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**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>English Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, II</td>
<td>noun classes I and II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>transitive subject, actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>absolutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>localization ‘near’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjP</td>
<td>Adjectival Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>prefix deriving from original adverbial function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrP</td>
<td>Agreement Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgrSP</td>
<td>Subject Agreement Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>addressee honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>action nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM</td>
<td>animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTIPASS</td>
<td>antipassive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOBL</td>
<td>oblique case of the attributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>apprehensive; ‘lest’ inflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>associative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR</td>
<td>attributive, attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>augmented (number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>benefactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>blunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, COMP</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>cardinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTT</td>
<td>cative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>class marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>conjugation marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNT</td>
<td>connective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBL</td>
<td>complementizing oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COH</td>
<td>coherence particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>contemporaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Complementizer Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSL</td>
<td>causal convert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVB</td>
<td>convert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>directional marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Insubordination and its uses**

**NICHOLAS EVANS**

### 11.1 Introduction

Prototypical finite clauses are main clauses—indeed, the ability to occur in a main clause is often taken as definitional for finiteness, e.g., by Crysall (1997: 427)—and prototypical nonfinite clauses are subordinate clauses. Problems arise when clauses that would by standard criteria be analysed as nonfinite are used as main clauses; examples are the use in main clauses of the English bare infinitive go (1a) or Spanish ir in (1b) (both from Etxepare and Grohmann 2005: 129), or the Italian and German infinitives used to express commands in (2).

1. a. John go to the movies! No way, man.
   b. ¿Dónde ir a esa fiesta? ¡Jamás!
   c. ¡No te untes a la fiesta! Never!

2. a. Alza-te, porció, avé, cap-ito?
   b. Rifa-re
   c. Get up-INF-REFL pig-PL have-2PL understand-PSTFCP make-INF
   d. lett-í, ma presto! Puli-í-í le 
   e. the.M.PL need-PL but quickly clean-INF-REFL the.F.PL shoe-PL

This chapter has had a long gestation, and earlier versions were presented at the Mouton University Seminar Series (1989), the inaugural conference for the Linguistic Typology in Prague (1991), and at the Cognitive Anthropology Research Group of the Max Planck Institute für Psycholinguistik (1999). I thank Franz Six for inviting me to revise it for the present volume, thereby rescuing it from further neglect, and Irina Kalimina for her subsequent editorial comments. For data, analysis, and references on specific languages I thank Margrit Ambacher (Ambacher), Wulfert Sauer (Dutch), Melissa Bever (Croatian), Sue Dakin (Chinese), David Gill (Modern Hebrew), Sotero Kita and Shigeki Nishiyama (Japanese), Alan King (Basque), Bill McGregor (Goondiwindi), Miren Ojedera (Basque), and Anne Wierzbicka (Polish), Bruce Rigby, Sandy Thompson, ScottSchwenter, and Tony Woodbury drew other crucial papers to my attention, and I am indebted to Eve Darriger, Mark Durie, Masha Koptijnko-Tamm, Steve Levinson, Marianne Mithun, Irina Nikolcheva, Eric Pedersen, Lesley Stirling, Claudia Wegener, David Wilkins, and two anonymous referees for a range of other critical comments on various versions of this paper.

---

1 See Kalimina and Sumbatova (Ch. 7 above) for the quoted definition and fuller discussion.

Such clauses are clearly problematic for typologies of finiteness. The two commonest solutions to the conundrum they pose are either to ignore them altogether or to treat them as underlying subordinate clauses from which some sort of main clause has been elided. A third solution would involve admitting them to the category of finite clauses, concurrently broadening the definition of finiteness in various ways, such as allowing, as finite, verb forms that fail to show tense, mood, or subject person. A fourth solution is to dissociate the assumed necessary link between main clause status and finiteness, allowing certain types of main clause to be nonfinite; see the chapters in this volume by Nikolova and by Kalimina and Sumbatova (Chapters 6 and 7 above) for strong arguments in favour of this position.

My contention will be that such constructions are much more widespread than is commonly believed. In fact I will be casting my net more widely, looking generally at the main clause use of (prima facie) subordinate constructions, whether nonfinite or not. This is because the relevant cross-linguistic patterns are more discernible if you examine the main clause use of subordinate constructions more generally, rather than restricting your purview just to that subset of subordinate clauses which happen to be nonfinite constructions in some languages—especially since the category 'subordinate clause', though not without its problems, is nonetheless cross-linguistically more robust than the category 'nonfinite clause'.

I will apply the term 'insubordination' to the conventionalized main clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses. In surveying the uses of insubordination cross-linguistically, I have three main goals:

- To establish the range of formal manifestations of insubordination (section 11.2), e.g., main clause use of infinitives, but also main clause subjunctives, subordinate word order or characteristic subordinating complementizers or conjunctions in apparent main clauses, logophoric
pronouns, or switch-reference in main clauses. As this list indicates, these include both types of nonfinite construction, such as infinitives, and those that are not normally considered to manifest nonfiniteness, such as subordinating conjunction, as well as categories that are intermediate or disputed.

- To establish the range of functions that are served by insubordinated clauses (section 11.3). These include:

(a) Various expressions of interpersonal coercion, including commands, as in (2), but also permissive, ablative, threats and warnings. These are discussed in Section 11.3.1.

(b) Modal framing of various types, including the unattributed evocation of quotation or belief (as in 1), and other kinds of deontic and evidential use. Here a main clause predicate expressing quotation, perception, thought, emotion, or inference is omitted. In some cases the semantics of this kind of insubordination goes beyond modality proper to tense. These are discussed in section 11.3.2.

(c) Marking of various discourse contexts, such as negation, contrastive statements, and reiteration, all high in presuppositionality, through the adaptation of devices for expressing interclausal relations to the expression of discourse relations more generally. These are discussed in section 11.3.3.

- To examine the diachrony of how these functions arise through a three-step process of (a) ellipsis, (b) conventionalized restriction of interpretation, (c) development of conventionalized main clause use.

This will lead back to the issue of how realistic it is to maintain a strict distinction between syntactic (inter-clausal) and discourse (inter-sentential) relations in natural language.

11.1.1 Insubordination: delimiting the phenomenon

A number of grammarians of individual languages have discussed the problems posed for analysis by what I am calling insubordinated clauses. Yet there has not, to my knowledge, been any detailed typological study of the

phenomenon, so it will be helpful to begin with some overall problems thrown up by this definition.

Many of the examples I will discuss lie at the uncomfortable boundary between parole and langue, where it is not always clear when grammar has emerged from discourse, and this leads to marginalized treatments in descriptions of particular languages. As a result, it is premature to attempt a fully systematic typological survey of the phenomenon, since in many cases the relevant constructions are considered too marginal or elliptical to be described in the standard reference grammars that need to be consulted over a structured sample in mature typological research. The 'if' request in English described below, for example, receives its first mention in an English reference grammar in Huddleston and Pullum (2002), though it is earlier mentioned in two analyses based on conversational corpora, Ford and Thompson (1986) for American English and Stirling (1999) for Australian English, who discusses it in detail. Likewise, crucial data on certain uses of independent dative clauses in German come from specialized discourse studies rather than reference grammars.

My purpose, therefore, is rather to sketch out some emerging patterns in an initial set of languages for which I have been able to obtain relevant information. Although twelve language families are represented, the initial impetus for this survey came from my attempts to make sense of the relevant constructions while writing a reference grammar of the Australian language Kayardild (Evans 1995a). To help with this I consulted the literature on other Australian languages and on Indo-European languages for which detailed work on the pragmatics-syntax interface was available, later adding in material from other languages around the world as I became aware of comparable constructions in them. This leads to a strong bias towards data from Australian and Indo-European languages, which between them account for twenty-four of the thirty-seven languages considered here. (For
substantial further data on comparable phenomena in Dağhestanian languages see Kalinina and Sumbatova, Chapter 7 above.) I hope this bias will eventually be corrected by further research built on a more representative sample, at the stage when more attention to the phenomenon in descriptive work makes a wider range of data available.

1.1.2 Insubordination and deparagmatization

In my definition above I used the hedge 'on prima facie evidence' to my criterion 'appears to be a formally subordinate clause'. The need for this hedge generally arises because of the following paradox. Insubordinated clauses usually look like subordinate clauses, because of the presence in them of prototypically subordinate characteristics, such as infinitive, participial or subjunctive inflections on their verbs, subordinate word order, complementizers, and so on. But to the extent that, over time, they get reanalysed as standard constructions, those features will no longer be restricted to subordinate clauses, so that the term 'subordinate' means, at best, having diachronic origins as a subordinate clause.

The historical trajectory that leads to the formation of insubordinated clauses follows four steps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordination</th>
<th>Ellipsis</th>
<th>Conventionalized</th>
<th>Reanalysis as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Subordinate</td>
<td>Ellipsis</td>
<td>Ellipsis</td>
<td>main clause structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Restriction of interpretation</td>
<td>of main clause</td>
<td>Conventionalized</td>
<td>subordinate clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) of ellipsed material</td>
<td></td>
<td>clause use of formally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Constructionalization)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Theories of ellipsis differ widely on the degree to which ellipsed material is recovered. As a matter of definition, for example, Quirk et al. (1972: 596) restrict the use of the term as follows: 'words are ellipsed only if they are uniquely recoverable, i.e. there is no doubt about what words are to be supplied ... What is uniquely recoverable depends on the context.' This is not a position I accept, for reasons to be discussed later in the chapter. I would rather define ellipsis as involving 'some recoverable elements that are grammatically acceptable', and then allow a range of situations from uniquely recoverable to non-uniquely recoverable (with perhaps an infinite range of possibilities).

4 In one respect, this parochial definition involves some circularity once stage (3) is reached. If such clauses are now normal main clauses, why include them in the survey? One reason is that analysts are traditionally reluctant to treat them as full main clauses; typically grammars will include them in the section on subordinate clauses, and then make an aside that they can also be used independently on occasion. As typologists dependent on secondary sources, we cannot always simply reanalyse the data. A second reason is that by including such cases in our survey we may be able to show that such awkward cases display many regularities cross-linguistically, and in this way lead to a better and more consistent treatment of them across languages.

The most detailed discussions of the phenomenon (though under different names) are in the literature on German, perhaps because the existence of special subordinate word order makes such constructions particularly obvious there (see e.g. Buscha 1974; Weuster 1983; Schwabe 1994b; Reis 1995, 2002; 2003; Schlobinski n.d., and references therein). Drawing on examples and analyses from Buscha and Weuster we may illustrate the four phases above.

Full construction with overt main clause. This phase is simply the normal situation where a subordinate clause is used as such; note that the subordinating conjunction ob 'whether' in (3) requires that its clause have subordinate word order, with the verb in clause-final position.

(3) Ich erinnere mich nicht, ob sie eine Karte gekauft hatte. I don't remember whether she bought a ticket. (Durrell 1957: 387)

Ellipsis of main clause. Any grammatically compatible main clause can be 'reconstructed' by the hearer. I have developed elsewhere (Evans 1993b) the concept of 'grammatical placedness' which amounts to a grammatical projection limiting possible main clauses (e.g. to predicates governing the subjunctive, or logophoric contexts). Exactly which main clause is restored is determined by processes of conversational inference.

For German, this is the situation where any grammatically compatible main clause could potentially be restored. I am not aware of any published arguments demonstrating this specifically, but the literature contains some suggestive examples. The discussion of insubordinated ob clauses in Buscha and Weuster contains such a wide range of reconstructed elements—with great variation in both the subject and the verb of the ellipsed clause—that there appear to be no grounds for claiming semantic restrictions on the restored materials:

(4) [Was mein-ist du dazu.] Ob ich mal wegen meiner Galle frag-t-e? (What would you think), if I just ask about my gall bladder?

(Buscha 1976)

7 For these examples, the English translations are my own; occasionally they are slightly non-literal in the interests of fluency.
(8) a. [Es wäre schön,] Wenn ich deine Statur hätte
it be.3sg.sg lovey if I your build had
'It would be lovely' if I had your build.'
b. [Ich wäre froh, ]
I be.1sg.sg glad
'I would be glad'
c. [Es wäre schlimm, ]
it be.3sg.sg bad
'It would be bad'

(9) Wenn Sie sich vielleicht die Hände waschen möchten?
if you self perhaps the hands wash-1nv might
a. [, können Sie das hier tun]
could you that here do
b. [, wäre das sehr nett von Ihnen]
were that very nice of you
c. [, können Sie das nicht tun]
could you that not do
d. [, wäre das nicht sehr nett von Ihnen]
were that not very nice of you

'If you would maybe like to wash your hands.
[, that would be very nice of you]
[, you can do it here]
[, you cannot do it]
[, that would not be very nice of you']

Or it may be very specific, such as the restriction of the main clause to 'what happens' in (10). Here Buscha comments that 'the matrix clause can be eliminated, without any change of meaning. The isolated subordinate clauses of this group [of sentences] need no linguistic or situational context for a monosemous interpretation.'

(10) Und wenn ich nicht von ihr loskomm-e?
and if I not from her get.away-1sg
'And if I don't get away from her?'
[< Was geschieht, wenn ich nicht von ihr loskomm-e?]
what happen-3sg if I not from her get.away-1sg

* Der Matrixsatz kann eliminiert werden, ohne daß sich eine Bedeutungsänderung ergibt. Die isolierten Nebensätze dieser Gruppe brauchen zur Monosemisierung keiner sprachlichen oder situativen Kontexte.
Conventionalization of the whole construction (Constructionalization). The construction now has a specific meaning of its own, and it may not be possible to restore any ellipsed material. A clear case where the construction has been conventionalized to the point where restoration of ellipsed material is not possible—at least in a way that allows all the overt material to be preserved—is the concessive use of wo (where) clauses with subordinate verb order. Buscha (1976), in discussing examples like (11a), is unable to supply a paraphrase from which this can be derived by simple deletion, and replaces wo by the subordinating concessive conjunction obwohl in her expansion (11b):\(^{10}\)

(11) a. Wo Zehntausende verreck-en müs- en
where ten.thousands die-INF must-3PL
Lit.: 'Where tens of thousands must die'

b. Obwohl Zehntausende verreck-en müs- en,
although ten.thousands die-INF must-3PL
machen-sie sich keine Gedanken darüber
they self no thoughts about that
'tEven though tens of thousands must die, they don’t think twice about it.'

Another nice example of conventionalized meaning going hand in hand with increasingly main-clause-like behaviour is the insubordinated use of si clauses in Spanish, historically conditionals, but which can now function as main clauses putting forth a proposition at odds with that articulated or presupposed by the preceding speaker (see 20 below). Arguments for their main clause status are presented by Almela Pérez (1985), Montoloi Durán (1999), and Schwenter (1999). In contrast to the subordinate use, which typically suspends factivity, the insubordinated use signals certainty on the part of the speaker (Schwenter 1999: 89), fails to activate negative polarity items such as postnominal placement of alguna ‘any’, is limited to one occurrence per utterance (whereas true conditional si can be repeated, one per condition), is impossible to embed under a speech act verb and cannot appear inside the scope of sentence adverbs like obviamente ‘obviously’.

