

1 The morphosyntax of Jejuan *-ko* clause linkages

3 Abstract

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

14 **keywords:** clause linkage; *-ko* converb; Jejuan; Jejueo; Ceycwu dialect

17 1. Introduction¹

18
 19 Koreanic language varieties are well-known for their richness in manifestations of clause linkage,
 20 much of which is realised by means of specialised verb forms. Connecting to an ever-growing body of
 21 research in functional-typological studies (cf. Haspelmath and König 1995), a number of authors in
 22 Koreanic linguistics have adopted the term *converb* for these forms (Jendraschek and Shin 2011, 2018;
 23 Kwon NY et al. 2006 among others). Languages such as Jejuan (Song S-J 2011) or Korean (Sohn H-M
 24 2009) make extensive use of an unusually high number of converbs, connecting clauses in a larger
 25 sentence structure that may correspond to entire paragraphs in languages such as English (cf. Longacre
 26 2007).

27
 28 (1) Jejuan, Pear Story, Kim S-U (2018a: jeju0060-05, 93)

29 *namu=es^{hə} ta-ku, ta-məŋ, ale nɔliə ola-ŋ=i, to*
 30 tree=ABL pick-AND pick-WHILE down move_down come-AND=RIGHT? again
 31 *piup-ko i=kə jo=ti ka-min itee t^hələtɛiə pu-n-ta*
 32 empty-AND THIS=THING THIS=PLACE go-IF now fall_down AUX-PRS-DECL

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

35
 36 Henceforth, I use ‘converb’ as a working notion referring to those clause linking verb forms with
 37 roughly adverbial function — that is, those forms not primarily heading complement clauses or
 38 adnominal clauses. Thus the forms *piup-ko*, empty-AND, *ta-məŋ*, pick-WHILE etc. encountered in example
 39 (1) above are all converbs; some have more specialised meanings such as conditional (*-min*), whereas
 40 those of others are more generic, such as *-ko* converbs (with its frequent variant *-ku*), the focus of this
 41 paper. Only the final verb in (1) bears tense and illocutionary force information, which is typical for such
 42 clause linkages. Korean also has a *-ko* converb, which belongs to the best studied ones in that language:

43
 44
¹ Abbreviations: 1=first person, 3=third person, ABL=ablative, ACC=accusative, ADD=additive, ADN=adnominal, AT=attributive, AUX=auxiliary, COM=comitative, COP=copula, DAT=dative, 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=honorific, ILLOC=illocutionary force, IMP=imperative, IND=indicative, INF=infinitive, (I)PF=(im)perfective, IRR=irrealis, LOC=locative, MED=medial, NMLZ=nominalizer, NOM=nominative, NON-SUCC=non-successive, PL=plural, PLR=polar, POL=politeness, PROG=progressive, PR(E)S=present tense, PST=past tense, PURP=purposive, Q=question, QUOT=quotative, RETR=retrospective, SG=singular, SS=same subject, STN=stance, SUCC=successive, TOP=topic

- 45 (2) Korean *-ko* linkages
 46 a. Kwon (2004: 102)
 47 *John-i chayk-ul ilk(-ess)-ko, Mary-ka tibi-lul po-ass-ta*
 48 John-NOM book-ACC read(-PST)-AND Mary-NOM TV-ACC see-PST-DECL
 49 ‘John read a book, and Mary watched TV.’
 50 b. Cho (2004: 36)²
 51 *Kim-i pap-ul mek(-ess)-ko kulus-ul chiu-ess-ta*
 52 Kim-NOM rice-ACC eat(-PST)-AND dish-ACC clean-PST-DECL
 53 ‘Kim ate the rice and cleaned the dihes.’
 54

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

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

74 In the next subsection 1.1, I give a contextualisation of Jejuan *-ko* converbs, and in section 1.2, I
 75 present the research methodology and some general remarks. In section 2, I very briefly summarise
 76 developments in functional-typological research on clause linkage (section 2.1) in order to show how
 77 the perspective argued for in this paper relates back to wider, recent discourses in the field. Subsection
 78 2.2 gives a summary of the research on Korean *-ko* clause linkages, focusing on Rudnitskaya’s (1998)
 79 and especially Kwon and Polinsky’s (2008) work, whose influential findings I use as points of
 80 comparison. Section 3 first presents the criteria applied to Jejuan *-ko* clause linkages, and then
 81 proceeds with the data description. Section 4 summarises the findings on Jejuan *-ko* linkages and
 82 discusses the patterns in relation to the wider literature. Section 5 concludes this paper.
 83

84 1.1. Jejuan and *-ko* converbs

85
 86 It is only in recent times that Jejuan (also known as Jejueo, Ceycwu(two)(s)mal) has been gaining
 87 the attention of researchers outside (South) Korean dialectology, especially since its classification as a
 88 critically endangered language by Moseley (2010). Traditionally, most research treats Jejuan as one of
 89 six traditional dialect areas (called Ceycwupangen, ‘Jeju dialect’ cf. Pangenyenkwuhoy 2001, Sohn
 90 H-M 1999, Yeon JH 2012, Kim J-H 2014, 2017), albeit as one of the most conservative ones. Novel
 91 views classifying Jejuan as an independent Koreanic language have focused on the great lack of mutual
 92 intelligibility, as well as clearly attestable lexical distance between Korean and Jejuan (O’Grady 2014;
 93 Long and Yim 2002; Brown and Yeon 2015; Barnes-Sadler 2017 and Lee S 2015). As Korean
 94 dialectology tends to emphasise the shared diachrony between Jejuan and Korean, there is still work to
 95 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.

96 variation (the same being true for other Koreanic varieties, cf. Silva 2010, Brown and Yeon 2015).
 97 Due to its close relationship to Korean, it is not surprising to see that the two languages are similar in
 98 many areas such as SOV constituent order and suffixing preference, the existence of PRO-drop, largely
 99 agglutinative morphology that includes information-structural encoding, as well as the distinction
 100 between a highly inflectional verb system inflecting for tense, aspect, mood, evidentiality, politeness
 101 and illocutionary force, and a nominal system where nouns and pronominals often do not inflect, but
 102 rather employ a rich system of particles. At the same time, many phenomena have developed that are
 103 not found in other regions of the Korean-speaking realm.

104
 105 (3) Kim S-U (2018b: 372) [HYJ1 jeju0157, 00:08:08]

106 *t̃ɛə əlin=s^ha ʃi-t̃ɛu=ke*

107 that elder=FOC write-STN=DSC

108 ‘Of course, she [lit. that elder person] knows how to write.’

109 (4) [HGS1, jeju0157, 00:00:20]

110 *ki nal oa-s^h-taŋ mək-i-k^wa-l-en ilimp^hjo tola-s^h-ə-nia?*

111 that day come-PST-AND eat-EP-EGO.PF-DECL-QUOT name:tag hang-PST-EV.IPF-Q.PLR

112 ‘Did [the mosquitos] leave a name tag saying ‘I came and ate your blood today’?’

113 (5) Kang Y-B (2007: 98) [transliteration and glossing mine]

114 *halipaŋ=s^hinti s^hɔ:l:ua pul-k^h-en hɔ-nan kiŋaŋ s^hus^himiak hɔjə*

115 grandfather=DAT tell.HON AUX-IRR-QUOTdo-AS just mute do

116 ‘As I told them that I would tell their grandfather, they just went mute.’
 117

118 Especially the verb system shows differences from Korean. Above, I show question markers that
 119 distinguish polar and content questions, a different system of politeness expression, speaker-centred
 120 marking (-k^wa- above), particles that partake in knowledge management in discourse (=ke above; Yang
 121 and Kim 2013), as well as a system of quotative formation that interacts with mood and evidentiality in
 122 the final clause (cf. Kim J-H 2014, Song S-J 2011). Due to ongoing language shift, speech patterns
 123 become more and more similar to Standard Korean as we move down the age groups, down to a level
 124 where only a few Jejuan traces remain in the colloquial code used by the youngest generation.
 125

Semantics	Converb	PST	PROG	PROG.IMP	PRS	EV.IPF
‘generic’	-ko	-s ^h -ko	-ms ^h -ko	-ms ^h i-ko	-	-
	-ŋ	-	-	-	-	-
imm. succession	-kəni	-	-	-	-	-
simultaneous	-məŋ	-	-	-	-	-
narrative change	-nan	-	-	-	-	-
	-taŋ	-s ^h -taŋ	-	-	-	-
causal	-nan	-s ^h i-nan	-ms ^h i-nan	-	-	-
concessive	-məŋ	-s ^h i-məŋ	-ms ^h i-məŋ	-	-	-
contrastive	-nti	-s ^h i-nti	-ms ^h i-nti	-	-ni-nti	-ə-nke

126 Table 1: A selection of Jejuan converbs and their inflectional range
 127

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

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

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

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

147
 148 (6) Non-successive *-ko* linkage [jeju0138, 00:04:48, proper names modified]

149 *jəŋhii=ka palis^hk^hweki=lil t̃eəŋman həjə(-ms^h)-ko s^humi=ka t̃eilim̩tək*
 150 Yeongheui=NOM fish-ACC prepare do-PROG-AND Sumi=NOM rice_cake

151 *t̃eit̃eə-ms^h-ə-la*

152 fry-PROG-EV.IPF-DECL

153 ‘Yeongheui was preparing the fish, and Sumi was frying the rice cake.’

154 (7) Successive *-ko* linkage [jeju0147, 00:20:55, 00:21:02]

155 *jəŋhii=ka s̩ɔlkɔlul=il kɔla oa(-s^h)-ko s^humi=ka*
 156 Yeongheui=NOM rice:flour=ACC grind come-PST-AND Sumi=NOM

157 *t̩ək=il t̃eit̃eə-s^h-t̃eə*

158 rice_cake=ACC fry-PST-DECL

159 ‘Yeongheui brought rice flour, and then Sumi made a rice cake (with it).’

