The Morphosyntax of Jejuan –*ko* Clause Linkages

Soung-U Kim[†]

SOAS University of London

ABSTRACT

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

Keywords: clause linkage, –*ko* converb, Jejuan, Jejueo, Ceycwu dialect

1. Introduction

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

entire paragraphs in languages such as English (cf. Longacre 2007).

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

namɯ=esʰə ʈa-ku,   ʈa-mən,   alɛ   nɔliə   ola-ŋ=i,   ʈo
tree=ABL   pick-AND pick-WHILE down move_down come-AND=RIGHT? again

piup-ko   i=kə   jo=ti   ka-min iʨe   tʰələʨiə   pu-n-ta
empty-AND THIS=THING THIS=PLACE go-IF   now fall_down AUX-PRS-DECL

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

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

(2) Korean *-ko* linkages
   a. Kwon (2004: 102)
      John-i   chayk-ul   ilk(-ess)-ko,   Mary-ka   tibi-lul   po-ass-ta
      John-NOM   book-ACC read(-PST)-AND Mary-NOM TV-ACC   see-PST-DECL
      'John read a book, and Mary watched TV.'
   b. Cho (2004: 36)[1]
      Kim-i   pap-ul   mek(-ess)-ko   kulus-ul   chiu-ess-ta
      Kim-NOM   rice-ACC   eat(-PST)-AND   dish-ACC   clean-PST-DECL
      'Kim ate the rice and cleaned the dishes.'

As shown above, Korean *-ko* converbs occur with both different and same-subject
reference, and interclausal semantics expressed by this linkage type are among the
widest and least specific, ranging from 'asyndetic, listing' semantics to temporal
simultaneity, temporal succession or cause-effect. The *-ko* clause linkage has received

---

1) This is a conflation of several examples; Cho SY (2004) distinguishes different Korean *-ko* linkage types.

a lot of attention due to the fact that sometimes it was demonstrated to exhibit prototypically coordinate properties, whereas in other cases its properties are subordinate (Yoon J-M 1996; Yoon J 1997; Rudnitskaya 1998; Cho SY 2004; Kwon NY 2004; Kwon and Polinsky 2008; Pak D-H 2013; Lee JS 2014). In a nutshell, non-successive event interpretations were found to correlate with coordinate properties, whereas successive event interpretations usually go along with subordinate properties. This finding intersects with -*ko* converbs and their tense inflection, since tense marking on converbs is said to be possible only in coordinate -*ko* linkages, with tense traditionally regarded crucial for finite clauses. Most studies adopt or confirm some or all of these findings.

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

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

1.1. Jejuan and -*ko* converbs

It is only in recent times that Jejuan (also known as Jejueo, Ceycwu(two)(s)mal) has been gaining the attention of researchers outside (South) Korean dialectology,

especially since its classification as a critically endangered language by Moseley (2010). Traditionally, most research treats Jejuan as one of six traditional dialect areas (called Ceycwupangen, 'Jeju dialect' cf. Pangenyenkwuhoy 2001, Sohn H-M 1999; Yeon JH 2012; Kim J-H 2014, 2017), albeit as one of the most conservative ones. Novel views classifying Jejuan as an independent Koreanic language have focused on the great lack of mutual intelligibility, as well as clearly attestable lexical distance between Korean and Jejuan (O'Grady 2014; Long and Yim 2002; Brown and Yeon 2015; Barnes-Sadler 2017; S Lee 2015). As Korean dialectology tends to emphasise the shared diachrony between Jejuan and Korean, there is still work to be done on elucidating synchronic differences between the two varieties, together with sociolinguistic variation (the same being true for other Koreanic varieties, cf. Silva 2010, Brown and Yeon 2015).

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

(3) Kim S-U (2018b: 372) [HYJ1, jeju0157, 00:08:08]
$\widehat{tɕ}ə$ əlin=sʰa   ṣi-tɕu=ke
that   elder=FOC   write-STN=DSC
'Of course, she [lit. that elder person] knows how to write.'

(4) [HGS1, jeju0157, 00:00:20]
ki nal oa-sʰ-taŋ   mək-i-kʷa-l-en   ilimpʰʲo tola-sʰə-nia?
that day come-PST-AND eat-EP-EGO.PF-DECL-QUOT name:tag hang-PST-EV.IPF-Q.PLR
'Did [the mosquitos] leave a name tag saying 'I came and ate your blood today''?