Note that the four-stage pathway proposed above zigzags between an opening up, then a closing, of the role of pragmatics. First a previously syntactically independent subordinate clause, made independent, becomes available for pragmatic interpretation; in this phase grammatical formatives get opened up to the pragmatics and become 'less grammatical'. Only in the second phase does 'degrammatization' occur, as the newly independent clause acquires a more specific constructional meaning. For example, a switch-reference marker originally interpreted in simply grammatical terms (e.g. tracking identity between subjects in main and subordinate clauses) may take on more general functions of tracking contrasts in discourse, the exact nature of which is to be determined pragmatically. An examination of insubordination is thus instructive for 'interactionist' functional typologies that do not seek to replace structural with functional accounts, but rather examine the ways in which various functions (including pragmatic interpretation) intricately interdepend with language-particular structures.

In addition to its typological importance for the relation between finiteness and subordination, insubordination is also of great interest for theories of historical morphosyntax. The extensive literature on morphosyntactic change—whether as grammaticization or reanalysis—largely concentrates on diachronic developments in the opposite direction, i.e. the development of subordinate constructions from material in main clauses. It has been widely asserted, particularly in the functionalist and grammaticization literatures, that there is a unidirectional pathway from pragmatics to syntax to morphology, one consequence of which is that loose paratactic ‘pragmatic’ constructions become syntacticized as subordinate clauses.

[Grammaticalization is unidirectional [...].] It leads from a 'less grammatical' to a 'more grammatical' unit, but not vice versa. A few counterexamples have been cited (e.g. ... Campbell, in press).\(^{11}\) These concern other grammaticalization or regrammaticalization. The former is present when the direction of grammaticalization is reversed, that is, when a more grammatical unit develops into a less grammatical one, while the latter applies when forms without any function acquire a grammatical function. Although both degrammaticalization and regrammaticalization have been observed to occur, they are statistically insignificant and will be ignored in the remainder of this work. Note that many cases of alleged degrammaticalization found in the literature on this subject can be shown to be the result of an inadequate analysis (see Lehmann 1982: 16–20). (Heine et al. 1991: 4–9)

From the diachronic point of view, [grammaticalization—N.E. is a process which turns lexemes into grammatical formatives and renders grammatical formatives still more grammatical. (Lehmann 1982: 2, italics mine)]

[Grammaticalization is a process whereby linguistic units lose in semantic complexity, pragmatic significance, syntactic freedom, and phonetic substance, respectively. (Heine and Reh: 1984: 15)]

\(^{10}\) Note Wexler’s comment (1985: 56) on this construction: 'Wo verreckt [in this example] nicht auf
den Ort es handelt sich vielmehr um das Konversativ wo; wo [where] refers not to a place, rather it is
a matter of conversative wo [i.e. English whereas].

\(^{11}\) = Campbell (1991), discussed below.
Discussions of reanalysis have been a bit more willing to admit developments from subordinate to main clause status:

The discussion so far has focused on unidirectionality, and what kinds of unidirectionality are characteristic of grammaticalization. Virtually nothing is exceptionless, and there are of course instances of change in languages that are counterexamples of tendencies that can be characterized as 'less -> more grammatical', 'main clause -> subordinate clause', etc. In these volumes the papers by Campbell and Greenberg explicitly raise counterexamples to unidirectionality...It is likely that all these examples are strictly speaking actually not cases of grammaticalization (although once they have occurred they may be subject to the generalization, reduction, loss, and other changes typical of grammaticalization). Rather, the examples Campbell and Greenberg cite can be regarded as instances of reanalysis. (Traugott and Heine 1995: 6–7)

It is not my concern here to situate insubordination within the grammaticalization-reanalysis dichotomy. Some scholars suggest that grammaticalization is not a logically independent type of morphosyntactic change, but merely a cluster of other processes such as sound change, semantic change, and reanalysis (Campbell 2000). On the reanalysis side, it is not clear that the normal definitions of reanalysis apply clearly to the phenomenon of insubordination, and as outlined above, the complex trajectory followed in insubordination, with its successive opening and restriction of pragmatic interpretation, may leave room for suitably redefined versions of each process to be identified. However, wherever we situate it within a taxonomy of morphosyntactic change, it is clear that insubordination goes against the usual direction of change by recruiting main clause structures from subordinate clauses.

12 Langacker’s oft-cited definition of reanalysis treats it as ‘change in the structure of an expression or class of expressions that does not involve any immediate or intrinsic modification of its surface manifestation’ (Langacker 1997: 25). Heine et al. basically follow this definition. Traugott (1982: 48) focuses on the reinterpretation of boundaries: ‘another well-known source of grammaticalization is reanalysis ... in which old boundaries are reinterpreted’. It takes a bit of managing to apply those to any stage of the insubordination trajectory I have outlined above. Concretely stage (b) could be seen as an example of a sentence boundary being realigned with a clause boundary, but it all seems rather forced and unilluminating.

13 It would certainly be consistent, for example, with Hopper’s substantivist allegory: ‘Grammaticalization ... is the tragedy of lexical items young and pure in heart but carrying with them the dank flow of original sin; their ineradicable wriggling as they encounter the corrupt world of discourse, their fall into the muck of Grammar; and their eventual redemption in the cleansing waters of Pragmatism’ (Hopper 1994: 142–4).

11.2 Formal realizations

Recall that we define insubordination as the conventionalized independent use of a formally subordinate clause. The criterion ‘formally subordinate’ can refer to any formal feature primarily associated with subordinate clauses in the relevant language: non-finitive verb forms; subordinating conjunctions and other complementizers (e.g., case markers with clausal scope); logophoric pronominal and long-distance reflexives; switch-reference markers; or special word order normally confined to subordinate clauses.

The rider ‘primarily associated’ in the preceding paragraph is important here, since the more an insubordinated clause allows independent use, the less its formal features can be taken as uniquely distinctive of subordinate clauses. This means that arguments of the form ‘clause type X is subordinate because it has formal features Y which are characteristic of subordinate clauses’ will be circular. Weuster (1983), for example, shows the fallacy of taking V-final clauses in German to be subordinate simply on the basis of their word order, since for some types at least embedding under a putatively ellipted main clause is either impossible or arbitrary. At the same time, as the independent use of erstwhile subordinate clauses becomes increasingly conventionalized, the relevant constructions may exhibit a mix of subordinate and main clause features. For example, some types of ‘suspended’ clause discussed for Japanese by Ohori (1995), which fall into my category of insubordinated constructions, behave like subordinate clauses in taking the participial ending -ne, but like complete sentences in taking the pragmatic particle -ne (see further discussion below). Finally, it may be the case that historical developments leading to formal similarity between main and subordinate forms have run in the opposite direction, such as the development of the West Greenlandic intransitive participle from the pan-Eskimo intransitive indicative, as discussed by Woodbury (1985).

The fact remains that virtually all cases discussed here are treated as basically subordinate in their morphosyntax by the sources, and discussed in the section on subordination as a special case. In defence of this position (though this is not always made explicit) there are three types of argument.
First, it may be demonstrable by comparative or historical evidence that the construction originated as a subordinate clause; this is the case for the Arizona Tewa examples discussed below, for example, where at the same time the analyst makes it clear that the construction in question is no longer so regarded synchronically.

Secondly, subordinate or main clause status is typically demonstrated on the basis of a cluster of tests, not all of which may yield a positive result in the case of insubordinated clauses; their anomalous position may be demonstrable through their non-prototypical performance here. Related to this are cases where the insubordinated use is semantically restricted compared to standard subordinate uses; an example would be the clear semantic restrictions on insubordinated if-clauses, such as the restriction to positive outcomes, compared to their corresponding subordinate clauses.

Finally, in cases where the first two arguments fail, we may argue that such clauses are basically subordinate by resorting to typological analogy, from the two facts that (a) nominalized clauses bearing case affixes on their nominalized verbs are typically a subordinate structure cross-linguistically, and (b) the complementizing use of case markers is, logically, an extension of their two-place predicate use to one in which both arguments are clauses.

The danger of circularity when arguing on such typological grounds is greatest in the case of certain categories that have entered the metalinguistic vocabulary with analyses of languages where they happen to occur in subordinate clauses, but where the cross-linguistic grounds for associating them with subordinate constructions are weak. Logophoric pronouns, for example, were first discussed in connection with African languages, where they are primarily found in subordinate clauses (see below), but subsequent work on Central Pomo (Mithun 1990) suggests that occurrence in subordinate clauses is not a necessary defining feature of logophoric pronouns. Similarly, the 'subjunctive' category has always been defined in a way that vacillates between structural grounds (in terms of particular types of subordinate clause, reflecting the term's origin as a translation of the Greek ὑποτατήρη 'subordinate'—see Palmer 1986: 22) and semantic grounds, such as Lavanda's (1983: 211) characterization of the Spanish subjunctive as referring to states of affairs 'whose occurrence could easily be denied or affirmed, but is instead left unasserted'.

My inclusion of a particular construction as insubordinate typically follows decisions in the primary sources to group them as special independent uses of subordinate clauses, or as descendants of subordinate clauses in previous language states; the component 'independent use' in my definition allows for the fact that there will be language-specific arguments for treating the construction as a main clause, and indeed the process of insubordination may have been so far-reaching that, synchronically, they have full main clause status.

We now pass to a survey of the various formal characteristics, normally associated with subordinate clauses in the relevant language, for which insubordinated uses have been reported.

11.2.1 Special subordinate verb forms

These are forms such as the subjunctive in Italian (12a, b) or Icelandic (25 below), participles in Lithuanian (13a, b) or Japanese (14a, b),10 and the so-called 'lest' or apprehensive forms in many Australian languages, e.g., Diyari (15a-b) and Kayardild (49 below).

Typically such verb forms are either nonfinite or can be analysed as containing an old complementizer such as a case marker. For each language I give an example of a 'typical', subordinate use, followed by an 'insubordinated', independent use.

a. Non voglio che venga domani not want-1SG that come.3SG.BSUB tomorrow 'I don't want him to come tomorrow.'
b. Che venga domani that come.3SG.BSUB tomorrow 'It's possible/likely/I hope/believe etc.) that he'll come tomorrow.'

(32) a. Möykstajas sáko, kai tą tantiago möykstis teacher.NOM say.3,3 that you be.lazy.PRES.PTCP study.NOM 'The teacher says that you are lazy in studying.' (Comrie 1981)
b. Traukínys iščiai įsigai septaitis vėlandą train.NOM leave.PRES.PTCP promptly.SG seventh.ACC house.ACC 'It is said that the train will leave promptly at seven o'clock.' (Comrie 1981)

10 (15b) is taken from Osher (1995) and follows his glosses. (14a) is a 'full' version that corresponds maximally to his insubordinated example, though according to Shigeno Natsuyama (email of 22 May 2002) this sounds a little awkward, though people do say that, and a more natural full version would be nukarynate-ko, nukarynate-namun ya, i.e. where the particle -ko 'and so' is replaced by -nun because 'This is typical of the structural idiosyncrasy that frequently accompanies insubordination, as the now main clauses become detached from their original complex structure and take on main clause features in their own right.'
11.2.2 Subordinating conjunctions and complementizers

Examples are the use of the word ‘if’ for polite requests in French (16), English (17, 18), or Dutch (19).

(16) Si on allait se promen-er?
if one went  
‘What if we went for a walk?’

(17) a. (I wonder) If you could give me a couple of 39c stamps please
b. If you could give me a couple of 39c stamps please
‘I’d be most grateful’

(18) (A milkman’s sheet about Xmas deliveries, including 17)
If you would kindly indicate in the boxes below your requirements and then hand the completed form back to your Roundman by no later than the 16th December 1995
‘Hans, whether you just to Edith will go
‘Hans, would you just go to Edith?’17

Though the commonest function of insubordinated conditionals is to express polite requests, they may have other conventionalized functions, such as

16 Alan King (p.c.) raises the question of whether the source is the conditional use (‘if, then I’d be grateful’) or the embedded-question use; the lack of a paraphrase with ‘whether’, which would suit the embedded-question use but not the conditional use, suggests the former, but English speakers who I have consulted are divided on their intuitions here. In Basque (see below) the two are formally distinct, and both are available for elliptical requests.

17 I am indebted to Melissa Bowern for this example.

18 Some of the Australian languages I cite use phonic symbols (Diyirr, Dyirbal). Some use a practical orthography employing digraphs to show retroflexes, lamino-dental, and lamino-palatal articulations: Kayardild, Gcoorinyndji, and Mparntwe Arrente use leading r for retroflexes, following 1 to show lamino-dental, and following y or j to show lamino-palatal, and Mparntwe Arrente use following w to show consonantal labialization. Western Desert dialects use underlying to show retroflexion. Ngayangka employs a mixture of these strategies. In general, voicing is non-phonemic and individual orthographies arbitrarily choose the voicing values. I normally follow the orthography employed in the source, to which readers are referred for phonological details, except that I have retranscribed Yukulta in the same practical orthography as the closely related Kayardild to facilitate comparison of morphemes.
(23) wu:ja ngi:jin-jii, wadu:na: baa:jinj
give:IMP me-LOC smoke-OBL bite:IMP
'Give me (the tobacco), so that I can have a smoke.'

(24) Wirdl-jinja-da dathin-a dukurduku binthu
stay-HORT-yet that-NOM moist-NOM prepuse-NOM
'Let those freshly circumcised foreskins wait a while yet (before burying them).'

Note that the complementizing case spreads to any object NPs present in the complementized clause: the dative to 'that wallaby' in (23), and the oblique to 'smoke' in (23); the Yukulta dative is cognate with the Kayardild Oblique. In addition, the relevant verb inflection, th.inja or j.inja in both languages according to conjugation, can be broken down into a conjunction marker th/plus the dative/oblique suffix inja/atta. In section 11.2.4 we examine a series of changes of this type that have occurred in the langkic languages, giving rise to new main clause tense/mood categories.

11.2.3 Logophoric pronouns and long-distance reflexives

These are normally restricted to subordinate clauses, but may in some languages be used independently to indicate reported speech or thoughts in a style indirect libre. An example from Icelandic is (25), in which all clauses after the first, though not overtly embedded, exhibit such subordinate clause features as the use of the subjunctive and of long-distance reflexives (LDRs). They are used in the 'logophoric domain' in which 'the speech, thought, perception, etc., of an individual, distinct from the speaker or the narrator, is reported on' (Sigurðsson 1986:13)—in this case, the chairman—and would be translated by something like he expressed in English. Further examples of insubordination with logophoric pronouns will be given in section 11.2.2.20

(25) Formaðurinn varð óslopalega reður. fíllagam varð
the.chairman became furiously angry the.proposal was.SBJV
svízþið og varð henni beint gagn sér
sincerely and varð her.his being given to sér
outrageous and was.SBJV it aimed at self(LDR)
persónulega, sér varð réyndar sama
personally self(LDR) was.SBJV in fact indifferent
'He became furiously angry. (He felt) the proposal was
outrageous and was directly aimed at himself personally. In fact, he
(s)elf did not care...' (Sigurðsson 1986: 12)

Note here that while subordinate clauses always presumably originate as such, logophoric pronouns may have a main clause origin—a point I shall return to later.

11.2.4 Switch-reference markers

Such markers are normally restricted to subordinate clauses but used, in special cases, with main clauses, as in the Australian language Arrente. Examples of this will be given in (113-16) below.

11.2.5 Special subordinate word order

Special subordinate word order may also occur in insubordinated clauses. An example is the German use of the verb-final subordinate word order when repeating a question, but with the main clause ich sagte or ich fragte omitted, as in (26), as well as the various other examples given in section 11.1.2 above.