160

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

163 (6), and (8) below:

164

165 (8) Progressive-imperative marking [jeju0138, 00:05:45, proper names modified]

166 *jəŋhii=laŋ t̃eilim̩tək t̃eit̃eə-ms^hi-ko s^humi=laŋ palis^hk^hweki t̃eəŋman*

167 Yeongheui=TOP rice_cake fry-PROG:IMP-AND Sumi=TOP fish prepare

168 *həjə-ms^h-i-la*

169 do-PROG-EP-IMP

170 ‘Yeongheui, you’ll be making fried rice cake and Sumi, you’ll be preparing the fish!’

171

172 Korean *-ko* converbs only allow for past tense or irrealis mood marking (the latter has not been attested
 173 in my research yet for Jejuan). Not only does the Jejuan *-ko* converb 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 *-ms^hi-*, PROG:IMP morpheme of the *-ko* converb and the */-ms^hi-/* string of the final clause verb as underlyingly different structures. Speakers clearly interpret these forms differently: the *-ms^hi-*, PROG:IMP verbal form is understood to express a command (see also recording jeju0140, 00:30:50). Without such meaning, the suffix would not be *-ms^hi-*, but just *-ms^h-*, as in ex. (6). In the final clause, the imperative component is the suffix *-la*. While the */-i-/* part of the imperative-progressive converb form is meaningful, the */-i-/* of the final verb is the result of phonotactic epenthesis. Reviewer 1 suggests that *t̃eit̃eəms^hiko* is in fact *t̃eit̃eə-m s^hi-ko*, fry-NMLZ EXIST.COP, a construction with a nominaliser and an existential copula. Neither does this account for the difference of *t̃eit̃eəms^hko* and *t̃eit̃eəms^hiko* synchronically, nor does it consider the fact that the Jejuan nominaliser *-m* suffixes to a verb root directly (*t̃eit̃eim*, with epenthetic */-i-/*), instead of suffixing using the stem vowel */-ə/* (**t̃eit̃eə*), a pattern that reaches as far back as Late Middle Korean (15th century, see Lee and Ramsey 2011: 176). For various perspectives, see Kim J-H (2017, 2016, 2014), Mun S-Y (1998, 2004, 2006), Kim S-U (2018b) and Ko et al. (2016: 31).

174 different from Korean, but also, elicitation with native speakers did not show any signs of
 175 impossibility of tense inflection on a *-ko* converb irrespective of different contexts such as
 176 different/same subjecthood, non-successive/successive semantics or particular syntactic tests such as
 177 relativisation (see section 3, ex. (29a), for example). During elicitation, consultants expressed a
 178 preference for untensed converbs, yet did not reject examples with tense marking on converbs in
 179 contexts which in Korean are reported to lead to ungrammaticality.⁵ This stands in contrast with the
 180 findings of most research on Korean *-ko* linkages, where the possibility of tense marking is seen as
 181 one criterion for the coordinate status of a *-ko* clause linkage, and where the impossibility of it is said
 182 to be a characteristic of a subordinate linkage.

184 (9) Kim S-J (2010: 210), glossing mine
 185 *t̃eə sʰalim=in til:i-ko t̃eəl:o il:o nəm-kok t̃eəl:o nəm-kok*
 186 that person=TOP carry:EP-AND thither hither cross-AND thither cross-AND
 187 *hə-məŋ ta tuteipə nwa*
 188 do-WHILE all flip_over put
 189 ‘That person takes it into his hands, and hopping hither and thither, back and forth,
 190 leaves everything flipped over.’
 191

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

202
 203 (10) Kang Y-B (2007: 48)
 204 *kʰəŋ kɔla-k kɔla-k hə-tən sʰalim=i ilmi=la?*
 205 thus talk-AND talk-AND do-EV.IPF.ADN person=NOM 3SG=COP
 206 ‘Is that the person who you witnessed talking on and on like that?’
 207

208 There are a number of reasons for considering the Jejuan *-ko* converb in isolation. One reason is that
 209 so far, there is very little research on Jejuan *-ko* linkages in ways comparable to Korean. At the same
 210 time, while Reviewer 3 questions the authenticity of *-ko* converbs as ‘genuinely Jejuan’, I have shown
 211 that these converbs are inflectable, largely following patterns observable elsewhere within the Jejuan
 212 converb system.⁶ Furthermore, regarding each occurrence of a Jejuan *-ko* converb as the elision of an
 213 entire morphosyntactic complex would be unsatisfactory, as we have many occurrences of *-ko*
 214 converbs which link clauses on their own, and which do not show the typical, repetitive narration
 215 semantics of ‘...-ko(k) ...-ko(k) hə-’ constructions.

216 Moreover, one can also find cases such as (10) where one finds ‘...-k ...-k hə-’ constructions. Both
 217 morphosyntactically and semantically, the structure is similar to that of ‘...-kok ...-kok hə-’

⁵ Reviewer 3 remarks that in a context such as (8), three options would be possible for converbs, in order of preference:
 1. untensed converb *t̃eite-i-ko(k)* 2. converb with PROG:IMP marking *t̃eiteə-msʰi-ko(k)*, and 3. converb with PROG marking
t̃eiteə-msʰ-ko(k). This is quite parallel to various comments given by my language teachers, see jeju0138, 00:12:40
 (speakers HJG1 and JOS1, Sukkun), and jeju0140, 00:30:50 (HGS1 and HYJ1, Jimnyeong). Reviewer 3 continues to
 explain that the TAM semantics of a converb would be ‘controlled’ by an imperative suffix in the final clause, and that
 this is why the inflection on the converb is not needed. I thank Reviewer 3 for this additional comment, and am glad to
 see that my consultants’ preference for untensed converbs finds itself confirmed in other speakers’ intuitions.

⁶ Jejuan consultants sometimes insisted on the usage of *-ko* instead of *-kok*, for reasons that still seem mysterious to me.
 See jeju0138, 00:06:49, and jeju0140, 00:05:16 in Kim S-U (2018a).

218 constructions. Given that the ‘*k*’ components do not occur consistently on *-ko* converbs (even with
219 one and the same speaker, e.g., HJG1 in jeju0135), one wonders whether they are inseparably part of a
220 ‘*-kok*’ suffix, or are morphological elements of their own. Undoubtedly, examining a wider range of
221 Jejuan linkage constructions across monoclausal and multiclausal contexts, and looking at both their
222 synchronic and diachronic inter-relationships would be valuable, yet would greatly exceed the scope
223 of a single paper. For now, I would like to thank Reviewer 3 for sparking this discussion and refer to
224 Kang Y-B (2007), Kim J-H (2014, 2017), Hyun and Kang (2011) or Song S-J (2011) for examples and
225 more.

227 **1.2. Research background and methodological concerns**

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

236 Much of the data found in this paper is a re-examination of data analysed in Kim S-U (2018b), a
237 larger study that compares the finiteness properties of a number of different Jejuan clause linkage
238 types with each other. Data was collected audio-visually, during two field trips in 2015/2016, for a
239 total of nine months, to the Northeast of Jeju Island, in Sukkun (Sinchon-Ri, Jocheon-Eup), and
240 Jimnyeong (Gimnyeong-Ri, Gujwa-Eup), two villages about 8.5 miles apart. Alongside the recording
241 of more naturalistic interactions, elicitations were done with an elderly couple in Sukkun (HJG1, mid-
242 70s and JOS1, late 60s), as well as two female friends in Jimnyeong (HGS1, late 80s and HYJ1, early
243 80s). The current paper focuses on the Sukkun data elicited from HJG1 and JOS1. While there are
244 some lexical and minor grammatical differences between the two varieties, no significant differences
245 were attested in the area of adverbial clause linkage.

246 Based on personal native speaker judgments, anonymous Reviewers 1 and 3 have questioned the
247 grammaticality or ungrammaticality, as well as the cultural appropriateness/intelligibility of a number
248 of examples in this paper. Following the format of the relevant clause linkage literature, examples
249 were constructed by the author in order to keep some factors in check such as overtness of
250 argument NPs or the length of a sentence. Preferably, they were inspired by data from witnessed
251 interactions in order to ensure actual attestation, relatibility and comprehension of examples.
252 They were presented verbally with elaborate (content-related, contextual) explanations that ‘set
253 the scene’ in order to ensure lest the wording or other extralinguistic issues interfered with
254 judgment – in fact, consultants sometimes suggested alternatives in case examples were deemed
255 unnatural or implausible, and elicitation was based on those examples instead. Of course, if
256 judgments were suspected to be made with considerable Korean interference, examples were
257 abandoned. As an example for such a negotiation, I recommend a passage in jeju0153, from
258 00:45:00 onwards in the on-line repository. Almost all Jejuan examples are accompanied by
259 recording numbers and timestamps, in the format of [jeju0000, hr:mm:ss]. I thank reviewers for their
260 watchful commentary. See footnotes for reviewers’ diverging judgments.

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

270 examples (table in appendix)⁷, Revised Romanisation for official terms, toponyms and proper names,
271 and Yale transliteration for Korean-language examples cited from other sources. Typos from cited
272 examples have been corrected. Interlinear glossing applies the Leipzig Glossing Rules.⁸
273

274 2. Clause linkage research: an overview of relevant themes

275
276 Before I proceed to the Jejuan data description, I give an overview of the relevant literature. I first
277 summarise important developments in the functional-typological literature in section 2.1, and then
278 delve into a brief overview of Koreanic linguistics literature on the Korean *-ko* linkage in section 2.2.
279

280 2.1. Clause linkage in functional-typological approaches

281
282 Traditional approaches to clause linkage in modern linguistics have worked with a dichotomous
283 conceptualisation that opposes ‘subordinate’ clauses with ‘coordinate ones’ (Cristofaro 2003: 16, Gast
284 and Diessel 2012: 4ff., Haiman and Thompson 1984: 510, Lyons 1968: 178). Subordinate linkages are
285 endocentric and asymmetrical, with the matrix clause dominating the subordinate clause that is
286 regarded syntactically embedded and dependent (cf. Croft 2001: 320/321). Haspelmath (1995: 12ff.)
287 gives a much-cited summary of clausal subordination:
288

289 (11) Criteria for clausal subordination (Haspelmath 1995: 12ff.)