(5) Kang Y-B (2007: 98) [transliteration and glossing mine]
halɨpaŋ=sʰinti   sʰɔlˑua   pul-kʰen   hɔ-nan kiɲaŋ sʰusʰimiak hɔjə
grandfather=DAT   tell.HON   AUX-IRR-QUOT do-AS   just   mute   do
'As I told them that I would tell their grandfather, they just went mute.'

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

Table 1. A selection of Jejuan converbs and their inflectional range

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

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

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

for example the ¬nan form which inflects in causal meaning, but does not when used in contexts expressing changes in narrative. Note that there is no consensus on how many converbs Jejuan has, which ones are 'genuinely Jejuan' and not borrowings from Korean, and even what their inflectional range in fact is.

Jejuan ¬ko converbs are among the least specified with respect to the kind of meaning relationship they create between linked clausal events (the 'generic' group above). As observed for Korean, however, two events linked by a ¬ko converb can either be temporally unrelated or simultaneous (henceforth 'non-successive ¬ko linkage'), or temporally successive (henceforth 'successive ¬ko linkage'):[2]

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

jəŋhii=ka   *pališ^hk^hweki=lil*   *t͡ɕaŋman*   *həjə(-ms^h)-ko*
Yeongheui=NOM   fish-ACC   prepare   do-PROG-AND

s^humi=ka   *t͡ɕilimʈək*   *t͡ɕit͡ɕə-ms^h-ə-la*
Sumi=NOM   rice_cake   fry-PROG-EV.IPF-DECL

'Yeongheui was preparing the fish, and Sumi was frying the rice cake.'

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

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

ʈək=il   *t͡ɕit͡ɕə-s^h-t͡ɕə*
rice_cake=ACC fry-PST-DECL

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

As shown in Table 1 above, Jejuan ¬ko converbs inflect for past tense, progressive aspect and a still somewhat mysterious combination that is interpreted by speakers as 'progressive-imperative'.[3] See also ex. (6), and (8) below:

---

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

3) Both Reviewers 1 and 3 have questioned the analysis of the *-ms^hi-*, PROG:IMP morpheme of the *-ko* converb and the */-ms^hi-/* string of the final clause verb as underlyingly different structures. Speakers clearly interpret these forms differently: the *-ms^hi-*, PROG:IMP converbal form is understood to express a command (see also recording jeju0140, 00:30:50). Without such meaning, the suffix would not be *-ms^hi-*, but just *-ms^h*, as in ex. (6). In the final clause,

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

jəŋh̆ii=laŋ   t͡ɕilimʈək   t͡ɕit͡ɕə-msʰi-ko   sʰumi=laŋ

Yeongheui=TOP   rice_cake   fry-PROG:IMP-AND   Sumi=TOP

palisʰkʰʷeki   t͡ɕaŋman   həjə-msʰi-la

fish   prepare   do-PROG-EP-IMP

'Yeongheui, you'll be making fried rice cake and Sumi, you'll be preparing the fish!'

Korean *-ko* converbs only allow for past tense or irrealis mood marking (the latter has not been attested in my research yet for Jejuan). Not only does the Jejuan *-ko* converb show inflectional properties different from Korean, but also, elicitation with native speakers did not show any signs of impossibility of tense inflection on a *-ko* converb irrespective of different contexts such as different/same subjecthood, non-successive/successive semantics or particular syntactic tests such as relativisation (see section 3, ex. (29a), for example). During elicitation, consultants expressed a preference for untensed converbs, yet did not reject examples with tense marking on converbs in contexts which in Korean are reported to lead to ungrammaticality.[4] This stands in contrast with the findings of most research on Korean *-ko* linkages, where the possibility of tense marking is seen as one criterion for the coordinate status of a *-ko* clause linkage, and where the impossibility of it is said to be a characteristic of a subordinate linkage.

---

the imperative component is the suffix *-la*. While the */-i-/* part of the imperative-progressive converb form is meaningful, the */-i-/* of the final verb is the result of phonotactic epenthesis. Reviewer 1 suggests that *t͡ɕit͡ɕəmsʰiko* is in fact *t͡ɕit͡ɕə-m sʰi-ko*, fry-NMLZ EXIST.COP, a construction with a nominaliser and an existential copula. Neither does this account for the difference of *t͡ɕit͡ɕəmsʰko* and *t͡ɕit͡ɕəmsʰiko* synchronically, nor does it consider the fact that the Jejuan nominaliser *-m* suffixes to a verb root directly (*t͡ɕit͡ɕim*, with epenthetic */-i-/*), instead of suffixing using the stem vowel */-ə/* (**t͡ɕit͡ɕəm*), a pattern that reaches as far back as Late Middle Korean (15th century, see Lee and Ramsey 2011: 176). For various perspectives, see Kim J-H (2017, 2016, 2014), Mun S-Y (1998, 2004, 2006), Kim S-U (2018b) and Ko et al. (2016: 31).

