</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ㅏ</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅑ</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅓ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅕ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅗ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅜ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Initial)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Han</th>
<th>JIPA</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ㅏ</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅑ</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅓ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅕ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅗ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ㅜ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>