(26) Aber wo kommst du denn jetzt her?
but where come-sg you then now how farther
'But where are you coming from now?'
Wie bitte?
how please
'What's that?'
Wo du jetzt herkommst?
where you now come-sg
'(I asked) Where you're coming from(?)

11.2.6 Combinations of subordinate features; minimal types

We have already seen examples where more than one feature characteristic of subordinate clauses is found—such as a complementizer and the subjunctive in Italian (12b), or the subjunctive and a logophoric pronoun in Icelandic (25). Example (27) illustrates the combination of a subordinating conjunction plus subordinate clause (verb-final) word order in German.

(27) Oh er kränk ist?
whether he sick is
'You’re asking/wondering // I wonder) whether he is sick?'

Or it may happen that a word that is ambiguous between main and subordinate clause functions is shown to be used with its subordinate clause function by its occurrence with some other subordinate clause feature, such as subordinate clause word order, as in (28). The German word warum can function as a main clause interrogative meaning 'why', with main clause (V-second) word order, or as an interrogative subordinating meaning 'as to why', with subordinate (V-final) word order; in (28) the V-final word order shows clearly that it is being used in the second function.
(28) Warum er noch nicht da ist? how he still not there is
‘(You’re wondering/asking if I can’t understand) why he still isn’t there (?)’

Japanese illustrates perhaps the most extremely reduced example of an insubordinated clause: (29) consists of just a subordinating conjunction, the word for ‘also’, plus an illocutionary particle, thanks to ellipsis of subordinate clause predicates and arguments in addition to ellipsis of the whole main clause:

(29) Ka mo ne whether also PRT
‘Possibly’, lit. ‘[I wonder] whether [it’s true].’ (Sotaro Kita, p.c.)

11.2.7 Scope and limits of the present survey

I shall exclude from this survey, for reasons of scope, formally coordinated clauses used independently, exemplified by the following sentence from Ewe (30). But it may well turn out that they have rather similar functional properties to insubordinated clauses. The overt cohesive contrasting of propositions expressed by different speakers is reminiscent of the ‘independent switch reference’ to be discussed in section 11.3.3.5, while in terms of interpersonal pragmatics the function of independent or-clauses is reminiscent of many insubordinated requests (section 11.3.1.1).

(30) ma-và fe si laa 3SG.INCL come evening 3SG.PRES or
‘Should I come this evening or?’ (Ameka 1991: 54)

My definition also requires that the resultant construction draw its material from only the old subordinate clause. This is to distinguish it from cases of clause union which end up including elements of an erstwhile subordinate clause (e.g. participial forms, or a causativized verb root) in addition to elements of the erstwhile main clause (e.g. an auxiliary, or a causativizing element). This requirement excludes from consideration such English sentence types as What if it rains? (of underlying biclausal nature, from What happens if it rains, according to Quirk et al. 1985) and What if they ARE illiterate? (from What does it matter if they ARE illiterate?), or Russian and other Slavic past forms based on the past participle, with historic loss of the auxiliary verb. It also excludes the plethora of forms in many Cariban languages, discussed at length in Gildea (1998), where the verbs of main clauses are historically nominalizations of various types, once part of copular clauses

from which the copula has disappeared.21 Cf. the Panare examples (31a), with the nominalization functioning as a habitual present, and no copula, with (31b), exemplifying what Gildea argues is the original construction, where the habitual nominalization is linked to the subject by an overt copula (Gildea 1998: 236).

(31) a. ti-pa:n-sen iye IRR-dry-HAB tree
‘(This kind of) pole/tree dries.’
b. na-ta:n-sen koh moh 2-ADD-kill-HAB 3SG.PRES
‘This could kill you.’ (Nominal interpretation: ‘This could be your killer.’)

Also excluded are cases where former main verbs are reduced to particles or suffixes to an erstwhile subordinate verb which has become the new main verb; an example would be the change from Latin cantare (h)abere to Italian cantare, or the derivation of evidential affixes in many languages from reduced verbs, such as the Maricopa ‘non-visual sensory evidence’ marker, -a, which is a reduced form of the verb pan- ‘hear’, and the visual evidential’ -yua, which derives from the verb yu- ‘see’ plus the 1st person prefix 2- (Willett 1988: 79). Similarly, it excludes cases like Teso (Niletic), discussed by Heine and Reh (1984: 104–5), where the reconstructed main clause negative verb “e-mam ‘it is not’ gets reduced to a negative particle mam ‘not’. As a result the originally subordinate verb remains the only full verb (32b); in the process this introduces a change from original VSO word order to SVO, as VS(VO) reduces to PartSVO.

(32) a. e-mam petro e-koto ekiPok 3SG.NEG want dog
‘Peter doesn’t want a dog.’ (Heine and Reh’s reconstruction for pre-Teso)

b. mam petro e-koto ekiPok not Peter 3SG.NEG want dog
‘Peter doesn’t want a dog.’

Finally, I exclude instances where complement-taking predicates embedded in main clauses reduce to formulaic particles, parenthetical phrases etc. This is illustrated in Thompson and Mulac’s (1999) discussion of reduction of I think from complement-taking predicate (I think that we’re definitely moving

21 For a comparable case in the Cuspan languages (Uto-Aztecan), where nominalized structures plus copula have been reanalysed as finite verb forms, see Jacobs (1979).
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toward being more technologically to a sort of epistemic adverb, as in It's just
your point of view you know what you like to do in your spare time I think.

Although there is some functional overlap between all the above cases and
insubordination, there is a crucial formal difference. Clause union condenses
a main and a subordinate clause while retaining semantic elements of both,
and examples of reduction of main clause verbs to either affixes (Maricopa) or
formuralic phrases (English I think) likewise retain material from both clauses.
In cases of insubordination, on the other hand, only material from the
subordinate clause is overtly expressed.\(^{23}\) The missing material is merely
alluded to—signalled by the presence of subordinate morphosyntax—and
must be restored inferentially.

To conclude this section, it is worth repeating that, under 'formally subor-
dinate', I include cases where the evidence for formal subordination is syn-
chronically obvious, as well as those where it is only diachronic. My main
reason for doing this is that the rapid turnover of some types of construction
in particular directives can bleach the indirectness from an 'indirect' insubor-
dinated request and leave it unacceptably direct. In addition, there are many
cases where it is not analytically clear how far insubordination has become
conventionalized. As we have seen there exists a continuum from subordinate
clases only used as such, to free-standing subordinate clauses for which an
eclipped main clause can be readily supplied, to insubordinated clauses which
can be supplied with main clauses though it sounds somewhat unnatural or
pedantic, to insubordinated clauses which have become so conventionalized
that they are felt to be quite complete in themselves. Once this last point has
been reached, there may be disagreement among analysts as to whether
'insubordinated' clauses should be treated as deriving from subordinate
clases at all, since an alternative analysis in which they are just another
main clause type becomes more plausible.

11.3 Functions of insubordination: towards a typology

In this section I survey the functions of insubordination, as defined above, in
a variety of languages. For each functional type I first discuss the attested
range of formal realizations, and then look at some functional reasons why
insubordination should occur. It should be noted that although, for expository
purposes, functions have been treated as distinct, there are many lan-
guages in which a single 'generalized insubordinate' type covers a number of

---

\(^{23}\) We shall see one partial exception to this: cases where focused-object constructions derive from a
fronted object and an old subordinate clause, reanalyzed as a single clause. The crucial difference is that
there is no retention of predicate material from the main clause.

functions. Some examples of this multifunctionality will be discussed in
section 11.4, where I look at the question of whether a unified semantics, or
a unified set of functions, can be given for insubordinated clauses.

11.3.1 Indirection and interpersonal control

By far the commonest type of insubordination is found in various types of
clause concerned with interpersonal control—primarily imperative and their
milder forms such as hints and requests, but also permissive, warnings, and
threats. All such clauses are, to a greater or lesser extent, "face-threatening acts"
(Brown and Levinson 1987), and insubordinating ellipsis has the effect of
putting the face-threatening act 'off the record'. In fact Brown and Levinson
(1987: 227) explicitly include the strategy 'be incomplete, use ellipsis' in their
section on 'off the record' ways of politely handling Face Threatening Acts.


This is as much a violation of the Quantity Maxim as of the Manner Maxim. Elliptical
utterances are legitimated by various conversational contexts—in answers to
question, for example. But they are also warranted in (face) T(reatmen) A(c)t/s.
By leaving an FTA half undone, S can leave the implication 'hanging in the air', just as
with rhetorical questions.

Sadock and Zwicky (1985: 193), in their discussion of how requests are
characterized by indirection, include the use of formally subordinate clauses
in their typology:

Indirection usually serves a purpose in that it avoids—or at least gives the appearance
of avoiding—a frank performance of some act that the speaker wishes to perform. For
this reason certain sorts of effects are more likely to be targets for indirect accom-
plishment than others. Most cultures find requests somewhat objectionable socially
and these are therefore frequently conveyed by indirect means...Numerous lan-
guages use some typically subordinate clause form, a free-standing infinitive or
subjunctive, for example, as a circumlocution for the imperative.

Insubordinated clauses of this type most commonly take the form of com-
plements of request, desire, or possibility predicates, purpose clauses with an
implicit 'I say this (in order that X)', and conditional clauses with an implicit
'It would be nice / You would make me happy / I would like it' etc.

11.3.1.1 Ellipsed predicates of desire To begin with an example of ellipsed
request or desire predicates, consider the well-discussed example of the
independent subjunctive in Latin (cf. Lakoff 1968), for which it is claimed
that (35b) is a paraphrase of (33a):

---
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(33) a. Imper-o / vol-o ut ven-ias
   order-1sg want-1sg that come-sbjv.2sg
   'I order/want you to come.'

b. Ven-ias
   come-sbjv.2sg
   'Come! May you come!'

The clear syntactic relationship between (33b) and (33a) is illustrated by the selection of negator; main clauses of command or desire select ne, while main clauses of possibility select non; these selections carry over into the corresponding insubordinated clauses (34). Note that epistemic interpretations are also available with the Latin indendent subjunctive, as with (35b).

(34) a. Imper-o/ vol-o ut ne ven-ias
   order-1sg want-1sg that NEG come-sbjv.2sg
   'I order/want you not to come.'

b. Ne ven-ias
   NEG come-sbjv.2sg
   'Don’t come! May you not come!'

(35) a. Potest fieri ut non ven-ias
   can.3sg become that NEG come-sbjv.2sg
   'It may be that you won’t come.'

b. Non venias
   NEG come-sbjv.2sg
   'Maybe you won’t come.'

11.3.1.2 Ellipted enabling predicate Enabling predicates are also commonly ellipsed, leaving behind an insubordinated purpose clause. An Indonesian example is (36), while the Kayardild example (37) is similar; a literal translation would be ‘in order to bring that bird back’.

(36) supeya di-baca halaman lima puluh
   in.order.that read-page five ten
   'If you could read page fifty.'

(37) dathin-a yarbud-a thaa-ri-jura-y
   that-nom bird-nom bring.back-pot-comp.loc
   '(Eat it in such a way that) you can bring that bird back (i.e. don’t eat it all).'

One specialized type of request realized by an insubordinated purposive clause in the Yankunytjatjara dialect of the Western Desert Language (Australian

Pama-Nyungan) is the request for permission, as in (38b) below; (38a) illustrates a canonical subordinate clause use of the purposive nominalized verb.

(38) a. ngayulu Yami-nya nyaku-nyija-ku pata-qi
   use-nom Yami-acc see-nmlz-purp wait-prs
   'I’m waiting to see Yami.' (Goddard 1985: 165)

b. ngayulu ngaku-nyija-ku / kuli-nyija-ku
   use-nom est-nmlz-purp listen-nmlz-purp
   'May I eat / listen?' (Goddard 1985: 166)

Goddard (1985: 166), who notes of this construction that ‘[a] purposive clause with rising intonation may constitute a complete sentence in itself’, goes on to suggest that ‘these utterances are probably best interpreted as “indirect speech acts”, for they implicitly request the addressee to do something, so that the situation they depict may become possible’.

An equally widespread type of insubordination found in polite requests is the independent if-clause, already exemplified above for French (16), English (17, 18), and Dutch (19); see Stirling (1999) for a detailed discussion of this phenomenon in Australian English. Among the many other languages using independent if-clauses for polite requests are Spoken Mon (39) and Japanese (40). In all of these languages non-elliptical versions are also possible; the ellipted portion is typically something like ‘[It would make me happy] if X, as in the non-elliptical (39a) or ‘[I think it would be a good idea] if X’ (40).

(39) a. (yo ra?) 'ya:on kwan m:n makeh, (Toa) cat mip
   if prt go visit village Mon if mind happy
   '(I) would be happy if (you) would visit a Mon village.'
   (W. Bauer, p.c.)

b. 'ya: on kwan m:n makeh
   go visit village Mon if
   '(You) should visit a Mon village.' (W. Bauer, p.c.)

(40) oishasan ni it-tara ii to omo-u
   doctor loc go-if good comp think-prs
   'I think that it would be good to go to a doctor.'

Footnote: Feed and Thompson (1986: 356) find that, in their conversational data, 7% of their initial if-clauses express polite directives. Although they state that “[p]lace this use of the conditional form in one of the least compatible with logical interpretation, it is not surprising that in many cases a consequent clause is very difficult to isolate, the examples they cite do in fact have an overt consequent and would hence not count as insubordinated clauses by my definition; an example is 'If you could get your table up with your new sketches just as soon as this is over I would like to see you.'
(41) oishasan ni it-tara?
   doctor LOC go-if
   'Why don't you go to a doctor?'

The more such subordinated if-clauses become conventionalized, the less
speakers are sure of exactly what has been ellipted. When asked to supply a
source main clause for a construction like if you could give me a 39c stamp, for
example, English speakers I have asked split between two alternatives, corre-
sponding to the conditional and question-embedding uses of English if: I
wonder if . . . and if . . . it would be good. One argument against the first
interpretation is that English speakers do not permit parallel examples with
whether, as in (42):

(42) 'Whether you could give me a 39c stamp.

However, one could dismiss this by claiming that selection applies to the
process of insubordination, such that not all possible subordinate clauses can
be used with the main clause, and that English only allows insubordin-
ation to occur with if, not whether. It becomes relevant to ask whether there
are other languages that allow insubordinated requests with both types; and
in fact we find that in Basque, which has distinct constructions for the two
types, employing distinct auxiliary forms, both are permitted as subordin-
ated requests:

(43) a. 39 peseta-ko bi sei ru ematen ba-diziklazu
   39 peseta-ADJ two stamp give.LMP SUBOR-AUX
   Lit. 'If you give me two 39 peseta stamps.' (condition)

b. Ea 39 peseta-ko bi sei ru enamo diziklazu-n.
   DUB 39 peseta-ADJ two stamp give.PRT AUX-SUBOR
   Lit. 'If you give me two 39 peseta stamps.' (embedded question)
   (Alan King, p.c.)

11.3.1.3 Ellipted result clauses Another common source of requests is the
omission of main clauses stating a consequence of result, leaving explicit
only a reason clause, or more generally a clause giving background. In
Kayardild, insubordinated reason clauses—formally, a complementized
version of immediate, past, future, or resultative clauses, without any main
clause—can be used as hints. The reason is stated, but not the suggested
course of action, which is pragmatically obvious.