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

296
297 In such an approach, diagnostics focus on showing that a particular clause linkage is *not* coordinate.
298 Point (1) is often referred to as a centre embedding or nesting test:
299

300 (12) Nesting of English *-ing* clauses

- 301 a. Max happily roamed around the streets of London while whistling his favourite song.
- 302 b. Max, while whistling his favourite song, happily roamed around the streets of London.

303 (13) Nesting tests for English coordinate clauses

- 304 a. Max happily roamed around the streets of London and whistled his favourite song.
- 305 b. *Max, and whistled his favourite song, happily roamed around the streets of London.

306
307 Coordinate clauses, are regarded exocentric and symmetrical where none of the clauses dominates
308 the other, and no clause is embedded in another (Haspelmath 2007a: 46). Point (6) follows J. R. Ross’s
309 well-known Coordinate Structure Constraint which stipulates that “[i]n a coordinate structure, no
310 conjunct may be moved, nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct”
311 (Ross 1967: 98f.). Many languages do not allow extraction of constituents out of only one clause in a
312 clause linkage, and if they do, they may show asymmetries between non-final and final clauses (see
313 Haspelmath 2004; Kazenin and Testelets 2004, Kwon NY 2004).⁹

⁷ Reviewer 3 questions the use of the IPA symbol ^h represented in Hangeul as ^h. Chang C (2013) points out that as a typological rarity, Korean exhibits a phonemic distinction between a lax, aspirate, voiceless, alveolar fricative and a inaspirate, voiceless, tense alveolar one (^h here, ^h in Hangeul). Impressionistically, the same distinction was identified in Jejuan, although this awaits further study.

⁸ See <https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf> [retrieved 2019-08-06].

⁹ Traditional ‘coordinate clauses’ are said to permit so-called Across-The-Board (ATB) extraction (Williams 1978). See discussions in Cho SY (2004) for Korean *-ko* linkages, *pace* Lee J S (2014).

- 314 (14) Extraction out of one linked clause in English
 315 a. After I had sold my house, I moved to a new place.
 316 b. The place that I moved to _____ after I had sold my house, was much smaller.
 317 c. *The house which after I had sold _____ I moved to a new place...

318
 319 Note that the dichotomous opposition between subordination and coordination is intimately
 320 connected to traditional views on finiteness, where non-finite verbs occur in subordinate clauses, and
 321 finite verbs occur in coordinate, main clauses (such simplistic views have now been revisited, cf.
 322 Nikolaeva 2007, 2010, 2013). It is through this link that the correlation between tense inflection on a
 323 Korean *-ko* converb and other traditionally coordinate properties is regarded so meaningful.

324 Researchers have found that even in languages believed to exhibit a clear coordination-
 325 subordination distinction, cases can be found where such a distinction is less clear (see Culicover and
 326 Jackendoff 1997 for English; and Yuasa and Sadock 2002). Increasingly, authors have acknowledged
 327 a theoretical separation between syntactic embedding and dependence (Foley and Van Valin 1984),
 328 with some suggesting a third category called ‘cosubordination’: this term stands for those cases where
 329 a clause is not embedded in another, but nevertheless shows a scope dependence under another clause
 330 with respect to “illocutionary force, evidentials, status and tense” (Foley and Van Valin 1984: 243,
 331 also 257; as well as Olson 1981). Such clauses were first described as ‘medial clauses’ in languages of
 332 Papua New Guinea, and entire clause linkages are often called ‘clause chains’ (Longacre 2007:
 333 398ff.). Clause chains show properties ascribed to both of traditional ‘subordination—coordination’
 334 oppositions, summarised below:

- 335
 336 (15) Medial clauses in Amele; after Kroeger (2004), Haspelmath (1995) and Roberts (1988)
 337 a. Medial clauses cannot be centre-embedded in final clauses; subordinate clauses can.
 338 b. Medial clauses must precede final clauses; subordinate ones can precede or follow them.
 339 c. Order reversal is possible for coordinate clauses but not for medial clauses.
 340 d. Cataphoric reference (‘backwards anaphora’) cannot be established into medial clauses,
 341 while this is possible with subordinate clauses.

342
 343 To give one example relevant for the present analysis, Roberts (1988) describes how in Amele,
 344 subordinate clauses can be centre-embedded in final clauses. Medial clauses do not allow this:

- 345
 346 (16) Amele, (Roberts 1988: 52-55; taken from Haspelmath 1995: 24)

- 347 a. Clause chain
 348 [*Ho busale-ce-b*] *dana age qo-i-ga.*
 349 pig run.out-MED.DS-3SG man they hit-3PL-HOD
 350 ‘The pig ran out and the man killed it.’
 351 b. Subordinate clause
 352 *Dana age [ho qo-qag-an nu] ho-i-ga.*
 353 man they pig kill-3PL-FUT PURP come-3PL-HOD
 354 ‘The men came to kill the pig.’
 355 c. Clause chain
 356 **Dana age [ho busale-ce-b] qo-i-ga.*
 357 man they pig run.out-MED.DS-3SG hit-3PL-HOD
 358 ‘The men, the pig having run out, killed it.’

359
 360 As I will show later, Jejuan *-ko* clauses cannot be centre-embedded, even though they are dependent
 361 in terms of their syntactic distribution. In many languages, it is adverbial clauses that now are often
 362 recognised as exhibiting lesser degrees of syntactic integration into their final clauses (Diessel 2013:
 363 342; Mathiessen and Thompson 1988). This is to say that typological research on clause linkage has
 364 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:

	SUCCESSIVE		NON-SUCCESSIVE	
	+TENSE	-TENSE	+TENSE	-TENSE
DS	n/a	-✓SUBORD	COORD	COORD
SS	n/a	SUBORD	COORD	COORD

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

Similar to other work on Korean *-ko* linkages, Rudnitskaya concludes that the semantic

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

424 (18) Rudnitskaya (1998: 185)

425 a. Base example 1

426 *Swun Mi-nun caki aphatu-lul phal(-ass)-ko cohun cip-ul sa-ss-ta.*

427 SwunMi-TOP own apartment-ACC sell-PST-AND good house-ACC buy-PST-DECL

428 ‘Sun Mi sold her apartment and bought a good house.’

429 b. Base example 2

430 *sonnim-tul-un achim-ul mek(-ess)-ko nokcha-lul masy-ess-ta*

431 guest-PL-TOP breakfast-ACC eat-PST-AND green_tea-ACC drink-PST-DECL

432 ‘Guests ate breakfast and drank green tea.’

433 c. Scrambling

434 *cohun cip-ul Swun Mi-nun caki aphatu-lul phal(*-ass)-ko sa-ss-ta.*

435 good house-ACC Swun-Mi-TOP own apartment-ACC sell(-PST)-AND buy-PST-DECL

436 ‘Sun Mi sold her apartment and bought a good house.’

437 d. Nesting

438 *Swun Mi-nun cohun cip-ul caki aphatu-lul phal(*-ass)-ko sa-ss-ta.*

439 Sun Mi-TOP good house-ACC own apartment-ACC sell(-PST)-AND buy-PST-DECL

440 ‘Sun Mi, after she had sold her apartment, bought a good house.’

441 e. Wh-question

442 *sonnim-tul-un achim-ul mek(*-ess)-ko mwusun cha-lul masy-ess-ni*

443 guests-PL-TOP breakfast-ACC eat(-PST)-AND what tea-ACC drink-PST-Q

444 ‘The guests had breakfast and drank what tea?’

445 For different-subject examples and further discussions, see Rudnitskaya (1998: 187ff.). As mentioned,
 446 the importance of tense marking in the correlation between syntactic properties and semantic
 447 interpretation of a Korean -ko linkage is a common theme in many papers on this linkage type.
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452

	Coordinate (non-successive)	Subordinate (successive)
Centre embedding	no	yes
Topicalisation	no	yes
Relativisation	no	yes
Backwards pronominalisation	no	yes
Permutation without meaning change	yes	no
Tense marking	yes	no

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

454 Kwon and Polinsky (2008) add complementary analyses, although their focus lies more on the
 455

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

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

- 466 (19) Korean *-ko* linkages with coordinate properties, Kwon and Polinsky (2008: 91/92)
- 467 a. *John-i Jane-ul cohaha-ko Mary-lul salangha-ess-ta*
 468 John-NOM Jane-ACC like-AND Mary-ACC love-PST-DECL
 469 ‘John likes Jane and loves Mary.’
- 470 b. Permutation possible without meaning change
 471 *John-i Mary-lul salangha-ko Jane-ul cohaha-ess-ta*
 472 John-NOM Mary-ACC love-AND Jane-ACC like-PST-DECL
 473 ‘John loves Mary and likes Jane.’
- 474 c. Backwards pronominalisation (=cataphoric reference) impossible
 475 **caki-ka Sue-lul cohaha-ko Tom-i John-ul silhehay-ss-ta*
 476 self-NOM Sue-ACC like-AND Tom-NOM John-ACC like-PST-DECL
 477 (‘He_i liked Sue and Tom_i disliked John.’)
- 478 d. Topicalisation in only one clause impossible
 479 **Mary-i-nun John-i Jane-ul cohaha-ko Tom-i _____i cohaha-n-ta*
 480 Mary-TOP John-NOM Jane-ACC like-AND Tom-NOM _____ like-PRS-DECL
 481 (‘Mary, John likes Jane and Tom likes.’)
- 482 e. Relativisation out of only one clause impossible
 483 **John-i Jane-ul cohaha-ko Tom-i _____i cohaha-n Mary_i*
 484 John-NOM Jane-ACC like-AND Tom-NOM _____ like-REL Mary
 485 (‘Mary_i who John likes Jane and Tom likes _____i.’)
- 486 f. Centre embedding impossible
 487 **Mary-ka [John-i yakwu-lul cohaha-ko] nongkwu-lul silheha-ess-ta*
 488 Mary-NOM John-NOM baseball-ACC like-AND basketball-ACC hate-PST-DECL
 489 (‘John liked baseball and Mary disliked basketball.’)
 490

