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1. Introduction

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

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

Marie: But you speak so well!  
Mas falas tão bem!  
¡Pero hablas muy bien!

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

Mary: And John still hasn’t called...  
E o John ainda não telefonou...  
Y John aún no ha llamado...
1. Introduction: One Step Back - Coordination

Coordination is traditionally defined as a process that allows the formation of complex sentence structures. These can be integrated coordinate sentences; non-integrated coordinate sentences; parentheticals; or juxtaposed.

- The coordination process allows mainly for the combination of constituents of the same (syntactic or semantic) category:

(3) [John] and [Mary] are roommates.
(4) I think that yesterday John [went to college] and [took a history class].

However, it is also possible to combine constituents from different categories:
(5) We are available [today] and [whenever you need].
(6) She wanted not only [quietness] but also [to be allowed to work].

Still, as noted by several authors, there is a need for sharing similar formal and semantic properties (Matos 2005).
1. Introduction: One Step Back - Coordination

- Coordinate sentences are subject to the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC) (Ross 1967).

- The CSC can, in some sentences, be overcome through ATB movement.

- Even though coordination has, traditionally, been analyzed as a uniform process, data from Canceiro (2016) showed that not all coordinate sentences behave the same and have specific properties associated to them.

This work also showed that in EP only copulative coordinate sentences present the integrated behavior described in the literature, and thus should be analyzed in a Specifier-Head-Complement configuration.

Regarding adversative and disjunctive sentences, their properties can be reflected in a Specifier-Head-Complement or an Adjunction configuration, depending on their level of integration.
2. The idea of Insubordination - Evans (2007)

Evans' (2007) work questions the syntactic status of some sentences, and also some constituents, regarding the pragmatic and discoursive context in which they occur.

The author considers insubordinate sentences to be those that display:

- finite verbs;
- subordinative connectors;
- subordinative verbal morphology (Italian);
- subordination-specific word order (German);
- others.

I will apply the term ‘insubordination’ to the conventionalized main clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses.

Evans (2007: 367)
2. The idea of Insubordination - Evans (2007)

Insubordinate sentences differ from subordinate in that the subordinative connectors acquire a different meaning:

*Though the commonest function of subordinated conditionals is to express polite requests, they may have other conventionalized functions, such as expressing disagreement, as in Spanish (...).*

Evans (2007: 380-381)

(7) Si pudieses, traeme um vaso de agua.
   If you can, get me a glass of water.
   [polite request]

(8)
[Sisters Q and R are looking at clothes in a shop window.]
Q: Ah, ¡mira qué chaqueta más chula!
Q: ‘Hey, look what a great jacket!’
   [disagreement]
R: Si es horrible.
R: ‘But it’s horrible!’

Evans (2007: 381)
2. The idea of Insubordination - Evans (2007)

Evans also considers that insubordinate sentences are associated to high pressuposition levels, i.e. they provide specific pressupositional information about the discoursive context in which the sentence can occur.

Most common contexts:

(a) negation, (b) focus constructions, (c) discourse contrast, (d) stipulated conditions before assenting to preceding assertions in interaction, (e) reiterations, (f) disagreement with assertions by the previous speaker.

Evans (2007: 410)
2. The idea of Insubordination - Evans (2007)

Regarding the evolution in the derivation of these sentences, Evans considers that:

_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._

Evans (2007: 429)
2. The idea of Insubordination - Evans (2007)

The examples presented below show that insubordinate sentences (in the final steps of insubordination) can occur as independent sentences:

(9) a. [Context: handing someone a bottle of wine]

   *To have with the main course.*

   [use of infinitive]

b. [Context: After a conversation in which someone complains about a situation, the speaker concludes]

   *Que lo siento mucho.*

   [CP projection]

   I’m so sorry.

Demonte & Soriano (2014: 31-32)

Regarding **stage 4**, the author refers that:

*By the final stage these clauses have been so nativized as main clauses that the generalizations gained by drawing parallels with subordinate structures are outweighed by the artificiality of not including them in the muster of main clause types.*

Evans (2007: 431)
3. Incoordination as a mirror of insubordination - Kuteva (2017)

*The process of “undoing” syntax in discourse-pragmatic situations may be detected not only in coordination, subordination but also (...)* - Kuteva (2017)

(10) **But** that is really interesting!

(11) ........................................ coordinating connective + Clause 2 [main clause]

**But** that is really interesting!

- According to Kuteva (2017), incoordinate sentences have **three main properties**:

i) they involve conectors *and* and *but*;

ii) these conectors occur in the beginning of the sentence;

iii) they result in the independent use of formally coordinate sentences.
3. Incoordination as a mirror of insubordination - Kuteva (2017)

- According to Kuteva (2017), in incoordinate sentences, the connectors and and but lose their original meaning and their status as coordinative conjunctions.