(44) mala-ntha bala-thurrrka kamarr-urrk
   sea-COBL hit-IMM.OBJ.COBL rock-IMM.OBJ.COBL
   '(Let's leave here,) because the sea is hitting the rocks now.'

(45) dathin-inja kunawun-inja rabi-jarra-nth rik-urrk
   that-COBL child-COBL get.up-PST-COBL crying-LOC.COBL
   wake-RES-COBL
   'Someone/you should comfort that child), because it's got up, because
   it's crying, because it's been woken up.'

(46) Kita Sotaro (p.c.) reports that in Japanese insubordinated 'because'
    clauses can be used in a similar way. An example with at least two quite
different interpretations is (46), which includes both request and other interpreta-
tions; similar interpretations are available with the structurally parallel but more
polite version (47).24

(47) Boku wa ik-ku kara
    I TOP go-PRES because
    'Since I am going, [please don't bother / don't worry / etc.].'
    'Since I am going, nobody else has to do it / the problem there will
    be solved etc.].'

11.3.1.4 Free-standing infinitives The use of free-standing infinitives for
requests is extremely widespread. Examples have already been given in
Italian (44) and German (2b); see also the data from Russian discussed by
Perlmutter (Chapter 8 above) and from various Daghestanian languages
discussed by Kalinina and Sumbatov (Chapter 7 above). In many languages
it is confined to written notices and other specialized contexts. But a good
example of a language allowing free-standing infinitives in the spoken form is
modern Hebrew. David Gil (p.c.) gives the following example of a lifeguard
who would continually admonish the bathers (over the megaphone) to move,
using an independent infinitive (48a); occasionally, when he felt he wasn't
being paid attention, he would elaborate by 'restoring' a matrix sentence (48b);
if he still was not obeyed, he would lose his temper and resort to a real
imperative, in this particular case employing the colloquial Hebrew option of
using the future as an imperative:

24 Oloss (1997: 350) gives an example of an insubordinated -koru clause being used to furnish an
excess for declining an invitation: A: 'Are you free today?' B: 'Yes, but because I'm tired (4-1 can't
make it).
In addition to infinitives, other nonfinite verb forms such as verbal nouns and causatives frequently occur in main clauses in a number of Daghastanian languages (see Kalinina and Sambatova, Chapter 7 above).

21.3.1.5 Warnings and admonitions Another type of interpersonal coercion widely expressed by the use of insubordinated clauses is the warning, admonition, or threat. In many unrelated languages this is expressed by an independent subordinate clause of purpose or negative purpose, spelling out the consequences to be avoided. Many Australian languages, for example, have a special type of subordinate clause, typically labelled 'lest', 'apprehensive', or 'reticitive' in grammars, which is used to express undesirable consequences to be avoided by carrying out the main clause action. An example from Diyarri has already been given in (15). For Kayardild, (49a) illustrates the subordinate use, while (49b) exemplifies an insubordinated use for giving a warning. See also example (50) from Basque, and (51) from Polish, where negative subjunctive clauses complemented with źęby can be used as warnings. Although Polish clauses of this type normally occur insubordinated, it is possible to insert mistrzę 'look out, pay attention' before them.

(49) a. walmathī kart-da rajuiri-n, ba-yit-nyarra on.top grass-NOM walk-NEGIMP bite-PASS-APPR yarbuth-iiwa-hnarr! snake-V.1AL2-APPR

'Don't walk across the grass, in case you get bitten by a snake.'

b. nyŋŋka ba-yit-nyarra kulkiji-iiwa-hnarr yonu.NOM bite-PASS-APPR shark-V.1AL2-APPR

'(Watch out/Do something,) you might get bitten by a shark.'

(50) crorā gabe, e!
fail.NOM.SIN without INTERJ
Lit. 'Without falling, huh!', i.e. 'Mind your step!' (Alan King, p.c.)
(As spoken, say, by a mother to a small child as they walk along a narrow path or down the garden steps.)

(51) Żęby-i siq tylko nie wywrocł-a in.order.that-you repl only not fall-PST-F

'Make sure you don't fall! You might fall!'

In most of these languages there is good comparative evidence that the subordinate use is historically prior; in Kayardild, for example, the apprehensive verb form -NHARRA derives from a verb complementized by the 'having' marker -MARRA. The extension to independent use then probably occurs through omission of the imperative, whose content is usually obvious if one knows the undesirable consequence, and which is in any case a face-threatening act. Insubordinated if-clauses may also be used as threats and warnings, as in English (52); the use of 'threatening intonation' and frequent presence of such lexical items as 'dare' distinguishes it from the 'if' requests.

(52) If you (dare) touch my car!

21.3.1.6 Insubordinated requests and politeness It is appropriate to end this section with some reservations about oversimplifications implicit in the account with which we began it, namely that insubordinated requests are favoured in requests for reasons of politeness by virtue of playing down the explicit interpersonal control made evident in imperatives and other direct commands.

The first problem is that some insubordinated requests actually sound more imperious than commands; an example is the French independent subjunctive.

A second problem is that insubordination may actually remove some markers of politeness; an example of this in Japanese is the ellipsis of kudasai 'please', etymologically meaning 'give'. Thus (53a), with a full main clause, is considerably more polite than the casual (53b):

(53) a. Are-o mi-te kudas-i. that-ACC look-PTCP give-PRES

'Look at that (for me). please.'

b. Are-o mi-te. that-ACC look-PTCP

'Look at that (for me)'

What seems more likely, then, is that the face-threatening nature of requests and commands places strong pressures on the language system to come up with new variants whose pragmatic force is freed from the history of existing formulas, and that insubordination provides one fertile source for this, but
that the actual pragmatic value of insubordinated clauses need not be more 'polite' than a more direct form.

11.3.2 Modal insubordination

Another widespread use of insubordination is to express various kinds of modal meaning, both epistemic—having to do with belief, truth, knowledge about the proposition—and deontic, i.e. 'concerned with action, by others and by the speaker himself' (Palmer 1986: 96) to bring about a state of affairs denoted by the proposition. Although both types of meaning get expressed by insubordinated clauses, there are interesting differences in the source constructions: whereas epistemic insubordination involves 'pure' markers of subordinate status, implicating ellipted main clauses of reporting, thinking, perceiving, or asserting, deontic insubordination frequently involves complementizers with additional semantic content, such as showing tense/mood relations between clauses.

In this section I also consider the frequent use of insubordinated clauses to express speaker reaction to the proposition, such as astonishment or disapproval, since they frequently display similar formal patterning. As Palmer (1986: 129) puts it: "if evaluatives are defined as attitudes towards known facts, they are not strictly modal at all. But they must be briefly considered, because they are sometimes included within, or as semantically closely related to, modal systems.'

Finally, because there are frequently further semantic developments from mood to tense, such as from purposive to future, the use of insubordination to yield new tense markers will also be discussed in this section.

11.3.2.1 Epistemic and evidential meanings

Probably the most common type of evidentializing insubordination involves the representation of indirect speech—whether of an identified participant in style indiciue librum, or simply of unidentified hearsay—by an independent subordinate 'form. Well-studied European examples are the use in indirect discourse of the accusative subject plus infinitive construction in Latin without overt framing quotative verb (54), or the subjunctive in German or Icelandic (25). As Hall (1964: 220–1) puts it, 'indications of subordination in parataxis can be used, in some languages, throughout long stretches of discourse to indicate their status as quotations or otherwise dependent elements.' He cites, as an example, the following Latin passage with its 'indirect discourse marked by sequences of infinitives in clauses printed as independent sentences. I give it here as transcribed in the

(54) locutus est pro his Diviciacus Aeduius: Galliae totius said is by these Diviciacus Aeduan in Gaul all factiones esse duas: harum alterius principatum tenere factiones be.Inf two of these one leadership.ACC hold-INF
Aeduis, alterius Arvernos. Hi cum tantopere Aeduii.ACC one Arvernii.ACC these so much de potentatu inter se multos annos contenterent, for political power among self many years vied factum esse, ut ab Arvernii Sequanis-que made.ACC be.Inf how by Arvernii Sequani-and Germans for pay were summoned
(Germa, de Bello Gallico, Book 13, 1, Loeb Classical Library edition)

Diviciacuses the Aeduan spoke on their behalf. 'In all Gaul,' he said, 'there are two parties; in one of them the Aedui have the primacy, in the other the Arverni. For many years there was a vehement struggle between the two for the dominion; then it came about that the Arverni and the Sequani summoned the Germans to their aid for a price…' (Quote continues in following paragraphs, not given here.)

Handford translation (p. 56 of Penguin Classics edition)
Their spokesman was the Aeduan Diviciacus. The Gauls, he said, were divided into two parties, one dominated by the Aedui, the other by the Arverni. After a fierce struggle for supremacy, lasting many years, the Arverni and Sequani hired some German mercenaries to help them.

Similar phenomena, though with different formal markers of subordination, are found in a wide range of languages. In Lithuanian, for example, indirect speech is normally reported with participles (see 13a). However, as an independent sentence, one could say (55), 'without accepting responsibility for the punctual departure of the train, by the use of the participle išeina' (Comrie 1978: 155).

(55) traukinių išeina lygių septintąjį valandą train.nom leave.PRES.3SG prompt.ADV seventh.ACC hour.ACC
'It is said that the train will leave promptly at seven o'clock.'
In Latvian as well (Comrie 1988: 135–4) the active past participle can be used to describe situations whose authenticity is not vouched for by the speaker; consequently it is common in fairy tales. See Comrie (1988: 153) for examples. While the participle form is noncommittal with respect to authenticity of the statement, there is a separate form, involving the suffix -ot, which is used to express uncertainty about the veracity of a statement, as in (56) as opposed to (57).

(56) Viņš esot bagāts
he.nom be.pres.infer rich.nom
'he is supposed to be rich'

(57) Viņš ir bagāts
he.nom be.pres.3 rich.nom
'he is rich'

Etymologically, this is a participial ending like the past participle it can also be used in indirect speech; compared to the quotative use of the past participle it has moved further towards syntactic independence (with its classification as a participle now being etymological rather than synchronic, according to Comrie 1988: 34), and semantically it now expresses uncertainty directly, rather than by implication from the fact of quotation.

Next door, in Estonian,26 free-standing clauses with quotative force, in the modus obliquus or ‘indirect’, as in (58), originated as subordinate clauses embedded under speech act verbs, as in (56), by a process of insubordination similar to those already discussed. See Campbell (1991) for a clear discussion of how this construction evolved, including evidence that the original ‘modus obliquus’ construction was an Estonian innovation that took place at a stage when the construction was still exclusively subordinate and had not yet been extended to main clauses, and which involved a reinterpretation of participles as finite verbs with a concomitant change in subject case marking from genitive to nominative. Wälchli (2003) contains further discussion in broader Baltic perspective.

(58) Ta tege-vat tōd-d
he.nom do-pres.incl work-party
'They say he is working.' (Campbell 1991: 287)

(59) Sai kuul-da, (et) seal üks mees ela-vat
get hear-ing that there one.nom man.nom live-mod.obj.
'He came to hear/he heard that (they say) a man lives there.'
(Campbell 1991: 287)

To illustrate a similar development from a totally different part of the world, in Sierra Miwok (Freeland 1951: 87–8), there are two ‘narrative tenses’, characteristically used in formal narrative when relating whole myths or anecdotes of old days. Although they occur in free-standing clauses, they have a number of formal features in common with subordinate constructions, lacking the pronominal subject suffix characteristic of normal main clauses. Freeland (1951: 87) comments: 'The narrative mode is obviously simply an extension in use of the subordinate mode...and illustrates the Miwok tendency to use as independent verbs, forms originally subordinate in character.' Presumably this originated as embedding under a main clause speech act verb, something like 'the old people said', although Freeland does not go into details on the exact mechanism.

Another manifestation of ‘evidentializing’ insubordination may involve the extension of logophoric pronouns to independent clause use. The canonical use of logophoric pronouns is in subordinate clauses embedded under matrix verbs of communication, thought, psychological state, or perception,27 to indicate coreference between a subordinate clause argument and the ‘epistemic source’ of the main clause (the sayer, knower, etc.). (60a) and (60b) contrast the use of logophoric and non-logophoric pronouns in Miwok subordinate clauses.

(60) a. Kofi be yë-dzo
Kofi say 1-loo-leave
'Kofi, said that he, left.'

b. Kofi be e-dzo
Kofi say 3-leave
'Kofi, said that (s)he, left.'

Now in some languages with logophoric pronouns it is possible to use them in main clauses to show ‘represented speech’ or ‘style indirect libre’ (Coulmas 1986: 7). In Tuburi, for example (Hagège 1974), logophoric pronouns may continue to be used at a great distance from the original locutionary verb that introduced them. Hagège (p. 298) cites an example in which an account of the origins of a clan, which began with the locutionary clause ‘my elders taught me that...’, continues to use logophoric pronouns thirty minutes into the text, as exemplified below. Here the logophoric acts as a sort of spoken inverted commas.

26 Areal influence is obviously a possibility here, though determining the direction of diffusion is problematic—see Campbell (1991), Wälchli (2000), and Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2000).

27 This list represents an implicational hierarchy, with types to the left more likely to trigger logophoric contexts (Stirling 1995: 229).
In fact, logophoric pronouns in Tuburi need not be introduced by a main clause locutionary verb at all. They may be used to indicate point of view, or to dissociate the speaker from the proposition (p. 300), in other words, they may have quotative evidential force.

In the case of such independent clause use of logophorics the historical arguments for regarding this as insubordination are weaker than with, say, participles, since we cannot be sure there was ever a stage where they were uniquely associated with subordinate clauses. It is equally possible that the constraint on their use has always been semantic (they can occur in utterances framed as thought or quotation), and that their statistical association with subordinate constructions is an epiphenomenon of the fact that these are the commonest grammatical contexts for such framing. We will not be able to answer this question until we have a better understanding of the historical syntax of logophorics.

Long-distance reflexives present a similar picture to logophorics. Typically found in subordinate clauses, they may also occur in insubordinated clauses, again typically accompanied by an independent subjunctive, and again, the semantic effect is to express represented speech or viewpoint. An Icelandic example using the long-distance reflexive sig, construed as coreferential with an elided 'thought' verb, was exemplified in (10) above. Sigurðsson (1986) cites such examples as evidence against a specifically syntactic account of Long Distance Reflexives in Icelandic, since they need not have any syntactic antecedent. Such LDRs are, he argues, interpreted semantically as referring to the 'story-experiencing self' in style indirekt freira, the erlendt Rade or 'represented speech and thought'. With their direct and conventionalized semantic interpretation of formally subordinate clauses, these represent a further possible case of insubordination. As far as the Long Distance Reflexives are concerned, there are the same caveats on whether they do in fact originate as subordinate constructions; but in this case they additionally involve independent uses of subjunctives, for which a subordinate clause origin is usually assumed.24

A semantically comparable case, but where the evidence for subordinate origins is much stronger due to the proliferation of overtly subordinating morphology in the form of 'complementizing case' suffixes distributed over

---

24 For further examples and discussion see Maling (1984a: n. 27) on Icelandic and Kameyama (1984: 239) on Japanese.
true perception-verb interpretation, vs. I hear/saw that the boat has come and I heard / saw I could hear I could see that the boat had come, in which the basis of knowledge may be more indirect, for example resulting from hearsay or inference.