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

- 496 (20) Korean: *-ko* linkages with subordinate properties, Kwon and Polinsky (2008: 92/93)
- 497 a. *Tom-i cip-ey o-ko Mary-ka tochakha-ess-ta*
 498 Tom-NOM house-to come-AND Mary-NOM arrive-PST-DECL
 499 ‘After Tom came home, Mary arrived.’
- 500 b. Permutation changes meaning
 501 *Mary-ka tochakha-ko Tom-i cip-ey o-ass-ta*
 502 Mary-NOM arrive-AND Tom-NOM house-LOC come-PST-DECL
 503 ‘After Mary arrived, Tom got home.’
 504
 505
 506

- 507 c. Backwards pronominalisation possible
 508 *caki_i-ka silswu-lul ha-ko Tom_i-i na-eykey hwa-lul nay-ss-ta*
 509 self-NOM error-ACC do-AND Tom-NOM 1SG-DAT anger-ACC give-PST-DECL
 510 ‘Tom got mad at me after he made an error.’ (‘He_i made a mistake and Tom_i got mad at me.)
 511 d. Topicalisation in one clause possible
 512 *Taycen_i-ulo-nun, John-i hankwuk-ey ipkwukha-ko(se)*
 513 Daejeon-to-TOP John-NOM Korea-LOC enter-AND
 514 *Tom-i _____i isaha-ess-ta*
 515 Tom-NOM _____ move-PST-DECL
 516 ‘As for Daejeon, after John entered Korea, Tom moved (to it).’
 517 e. Relativisation possible
 518 *[Mina-ka phyenci-lul ssu-ko(se) _____i ka-n] hakkyo_i*
 519 Mina-NOM letter-ACC write-AND _____ go-ADN school
 520 ‘The school that Mina went to after she wrote a letter.’
 521

522 Several authors have remarked that in successive contexts, *-ko* converbs can be replaced with *-kose*
 523 forms, as shown above. Furthermore, centre embedding is possible in successive interpretations:
 524

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

- 526 a. *John-i hakkyo-ey ka-ko Mary-ka John-uy pang-ey*
 527 John-NOM school-to go-AND Mary-NOM John-GEN room-to
 528 *mollay tule ka-ess-ta*
 529 sneak enter go-PST-DECL
 530 ‘John went to school and Mary sneaked into John’s house.’
 531 b. *Mary-ka [John-i hakkyo-ey ka-ko] John-uy pang-ey*
 532 Mary-NOM John-NOM school-to go-AND John-GEN room-to
 533 *mollay tule ka-ess-ta*
 534 sneak enter go-PST-DECL
 535 ‘Mary, after John went to school, sneaked into John’s house.’
 536 c. *Inho-nun olaystongan TV-lul po-ko Mina-eykey malha-ess-ta*
 537 Inho-TOP long TV-ACC watch-AND Mina-DAT talk-PST-DECL
 538 ‘Inho watched TV and talked to Mina for a while.’
 539 d. *Inho-nun Mina-eykey_i [olaystongan TV-lul po-ko] _____i malhay-ss-ta*
 540 Inho-TOP Mina-DAT long TV-ACC watch-AND _____ talk-PST-DECL
 541 ‘Inho watched TV for a while and then talked to Mina.’
 542

543 While Kwon and Polinsky (2008) largely focus on different-subject contexts, their data suggests that
 544 cross-clausal subject reference could be an additionally relevant factor. See the opposition between
 545 different- and same-subject reference contexts in successive interpretations below:
 546

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

- 548 a. **[Mina-ka _____i hapkyekha-ess-ko emeni-ka kippum-uy*
 549 Mina-NOM _____ pass-PST-AND mother-NOM joy-GEN
 550 *nwunmwul-ul hulli-n] tayhak*
 551 tear-ACC shed-ADN college
 552 (‘The college that Mina got into and her mother shed tears of joy.’)
 553 b. *[sonyen-i _____i namki-ko hakkyo-lo ttena-n] phyenci_i*
 554 boy-NOM _____ leave-AND school-to leave-ADN letter
 555 ‘A letter that the boy left and went to school.’
 556

557 In sum, these are the most central findings that research on Korean *-ko* clauses has reported on:

558

559 (23) Main findings on Korean *-ko* linkages

- 560 a. A non-successively interpreted event relationship in a *-ko* linkage correlates with
561 ‘coordinate’ properties.
562 b. A successively interpreted relationship correlates with ‘subordinate’ properties.
563 c. ‘Coordinate’ *-ko* clauses allow for tense inflection, while ‘subordinate’ *-ko* clauses do
564 not.
565 d. Properties only cluster into these two extremes.

566

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

569

570

571 3. Characteristics of Jejuan *-ko* clause linkages

572

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

578

579 3.1. Tests and criteria applied

580

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

583

584 (24) Tests applied in this section:

- 585 a. Centre embedding of a *-ko* clause in the final clause (henceforth ‘nesting’)
586 b. Topicalisation within a *-ko* clause
587 c. Relativisation of converb clause, or final-clause constituents
588 d. Cataphoric reference establishment from final clause into the *-ko* clause
589 e. Change of syntactic order of clausal events

590

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

599

600

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

605

606

607

608 **3.2. Syntactic characteristics of Jejuan –ko linkages**

609 As mentioned, –ko linkages exhibit flexible subject reference. Nesting of –ko clauses leads to
 610 ungrammaticality, regardless of subject reference or successive/non-successive event interpretation.
 611 Below I link to non-nested counterparts shown earlier (note that final-clause verb morphology may
 612 differ; proper names have sometimes been amended from recordings to avoid confusion).¹⁰

613
 614 (25) Different-subject –ko clauses

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

616 *s^humi=ka [jəŋhii=ka t̃e^həp̃s̃ɔlkɔlul=il kɔla o-ko]
 617 Sumi=NOM Yeongheui=NOM rice:flour=ACC grind come-AND
 618 t̃ək=il t̃eit̃eə-n
 619 rice_cake=ACC fry-PST

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

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

622 *s^humi=ka [jəŋhii=ka palis^hk^weki=lil t̃eəŋman hə-ko]
 623 Sumi=NOM Yeongheui=NOM fish=ACC prepare do-AND
 624 t̃elim̃t̃ək=il t̃eit̃eə-ms^h-ə-la
 625 rice_cake=ACC fry-PROG-EV.IPF-DECL

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

627 (26) Same-subject –ko clauses

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

629 tɔŋs^hu=ka naŋ=il at̃eə-ŋ o(a-s^h)-ko t̃e^həls^hu=jəŋ hɔnti
 630 Dongsu=NOM tree=ACC pick_up-AND come(-PST)-AND Cheolsu=COM together
 631 k̃et̃eip=il t̃eis^hə-n
 632 dog.house=ACC build-PST

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

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

635 *tɔŋs^hu=ka k̃et̃eip=il [naŋ=il at̃eə-ŋ o-ko]
 636 Dongsu=NOM dog:house=ACC wood=ACC pick_up-AND come-AND
 637 t̃e^həls^hu=jəŋ k̃ət̃ei t̃eis^hə-n
 638 Cheolsu=COM together build-PST

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

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

641 t̃e^həls^hu=nin at̃əl=il wəns^həŋ hə(jə-s^h)-ko t̃ɔl=il aḳawa hə-n-ta
 642 Cheolsu=TOP son=ACC blame do(-PST)-AND daughter=ACC cherish do-PRS-DECL
 643 (‘Yeongsu blames his son and cherished his daughter.’)

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

645 *t̃e^həls^hu=nin t̃ɔl=il [at̃əl=il wəns^həŋ hə-ko] aḳawa hə-n-ta
 646 Cheolsu=TOP daughter=ACC son=ACC blame do-AND cherish do-PRS-DECL
 647 (‘Yeongsu, blaming his son, cherished his daughter.’)

648

¹⁰ Reviewer 3 reports different grammaticality judgments for examples presented in this paper, judging ungrammatical

According to Reviewer 1’s intuition, examples (25a), (25b), (26b) and (26d) would be uniformly ungrammatical in Korean as well, contrary to what Kwon and Polinsky (2008) and Rudnitskaya (1998) have found. Reviewer 3 judges ex. (26b) and (26d) as ‘perfectly grammatical’ (pace Reviewer 1), the same for (29b) and (30b). I thank Reviewers for their grammaticality judgments, yet would like to focus on the above literature on Korean –ko linkages, as well as judgments given by elderly native speakers of Jejuan.

649 The above examples contrast with Korean as discussed by Rudnitskaya (1998) and Kwon and
 650 Polinsky (2008: 92, 93, 98), where nesting a *-ko* clause is said to be grammatical in successive
 651 interpretation contexts (see ex. (21)), and where tense marking was deemed impossible.