(12) Mary loves cake but she is rather slim. Source meaning

(13) Many citizens of the so-called First World are still shocked to discover that we tropical islanders speak English, “But you speak English so well”, they say. Resulting meaning

- The author suggests that incoordinate sentences are associated to mirative values.

(i) sudden discovery
(ii) surprise
(iii) unprepared mind
(iv) counterexpectation
(v) new information

- Also as referred by Kuteva, Evans (2007: 403ff) shows that insubordination is what often underlies the rise of surprise-denoting utterances.
3. Incoordination as a mirror of insubordination - Kuteva (2017)

Summary of Kuteva's proposal:

- Sentences that consist of a coordinating conjunction and a second coordinate conjunct.

- In these constructions, if we don't have a sentence in the specifier position, we can infer its content pragmatically.

- When these conjunctions go through the incoordination process they loose their status, and transform into sentence particles with a mirative value.

- This happens because the conjunction (but) changes their source meaning (counterexpectation) and acquires a different one (mirativity).
4. Incoordination in European Portuguese

Bearing in mind Evans' analysis of insubordinate sentences and Kuteva's proposal of incoordination, we suggest that sentences as (14) should be analysed as incoordinate.

(14) [Hoje, depois do almoço, o João disse à Maria para não mexer no computador enquanto estivesse a fazer atualizações. Às 16:00, o João vê a Maria a enviar emails.]

[Today, after lunch, John told Mary not to work on the PC, as it was updating the system. At 4pm, John sees Mary sending emails.]

João: Mas o que é que estás a fazer?!

But what are you doing?!

(15) .................................. coordinating conjunction + second conjunct

Mas o que é que estás a fazer?!

- We propose that only sentences as (14) should be considered incoordinate as there is no first conjunct.
4. Incoordination in European Portuguese

Insubordination:

(16) [Context: handing someone a bottle of wine]

To have with the main course.

(17) S: Is it practically impossible to have that [a certain demand curve]? 
I: If you have this base [it is practically impossible to have that].

Incoordination:

(18) [A Maria está em casa a ver a chuva a cair.]

[Mary is at home watching the rain]

Maria: Mas a chuva não pára?!

But won't it ever stop?!

(19) Adam: Só estudo português há 8 meses.

I've only been studying portuguese for 8 months.

Maria: [Só estudas há 8 meses,] Mas falas português tão bem!

[You have been studying for only 8 months] but you speak so well.

This example, however, should not be considered as of the same type of (18). We believe that (19) represents an example of a coordinate sentence with an omitted first term.
4. Incoordination in European Portuguese

Regarding example (19) and the possibility of having coordinate sentences with an omitted first term:

(...) we believe that a possible solution [to this question] may be to consider that the parallelism that legitimates the ellipsis can be established between discourse fragments (...). By considering that the discoursive parallelism can legitimate the ellipsis, we can then explain the possibility of phonetically deleting the content of the first coordinated conjunct (...).

Colaço (2013: 267)

We believe that the discoursive parallelism represents the omitted first term of such sentences. Thus, these should not be considered as of the same type of (18) that can occur in an out of the blue context.
4. Incoordination in European Portuguese

Regarding incoordinate and coordinate sentences with an omitted first term:

- Colaço & Matos (2010) suggest that it is possible to assume that in a similar type of constructions ConjP is incomplete as it does not project a specifier position. Thus ConjP would consist of a conjunction and its complement.

**PROBLEM #1:** Conjunctions select two (or more) conjuncts.

- This would not pose a problem for incoordinate structures because, as assumed by Kuteva, the discoursive / pragmatic context can be equivalent to the first conjunct.

**PROBLEM #2:** Definition of ConjP features. Usually this happens through Agree with the first conjunct.

- It's possible to assume that the definition of the categorial features of ConjP would be obtained via Agree with the Complement (Matos 1997, 2000; Colaço & Matos 2010), instead of the Specifier (Chomsky 2013, Rizzi 2016).
4. Incoordination in European Portuguese

Based on Chomsky (1995, chapter 4), Matos (1995) assumes that the Specifier-Head relation does not have a privileged status, and that the process of feature checking can operate locally through Agree in Head-Complement structures. By adopting this analysis, the non-existence of the first coordinate conjunct is compatible with the computation of a categorical value of the coordinate structure.

Colaço & Matos (2010: 13)

We can, indeed, assume that, in coordinate structures with just one coordinate conjunct, the [ConjP [Conj' [Conj but] [YP]]] configuration occurs; and thus [ConjP [XP] [Conj' [Conj but] [YP]]] corresponds to the unmarked option for standard binary coordinate sentences. Actually, nothing prevents Agree from operating either on [ConjP [Conj' [Conj but] [YP]]] or on [ConjP [XP] [Conj' [Conj but] [YP]]].

Colaço & Matos (2010: 14)
4. Incoordination in European Portuguese

Syntactic Structure

Munn (1992, 1993, 1999) argues for an Adjunction configuration to show that the conjunction has a closer relation with the second term, rather than the first.