We now turn to the question of why insubordinated clauses should be used for this range of functions, rather than simple clauses on the one hand or explicitly biclausal constructions (I think that X; it seems to be the case that X, etc.) on the other. I shall begin by considering the very insightful account by Schlobinsky (n.d.) of independent daß clauses in German client-centred therapeutic discourse. Then I shall extend the discussion to a more general level, and show why there are good pragmatic reasons, not limited to the specialized domain of client-centred therapy, why insubordinated clauses should be used in this way.

In German client-centred therapeutic discourse, therapists regularly follow turns by the client with insubordinated daß clauses which restate, suggest interpretations of, or clarify material in the client’s turn. Such insubordinated daß clauses are associated with a weakly rising intonation, which has the effect of passing back the turn to the client for further restatement. For example:

(66) Client: Ich glaub, also, ich geb erstmal klein bei, um (...) wenn ich jetzt nochmal was dagegen sage, kann ich mir einfach nicht erlauben, dann wird er wieder laut. Also muß ich schon mal klein begießen.

Therapist: Daß Sie doch jetzt das Gefühl haben, acht ducken zu müssen.

That you already have the feeling now you have to knuckle under. (Schlobinsky n.d.)

In Rogerian therapeutic discourse, insubordinated daß clauses are always connected to a client’s utterance, forming the second pair-part of an adjacency pair. The most significant thing about these clauses, from both a semantic and sociolinguistic point of view, is that they are unspecified with regard to facticity: ‘the attitude of the speaker remains unspecifie because of the absence of the modal operator’ (p. 12). The epistemic status of the proposition can only be interpreted through context, which may allow the speaker’s attitudes to be recovered inferentially.

Schlobinsky proposes the following functional reason why, in the context of client-centred therapy, insubordinated daß clauses are preferable to more explicit constructions with an overt main clause with an epistemic verb.

One could also imagine an utterance like ‘I think you are trying to play that down a bit.’ Here however the therapist would raise himself qua SubjectAgent to the discourse agent, and lessen the focus on the client. His utterance would therefore be more directive. By deleting the attitude operator in the superordinate clause the therapist takes his role back and takes the role of the client or reflects her conversational work without attributing a specific attitude to the client such as ‘you believe, are convinced, that p...’ It is exactly here that the two-party monologue is continued. As opposed to an utterance like ‘you have the feeling...’ the daß clause is unspecified with regard to facticity and thus allows the client to personally evaluate the proposition. The client is forced to take a position on the part of discourse in focus. (Schlobinsky n.d.: 17)

Schlobinsky thus stresses the specific social features of client-centred therapy as a reason for favouring the independent daß clause construction, in particular the non-directiveness of the therapist and the method of arriving at an analysis by joint focusing. But in fact similar characterizations could be made of normal conversation in many small-scale societies, such as Australian Aboriginal societies, in which conversation is normatively non-directive and epistemic statements are arrived at by negotiation of essentially equal conversational participants rather than clear assertion by a more knowledgeable person.

3.3.2.2 Deontic meanings A number of languages use insubordinated clauses to express various deontic meanings. In Latin, Italian, French, etc., the independent subjunctive can have a hortative meaning, while in several Baltic languages necessity is expressed by ‘deictive’ verbal nouns or infinitives (see Wulff 1990 for a survey of the Baltic data).

An Italian example of the use of an independent subjunctive with hortative meaning is:

(68) Si aggiunga poi che l’uomo è pedante a

Schlobinsky proposes the following functional reason why, in the context of client-centred therapy, insubordinated daß clauses are preferable to more explicit constructions with an overt main clause with an epistemic verb.
(69) Jón òyrfrí að fara heim
John had.shw.3sg to go home
'John should (would need to) go home.' (Sigurðsson 1986: 21)

According to Sigurðsson,
main clause subordinates reflect the speaker's feelings, opinions, etc.; the speaker feels
that John should go home and uses the preterite subordinate to express this (epistemic
modality) ... The speaker claims [the indicative equivalent] to be true in our (past)
world, whereas he claims [65] to be true in the 'world' of his own feelings, opinions,
desires, etc. (Sigurðsson 1986: 33).

In Dyrbrid 'implicated clauses' are basically subordinate and derive historically
(in the y-conjugation at least) from the addition of a complementizing
purposive case marker -gu to the verb (this is cognate with the Yankunytjarra
purposive -ku exemplified in 38). Normally they indicate that the subor-
dinate clause is a consequence of the main clause, as in:

(70) balan ðugumbl baŋgil yara-tga baľga-n, bađi-gu
DEMI.IN.ACC woman.ACC DEM.I.ERG man-ERG hit-NP fall-IMP.
'Man hits woman, causing her to fall down.' (Dixon 1972: 68)

However, implicated clauses may also be used independently with the mean-
ing 'must' or 'has to', as in the following examples:

(71) balan ðugumbl miyana-yaŋ
DEMI.IN.ACC woman.NOM laugh-IMP.
'The woman wants to laugh (i.e. something has happened to make her
want to laugh, and she will have to restrain herself to avoid doing so).'
(Dixon 1972: 69)

(72) bai yara yanuli
DEMI.IN.ACC man.NOM go-IMP.
'The man has to go out (for some reason).'

Dixon offers a plausible explanation for the development of subordinate
implicated clauses into subordinate deontic clauses: the obligation arises
from a causal (or 'implicating') connection between an earlier, unreported
event and the obligatory event. In other words, insubordination allows the
causal relationship expressible by interclausal morphosyntax to be harnessed
for the expression of the causal element present in all deontics of obligation.

Another Australian language, Ngikyambo (Donaldson 1980), uses the same
form in subordinate clauses of purpose (73) and as a deontic, usually trans-
lated 'must' (74) or 'has got to' (75), in main clauses. Although Donaldson
does not analyse the main clauses as derived by ellipsis from the purposive
construction, the fact that this is the only main clause inflection also serving in
nonfinite subordinate clauses suggests that the main clause construction
arises from an insubordinated clause, with a similar semantic develop-
ment to Dyrbrid. Interestingly, verbs in the -i-conjugation have the same
form, -li, as implicated verbs in the Dyrbrid -i-conjugation, suggesting a form
of some antiquity given that the two languages are not closely related.

(73) qadhu-na gëjìyi / girma-1-i qinu:
1SG.NOM-3ABS shìy:PEF wake-CM-PURP you.OBL.
'I told her to wake you.' (Donaldson 1980: 280)

(74) qadhu bawuag-ga yuwa-giri
1SG.NOM middle-LOC lie-PURP
'I must lie in the middle.' (Donaldson 1980:162)

(75) buru-duhu dhitigs dha-1-i
child-ERG meat.ABS eat-CM-PURP
'The child has got to eat meat.' (Donaldson 1980: 162)

11.3.2.3 Exclamation and evaluation Insubordinated that clauses in English,
dash clauses in German, and subjunctives in Italian can be used to express
evaluation, with reconstructable main clause predicates such as 'I am amazed',
'I am shocked', or 'I would not have expected'. Quirk et al. (1985: 841)
comment in this regard on 'the omission of the matrix clause... being
minetic of speechless amazement'. For further discussion and data in this
volume, see also the discussion of nonfinite exclamative clauses in Bagwalal
and Dargwa in the chapter by Kalinin and Sumbatova (Chapter 7 above).

Examples for English (76) are from Quirk et al. (1985)—who do not,
however, supply reconstructions of the ellipsed material—and for German
(77), from Buscha (1976).

(76) a. [I am amazed and shocked] That he should have left without asking me!
 b. That I should live to see such ingratitude!

(77) a. [Ich wandere mich.] Daß du immer noch Witze
 I am.amazed REFPL that you still still jokes
mache-en kann-st!
make-INF CAN-2SG
'I am amazed' that you can still make jokes (about it).'
b. Daß ich dich hier treffe[n] würde / [habe ich nicht 
that I you here meet would, say have I not 
erwartet] 
expected

'I didn't expect that I would meet you here'

Similar constructions using a range of wh-questions with subordinate word order also exist in both languages (78, 79); both examples in (78) were heard from speakers of Australian English in Melbourne, January 1996. Buscha (1976) and Weuster (1982) discuss comparable examples in German in some detail (they are not discussed in Quirk et al.). The reconstructable ellipses are basically comparable in both languages, and express astonishment or surprise, with either 1st person or indefinite 3rd person subjects: 'I’m amazed at [how...]; 'I don’t understand [how...]; 'No one understands [why...].
Frequently exclamative intonation is also used.

(78) a. [I don’t understand] How they can bot on a bloody dog like that!

b. [Can anyone tell me] Why they don’t schedule the under 1st first!

(79) a. [Ich wundere mich.] Wie du das nur mach-sst? 
I am amazed REFL how you that only do-3SG

'[I’m amazed] how on earth you can do that!’ (Buscha 1976)

b. [Niemand begreift-3SG] Warum du wohl nie zu Potte 
no-one understand-3SG why you well never to pottery

kommen-st

'[No one understands] why you can never get going.’

(Weuster 1983: 56)

A third type of insubordinated clause, employing a main clause infinitive, can be used to express surprise in English (80):

(80) a. To think that she should be so ruthless! (Quirk et al. 1983)

b. To think that I was once a millionaire! (Quirk et al. 1983)

Quirk et al. (p. 84a) argue that '[t]he implied subject in such sentences is the first person pronoun,' although they later broaden this to include indefinite subjects in their analysis of the reconstructed material as 'It surprises me to think...’ or 'It surprises one to think...'. The tendency of ellipses subjects to be construed as 1st person will be returned to in section 11.4.2.

A further nonfinite structure used in English, Spanish, and other languages to express hypothetical events (often then repudiated in a further sentence) was illustrated in example (1), and originally discussed for English by Akmajian (1984). See Extepare and Grohmann (2005) for discussion of their meaning and syntactic properties.

11.3.2.4 New tense categories through deictic recentering. Given the cross-linguistic tendency for obligation to develop into future tense, it is not surprising that there should be constructions which develop from (subordinate) purpose clause to (in)subordinated deontics with meanings of obligation or intention and on to (in)subordinated markers of futurity. Blake (1976: 422–3) discusses the development of purpose case markers in Australian languages to complementizers on purpose clauses to markers of desiderative and on to future in some languages; the dative/purpose case suffix -ku in Australian languages of the Pama-Nyungan family is a well-known example, and has been exemplified with purpose-complement and permissive uses above for Dyirbal and Yankunytjara, but in some other languages it occurs as a future marker, as with the Pitjantjatjara dialect of the Western Dialect language (Blake 1976: 422).

(81) minyma yula-ku

woman CRY-FUT(=DAT)

'The woman will/may cry.'

A comparable but independent series of developments has occurred with the suffix -kur(l)/ku in another Australian family, Tangic. Basically a propositive case suffix marking 'having', it is used in all Tangic languages to mark intention goals, e.g. 'look for kangaroo-PROF.' i.e. 'look for, having a kangaroo (in mind). In all modern Tangic languages and therefore almost certainly in proto-Tangic it can also be used for purpose clauses, being added both to the verb stem and its non-subject arguments. The following example is from Yulka, which appears to preserve the proto-Tangic structure in all essential respects:

(82) wanjiJa-kadi [marliyan-kuru bala-thurlu]suno

go UP-IND-PRES PROF POSSUM-PROF hit-7HM-PROF

c. 'I’m climbing up to hit that possum.'

In addition to this original complementizing use of the propositive, Kayardild and Lardili have evolved an independent, insubordinated use. The carrying of complementizing case marking on NPs into main clause constructions has been rise to the strange phenomenon of 'modal case', by which non-subject

-i.e. the root plus the conjunctive 'thematic'; it is possible this stem functioned as a participle-base.
NP's take case-type suffixes encoding mood and tense choices (see Dench and Evans 1988; Evans 1995a; 1995b).

In Kayardild, whose verbal semantics are known in most detail, and where the gloss 'potential' is used for this inflection, the insubordinated use has a wide semantic range that includes future, prescription, desire, and ability, as attested by (83). -\text{-thu} and -\text{-wu} are the Kayardild equivalents of Yukulta -\text{-thurla} and (in another declension) -\text{-kurla} (see Evans 1995a).

(83) dathin-a dangka-a balu-thu bijarrib-a \text{-wu}
that-NOM man-NOM hit-POT dugong-MPROP
'\text{That man will/must/wants to/can hit the dugong.}'

The development to future is likely to have been the endpoint of a shift that began, at the time insubordination occurred, with a shift from relative to absolute 'intentional' meanings, i.e. from 'at the time of the main clause, X intended to do Y' to 'now X intends to do Y'; this was followed with a semantic extension from intention to futurity.

The developments just described clearly involve modality evolving from the semantics of the case marking complementizer, and are comparable to the evolution of various deontic modal categories from insubordinated purposes, already described in section 11.3.4.2. But in parallel to this development, Kayardild and Lardil applied similar processes of insubordination to other subordinate clauses using complementizing case markers to show relative tense; in the process new categories of absolute tense evolved, as 'immediate present' evolved from 'simultaneous' subordinate clauses marked with a complementizing locative, and 'past' evolved from 'prior' subordinate clauses marked with a complementizing ablative.

For example, 'prior' subordinate clauses are found in Yukulta. They are marked by an ablative case on non-subject NPs in the subordinate clause, and a special 'prior' form of the verb, -\text{-jarrib}-\text{-tharrba}, which is etymologically analyzable into conjunctional thematic th/ plus the consequential case suffix -\text{-ngjarriba}, closely linked semantically to the ablative. Comparative evidence suggests the subordinate clause construction in proto-Tangkic allowed NPs to take either the ablative or the consequential case, but that Yukulta has eliminated the second possibility. Such 'prior' subordinate clauses express events that began before the main clause; they may overlap, as in the case of (84), or precede it entirely (see Keen 1972; 1983 for examples).

(84) kurrija-nganta [kabaj-inaba jawi-jarrib]
sek-ind-ind-a-pst sayd-abi. inu-prior
'I saw you running on the sand.'

Kayardild and Lardil still allow the subordinate clause use, but have additionally extended such clauses to main clause use through insubordination. In both languages, the resultant clause type serves as a marked way of describing pass events (the unmarked way is to use the 'actual' verb inflection which does not distinguish past from present); an example is (85). Non-subject NPs bear the 'modal ablative' case (in Kayardild), and the past verb inflection is a reduced form of -\text{-jarrib}-\text{-tharrba}.

(85) ngada yakurri-na jungarrib-a na ra-jarr
iseq-nom fish-MABL big-MABL speec-PST
'I speared a big fish.'

Insubordination, in this case, has led to a recentring of the relationship of temporal priority. Instead of holding between the main clause and the subordinate clause, it now holds between the speech act and the insubordinated clause. Compare the former process has been applied to the old simultaneouess clause construction, whose insubordinated reflex in Kayardild has an 'immediate present' reading. These changes form part of a suite of insubordinations that have given rise to the majority of tense/mood inflections in Kayardild and Lardil, with their unusual patterning of marking tense/mood both on the verbal inflection and on non-subject NPs through the device of 'modal case'.

The changes described above have run to completion in the sense that the resultant clauses have no synchronic formal reason to be described as subordinate in Kayardild or Tangkic—in fact, as a result of the prevalence of this method for recruiting new tense/mood categories, they are now the canonical main clause type (see Evans 1995a; ch. 20 for details).