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

655 (27) Different-subject

- 657 a. Successive, topicalisation of (7) [jeju0147, 00:27:46]
 658 $\widehat{t\acute{e}h\text{ɔ}p\text{s}\text{ɔ}l\text{k}\text{ɔ}l\text{u}l}=\text{in}$ $j\text{ə}ŋ\text{hii}=\text{ka}$ $k\text{ɔ}la$ $oa(-s^h)\text{-ko}$ $s^h\text{umi}=\text{ka}$
 659 rice:flour=TOP Yeongheui=NOM grind come(-PST)-AND Sumi=NOM
 660 $t\text{ək}=\text{il}$ $\widehat{t\acute{e}i\text{t}\text{e}\text{ə}-s^h\text{-t}\text{e}\text{ə}}$
 661 rice_cake=ACC fry-PST-DECL
 662 ‘As for the rice flour, Yeongheui bought it and Sumi fried the rice cake (made out of it).’
 663 b. Non-successive, topicalisation of (6) [jeju0138, 00:24:27]
 664 $p\text{al}i\text{s}^h\text{k}^h\text{w}\text{e}k\text{i}=\text{nin}$ $j\text{ə}ŋ\text{hii}=\text{ka}$ $\widehat{t\acute{e}aŋ\text{man} h\text{ə}(j\text{ə}-s^h)\text{-ko}}$ $s^h\text{umi}=\text{ka}$ $\widehat{t\acute{e}i\text{li}m\text{t}\text{ək}=\text{il}}$
 665 fish=TOP Yeongheui=NOM prepare do(-PST)-AND Sumi=NOM rice_cake=ACC
 666 $\widehat{t\acute{e}i\text{t}\text{e}\text{ə}-s^h\text{-u}\text{-ta}}^{11}$
 667 fry-PST-POL-DECL
 668 ‘As for the fish, Cheolsu cleaned it and Yeongheui had fried the rice cake.’

669 (28) Same-subject

- 670 a. $\widehat{t\acute{e}^h\text{ə}l\text{s}^h\text{u}}=\text{ka}$ $m\text{ɔ}ŋ\text{ə}$ $s^h\text{ɔ}s^h\text{n}\text{e}k\text{i}=\text{lil}$ $k\text{ɔ}(a-s^h)\text{-ko}$ $s\text{i}s^h\text{m}\text{a}ŋ\text{t}^h\text{e}ŋ\text{i}=\text{lil}$ $\widehat{t\acute{e}o\text{la}-n}$ [jeju0153, 00:50:39]
 671 Cheolsu=NOM first cord=ACC braid(-PST)-AND seed:basket=ACC weave-PST
 672 ‘Cheolsu first braided the strap cord, and then wove the seed basket part.’
 673 b. Successive, topicalisation of (28a)¹² [jeju0153, 00:51:05]
 674 $*s^h\text{ɔ}s^h\text{n}\text{e}k\text{i}=\text{nin}$ $\widehat{t\acute{e}^h\text{ə}l\text{s}^h\text{u}}=\text{ka}$ $m\text{ɔ}ŋ\text{ə}$ $k\text{ɔ}\text{-ko}$ $s\text{i}s^h\text{m}\text{a}ŋ\text{t}^h\text{e}ŋ\text{i}=\text{lil}$ $\widehat{t\acute{e}o\text{la}-n}$
 675 cord=TOP Cheolsu=NOM first braid-AND seed:basket=ACC weave-PST
 676 (‘As for the strap, Cheolsu braided it first and then he wove the seed basket.’)
 677 c. Non-successive, topicalisation of (26c) [jeju0153, 01:22:19]
 678 $*a\text{t}\text{əl}=\text{in}$ $\widehat{t\acute{e}^h\text{ə}l\text{s}^h\text{u}}=\text{ka}$ $w\text{ə}n\text{m}\text{a}ŋ h\text{ə}\text{-ko}$ $t\text{ɔ}l=\text{il}$ $a\text{k}\text{awa}$ $h\text{ə}\text{-n}\text{-ta}$
 679 son=TOP Cheolsu=NOM blame do-AND daughter=ACC cherish do-PRS-DECL
 680 (‘Cheolsu blamed his son and cherished his daughter.’)

681
 682 The above examples show how the topicalisation behaviour of Jejuan *-ko* clauses differs
 683 according to subject reference, yet not according to the semantic interpretation of a *-ko* linkage.
 684 This contrasts with the Korean findings from Kwon and Polinsky (2008, see ex. (19d) and (20d)),
 685 where topicalisation is said to be impossible in non-successive contexts, yet possible in successive
 686 ones.¹³

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

¹¹ Reviewer 3 claims that ‘the correct orthography would be to write *-s^hu-* 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.

- 690
691 (29) Different-subject, successive
692 a. Relativisation of final-clause object in (7) [jeju0147, 00:23:05]
693 [jəŋhii=ka ʃɔlkɔlul=il kɔla oa(-sʰ)-ko sʰumi=ka _____ tɛitɛ-in]
694 Yeongheui=NOM rice:flour=ACC grind come(-PST)-AND Sumi-NOM fry-ADN
695 ʔək
696 rice_cake
697 ‘The rice cake that Sumi fried after Yeongheui bought the rice flour’
698 b. Relativisation of converb clause object [jeju0140, 00:25:39]
699 *ki [jəŋhii=ka _____ kɔla o-ko sʰumi=ka ʔək=il tɛitɛ-in]
700 that Yeongheui=NOM grind come-AND Sumi=NOM rice_cake=ACC fry-ADN
701 tɛʰɔpʃɔlkɔlul
702 rice:flour
703 (‘That rice flour that Sumi fried rice cake with after Yeongheui bought it’)
704 (30) Same-subject, successive
705 a. Relativisation of final-clause object in (26a) [jeju0153, 00:19:29]
706 [toŋsʰu=ka naŋ=il atɛən o(a-sʰ)-ko tɛʰəlsʰu=jəŋ kɔtɕi
707 Dongsu=NOM tree=ACC pick_up:AND come(-PST)-AND Cheolsu=COM together
708 _____ tɛisʰ-in] kɛtɕip=i mak kʰəla
709 build-ADN dog:house=NOM very be_big:EV.IPF:DECL
710 ‘The dog house, that Dongsu brought wood for and built together with Cheolsu, was
711 very big.’
712 b. Relativisation of converb clause object [jeju0153, 00:22:34]
713 *[toŋsʰu=ka _____ atɛən o-ko tɛʰəlsʰu=jəŋ kɔtɕi
714 Dongsu=NOM pick_up:AND come(-PST)-AND Cheolsu=COM together
715 kɛtɕip tɛisʰ-in] naŋ=i mak hulk-ə-la
716 dog:house build-ADN tree=NOM very thick-EV.IPF:DECL
717 (‘The wood that Dongsu brought and built a dog house with, was very thick.’)¹⁴
718
719 In non-successive contexts, extraction is blocked out of both the converb clause and final clause.
720
721 (31) Different-subject, non-successive [field notes, EQ2015-12-03, (5)]
722 a. sʰumi=nin tɛʰəlsʰu=lil sʰɔlaŋ hə-ko toŋsʰu=nin jəŋhii=lil sʰɔlaŋ
723 Sumi=TOP Cheolsu=ACC love do-AND Dongsu=TOP Yeongheui=ACC love
724 hə-n-ta
725 do-PRS-DECL
726 ‘Sumi loves Cheolsu and Dongsu loves Yeongheui.’
727 b. Relativisation of converb clause object
728 *[sʰumi=ka _____ sʰɔlaŋ hə-ko toŋsʰu=ka jəŋhii=lil
729 Sumi=NOM love do-AND Dongsu=NOM Yeongheui=ACC
730 sʰɔlaŋ hə-nin] tɛʰəlsʰu
731 love do-ADN Cheolsu
732 (‘Cheolsu who Sumi loves and Dongsu loves Yeongheui’)

¹⁴ Reviewer 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.

- 733 c. Relativisation of final clause object
 734 **[sʰumi=ka t̃ɛʰəlsʰu=lil sʰɔlan hə-ko toŋsʰu=ka _____*
 735 Sumi=NOM Cheolsu=ACC love do-AND Dongsu=NOM
 736 *sʰɔlan hə-nin] jəŋhii*
 737 love do-ADN Yeongheui
 738 ('Yeongheui who Sumi loves Cheolsu and Dongsu loves')
 739 (32) Same-subject, non-successive
 740 a. Relativisation of converb clause object [jeju0153, 01:19:00]
 741 **[jəŋsʰu=ka _____ wənsʰəŋ hə-ko tɔl=il¹⁵ aɸawa hə-nin] atəl*
 742 Yeongsu=NOM blme do-AND daughter=ACC cherish do-ADN son
 743 ('The son who Yeongsu blames and cherishes his daughter')
 744 b. Relativisation of final clause object [jeju0153, 01:19:00]
 745 **[jəŋsʰu=ka atəl=il wənsʰəŋ hə-ko _____ aɸawa hə-nin] tɔl*
 746 Yeongsu=NOM son=ACC blame do-AND cherish do-ADN daughter
 747 ('The daughter who Yeongsu blames his son and cherishes')
 748

749 In essence, Jejuan -ko linkages behave similar to Korean when it comes to relativisation, since
 750 in both languages, extraction is impossible in non-successive interpretations, whereas it is
 751 possible in successive interpretations.

752 Authors report that in Korean, extraction from a -ko clause is possible in successive
 753 interpretations (see (22b)). In Jejuan, extraction out of a converb clause is always blocked,
 754 regardless of semantic interpretation, as shown above. The difference between successive and
 755 non-successive linkages, then, lies in whether one can extract from a final clause (ex. (29a) and
 756 (30a)) or not (ex. (31c) and (32b)). This phenomenon has been observed for other Jejuan clause
 757 linkage types (cf. Kim S-U 2018b), as well as in other languages (Kazenin and Testelets 2004).

758 Cataphoric reference tests mostly lead to ungrammaticality, with some caveats to be discussed
 759 below. In the following I show examples employing the deictic phrase (*ki*)*kə* (a simplified
 760 representation of *ki=kə*, THAT=THING), as well as the pronominal *ijək*, 'oneself'.
 761

762 (33) Cataphoric reference

- 763 a. Successive [jeju0147, 00:32:07]
 764 *jəŋhii=ka kikə=l_{*i/√j} t̃ɛit̃ɛ-i-ko sʰumi=ka t̃ɛilimɸək=il_i*
 765 Yeongheui=NOM THAT=ACC fry-EP-AND Sumi=NOM rice_cake=ACC
 766 *məkə-sʰ-t̃ɛə*
 767 eat-PST-DECL
 768 ('Yeongheui fried that_{*i/√j} and Sumi ate the rice cake_i.')
 769 b. Successive [jeju0153, 00:33:32]
 770 *ijək=i_{*i/√j} kɔsʰ=il sʰa-ko kə=l sʰumi_i t̃ɛip apʰ-ita noa-n*
 771 self=NOM flower=ACC buy-AND THAT=ACC Sumi house front-LOC put-PST
 772 ('She herself_i bought a plant and put it in front of Sumi's_i house.')¹⁶

¹⁵ Reviewer 3 suggests that this example may be grammatical if one changed the ACC particle =*il* on *tɔl*, 'daughter' to a DELIMITER, =*man*, 'only'. I thank the reviewer for this suggestion, yet I do not have more data at present to confirm this claim. The intersection with the morphosyntax and information-structural semantics of focus that =*man* operates at, currently lies outside the scope of this paper.