(i) a. John left, and he didn’t even say good-bye.
   b. John left. And he didn’t even say good-bye.
   c. *John left and. He didn’t even say good-bye.

Ross (1967: 90-91)

Status of the 1st conjunct

- Matos (2003, 2006, 2009), Colaço & Matos (2008, 2010) and Matos & Colaço (2011) consider two possibilities, regarding the status of the first conjunct:
  - omitted first term;
  - element from the previous discourse fragment.
4. Incoordination in European Portuguese

So, if these are incoordinate sentences, are *but* and *and* really coordinative conjunctions?

(...) *the particle e (and)* seems to present a behavior that is simultaneously conjunctional - since it is used as a connecting particle - and discursive - since it is associated with the advancement of narration. Colaço (2013: 256)

- Kuteva assumes that in incoordinate sentences *but* changes its source meaning and acquires a mirative meaning, thus losing its conjunctional status.

Although this is true, we consider mirativity to be a sub-value of counterexpectation, which is one of the source meanings of *but* (Cf. Delancey).
4. Incoordination in European Portuguese

Kuteva presents the example below as evidence to the change in meaning associated to conjunctions in incoordinate sentences:

(20) Bill, and this is so typical, was dating several women at the same time.

However, [and this is so typical] should be analysed as a parenthetical and, thus, and is still a coordinative conjunction, and not a comment marker, as Kuteva proposes.

Another option, would be to consider these constituents as Discourse Markers, however, as DMs are optional, and, in incoordinate sentences, they convey a discoursive meaning, we don't believe these should be analysed as such:

Therefore, DMs [Discourse Markers] are a grammatically heterogeneous, multifunctional type of pragmatic markers, hence syntactically optional and non-truth-conditional, constraining the inferential mechanisms of interpretation processes.

Crible (2014: 3-4)
4. Incoordination in European Portuguese

Another hypothesis:

This paper has argued that the distinction between conjunctions and discourse markers is better conceptualized as a continuum rather than as two separate and independent categories. (...) While medial position is generally speaking a useful indicator that a connective is functioning as a conjunction and initial position as a discourse marker, this is not a true litmus test.

Fielder (2008: 96)

Perini (2001, p. 145), in its Descriptive Grammar of Portuguese, referring to syntactic coordination includes but as a partly coordinating element, since it does not have, according to Perini’s understanding, all the properties inherent to such function: and and or belong to the first group of coordinators, in which but appears as a third member, quite deviant.

Silva (2004: 361)
4. Incoordination in European Portuguese

Our proposal:

Gradience in grammar is usually characterized as the phenomenon of blurred boundaries between two categories of form classes α and β, such that certain elements can be said clearly to belong to α, others indisputably to β, with a third group of elements belonging to the middle ground between the two categories. This situation can be represented by ordering linguistic entities along a linear scale with α at one end and β at the other, and a blurred area in between (...)

Aarts (2007: 34)
5. Final Remarks

- This study allowed us to understand that sentences as those presented below, even if considered to be both incoordinated, must be analyzed as different types of incoordination:

**Linguistic antecedent:**

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

Marie: But you speak so well!  
Mas falas tão bem!  
¡Pero hablas muy bien!

**No linguistic antecedent:**

(22) [**Context 2:** John told Mary he would call her at 18h, but at 18h45 he still hasn’t called...]

Mary: And John still hasn’t called...  
E o John ainda não telefonou...  
Y John aún no ha llamado...
5. Final Remarks

- It also allowed us to better understand that there are **different levels of integration** associated to coordinate/incoordinate sentences.

- Differently from Kuteva, we believe that incoordinate sentences result in the **independent use** of formally second coordinate conjuncts.

- Bearing in mind the presence of **mas** (but) and **e** (and), and a main clause, we believe that these sentences **resemble an Adjunction structure**, as proposed by Munn 1992, 1993, 1999.

- An Adjunction structure will provide a good reflection of the **relation between the conjunction and the second coordinated conjunct** (Ross, 1967).

- Incoordinate sentences also **question the traditional labeling strategy** given that these sentences and coordinate sentences with an omitted first term cannot be labeled as is proposed by Chomsky (2013) and Rizzi (2016).
5. Final Remarks

- We propose that the definition of ConjP features will be derived through Head-Complement Agree (Matos 1997, 2000; Colaço & Matos 2010).

- Regarding the conjunctional status of mas (but) and e (and), we propose that these constituents should be placed in a continuum of connectivity, where they share properties associated to conjunctions and discourse markers (Aarts, 2007; Fielder 2008).

- This study will, ultimately, allow for a better understanding of incoordinate and non-canonical coordinate constructions, providing a better description of paratactic constructions.
Thank you!

This investigation is being developed as part of my PhD project, which is funded by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia - FCT (BD/138048/2018).
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