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

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

t͡ɕə   sʰalim=in   tiĺ:i-ko   t͡ɕəĺ:o   iĺ:o   nəm-kok
that   person=TOP   carry:EP-AND   thither   hither   cross-AND

t͡ɕəĺ:o   nəm-kok   hə-məŋ   ta   tut͡ɕipə   nwa
thither   cross-AND   do-WHILE   all   flip_over   put

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

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

(10) Kang Y-B (2007: 48)

kʰɨŋ   kɔla-k   kɔla-k   hə-tən   sʰalim=i   ilmi=la?
thus   talk-AND   talk-AND   do-EV.IPF.ADN   person=NOM   3SG=COP

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

There are a number of reasons for considering the Jejuan *-ko* converb in isolation. One reason is that so far, there is very little research on Jejuan *-ko* linkages in ways comparable to Korean. At the same time, while Reviewer 3 questions the authenticity of *-ko* converbs as 'genuinely Jejuan', I have shown that these converbs are inflectable, largely following patterns observable elsewhere within the Jejuan converb system.[5] Furthermore, regarding each occurrence of a Jejuan *-ko* converb as the elision of an entire morphosyntactic complex would be unsatisfactory, as we have many occurrences of *-ko* converbs which link clauses on their own, and which do not

---

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

show the typical, repetitive narration semantics of '...-ko(k) ...-ko(k) hɔ-' constructions.

Moreover, one can also find cases such as (10) where one finds '...-k ...-k hɔ-' constructions. Both morphosyntactically and semantically, the structure is similar to that of '...-kok ...-kok hɔ-' constructions. Given that the '-k' components do not occur consistently on -ko converbs (even with one and the same speaker, e.g., HJG1 in jeju0135), one wonders whether they are inseparably part of a '-kok' suffix, or are morphological elements of their own. Undoubtedly, examining a wider range of Jejuan linkage constructions across monoclausal and multiclausal contexts, and looking at both their synchronic and diachronic inter-relationships would be valuable, yet would greatly exceed the scope of a single paper. For now, I would like to thank Reviewer 3 for sparking this discussion and refer to Kang Y-B (2007), Kim J-H (2014, 2017), Hyun and Kang (2011) or Song S-J (2011) for examples and more.

1.2. Research background and methodological concerns

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

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

Based on personal native speaker judgments, anonymous Reviewers 1 and 3 have

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

Note that throughout the discussion of clause linkage in this paper, I use the terms 'converb clause' (CC) and 'final clause' (FC). Reviewer 2 remarks that the notion of 'final clause' may be problematic in cases where a converb clause is used in insubordinated or desubordinated contexts. In this paper, I do not have such examples, and these notions serve to linearly distinguish between different parts of a *-ko* clause linkage, which in relevant examples are biclausal, in the order of [CC FC]. This way, I want to avoid rather loaded terms such as 'subordinate', 'main' or 'matrix' clause which may conventionally presuppose bundlings of properties that are not born out consistently by the Jejuan data. I thank Reviewer 2 for terminological suggestions, and sparking this discussion. For greater convenience, I refer to *-ko* clause linkages as '*-ko* linkages'. I employ an IPA system for Jejuan examples (table in appendix)[6], Revised Romanisation for official terms, toponyms and proper names, and Yale transliteration for Korean-language examples cited from other sources. Typos from cited examples have been corrected. Interlinear glossing applies the Leipzig Glossing Rules.[7]

---

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

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

2. Clause linkage research: An overview of relevant themes

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

2.1. Clause linkage in functional-typological approaches

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

(11) Criteria for clausal subordination (Haspelmath 1995: 12ff.)
   1. Subordinate clauses may disrupt the clause-internal, linear word order of the matrix clause.
   2. Only subordinate clauses may precede or follow their main clause.
   3. Backwards pronominal anaphora is only allowed into subordinate structures.
   4. Only subordinate clauses can narrow down the reference of the main clause.
   5. Only subordinate clauses can be focused.
   6. Extraction of constituents is possible only from subordinate clauses.

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

(12) Nesting of English *-ing* clauses
   a. Max happily roamed around the streets of London while whistling his favourite song.
   b. Max, while whistling his favourite song, happily roamed around the streets of London.