¹⁶ Reviewer 3 is sceptical of glossing -*n* as a -PST marker, as they point out it is formally identical with a -*n* converb form, a 'realis mood variant' of a -*ŋ* converb (Hong J-R 2001), cf. (1). They claim that when used sentence-finally, the utterance is a result of 'truncation', with a subsequent final clause being omitted, adding that in these contexts, the -*n* would be 'freely interchangeable' with the past tense form -*asʰ-ə*, -PST-ILLOC. This is precisely the point: the clause with a -*n* PST form can carry illocutionary force just like one with a -*asʰ-ə*, -PST-ILLOC form. The tense reference of the -*n* converb is relative, but the tense reference of an independent utterance with a -*n* PST suffix is absolute. Also, the converb form varies with a -*ne* form, while the past tense marker does not. The intonation takes on a typical sentence-

773 c. Non-successive [jeju0138, 01:52:18]
 774 ?*ɨnək*=*in_i* *teiptɕujən*=*il wəns^həŋ hə(jə-ms^h)-ko* *teiptɕujən*=*in toŋs^hu=lil_i*
 775 self=ACC landlord=ACC blame do(-PROG)-AND landlord=TOP Dongsu=ACC
 776 *aɕawa hems^htɕə*
 777 cherish do:PROG:DECL
 778 ('Himself_i blames the landlord, and the landlord appreciates Dongsu_i.')

780 Somewhat surprisingly, in (33c), consultants were able to construe *toŋs^hu=lil* to be co-referential
 781 with *ɨnək*. Given that most cataphoric reference tests seem to prohibit reference establishment from the
 782 final clause into the *-ko* clause, this is slightly puzzling. Seen from the perspective of nesting tests, it
 783 would not be surprising to see that *-ko* linkages do not allow for cataphoric reference since *-ko* clauses
 784 are not embedded, parallel to the understanding of traditional coordination explained in section 2.1.
 785 However, as soon as a reference context was established in the wider discourse through the author's
 786 explanations and repetitions of similar examples, consultants sometimes identified co-reference easily.

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

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

800
 801 (34) Same-subject, successive
 802 a. *s^humi=ka* *ɕɔlkɔlul=il* *kɔla o(a-s^h)-ko* *teilimɕək* *teitɕə-s^h-u-ta*
 803 Sumi=NOM rice:flour=ACC grind come(-PST)-AND rice_cake fry-PST-POL-DECL
 804 'Sumi brought the rice flour and fried the rice cake.'
 805 b. #*s^humi=ka* *teilimɕək* *teitɕə(a-s^h)-ko* *ɕɔlkɔlul=il* *kɔla oa-s^h-u-ta*
 806 Sumi=NOM rice_cake fry-PST-AND rice:flour=ACC grind come-PST-POL-DECL
 807 #'Sumi fried rice cake and brought the flour for it.'/✓'Sumi fried rice cake and brought
 808 rice flour for something else.'

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

816 4. Discussion of findings

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

820

final intonation (see Ko Y.-L 2009), whereas for the converb one will have one typical for linked clauses.

Table 4: Morphosyntactic properties of Jejuan *-ko* linkages

Variety	JEJUAN				KOREAN	
	NON-SUCCESSIVE	SUCCESSIVE	NON-SUCC	SUCC	NON-SUCC	SUCC
Semantic interpretation	DS	SS	DS	SS	DS/SS	DS/SS
Subject reference	DS	SS	DS	SS	DS/SS	DS/SS
Centre embedding	no	no	no	no	no	yes
Topicalisation	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes
Relativisation	no	no	FIN	FIN	no	yes
Cataphora	no	no	no	no	no	yes
Tense marking	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
Order change	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no

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.
2. Cataphoric reference is generally disallowed in a Jejuan *-ko* linkage, albeit subject to discourse-pragmatic ‘porousness’. Korean *-ko* clauses allow such reference 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.

Although consultants did utter a preference for untensed converbs in general, the lack of consistent correlation with tense marking suggests that it should be possible to conceive of this property as theoretically independent of others. Judging solely from centre embedding and cataphoric reference behaviour, one may suggest that Jejuan *-ko* clauses are to be regarded ‘coordinate’, as it is expected for the two properties to pattern jointly (cf. section 2.1). Yet again, neither is cataphoric reference establishment entirely impossible as necessary for stipulating coherent categorial bundling, nor do these properties line up with topicalisation, relativisation and order change properties as described for Korean *-ko* linkages:

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.

866 Now, points (4) and (5) above suggest that Jejuan *-ko* linkages do show some ‘subordinate’ properties,
867 yet the two dimensions are issues independent of each other.

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

872 Restrictions on extraction, on the other hand, have to do with syntactic island effects now widely known
873 through Ross’s (1967) seminal work on the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC). The Jejuan data
874 suggests that quite similar to other languages such as Tsakhur (Kazenin and Testelefs 2004; cf. Haspelmath
875 2004), *-ko* clauses in successive *-ko* linkages are syntactic islands, where in non-successive contexts, the
876 entire linkage constitutes a syntactic island similar to what we traditionally know under coordination.

877
878 (35) after Jendraschek and Shin (2018: 1119)

879 a. ‘coordinate’ construal

880 **minswu-ka wuyu-lul kacye o-ko nay-ka sa-ss-te-n*
881 Minsu-NOM milk-ACC have:INF come-AND 1SG-NOM buy-PST-RETR-AT
882 *ppang-i masiss-e-yo*
883 bread-NOM taste-ILLOC-POL
884 (‘The bread I bought and Minsu brought milk is tasty.’)

885 b. ‘adverbial’ construal

886 ✓*minswu-ka wuyu-lul kacye o-ko (na-n twi-ey)*
887 Minsu-NOM milk-ACC have:INF come-AND exit-AT behind-LOC
888 *nay-ka sa-ss-te-n ppang-i masiss-e-yo*
889 1SG-NOM buy-PST-RETR-AT bread-NOM taste-ILLOC-POL
890 ‘The bread I bought after Minsu brought milk is tasty.’

891
892 In Jendraschek and Shin’s (2018: 1119) functional take, the divergent relativisation behaviour of
893 Korean *-ko* linkages is traced back to the ‘coordinate’ or ‘adverbial construal’ of event relationships.
894 Similar to what other authors have observed, successive contexts allow for an addition of *na-n twi-ey*,
895 exit-AT behind-LOC above. The evidence above is similar to various discussions found in Rudnitskaya
896 (1998), Kwon and Polinsky (2008: 96ff.) or Cho SY (2004), although Jendraschek and Shin’s (2018)
897 point out that if in a potentially ambiguous case such as above, a *-ko* linkage was construed as
898 describing a situation with two semantically unrelated events, they state that such a clause linkage “is
899 construed as coordinate rather than adverbial” (Jendraschek and Shin 2018: 1119), which then
900 prohibits the relativisation out of the *-ko* clause. An adverbial construal of events linked in a *-ko*
901 linkage enables relativisation, as shown in (35b).

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

911 The topicalisation behaviour of Jejuan *-ko* clauses is the only one which is influenced by the subject
912 reference of a *-ko* linkage. The data suggests that in Jejuan *-ko* clauses, the presence or absence of a
913 subject argument also has consequences for the internal structure of a *-ko* clause: in those syntactic
914 frameworks assuming dedicated positions for topicalised constituents, different-subject *-ko* clauses
915 could be regarded as licensing a clause-internal topic position (example (27)), whereas same-subject
916 *-ko* clauses do not (ex. (28)). In principle, the possibility or impossibility of topicalisation in adverbial
917 clauses has been attested in the literature:

- 918 (36) English
919 a. ‘Central’ adverbial clause (Hageman 2010: 629)
920 *While this paper I was revising last week, I thought of another analysis.
921 b. ‘Peripheral’ adverbial clause (Haegeman 2003: 332), [formatting theirs]
922 If *his* SYNTACTIC *analysis we can’t criticise*, there is a lot to be said against the
923 SEMANTICS of the paper.
924

925 According to Haegeman (2003, 2010), English ‘Central adverbial clauses’ do not permit
926 topicalisation while ‘peripheral adverbial clauses’ do, which within a cartographic framework is
927 assumed to imply the presence or absence of a TopP position within the internal structure of an
928 adverbial clause. On a typological level, authors such as Nikolaeva (2013:109) have mentioned that in
929 clause linkage, non-final clauses may frequently show restrictions in the expressibility of information-
930 structural processes (such as topicalisation) normally available to canonically finite clauses, yet this
931 may vary. Back to our Jejuan analysis, what is interesting is that this sensitivity of topicalisation to
932 cross-clausal subject reference seems to be largely independent of other properties.

933 In sum, I have shown how on the level of individual properties, Jejuan *-ko* linkages may behave the
934 same way or not as their Korean counterparts. However, the overall, rigid distinction between
935 coordination and subordination suggested for the understanding of Korean *-ko* linkages is not helpful
936 for analysing the grammar of Jejuan *-ko* clause linkages, as the properties do not consistently align
937 with each other.
938

939 5. Conclusion

940
941 In this paper, I have argued that one cannot apply a consistent coordination-subordination distinction to
942 Jejuan *-ko* clauses in the same way as done for Korean in approaches à la Kwon and Polinsky (2008) or
943 Rudnitskaya (1998), as several properties (centre embedding, cataphoric reference, tense marking) do not
944 show a dichotomous diversification pattern, subject to either semantic interpretation or subject reference.
945 Those properties that in fact do diverge, do so independently of others: relativisation and order change
946 behaviours both diverge along the lines of successive or non-successive semantic interpretation yet are
947 motivated separately, and the possibility of topicalisation relates to possible structural consequences arising
948 from different- or same-subject reference.

