

But what is incoordination?!

Nádia Canceiro

nadia.canceiro@campus.ul.pt

School of Arts and Humanities, University of Lisbon

1. Background and Goals: In this paper we aim at exploring the syntactic status of sentences as (1) and (2), that have recently been designated as *incoordinate* by Kuteva (2017).

(1) [Context: Adam and Marie are talking and he says that he has been studying French for 8 months]

Marie: But you speak so well! (English, **Eng**)

Mas falas tão bem! (European Portuguese, **EP**)

¡Pero hablas muy bien! (Spanish, **Sp**)

(2) [John told Mary he would call her at 18h, but at 18h45 he still hasn't called...]

Mary: And John still hasn't called... (Eng)

E o John ainda não telefonou... (EP)

Y John aún no ha llamado... (Sp)

Kuteva takes the conjunct *incoordination* from Evans' (2007) work on insubordination. Kuteva elaborates on Evans and considers incoordination to be a mirror of insubordination, being, thus described as a complex sentence that consists on a coordinating connective and a main clause. Kuteva assumes that all sentences beginning with *but* or *and* are incoordinated and that when these conjunctions go through the incoordination process they loose their status, and transform into sentence particles with a mirative value. The author's main argument for this is the fact that the conjunction changes their source meaning (counterexpectation) and acquires a different one (mirativity). In this paper, we will also look into the behavior of these constituents and their meaning in incoordinate constructions.

2. Data: Differently from Kuteva, our analysis considers sentences (1) and (2) to be different, and to correspond to distinct syntactic structures. The sentences in (1), we believe, should not be analyzed as incoordinate because the information in the first conjunct can be recovered, and thus the sentence should be analyzed as coordinate with an omitted first conjunct. Bearing this assumption in mind, we propose that, in sentences as (1), the connecting element that initiates the sentence is indeed a coordinate conjunction. Also, regarding these sentences, we believe that the difference established in Anscombe & Ducrot (1977) between corrective and counterexpectation *but* is relevant given that, in Romance languages, only counterexpectation *but* allows these constructions:

(3) A: (**Eng**) They had not invited Jill. / (**EP**) Eles não tinham convidado a Jill. / (**Sp**) Ellos no habían invitado a Jill.

B: (**Eng**) *But her husband. / (**EP**) *Mas o seu marido. / (**Sp**) *Sino a su marido.

B': (**Eng**) *But her husband yes. / (**EP**) Mas (sim) o seu marido (sim). / (**Sp**) Pero (sí) a su marido (sí).

Bearing in mind the omitted first conjunct, we believe that these sentences should be analyzed as adjunction structures as proposed by Munn (1992, 1993, 1999), given that this syntactic configuration allows for a better reflection of the close relation between the conjunction and the second coordinated conjunct (Ross, 1967). If we assume this syntactic structure for sentences as (1), we must question the status of the first coordinated conjunct. Considering Colaço's (2013) proposal for coordination across discursive barriers that assumes that it is possible for the first conjunct to be an omitted conjunct, we believe that the status of the first conjunct in these sentences can be analyzed as similar to the one that occurs in parentheticals or juxtaposed sentences.

(4) Adam: I have only been studying French for 8 months.

Marie: ~~'You have only been studying for 8 months,~~ But you speak so well!'

Colaço and Matos (2010) consider that, if we assume the existence of coordinate sentences without the first conjunct, we could hypothesize that the ConjP projection is incomplete. Also, in these cases, we would have to assume that the definition of the categorial features of ConjP would be obtained via *Agree* with the complement (Matos 1997, 2000), instead of the specifier (Chomsky 2013, Rizzi 2016).

3. Incoordination: The sentences in (2), however, do not have a linguistic antecedent that can be recovered from a previous context and therefore occur out of the blue. Thus, we propose that these are the sentences that should be analyzed as incoordinate, and, similarly to sentences as those in (1), incoordinate sentences should be analyzed as adjunction structures as a demonstration of the close relation between the conjunction and the second coordinated conjunct. In regard to incoordinate sentences, we believe that they still share properties with coordinate sentences and, as Evans (2007: 367) refers regarding in subordinate sentences: "on *prima facie* grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses.". As such, they should be analyzed as a new type of sentence, i.e. incoordinate, and not as a different type of independent clause.

4. Syntactic Gradience: In this paper we will argue for a proposal that takes into consideration the theory of *Syntactic Gradience* proposed by Aarts (2007: 34), i.e., there are "blurred boundaries between two categories of form classes α and β , such that certain elements can be said clearly to belong to α , others indisputably to β ". Bearing in mind these properties and elaborating on Matos (2009) and Canceiro's (2016) analysis of coordinate structures, which allowed us to understand that coordination is not a uniform process and that among coordinate sentences there are different levels of integration and different properties, we propose the existence of incoordinate sentences, and also that paratactic constructions should be placed along a continuum of connectivity/levels of integration.

Although we disagree with Kuteva's analysis of incoordination, given that our proposal is that only sentences as (2), that do not have a linguistic antecedent, should be analyzed as incoordinate, we agree that *and* and *but*, when occurring in the beginning of these sentences, are not coordinate conjunctions. Colaço's (2013) paper also discusses the status of coordinating conjunctions in these sentences in which, as the author refers, the conjunction has an ambiguous behavior, as it shows properties of a coordinating conjunction and also some characteristics that are closer to discourse markers.

Regarding the status of the coordinating conjunctions that occur in these sentences, we will once again take into account the proposal by Aarts (2007) and also the work of Fielder (2008) that proposes the existence of a continuum of connectivity. We believe that the change in meaning referred by Kuteva is not systematic in these constructions and if, for example, we take the sentence in (1), the source meaning of *but* is still counterexpectation. Thus, we assume that mirativity is, in fact, a sub-value of the source meaning of the conjunction. As such, in our analysis, these constituents are placed in a continuum, and share properties with both discourse markers and coordinate conjunctions.

5. Preliminary Remarks: This investigation allows us to better understand that there are different levels of integration associated to coordinate/incoordinate sentences, and that the labeling strategy of incoordinate sentences and coordinate sentences with an omitted first term has to be different than that proposed by Chomsky (2013) and Rizzi (2016). This study will, ultimately, allow for a better understanding of incoordinate and non-canonical coordinate constructions, providing a better description of paratactic constructions.

Selected references: Aarts, Bas (2007) *Syntactic gradience: The nature of grammatical indeconjunctivity*, OUP Oxford; Colaço, Madalena & Gabriela Matos (2010) Estruturas coordenadas sem especificador realizado em português europeu. *Diacrítica* 24(1): 267-288 – *Revista do Centro de Estudos Humanísticos*, Univ do Minho; Colaço, Madalena (2013)

Coordenação e fronteiras discursivas. In F. Silva, I. Falé & I. Pereira (eds) *Textos Seleccionados do XXVIII Encontro Nacional da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística 2012*. Lisboa: APL Textos, pp. 249-269.; **Evans**, Nicholas (2007) Insubordination and its uses, In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, Oxford: OUP, pp. 366-431.; **Felder**, Grace (2008) Bulgarian adversative connectives: Conjunctions or discourse markers?, In Ritva Laury (ed.), *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The multifunctionality of conjunctions*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 79-97.; **Kuteva**, Tania (2017) *The "mirror" of insubordination*, Presentation on SOAS University of London.