In addition to this 'first round', however, there is a second round of insubordination still taking place in Kayardild, and producing a new 'relevant present' construction. This construction is used for a present situation, usually newly arisen, that motivates the speaker's comment (86) or curiosity (87); informants always translate these clauses with 'now'.

(86) [dathin-inja dangka-nha natha-mandurr]
that-corr man-corr camp-locc-corr
'\text{That man is married now (i.e. sleeps in his own camp, with his new wife).}'

\footnote{As with the possessive, processes of final truncation make the correspondence with the Yukulta form less than perfect, but the forms found in phonologically protected environments, i.e. before either case suffixes, show the cognition more clearly. For example the Kayardild possessive, normally \text{-kura} or \text{-wu}, becomes \text{-kurru} or \text{-wurr} before an outer locative case and the deaccent of proto-Tangkic 0 in Kayardild is regular, similarly the ablative, normally -\text{-kura} in Kayardild, becomes -\text{-kura} before a following locative case suffix. See Evans (1995a) for details.}
Such clauses clearly pattern formally as subordinate clauses. In terms of their morphosyntax they are identical to the ‘complement-tized clauses’ whose various other functions have been described above in section 11,3.2.11: they bear a complementizing case (oblique or locative according to the person of the clause’s subject) outside all other inflections, and their subjects, if pronominal, have special forms for the complementizing oblique. In terms of their semantics, it is most likely that they have developed from the ‘perceptual complement’ clauses discussed in section 11.3.2.1—from ‘(I see/hear) X happening now’ to ‘X [is] happening now’ as the matrix perception predicate underwent ellipsis—but the link to present experience and relevance remained.

Unlike most of the functional types of insubordination described above, which have independent attestation in a range of language families, the use of insubordination to recruit new tense categories is largely limited to the Tangic group; it may have arisen as a response to the paucity of tense/mood categories in the proto-language (McCorvall 1983). However, there are occasional parallels from other languages.22

In Dyrbal (Dixon 1972: 104), dependent relative clauses in -gu (which is probably related to an ablative formative -gu- widespread in Pama-Nyungan) have a perfective reading. As subordinate relatives, ongoing or complete interpretations are allowed:

(88) baggu yugu-ugu [gunba-gu-ru] baggul
DEm.ERG.4V tree-ERG cut-REL-ERG DEM.ERG.4V
yapa-ugu ] bagguu biridju balga-n
man-ERG.decl nearly hit-PROX

The tree which the man cut nearly fell on me.

(89) pa7a [ balan dugumbil jina-ju ] buu-n
1SG.NOM DEM.ABS.2I WOMAN.ABS sit-REL SEE-PRES

I am watching the woman who is sitting down.

22 For another Australian example, see Deen (forthcoming), who discusses the development, in Nyamal, of an original dativemarked nominalized construction into a narrative present, via independent perspective, to a use to describe culmination points in sequential narratives (‘narrative prospective’), to narrative present more generally, to standard present.

But they may be also used as main clauses, in which case only the complete interpretation is allowed:

(90) pa7a babil-7a-pu ba-gu-m mirap-gu
1SG.NOM scrape-ANTIPASS-REL DEM-DAY-3I black-bean-DAT

'I've scraped the beans.'

There are many languages around the world where perfect or perfective-type constructions, which originated as copula plus complete or resultative participle, lose the copula through time so that the synchronic past perfective is etymologically a participle of some type. The perfective in most Slavic languages has arisen in this way in section 11.2.7 we excluded these from being considered ‘insubordination’ because they have a biclausal (or at least biverbal) origin. Functionally, however, the Dyrbal and Kanyardil examples discussed above may be very similar, except that the lack of a copula in their previous language states meant that participles and nominalizations of various types could serve directly as a nonfinite predicate, without needing an auxiliary verb.

A non-Australian example of nominalized / gerundive forms developing an incipient independent use in a way that is reminiscent of Dyrbal and Kanyardil is in the South Semitic language Tigrinya. Here what Leslau (1941: 85) calls the ‘gerundive’ (geründif),23 which can be used in subordinate clauses to express simultaneity or anteriority with respect to the main clause, may also be used independently to express a resultant state. Although Leslau’s description actually cites the independent use first, other authors emphasize that the dependent use is primary. Kogan (1997: 439) states:

Used independently, the gerund denotes the result of an action in the past (mostly from verbs with stative meaning) … In most cases, however, the gerund is found followed by another verb in the perfect or imperfect and denotes an action simultaneous or anterior to this one [the action expressed by the main verb].

It is also possible to use the gerund independently in the closely related Amharic:

A

23 In discussing the historical origins of the gerund, in turn, Leslau proposes (1955: 56), for the closely related Amharic, that a form like adhem ‘having broken, pl’ derive ‘through a process such as ‘breaking’ > ‘be breaking’ > ‘he having broken’. This elaborates the earlier position taken by Deen, who asserted for Amharic: ‘Le geründif, ancien nom verbal conjugué au moyen des pronoms des de nom, se ser normalement, lorsque il est seul, qu’être des arcs de propositions de seules incidences’ (Colin 1996: 18).
At times the gerund stands alone at the end of the sentence without a principal verb. It then behaves like a finite verb. This usage of the gerund occurs when it refers to, or is a continuation of, a thought expressed in the preceding statement, or in answer to a question. The gerund is then uttered with a rising-falling tone on the last syllable. (Leslau 1995: 363)

For example, in replying to the question kābbāda ṭat ṣallā [Kebbede where exist.3.SG.FV] ‘where is Kebbede?’, a possible reply is the 3rd masculine gerundive form had-a, lit. ‘his having gone’, but translates in this context as ‘Why, he has already left.’ Given the availability of ample textual material in the liturgical language Ge'ez, ancestral to both Amharic and Tigrinya, a diachronic study of how this construction developed would be fascinating, but as far as I know has yet to be carried out: Leslau (1999: 81) writes: ‘The details on the gerund in the various Ethiopian languages still await a thorough investigation.’

11.3.3 Signalling presupposed material

A third function of insubordinated clauses is to signal high levels of presupposed material in the insubordinated proposition, i.e. signalling relatively specific presuppositions about the discourse context in which the sentence can occur (see also Chapter 7 above by Kalinina and Sumbatov for a discussion of the impact of high presuppositionality in the use of nonfinite forms in Daghestani main clauses). Specific examples of this use of insubordination are (a) negation, (b) focus constructions, (c) discourse contrast, (d) stipulated conditions before asserting to preceding assertions in interaction, (e) reiterations, (f) disagreement with assertions by the previous speaker. I shall discuss each in turn below.

11.3.3.1 Negation

Givón (1979: 107) has observed that ‘negative assertions are used in language in contexts where the corresponding affirmative has been mentioned, deemed likely, or where the speaker assumes that the hearer—erroneously—holds to a belief in the truth of that affirmative.’ Leech (1983: 298–9) makes a similar point in terms of implicature from negatives to positives: ‘If X is a negative proposition, and if F is the most communicatively significant feature within the “scope of negation” in X and if Y is a proposition identical to X except that it is positive and does not contain F, then X implicates Y.’ We shall see below that many languages display formal similarities between negatives and subordinate forms, and will account for this by proposing that such negatives were originally subordinated to main clauses bearing the main assertion.

Kroskity (1984) proposes this line of analysis for Arizona Towa (Tanoan, Kiowa-Tanoan), where the language negative verbs combine a prefix we- with a suffix -di which is formally a subordinator. Compare (93), which exemplifies a subordinate adverbial clause, with (93), a simple negative clause:

\[
(91) \text{he's seen na-mun-di ‘o-yohk’o that man is-stat-go-superior 3-stat-be-asleep}
\]

‘When that man went, I was asleep.’ (Kroskity 1984)

\[
(92) \text{sen kwiyo we-mun-mun-di man woman neg-3>3 active-see-neg-2.3}
\]

‘The man did not see the woman.’

It is important to note that in Arizona Towa there is no grammatical means for indicating the scope of the negation within the clause itself, unlike in the Isleta Tiwa dialect, where different negation scopes are shown by different placements of the negative affix (Leap 1975; Kroskity 1984). Instead it simply conjoins, as a main clause, an assertion which implicates the scope of the negative. Examples (93–5) below exemplify the use of this construction to negate subject/agent, object and predicate respectively. Note that the analysis of -di as a negative suffix means that, in modern Towa, it must be followed by a homophonous doublet acting as a subordinator.

\[
(93) \text{Kada we-mun-mun-di-di dō-mun}
\]

Kada neg-3>3 active-see-neg-superior 3>3 active-see ‘Kada did not see her/him/it, I did!’

\[
(94) \text{se’ewe we-dō-kup’e-wan-di-dī t’ummele}
\]

pottery neg-1>3 active-sell-compl-neg-superior plaque dō-kup’e-wan 1>3 active-sell-compl ‘I didn’t sell pottery, I sold a (wicker) plaque.’

\[
(95) \text{he’i kwiyo sen we-mun-hec-’an-di-dī}
\]

that woman neg-3>3 active-sick-compl-neg-superior man-hay 3>3 active-sick ‘That woman didn’t make the man sick, she killed him.’

Kroskity suggests that, at an earlier phase of the language, negatives were typically biclausal structures with the following structural analysis:

Kroskity imposes this to Uto-Aztecan, following Whorf and Trager (1932), but recent classification do not support this hypothesis and consider it part of Kiowa-Tanoan (Campbell 1997: 136–9).

References for this information.

Kroskity argues that the availability of positional options is an ideational innovation.
The -di subordinator, through association with negation, was probably reanalysed as a negative suffix. A further reanalysis saw 'elliptical negatives' (the negative S plus subordinator but without any following affirmative) reanalysed as simple negatives through insubordination, and the -di reanalysed as a negative rather than a subordinate marker. Once this reanalysis had taken place, overtly subordinated clauses then needed to be marked by a second -di, as exemplified in (99-100).

Krookrity cites a number of other languages in which negatives are morphologically associated with subordinate clauses. In the Numic language Kawaiisu (Muñoz 1976: 308), part of the Numic branch of Uto-Aztecan (Campbell 1997: 134), negatives differ from affirmatives in three ways: by an overt negative marker, by assigning object case to their subject, and by employing 'series II' verb endings, characteristic of embedded or nominalized clauses. An example is:

(97) ta'ni-pazi-a yuwaist pi-ke-e-ne-ma mono-o na man-o neg see-pst-series-II 3anim>3anim woman-o

'The man didn’t see the woman.'

In Western Mono (Bethel et al., n.d.), another Numic language within Uto-Aztecan (Campbell 1997: 134), negative imperatives take a subordinating suffix on the verb.

A number of Australian languages display similar correlations. In the Warburton Ranges dialect of Western Desert (Douglas 1964: 53), negatives usually juxtapose a positive verb bearing tense/mood/aspect with a negated nominalized verb. (98) and (99) illustrate negative imperatives; (100) a negative indicative.

(98) wanga-nja-maal-pa kamara-ri-e!
    talk-nmlz-neg-nom  quiet-pst-imp

'Don’t talk, be quiet!' (Lit. ‘Not talking, be quiet.’)

(99) tjarpatju-nkurja-maal-tu yila-lal
    insert-nmlz-neg-erg pull-imp

'Don’t insert it, pull it!’

(100) ngayulu wangka-nja-maal-pa kamara-ri-ngu
    I talk-nmlz-neg-nom quiet-pst-compl

'I didn’t talk, but became quiet.'

In some related dialects all negative verb forms are historically nominalizations suffixed with the privative ('without') case; it is no longer necessary to conjoin an affirmative. In the Yankunytjatjara dialect, negation simply involves privativized nominalization:

(101) katja-lu wangka ngayi-nya kuli-nja wiya
    son-erg talk-acc me-acc listen-nmlz not

'(My) son doesn’t heed my words.'

Similar historical processes may be assumed to have applied in other languages, such as Kayteeye (not closely related to Western Desert), where negative forms of the verb employ a privative nominalized form:

(102) ape-nge-wamencye
    go-nmlz-priv

'not go' (Lit. ‘without going’)

It seems likely that in all these languages the use of insubordinated verb forms in negative clauses arose in the way outlined by Krookrity. At first subordinate negative verbs were conjoined with main clause affirmatives; then the affirmatives were elided; then the originally elliptical negative was reanalysed as a free-standing main clause, and the subordinating morphology was reanalysed as negative morphology. The synchronic result is that one type of main clause, high in presuppositionality, shows morphological affinities with subordinate clauses.

11.3.3 Contrastive focus constructions Negative clauses presuppose the existence of some affirmative clause which is being disconfirmed by the negative. Contrastive focus clauses are high in presuppositionality for another reason: they presuppose a clause which is similar, but predicated of another referent. For example, the relative clause It’s John who I saw presupposes the relevance of a clause asserting that I saw someone other than John. Many languages develop focus clauses from subordinate clauses
by a route something like the English cleft, without the initial presentative: 'John SUB I saw.'

An example of a language using subordinate forms for marked focus constructions is the Australian language Ngandi (Heath 1989). Like many Australian languages, Ngandi has a single generalized subordinate clause type, marked formally by the prefix ga- inside the verbal word. Typically ‘a simple subordinated -ga- clause functions to provide background for the juxtaposed (usually directly following) matrix clause’ (p. 58). This meshes with a leisurely discourse style in which each previous clause is reiterated as background to the next, as in:

(103) gu-wolo-yuŋ buluy par-udu-ni par-ga-rug-ni
    Gun.class-that-ABS indeed PL.EXC-go-PRS INFL.EXC-SUB-go-PRS
    par-war?tu-ni
    IPL.EXC-look-PRS
    ‘...then indeed we go along; going along, we take a look...’

Alongside this genuine subordinate use, we find formally subordinate verbs in -ga- also used for what Heath calls ‘focus constructions’, in which ‘a constituent other than the verb is highlighted as clause focus’. These may be translated into English by inversion constructions (104), passives (105), or cleft constructions (106). From a discourse perspective, what is important is that the non-focused persons are presupposed, but the connection of the focus with the non-focused part is newly asserted.

(104) gu-djavel-gic ya-ga-rug-ni
    Gun.class-country-ALL 1SG-SUB-go-PST.CONT
    ‘I went to the country’, ‘To the country I went.’

(105) gu-mulmu ni-gu-ga-r-gi ni-deremu-le
    Gun.class-grass 3PL.GN.GU-SUBOR-SEE-PST.CONT M.SG-MAN-ERP
    ‘The man saw the grass’, ‘The grass was seen by the man.’

(106) Q: ba-jja ba-ga-rug-ni
    PL-who 3PL.EXC-SUB-go-PST.CONT
    A: ni-deremu ni-ga-rug-ni
    M.SG-MAN 3PL.GN-SUB-go-PST.CONT
    Q: ‘Who went? A: ‘The man went / It was the man who went.’

It seems likely that constructions like these have evolved via a cleft-type construction in which a NP was presented simply by mentioning it (i.e. with no overt presentative), and followed by a relative clause: ‘it’s the man (who) went (suborn).’ Subsequently a merger of intonation contours yielded a single clause with a marked informational status. What is important for our analysis here, and parallel to the case with insubordinate negative clauses, is that the insubordinated part (here, the ga-verb) is presupposed, not asserted.