949 Clearly, one needs to find a way to accommodate the fact that Jejuan *-ko* clauses do not show all
950 properties of either traditional coordination or subordination. Moreover, if Jejuan behaves differently
951 from Korean, it may be that other Koreanic varieties may show some variation in this respect as well.
952 Thus a less conflicting model of clause linkage should ensure for variety-specific peculiarities to be
953 captured, without having to call into question major categorial distinctions that turn out to have been
954 ill-conceived in the first place. Inspired by the typological literature that debates issues of cross-
955 linguistic comparability (see section 2.1 cf. Plank 2016, Brown et al. 2013, Bickel 2010, Lehmann
956 1988), I would either suggest a more open approach such as Jendraschek and Shin’s (2018) that allows
957 us to place individual linguistic phenomena on a continuum between subordination and coordination,
958 or recommend decomposing the categories of ‘coordination’ and ‘subordination’ into a
959 multidimensional array of defining properties (cf. Bickel 2010 or Haiman and Thompson 1984), each
960 of which can operate theoretically independently.
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970

971 **Acknowledgments**

972 This work was supported by the Laboratory Programme for Korean Studies through the Ministry of
973 Education of the Republic of Korea and Korean Studies Promotion Service of the Academy of Korean
974 Studies (AKS-2016-LAB-2250003), the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme of the
975 Arcadia Fund (IGS0208), as well as the British Arts and Humanities Research Council. Thanks to Irina
976 Nikolaeva, Peter Austin, Jaehoon Yeon, Youkyung Ju and Jaewoon Ko for guidance and commentary
977 at various stages of this work. I am deeply indebted to Jeon-Seung Choi, Young-Bong Kang, Sun-Ja
978 Kim, Chang-Yong Yang, and of course, the Jimnyeong and Sukkun communities. I dedicate this work
979 to their wisdom. All remaining errors are mine.

980
981

982 **References**

983

984 Barnes-Sadler, Simon (2017). *Central Asian and Yanbian Korean in Comparative Perspective*. PhD
985 Thesis (4458), SOAS University of London.

986

987 Bickel, Balthasar (2010). Capturing particulars and universals in clause linkage: A multivariate
988 analysis. In Isabelle Bril, ed., *Clause-Hierarchy and Clause-Linking: The Syntax and*
989 *Pragmatics Interface*, 51–101. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

990

991 Brown, Lucien and Jaehoon Yeon (2015). Varieties of Contemporary Korean. In Lucien Brown and
992 Jaehoon Yeon, eds., *The Handbook of Korean Linguistics*, 439–458. Hoboken: John Wiley &
993 Sons.

994

995 Cho, Sae-Youn (2004). *Sequentiality and non-tensed verbal coordination in Korean*. Paper
996 presented at the 30th Berkeley Linguistics Society Conference, February 13-16, 2004.
997 Berkeley, CA.

998

999 Cristofaro, Sonia (2003). *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1000

1001 Croft, William (2001). *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological*
1002 *Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1003

1004 Crowley, Terry (2007). *Field Linguistics: A Beginner's Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1005

1006 Culicover, Peter W. and Ray S. Jackendoff (1997). Semantic subordination despite syntactic
1007 coordination. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28.2, 195-218.

1008

1009 Diessel, Holger (2013). Adverbial Subordination. In Silvia Luraghi and Claudia Parodi, eds., *The*
1010 *Bloomsbury Companion to Syntax*, 341-353. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

1011

1012 Everett, Daniel L. (2001). Monolingual field research. In Paul Newman and Martha Ratcliff, eds.,
1013 *Linguistic Fieldwork*, 166-188. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1014

1015 Foley, William A. and Robert D. Van Valin (1984). *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*.
1016 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1017

1018 Gast, Volker and Holger Diessel (2012). The typology of clause linkage: status quo, challenges,
1019 prospects. In Volker Gast and Holger Diessel, eds., *Clause Linkage in Cross-Linguistic*
1020 *Perspective: Data-Driven Approaches to Cross-Clausal Syntax*, 1-34. Berlin: De Gruyter
1021 Mouton.

1022

- 1023 Gippert, Jost, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann and Ulrike Mosel, eds., (2006). *Essentials of Language*
1024 *Documentation*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
1025
- 1026 Givón Talmy (1985). Iconicity, isomorphism, and non-arbitrary coding in syntax. In John Haiman,
1027 ed., *Iconicity in Syntax*, 187–220. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
1028
- 1029 Haegeman, Liliane (2010). The internal syntax of adverbial clauses. *Lingua* 120.3, 628-648.
1030
- 1031 Haegeman, Liliane (2003). Conditional clauses: external and internal syntax. *Mind and Language*
1032 18.4, 317-339.
1033
- 1034 Haiman, John (1980). The iconicity of grammar: isomorphism and motivation. *Language* 56,
1035 515–540.
1036
- 1037 Haiman, John and Sandra A. Thompson (1984). Subordination in Universal Grammar. In Brugman,
1038 Claudia and Monica Macauley, eds., *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the*
1039 *Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 510-523. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1040
- 1041 Haspelmath, Martin (2007a). Coordination. In Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and*
1042 *Syntactic Description II: Complex Constructions*, 1-51. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge
1043 University Press.
1044
- 1045 Haspelmath Martin (2007b). Pre-established categories don't exist: Consequences for language
1046 description and typology. *Linguistic Typology* 11.1, 119-132.
1047
- 1048 Haspelmath, Martin (2004). Coordinating constructions: an overview. In Haspelmath, Martin, ed.,
1049 *Coordinating Constructions*. 3-40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
1050
- 1051 Haspelmath, Martin (1995). The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. In Haspelmath,
1052 Martin and Ekkehard König, eds., *Converbs in Cross-linguistic Perspective: Structure and*
1053 *Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms—Adverbial Participles, Gerunds*, 1-55. Berlin: De
1054 Gruyter Mouton.
1055
- 1056 Haspelmath, Martin and Ekkehard König, eds. (1995). *Converbs in Cross-linguistic Perspective:*
1057 *Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms—Adverbial Participles, Gerunds*, 1-55.
1058 Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
1059
- 1060 Hong, Jisup (2012). *Connective Polysemy and Clause Linkage Typology in Korean*. UC Berkeley
1061 Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Available under: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/58z7r4dg>
1062 [retrieved 2019-02-15]
1063
- 1064 Hong, Jong-Rim (2001). *Ceycwupangen Yenkyelemi '-n, -ŋ'ey tayhaye* [About the Connective
1065 Suffixes '-n', '-ŋ' in Ceycwu Dialect]. *Enehak [Linguistics]* 38, 271-304.
1066
- 1067 Hyun, Pyeong-Hyo and Young-Bong Kang (2011). *Ceycwue Cwosa Emi Sacen* [A Dictionary of
1068 Jejuan Suffixes and Particles]. Gak/National Institute of Korean Language, Jeju National
1069 University.
1070
- 1071 Jendraschek, Gerd and Yong-Min Shin (2018). Korean converbs between coordination and
1072 subordination. *Linguistics* 56.5, 1099-1139.
1073
- 1074 Jendraschek, Gerd and Yong-Min Shin (2011). Suffixal clause-linking in Korean on the
1075 Subordination-Coordination Continuum. Presentation held at the 44th Annual Meeting of the
1076 Societas Linguistica Europaea in Logroño, Spain, 2011-09-11.

- 1077 Jones, Mari C. and Sarah Ogilvie, eds. (2013). *Keeping Languages Alive: documentation,*
1078 *pedagogy and revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1079
- 1080 Kang, Young-Bong (2007). *Ceycwue* [Jeju language]. National Folk Museum, Jeju Special Self-
1081 Governing Province.
1082
- 1083 Kazenin, Konstantin I. and Yakov G. Testelet. 2004. Where coordination meets subordination:
1084 Converb constructions in Tsakhur (Daghestanian). In Haspelmath, Martin, ed., *Coordinating*
1085 *Constructions*, 227-240. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
1086
- 1087 Kim, Jee-Hong (2017). Non-canonical Ending Systems in Jeju Korean. *Pangenhak* 26, 229–260.
1088
- 1089 Kim, Jee-Hong (2016.) Ceycwu pangenuy senemalemiwa cwongkyele mi cheykyey [The pre-final suffixes
1090 and final suffixing system of the Ceycwu dialect]. *Hankul* 313, 109-171.
1091
- 1092 Kim, Jee-Hong (2014). *Ceycwu pangenuy thwongsa kiswulkwa selmyeng: kipwonkwumunuy*
1093 *kineungpemcwu pwunsek* [The Description and Explication of Ceycwu Dialect Syntax: the
1094 analysis of functional categories within a basic clause]. Seoul: Kyungjin.
1095
- 1096 Kim, Soon-Ja (2010). *Tolkak tolkak minyeng ssameng ulin nulkescwu – aywelup pwongsengli*
1097 *kangcisuk halmeni sayngay kwusul* [“Well, we would work the cotton again and again, that’s
1098 how we got older” – a life history of Ms Kang Cisuk from Aewol-Eup Bongseong-Ri]. Jeju
1099 City: Jeju National University, National Language Institute.
1100
- 1101 Kim, Soung-U (2018a). *A multi-modal documentation of Jejuan conversations*. London: SOAS,
1102 Endangered Languages Archive. URL: <https://elar.soas.ac.uk/deposit/0351>. Accessed on
1103 [2019-08-10].
1104
- 1105 Kim, Soung-U (2018b). *Finiteness in Jejuan Adverbial Clauses: a Canonical Typology Approach*.
1106 PhD thesis, SOAS University of London (4617).
1107
- 1108 Ko, Dong-Ho, Sang-Jo Song, Chang-Myeong O, Sun-Deok Mun and Seung-Hun O (2016).
1109 *Ceycwusmaluy ihay* [On the Jeju lect]. Jeju City: Jeju Studies Research Centre at Jeju
1110 Development Research Institute.
1111
- 1112 Ko, Young-Lim (2009). Ceycwu pangenuy tayhwachey tamhwaey nathanan ekyang yenkwu – 70tay
1113 isang kwolyeng hwacalul chwungsimulwo [Intonation characteristics in conversational
1114 discourse of Cheju dialect - case study on speakers older than 70]. *Hankwukemunhwa* 40,
1115 5-28.
1116
- 1117 Kroeger, Paul (2004). *Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge
1118 University Press.
1119
- 1120 Kwon, Nayoung and Maria Polinsky (2008). What does coordination look like in a head final
1121 language? In Barbara Lewandowski, ed., *Asymmetric Events*, 87–102. Amsterdam: John
1122 Benjamins.
1123
- 1124 Kwon, Nayoung (2004). Syntactic and Semantic Mismatches in the Korean ko-Construction. In
1125 Benjamin Schmeiser, Vineeta Chand, Ann Kelleher and Angelo Rodriguez, eds.,
1126 *WCCFL 23 Proceedings*, 101-114. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
1127
- 1128 Lee, Ki-Mun and S. Robert Ramsey (2011). *A History of the Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge
1129 University Press.
1130