Similar focusing uses of a generalized subordinate clause type are found in several other Gunwingguan languages of Arnhem Land, including Rembarrnga (McKay 1975), Ngkalak (Merian 1983), Mangarayi (Merian 1986; 1988) and Jawoyn (Merian 1988). In Rembarrnga subordination is signalled by a special series of pronominal pronouns to the verb. Subordinate clauses have a wide range of functions, both adnominal and adverbial, with the exact interpretation determined by context and by the TAM categories. Of interest here is the fact that subordinate clauses can be used independently for contrasted objects, as in:

(107) yarapa?-waŋ?-miŋ muṯulŋa-kaŋa-kaŋŋaŋ? ken
    UNI1.AUX-look-PST.PUN saratoga-fish-DIM-small woops
    muṯulŋa-kaŋa-kaŋŋaŋ? dirmar-kaŋa-kaŋŋaŋ? biri-dol?-miŋ
    saratoga-DIM-small barramundi-DIM-small 3SG.SUBOR-float-
    PST.PUN
    ‘We saw a lot of little saratogas... Woops! Little saratogas... It was little barramundis which were floating.’ (McKay 1975: 346)

In Ngkalak such generalized subordination is achieved by suffixing -nku to the verb. Historically this probably derives from a complementizing use of a dative/purpose case marker, which has the form -gan, -gen, or -gin in other Gunwingguan languages of the area. (108) illustrates a true subordinate use—here interpreted as a relative clause—while (109) illustrates an object-contrasting use in an insubordinated clause.

    3/4-tell-AUX-PST.CONT F-thAT-DAT F-old.person-DAT
    meŋeri Ø-man-jŋ-jŋin mu-juŋu
    Hodgson.Downs 3/4-make-PST-PUN-SUBOR v1-g-lancewood
    ‘They told me about the old woman who made the lancewood at Hodgson.Downs’

(109) ngi-gun?biri barramunu gur-ne-jŋ-gan
    M-thing sand-goanna INCPL.PL.COOK-PUT-SUBOR
    ‘It’s the sand goanna we will cook.’ ‘We’ll cook the sand goanna.’

Merian (1981), whose article describing these constructions explicitly addresses the relationship between mood, focus, and subordination, argues that: ‘subordination simply acts as an instruction to relate the subordinate clause to some part of the message, the precise relation being subject to interpretation by a
variety of textual and other cues. Subordination in languages like Mangarayi is thus directly and primarily a part of the language system for expressing the relation of parts of the message to other parts. In view of its function in information structuring, it is perhaps not surprising to find that in a number of northern languages with generalized subordinate clauses, that which marks subordination also functions at the intrACLASS level in structuring focused configurations. (p. 200)

In Kayardild (Evans 1995a: 534), object-focused clauses (used, for example, when the object is given but not the subject) are unmarked, and the focused NP is either omitted or escapes case marking:

(110) ngiiyura mima-tharra-nth
    1SG.COB.1 beget-PST-COB.1
    'He's my son.' (Lit. 'I begot (him)'; ('He's the one whom) I begot')

11.3.3 Trans-sentential contrast and switch-reference. Switch-reference is primarily a device for indicating whether relations of coreference or non-coreference, and perhaps also of temporal or molar equivalence, hold between a matrix and subordinate clause. A clause marked with SR morphology thus presupposes a matrix whose subject differs from its own, or whose tense or modality bears a significant relationship of sameness or difference to its own. In many Australian languages, including the Mparntwe Arrernte case discussed below, there is evidence of a subordinate origin for switch-reference markers, which originate as case markers with clausal scope (Austin 1981b; Dench and Evans 1988).

An example of such canonical SR use from the Central Australian language Mparntwe Arrernte (Wilkins 1988), is the contrast between 'same-subject' (SS) marking on the subordinate clause in (111) and 'different-subject' (DS) marking in (112):

(111) artwe-le alye-le-me-le kere ite-le
    man-SUB sing-DTR-NPST.PROG-SS meet COOK-PST.COMPL
    'The man cooked the meat while singing.'

(112) artwe alye-le-me-reli geere peye-me
    man sing-DTR-NPST.PROG-DS 1SG.NOM come-NPST.PROG
    'I'm coming while the man is singing.'

But switch-reference marking is also sometimes found on independent clauses, where it functions as a cohesive device for indicating tense relations between subsequent independent clauses, or common or disjoint reference across turns by different speakers. Wilkins (1988: 159) cites the following example:

(113) tawle renhe kemparre twe-me arlwe-re-yame
    tail 3SG.ACC first hit-ss cat-PST.PROG
    [long pause]
    ikwere-re-yame kwulre, arrerre me arratelycerenre
    390.DAY-TIME hearDAT demon 390.NOM appear-go.and.do-DS
    'He chopped up the tail and was eating it. [Long pause]. It was then, they say, when the cannibal arrived on the scene.' (Wilkins 1988: 155)

He comments: 'The split into two sentences in this way presumes the "simultaneity" of the two events, most commonly expressed through switch-reference clauses, and also serves to highlight the entrance of a character who is to play an important role as the text unfolds.'

Such uses of SR markers in independent clauses may also be a powerful device for integrating successive conversational turns: 'a participant in a conversation may interject, add to, or question the statement of another participant, by using a sentence that is a clause morphologically subordinated (marked for same- or different-subject) to a sentence uttered by another participant.' An example is:

(114) A: yeah, ikwere-kere, re pente-le kwete,
    INTERJ 390.DAY-PROP 390G follow-PST.COMPL still
    bullock re
    bullock 390.NOM
    'Yeah, (they walked along) with it. That bullock, he kept on following (them).'

B: nhenge kaltyirre-mele, eh?
    remember learn-SS INTERJ
    'Was (that one we're talking about) learning (as he followed along)'

Different-subject markers may also indicate contrasting activities or directions, and as such may become conventionalized at event boundaries such as leave-takings. John Henderson (p.c.) reports that two common leave-taking expressions in Mparntwe Arrernte involve different subject markers attached to independent verbs:

(115) kele yenge lhe-me-ngg
    OK I go-PST-DS
    'As for me, well I'm off.' (I don't know what you're up to, but . . .)

(116) urekhe arre-tyenhe-ngg
    later see-PST-DS
    'See you later.'
The function of SR morphology may thus be extended from the grammaticalized linking found in complex sentences to the pragmatically presupposed linking found in conversational turns, and adjacency pairs like leave-taking sequences. In some cases, such as (115), it may be possible to plausibly supply an ellipsed segment in such cases we may wish to analyse these as cases of ellipsis. In others like (116), however, a stage of conventionalization appears to have been reached where it is no longer normal or even possible to supply the missing material, so we may wish to consider this a case of insubordination.

11.3.3.4 Conditions on preceding assertions in interaction  Very similar to the insubordinated SR clause is the adaptation, for cohesive purposes, of other constructions normally associated with subordinated clauses, such as the use of 'if' clauses to limit agreement with a previous speaker by laying down a particular condition (117). As Ford and Thompson (1986: 368) put it in their discussion of this example, 'the speaker who states the condition does not repeat the main clause, but merely gives the condition which relates to a preceding proposition (although not the speaker's own claim)'. In this case, however, it seems likely that we are only dealing with ellipsis, harnessed to interactional cohesion, since there is obviously recoverable ellipsed material, along the lines of 'I admit that it's possible, if...'. In this example.

(117) S: Is it practically impossible to have that kind of curve?  I: If you have this base.

11.3.3.5 Reiteration  A further example of insubordination in cases high in presuppositionality involves their use in reiterating clauses of a subordinate form appropriate to embedding under a main clause such as 'if I said [ ]' or 'I asked [ ]' may be used independently, with ellipsis of the main clause reporting the speech act. Here the context of mutually manifest repetition makes the restoration of the ellipsed speech act verb quite clear.

We have already seen an example of this from German in section 11.2.6, with verb-final word order being used independently when repeating a question, and the speech act main clauses ich frage 'I asked' or ich sage 'I said' ellipsed. A more intricate example comes from Basque, which uses different subordinate forms for statements, questions, and commands. The basic form of a verb such as dator 'is coming' (118) will be changed, when embedded under an epistemic or reportative predicate, to the subjunctive

18 I am indebted to Alan King (1995 and p.c.), from whose work the Basque examples and analysis are adapted.

form datorrela (119); when a question (120) is so embedded, the form will be datoren (121).

(118) Jon d-a-tor  John 3SG.ABS-PRES-come  'John's coming.'
(119) Uste d-u-t Jon d-a-torr-elal  think 3ABS-AUX-sg  John 3ABS-PRES-come-dbc sbjv  'I think John's coming.'
(120) Jon d-a-tor  John 3SG.ABS-PRES-come  'Is John coming?'
(121) Ez d-a-ki-t (ex) Jon d-a-torr-en not 3ABS-PRA-know-erg dub John 3SG.ABS-PRES-come-int sbjv  'I don't know whether John is coming.'

In cases of reiteration, the appropriate subordinate form may be used independently: the declarative subjunctive for a reiterated statement (122) and the interrogative subjunctive for a rephrased question (123). Note that this means that the reiterated, insubordinated clauses make explicit formal distinctions with regard to speech-act type that are not made in the case of the primary main clause.

(122) A: Jon d-a-tor  John 3SG.ABS-PRES-come  B: Zer? what
(123) A: Jon d-a-tor  John 3SG.ABS-PRES-come  B: Zer? what
A: Ez Jon d-a-torr-en  John 3SG.ABS-PRES-come-int sbjv  'Is John coming?' B: 'What?' C: 'Whether John is coming.'

In commands, the main clause imperative construction exemplified in the line of (124) is replaced by an 'imperative subjunctive' form, as in the third
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(124) A: Etor zaitze hona
    come AUX here
B: Zer?
what
A: Etor zaitze-ela
    come 2SG.FORMAL.AUX-IMP.SBJV here
A: 'Come here!' B: 'What?' A: '(I said) to come here!'

(125) A: Etorri-i hona
    come-PTCP here
B: Zer?
what
A: Etor-zeeko hona
    come-GER here
A: 'Come here!' B: 'What?' A: '(I said) to come here!'

In the case of reiterated statements and questions, the subject of the ellipsed main clause is taken to be the 1st person. With reiterated commands, however, the subject may be either the 1st person or a 3rd person, since this pattern of reiteration is not restricted to cases where the speaker who reiterates is the originator of the original speech act. If a mother tells her daughter Mila, for example, to go and tell Mila’s sister Pili to come to the house to eat lunch, the command could be reiterated by Mila using the gerundive as follows:

(126) MOTHER: Mila, esan Pili-ri etortzeiko bazkaltzera
Mila tell.PTCP Pili-DAT come.GER have.lunch.3SG
MILA: Pili, etortzeko bazkaltzera!
Pili come.GER have.lunch.3SG
MOTHER: 'Mila, tell Pili to come to eat lunch.'
MILA: 'Pili, to come to eat lunch.'

Mila thereby conveys quite explicitly that she herself is not the originator of the command, as she would be if she had said:

Though Alan King, who supplied these examples, points out that (126) is rather less likely than (125) to occur colloquially because 'colloquially, ... the forms en zaitze and eze zaitzea just aren't used much (in speech); creating a stylistic clash between the informality of the structure and the literary sound of this form of the verb (Alan King, emall of 4 Apr. 2002).

The reiterations discussed here superficially resemble the insubordinated clauses found with free indirect speech discussed in section 11.3.2.1 above, a use that develops into quotative or hearsay evidentials in many languages. However, there are significant differences: reiterations are much more context-specific, presupposing both a preceding question like 'what?' and, before that, the statement, question, or command being reiterated. In addition, reiterations are semantically more specific, in the sense that the subject of the ellipsed clause in reiterations is 1st person (except in the special Basque case of reiterated commands, where it may be either 1st person or a 3rd person close at hand), whereas the subject of the ellipsed clause in evidentializing insubordination is usually a nonspecific 3rd person; 'they', or 'people' or 'the elders'.

The very specific alignments between the various forms of subordinate marker on the Basque verb and corresponding complex-clause structures point to clear sources in elliptical structures in each case. However, the limitations on the person of the subject of the ellipsed clause, and of the ellipsed verb itself, illustrate the transition between stages 2 and 3 of our scenario, in the sense that conventionalized restrictions on interpretation have begun to accrue.

11.3.3.6 Disagreement with assertions by the previous speaker. The use in Spanish of insubordinated conditional clauses with si (originally 'if') has already been discussed and exemplified (26). Recall that syntactic tests for the main clause status of this construction, such as its behaviour with negative polarity items, were summarized in section 11.1.3, and that the likely development has been from 'if X, then how can you say Y' to 'but it's the case that X'. It is worth reiterating here, though, the characterizations that have been given by authors examining this construction. According to Schwenter (1996: 328), uses of insubordinated si 'all deal with correcting modifying underlying pragmatic presuppositions that have been evoked or inferred in conversation'. Almela Perez (1985: 6) puts it slightly differently: if we are concerned with is adversative: in every case it signifies a frustration of the previous turn; it therefore always allows, before it, the form pero [but]. Although there is, in one way, a similarity to the

si del que nos ocupamos es adversativo: en todos los casos significa una frustración del turno anterior; por eso siempre admite, precedentemente, la forma pero.
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'contrast' use of switch-reference markers discussed in section 11.3.3.3, in those cases there is no perceived incompatibility between the propositions put forth by successive speakers: it is simply a matter of them pointing out some contrast that holds between them, e.g. between what two different participants under discussion are doing. With insubordinated si in Spanish, by contrast, the proposition being put forward by the speaker using si is logically incompatible with the one it is aimed against. In the first case, then, the first speaker's proposition is presupposed and serves as a point of departure for a contrasting proposition about something else, while in the second case the fact that the first speaker's proposition has been asserted is presupposed, but its truth is then disputed, bringing this usage closer to the use of insubordination with negatives.

11.3.3.7 Presuppositionalizing insubordination: summary

In the first three cases discussed above—negatives (11.3.3.1), focus constructions (11.3.3.2), and trans-sentential contrast (11.3.3.3)—the tight grammatical conditions attached to particular subordinate clause constructions become loosened so that they can be satisfied by the broader discourse context rather than by a governing main clause. Negative clauses in Tewa and Western Desert move from needing an overt main clause explicitly expressing the contrasted positive to implicating some general positive state of affairs calculable from context. Focusing subordinate clauses in a number of Australian languages move from requiring a contrasted clause, or the overt eucational element of a left construction, to implicating such a component roughly, from 'It was X which were floating' to 'X which were floating'. Generalizations from switch-reference proper to trans-sentential contrast more generally in languages like Mparntwe Arrernte involve the ellipsis of the contrasted element: '[X is/may be Ving]' while C-SR.

Free-standing conditions (11.3.3.4) and reiterations (11.3.3.5) remain closer to the original construction: their context-specificity means that the candidate ellipsed clause is heavily restricted. The 'disagreeing si' construction in Spanish (11.3.3.6), like free-standing conditions and reiterations, remains tightly bound in terms of being restricted to second turns, though its semantics has moved further away from what can be readily stated by restoring a conversationally restricted main clause.

In each of these six subtypes, grammatical machinery that originally developed around overt relations between a main and subordinate clause, often using the inherently two-place predicate expressed by complementizing case, is subsequently generalized to encode similar relations between the insubordinated clause and some other part of the discourse. This latter may be unexpressed, or no longer involved in a subordinating grammatical relation to the insubordinated clause.

11.4 Multi-purpose insubordination, constructional indeterminacy, and pragmatic interpretation

In a number of languages, insubordinated clauses have what at first sight seem to be a bewilderingly wide range of functions. In this section I examine two Australian languages—Goonyardy and Kayardild—with such 'multi-purpose' insubordination. I show that the functional range of insubordinated clauses is essentially the union of the three higher-level functions above: indirecting, modalizing, and presuppositionalizing. I also examine the extent to which the precise interpretation can in large measure be recovered pragmatically because of predictable interactions with verbal tense/aspect/mood categories.

11.4.1 Goonyardy

In this non-Pama-Nyungan language (McGregor 1988; 1990) so-called 'subjunctive' clauses, marked by an enclitic -ja, can occur either as subordinate clauses or independently. I shall assume that the subordinate function is primary and that the independent use results from insubordination. McGregor identifies the following 'common core of meaning' for subjunctive clauses in Goonyardy, whether main or subordinate:

[The speaker is not asserting or proposing the propositional content of the clause; he is neither asserting/proposing that the situation will occur (realized by future tense), nor that it might have occurred (realized by potential mode). Rather, what he is asserting/proposing is that the propositional content of the clause is hypothesized, supposed, redoned, guessed, hoped, and so on... The enclitic -ja functions like the logical operator [...]. In other words, the speaker is not asserting/proposing a proposition about the world, but rather, a proposition about a proposition about the world, in effect that he will entertain its validity. (p. 41)]

In spelling the language name I am employing the practical spelling now preferred for this language, and used in McGregor's (1990) reference grammar, but which differs from the spelling currently used in McGregor (1988). Examples retain the orthography of the source, because there is no obvious formal marker of subordination, McGregor avoids taking the subordination of subjunctives as primary, and implies that they share the same multifunctional character as whether they are subordinate or independent. The analysis I propose here suggests they would be categorized as subordinate clauses, a question that can only be answered by historical work on languages.
The specific nature of this ‘second order proposition’ however, results from interaction of the subjunctive clitic with the tense markers—past, present, and irrealis—and with the person of the subject.

Combined with the past tense, the subjunctive suggests a statement about the past made on the basis of inference, as in (128).

(128) (A police pose discovers the recently vacated dinner camp of a group of Aborignites they are following. The head tracker asserts
(to the policeman:)
ngapijWirra ngamunyali
est.sbjv inflammable before.KINF
‘They were eating here not long ago.’ (McGregor 1988: 42)

Combined with the future, the subjunctive can produce a request for permission with a 1st person subject (129; cf. the Yankunytjatjara example (38b)), and a prediction with a non-1st person subject (130).

(129) nganyi waringiri miikarlingini majayu
1 go.prs.1sg L.told.him boss
wartjawulumayi ngarakice yawarta
go.sbjv.1sg>3du my horse
kay wartipinyi mikamingarra
OK go.3du he.told.me
‘I’m going’, I told the boss.
‘I might (would like to) take the two horses.’
‘OK, take them’, he told me.’ (McGregor 1988: 40)

(130) paplijingini nguljangu palma yuwarli thuwaingkani
pub.arl east creek one descend.sbjv.1sg
‘From the pub you’ll go east, and cross one creek.’ (McGregor 1988: 59)

Combined with the present, the subjunctive is used ‘to avoid stating the obvious by intruding his own attitude’; this may have the effect of strengthening the epistemic status of the proposition rather than weakening it, along the lines of English I reckon I walk.

(131) wartjangiri
go.sbjv.1sg
‘I walk hard.’

Combined with the irrealis, the subjunctive suggests that the speaker ‘may suppose or entertain the notion that the situation occurred even though he knows it didn’t’:  

(132) yuwulunga marniwa kartjayuni
man 1 his.sister hit.sbjv.1sg
‘The man might have hit his sister (though I know he didn’t).’

The subjunctive in Gooniyandi, then, signals that the speaker is not asserting/proposing a proposition about the world, but rather, a proposition about a proposition about the world. The exact nature of the second order proposition, however, is not directly asserted but left to inference: it may involve circumstantial evidence (128), an indirect seeking of permission (129), or even strengthened assertion (131).

11.4.2 Kayardild

The functional range of the Gooniyandi independent subjunctive covers certain indirectivizing uses (requests for permission) and a number of evidentializing or modalizing ones (hearsay, inference, assertion of conviction, prediction), but not the presuppositionalizing or deictic-reciprocating sets. In Kayardild the problem is more complicated still, since all main functional types of insubordination are present: interpersonal coercion, modal (both deontic and epistemic), and presuppositionalizing.

Presuppositionalizing insubordination in Kayardild, in the form of object-topicalized clauses, is always formally distinctive: the object is either omitted, as in (113) above, or appears in the nominative (133) instead of the usual object-marking (which would here take the form of the modal propititive plus complementizing oblique case, giving the form ngiarrkuwenda were it not for the rule assigning object topics the nominative—see Evans 1995b).

(133) kambuda barji-ja, ngiarrka barji-ja
pandanus.fruit.nom fall.ACT pandanus.fruit.nom fall.ACT
rar-umban-da warmark.
[mutha-wuwa-tha
south-orig-nom wind.nom much-mprop-coal
dart-u-tha diya-juu-tha ngiarrka]corb
time-mprop-corl ear-mprop-corl pandanus.fruit.nom
‘The pandanus fruit falls, the pandanus nut falls at the time of the south wind. (One) can go on eating pandanus nut for a long time.’

Even though the odd-topic formal pattern—absent or nominative object—always overtly signals the presence of a presuppositionalizing function in the
sense of object-focusing, it does not follow that this is the only function of such clauses. In (37), for example, there is simultaneous signalling of the utterance's function as an indirect request (through the choice of potential verb plus complementizing case), and as an object-focused construction (through the appearance of the object in the nominative).

So although an algorithm for interpreting insubordinated clauses in Kayardild can begin by searching for the manifestations of 'odd-topic marking' and assigning any insubordinated clauses with this feature to the object-topicalized category discussed in section 11.3.3.2 above, it cannot then conclude that this is the only aspect of insubordinated interpretation to be given to such a clause, since there may be other aspects (e.g. indirect request) motivating the choice in addition to the fact of object topic.

Nor does this exhaust the possibilities of using insubordinated clauses for a presupposed discourse context. For example, insubordinated clauses in the potential may be used to give consequences of a prior assertion, comparable to the independent use of a so or so that clause in English. An example from a Kayardild argument between two women—D, who is voicing her grievance at having lost her husband to M—is the following, which involves insubordinated clauses in the second and third turns (see Evans 1995a: 626-30 for the full text). In the second turn, by M, the insubordinated clause, in conjunction with the stress on the subject pronoun, expresses contrastive focus on the subject: 'I've taken him.' But in the third turn the insubordinated clause, which here has no arguments in the nominative or ellipted, is expressing the consequence of the action described in the preceding two turns: 'so that I'll be left with nothing':

(134) D: ngjuin-jina dun-kina nyiŋkka buru-tharr! my-marl husband-marl 2sg.nom take-pst
'You've taken my husband!'
M: [ngjuwa buru-tharra nth, natha-maru-tharra nth
1sg.sbjv.corel take-pst-corel camp-v.dat-pst-corel
ngju-maru-tharra nth] corel.
my-v.dat-pst-corel
'I've taken (him), to my camp!'
D: [ngjuwa wirdi-juu nth wairsth nth wirdi-juu nth] corel.
1sg.sbjv.corel remain-pot-corel nothing.corel remain-pot-corel
'So I'll be left with nothing!'

This leaves the problem of determining the meaning of insubordinated clauses lacking object topic marking. Table 11.1 summarizes the interpretive options available for three selected TAM categories in Kayardild insubordinated clauses. Note that for the past tense two interpretations are possible, and for the potential and immediate, three each. How far can these various functions of insubordinated clauses be derived from functions of regular subordinate clauses? Can we derive the insubordinated meanings from the subordinate ones, via main clause ellipsis? Or is there a sufficient difference that we should attempt to associate constructional meanings directly with the various types of insubordinate clause?

In support of an ellipsis analysis one can cite the many constructions, exemplified in the preceding sections, where appropriate main clauses can readily be supplied. To the insubordinated yalubuntha karnajureka niwanjurek [flame burns him]corel, for example, we can supply a main clause nigada karrija 'i see! This would account for the presence of complementizing case, the immediate verb inflection, and the meaning supplied on the occasion of the utterance: 'I see him being burned by the flames.'

Further support for the ellipsis analysis comes from the many interpretations available for a given insubordinated clause, as represented partially in Table 11.1. Although I have given very specific translations to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation of reconstructed clause</th>
<th>Tense/mood of insubordinated clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Epistemic                             | Perception (62, 63)              | Knowledge (65)                     | Inference (64) | What I behold must result from X
|            | I see/hear/etc. that X           | I know/assume that X               | XHint:          | (do something)
| Directive                             | Hint: (do something)              | (do something) so X will happen    | (39)            | (37) because X has happened (45)
|            | because X is happening now       |                                 | X Hint:         | (do something)
| discourse context                     | Consequence of previously stated fact: (V has happened) so X will happen (34) |
| Locative                              | X is the case now                 |                                 |                 | (66, 87) |
insubordinated clauses in my examples, it must be borne in mind that these are utterance rather than sentence translations, and involve interpretations of the particular contexts in which they were recorded. Many would, in other contexts, be given quite a different interpretation. This makes it impossible to pair insubordinated clauses directly with constructional meanings (e.g. those summarizable as 'perception evidential' or 'polite command').

Such a wide range of interpretations is available for two main reasons. First, there is a range of possible matrix predicates, e.g. 'see', 'hear', 'smell' in the case of perception predicates. Secondly, some tense/mood in the insubordinated clause are potentially compatible with several types of matrix predicate. For example, potential clauses are compatible with main clause imperatives (giving rise to the 'hint' use exemplified in 37), and with actual main clauses of different types (giving rise to the 'inference' and 'consequence' meanings exemplified in 65 and 134 respectively). Only hortative and desiderative insubordinated clauses (not shown in Table 11.1) have a single reconstructed clause type, although even there the actual predicate ('say' vs. 'ask' vs. 'warn') is not specified.

Against the pure form of the ellipsis analysis one can make two arguments. First, it is rather difficult to relate some insubordinated meanings (such as the 'relevant present') directly to those found in complex clauses, and even in some other cases (such as the 'inferential' use of the past and potential) some semantic bridging is necessary. In such cases it seems more reasonable to see ellipsis as a first step in the development of the construction, as outlined in section 11.1.2, but to attribute the detailed semantic characteristics to 'defragmatization'; the conversion of pragmatic enrichment (such as perceptual comments being most commonly made of present events) to constructional meaning.

Secondly, there appear to be restrictions on what may be the subject of the 'restored' main clause predicate if this is a perception verb: the subject of the higher clause is always interpreted as 1st person in a declarative and second person in a question. There are good pragmatic reasons for this—a perceptually based assertion about an ongoing situation naturally implicates that the perceiver is the speaker, and a perceptually based question naturally implicates that the perceiver is the addressee—and these extra constraints appear to have accrued to the relevant constructions by defragmatization.

44 See Hargreaves (1990) for a discussion of how evidentials in Khammash Newari take the same as epistemic source in statements, and the hearer in questions.

The balance of evidence, then, supports a hybrid position. On the one hand, in many cases the presence of complementizing case seems to signal simply that the hearer should interpret an insubordinated clause by inferentially restoring an ellipsed, contextually appropriate main clause that is grammatically compatible with the insubordinated clause (in the sense that it would assign complementizing case, and use an appropriate sequence of tenses). On the other hand, there are further, conventionalized constraints on the interpretation of some insubordinated clauses that suggest they have been grammaticized: the meaning of these constructions is more specific than the one would expect if it were simply a matter of restoring ellipsed material.

11.5 Conclusion

This chapter has been a heuristic one, concerned with exploring constructions which tend to get marginalized in linguistic analysis and description. As a result, it is hard to get a systematic picture across the world's languages. If the phenomena have eluded description in English, it is certainly less that less well-described languages will have examples of the phenomenon that have yet to be made available for typological comparison, although working in their favour is that corpus- and fieldwork-based descriptions are less likely to dismiss relevant data in the way that Matthews (1988: 40-42) dismisses utterances as 'of no concern to syntax, except as a source of confusion in our data'. I hope that the preliminary systematization of data presented here will encourage linguists to take these constructions more seriously, and have no doubt that we will see further formal and functional types being identified.

Insubordination is an important phenomenon because of the unusual way the direction of diachronic change runs: from subordinate clause to main clause, from morphosyntax to discourse, and (in its initial stage) from grammar to pragmatics. In each of these, it is a sort of backwash against the prevailing direction in which historical developments are supposed to occur. Functionalist who have shown us in how many ways grammar can change from discourse, it is a reminder that elaborate grammatical structures can also be partly disassembled and co-opted as discourse devices. For instance, pragmatic implicature, it illustrates how projected grammatical features can act as a scaffold for the inferencing process.

The material we have surveyed here is relevant to debates about finiteness in several ways. First is the issue of how far main clause status entails finiteness. Just as insubordination can make it harder to maintain a crisp lexical distinction between subordinate and main clauses, so it can blur
the boundary between finite and nonfinite clauses. In particular cases, however, we want to know what motivates the discrepancy: should we appeal to characteristics of nonfiniteness in particular (such as lack of assertativeness)? Or should we see it as following from broader characteristics of insubordination, as sketched here, which happen to bear nonfinite constructions up into main clause structures along with others which it would be artificial to term nonfinite, such as clauses introduced with complementizers or general markers of subordination?

Secondly, we want to know whether the changes from subordinate to main clause status necessarily entail changes in finiteness as part of the reanalysis process. Again, considering a broader range of insubordination types, only some involving nonfinite constructions, makes it seem less of an automatic consequence that change to main clause status would automatically increase the finiteness of a construction. The redeployment of linkages from intrACL to general discourse links, for example, has nothing to do with finiteness as it is normally defined. Accepting insubordination as a common process makes it clearer what is special about finiteness, by dissociating it from the main vs. subordinate clause parameter.

Thirdly, finiteness, like any other semantic value, is subject to diachronic change. Speakers draw on nonfinite constructions to deflect themselves from speech-act or epistemic commitments, whether by presenting infinitives as impersonal alternatives that avoid making the command stance overt or by using participles in cases of hearsay to avoid taking responsibility for direct assessment of epistemic value. This process of sign-building means that the contexts and communicative intentions behind these initially disembodied nonfinite statements gradually attach to the constructions themselves, turning infinitives into normal imperatives, and erstwhile participles into hearsay evidentials. Once this process occurs, we do indeed see a semantic shift towards finiteness as insubordination occurs.

Returning to the general problem posed by insubordination for grammatical description, as reanalysis of erstwhile subordinate clauses (nonfinite or otherwise) into main clauses proceeds, at least some of their morphosyntactic characteristics are no longer sufficient conditions for identifying a clause as subordinate. In the first stage of the process, the distinction can be saved by treating insubordinated clauses as underlying subordinate clauses whose main clauses have been ellipsed but can plausibly be restored for analytic purposes. At the second stage, while the structure itself may still be adequately described by treating it as an underlying subordinate clause, this can only be achieved by turning a blind eye to the greater semantic specificity associated with the insubordinated clause, and ignoring the fact that certain logically