- 1131 Lee, Jenny S (2014). Adjoined koP in Korean clausal coordination: implications for the
1132 Across-the-Board analysis. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 20.1.
1133 Available under: <https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol20/iss1/21> [retrieved 2019-02-21].
1134
- 1135 Lee, Sean (2015). A Sketch of Language History in the Korean Peninsula. Igor Mokrousov, ed., *PLoS*
1136 *ONE* 10.5.
1137
- 1138 Lehmann, Christian (1988). Towards a typology of clause linkage. In Haiman, John and Sandra A.
1139 Thompson, eds., *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*, 181-226. John Benjamins.
1140
- 1141 Long, Daniel and Young-Cheol Yim (2002). Regional Differences in the Perception of Korean
1142 Dialects. In Daniel Long and Dennis R. Preston, eds., *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology*
1143 *II*, 249-275. John Benjamins.
1144
- 1145 Longacre, Robert E. (2007). Sentences as combinations of clauses. In Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language*
1146 *Typology and Syntactic Description II*, 372–420. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University
1147 Press.
1148
- 1149 Lyons, John (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
1150 Press.
1151
- 1152 Matthewson, Lisa. 2004. On the methodology of semantic fieldwork. *International Journal of*
1153 *American Linguistics*, 70.4, 369-415.
1154
- 1155 Moseley, Christopher, ed. (2010). *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, 3rd ed. UNESCO
1156 Publishing.
1157
- 1158 Mun, Sug-Yeong (2006). Ceycwupangenuy ‘-emsi-’uy pemcwuwa kwanlyentwoyn myech muncey [On issues
1159 regarding the categories related to ‘-emsi’ of the Ceycwu dialect]. *Hyengthayron* 8(2), 393-403.
1160
- 1161 Mun Sug-Yeong (2004). Ceycwu pangenuy hyeoncaysicey hyengthayswoey tayhaye [On the present tense
1162 morphology of the Ceycwu dialect]. *Hyengthayron* 6(2), 293-316.
1163
- 1164 Mun-Sug-Yeong (1998). *Ceycwutwo panenguy sisang hyengthayey tayhan yenkwu [On the tense-aspect*
1165 *morphology of the Ceycwu dialect]*. Masters dissertation, Seoul National University. Available under
1166 <http://s-space.snu.ac.kr/handle/10371/53637> [retrieved 2019-08-13]
1167
- 1168 Nikolaeva, Irina (2013). Unpacking finiteness. In Dunstan Brown, Marina Chumakina, and
1169 Greville G. Corbett, eds., *Canonical Morphology and Syntax*, 99-122. Oxford: Oxford
1170 University Press.
1171
- 1172 Nikolaeva, Irina (2010). Typology of finiteness. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4(12), 1176-
1173 1189.
1174
- 1175 Nikolaeva, Irina, ed. (2007). *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. Oxford: Oxford University
1176 Press.
1177
- 1178 O’Grady, William (2014). Jejueo: Korea’s Other Language. Paper presented at the 7th World
1179 Congress of Korean Studies, 5th—7th Nov 2014, at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.
1180 http://congress.aks.ac.kr/korean/files/2_1413765292.pdf [retrieved 2019-02-21]
1181
- 1182 Olson, Michael (1981). *Barai Clause Junctures: Toward a functional theory of interclausal*
1183 *relations*. Canberra: Australian National University dissertation.
1184

- 1185 Pak, Dong-Ho (2013). A study of the Korean clausal connectives ‘-ese’ and ‘-ko’ of temporal
1186 sequence. *Acta Koreana* 16.1, 5-21.
1187
1188 Pangenyenkwuhoy (2001). *Pangenhaksacen* [A Dictionary of Dialectology]. Seoul: Taehaksa.
1189
1190 Plank, Frans (ed.). 2016. *Linguistic Typology* 20(2).
1191
1192 Roberts, John R. (1988). Amele switch-reference and the theory of grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19.1,
1193 45-63.
1194
1195 Ross, John R. (1967). *Constraints on variables in syntax*. MIT at Harvard, Massachussets,
1196 Unpublished PhD dissertation.
1197
1198 Rudnitskaya, Elena (1998). Syntactic properties of the Altaic Coordination Construction in Korean.
1199 *Sprachtypologische Universalienforschung* 51.2, 179–198.
1200
1201 Silva, David. 2010. Death, Taxes, and Language Change: The Inevitable Divergence of Korean Varieties as
1202 Spoken Worldwide. In Robert J. Fouser, ed., *Contemporary Korean Linguistics: International*
1203 *Perspectives – In Honor of Professor Sang-Oak Lee*. Seoul: Taehaksa, 300–319.
1204
1205 Sohn, Ho-Min (2009). The semantics of clause linking in Korean. In Robert M. W. Dixon and
1206 Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, eds., *The Semantics of Clause Linking. A cross-linguistic typology*,
1207 285-317. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
1208
1209 Sohn, Ho-Min (1999). *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1210
1211 Song, Sang-Jo (2011). *Ceycwumaleyse Ttaykalimswō ‘-ng, -n’kwa Ssikkuthtuluy Hwoung* [The
1212 morphemes *-ŋ, -n* of temporal distinction and the interaction of suffixes].
1213 *Hankookmunhwasa*.
1214
1215 Williams, Edwin (1978). Across-the-board rule application. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 31-43.
1216
1217 Yang, Chang-Yong and Wonbo Kim. 2013. Ceycwue ‘key’uy tamhwacek kinungey tayhan kwochal [A
1218 study on the discourse functions of *-key* in the Jeju language]. *Language and Linguistics* 59. 143-
1219 164.
1220
1221 Yeon, Jaehoon (2012). Korean dialects: a general survey. In Nicholas, Tranter, ed., *The*
1222 *Languages of Japan and Korea*, 168-185. Abingdon: Routledge.
1223
1224 Yoon, James (1997). Coordination (A)Symmetry. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 7, 3-30.
1225
1226 Yoon, Jeong-Mee (1996). Verbal coordination in Korean and English and the checking approach to
1227 verbal morphology. *Ene* 21.4, 1105-1135.
1228
1229 Yuasa, Etsuyo and Jerry M. Sadock. (2002). Pseudo-subordination: a mismatch between syntax and semantics.
1230 *Journal of Linguistics* 38(1): 87– 111.
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238

1239 **Appendix: Transliteration conventions**

1240 ‘Han’=Hangeul, ‘JIPA’=‘Jejuan IPA transliteration’ devised by the author, ‘Y’=‘Yale
 1241 romanisation’, ‘RR’=‘Revised Romanisation’.

1242

	Han	JIPA	Y	RR	Han	JIPA	Y	RR
	ㄱ	k	k	g/k	ㅈ	o	(w)o	o
	ㄴ	n	n	n	ㅊ	ə	e	eo
	ㄷ	t	t	d/t	ㅊ	a	a	a
	ㄹ	l	l	r/l	ㅣ	i	i	i
	ㅁ	m	m	m	. (alay-a)	o	o	-
	ㅂ	p	p	b/p	ㅍ	u	wu	u
	ㅅ	s ^h	s	s	ㅡ	i	u	eu
○ (initial)	-	-	-	-	ㅍ	ε	ay	ae
○ (final)	ㅇ	ŋ	ng	ng	ㅑ	e	ey	e
ㅈ	t͡ɕ	c	j	j	ㅓ	jo	yo	yo
ㅊ	t͡ɕ ^h	ch	ch	ch	ㅕ	jə	ye	y eo
ㅋ	k ^h	kh	k	k	ㅗ	ja	ya	ya
ㅌ	t ^h	th	t	t	ㅠ	ju	yu	yu
ㅍ	p ^h	ph	p	p	ㅍ	jε	yay	yae
ㅎ	h	h	h	h	ㅑ	je	yey	ye
ㅃ	p͈	pp	pp	.. (double alay-a)	ㅓ	jo	-	-
ㅆ	t͡ɕ͈	cc	jj	j	ㅗ	wa	wa	wa
ㅉ	t͡ɕ͈	cc	jj	j	ㅜ	wi	wi	wi
ㅊ	k͈	kk	kk	k	ㅜ	we	woy	oe
ㅆ	s͈	ss	ss	s	ㅗ	wε	way	wae
ㄹㄹ	l:	-	-	-	ㅑ	we	wey	we
냐/녀	na/nə	-	-	-	ㅑ	wə	we	wo
					ㅣ	ii	uy	eui

1243