(13) Nesting tests for English coordinate clauses
    a. Max happily roamed around the streets of London and whistled his favourite song.
    b. *Max, and whistled his favourite song, happily roamed around the streets of London.

Coordinate clauses, are regarded exocentric and symmetrical where none of the clauses dominates the other, and no clause is embedded in another (Haspelmath 2007a: 46). Point (6) follows J.R. Ross' well-known Coordinate Structure Constraint which stipulates that "[i]n a coordinate structure, no conjunct may be moved, nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct" (Ross 1967: 98f.). Many languages do not allow extraction of constituents out of only one clause in a clause linkage, and if they do, they may show asymmetries between non-final and final clauses (see Haspelmath 2004; Kazenin and Testelets 2004, Kwon NY 2004).[8]

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

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

Researchers have found that even in languages believed to exhibit a clear coordination-subordination distinction, cases can be found where such a distinction is less clear (see Culicover and Jackendoff 1997 for English; and Yuasa and Sadock 2002). Increasingly, authors have acknowledged a theoretical separation between syntactic embedding and dependence (Foley and Van Valin 1984), with some

---

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

suggesting a third category called 'cosubordination': this term stands for those cases where a clause is not embedded in another, but nevertheless shows a scope dependence under another clause with respect to "illocutionary force, evidentials, status and tense" (Foley and Van Valin 1984: 243, also 257; as well as Olson 1981). Such clauses were first described as 'medial clauses' in languages of Papua New Guinea, and entire clause linkages are often called 'clause chains' (Longacre 2007: 398ff.). Clause chains show properties ascribed to both of traditional 'subordination —coordination' oppositions, summarised below:

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

To give an example, Roberts (1988) describes how in Amele, subordinate clauses can be centre-embedded in final clauses. Medial clauses do not allow this:

(16) Amele (Roberts 1988: 52-55; taken from Haspelmath 1995: 24)
    a. Medial clause

[Ho	*busale-ce-b]*		*dana*	*age*	*qo-i-ga.*
pig	run.out-MED.DS-3SG		man	they	hit-3PL-HOD

      'The pig ran out and the man killed it.'
    b. Subordinate clause

Dana	*age*	*[ho*	*qo-qag-an*	*nu]*	*ho-i-ga.*
man	they	pig	kill-3PL-FUT	PURP	come-3PL-HOD

      'The men came to kill the pig.'
    c. Medial clause

*Dana	*age*	*[ho*	*busale-ce-b]*		*qo-i-ga.*
man	they	pig	run.out-MED.DS-3SG		hit-3PL-HOD

      'The men, the pig having run out, killed it.'

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

2.2. Previous research on clause linkage in Korean

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

Almost all studies on the Korean *-ko* linkage have a Chomskyan background, within which the authors have adopted the traditional, dichotomous views on clause

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

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

(17) after Rudnitskaya (1998: 184), [factor names mine]
   a. **tense marker factor:** presence or absence of tense inflection on the *-ko* converb
   b. **subject reference factor:** same-subject or different-subject reference
   c. **semantic interpretation factor:** successive or non-successive interpretation of event relation

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

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

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

Similar to other work on Korean *-ko* linkages, Rudnitskaya concludes that the semantic interpretation of two linked events "determines the coordinate/subordinate status directly, while the tense affix and same/different subject factors can influence the status only indirectly, via the interpretation factor" (Rudnitskaya 1998: 196). Non-successively interpreted *-ko* linkages exhibit typical properties of clausal coordination, whereas successive interpretation yields subordinate properties. Successive interpretations are said to occur more with same-subject reference, and different-subject reference

is claimed to "normally disallow successive interpretation" (hence the indication '-✓ subordinate' in Table 2 above). If they do, it is only in the absence of tense marking that subordinate properties can be observed (Rudnitskaya 1998: 188). The same is true in same-subject contexts, where subordinate properties are said to correlate with successive event interpretation, and the absence of tense:

(18) Rudnitskaya (1998: 185)

    a. Base example 1

       Swun   Mi-nun   caki   aphatu-lul   phal(-ass)-ko

       Swun   Mi-TOP   own   apartment-ACC   sell-PST-AND

       cohun   cip-ul   sa-ss-ta.

       good   house-ACC   buy-PST-DECL

       'Sun Mi sold her apartment and bought a good house.'

    b. Base example 2

       sonnim-tul-un achim-ul   mek(-ess)-ko   nokcha-lul

       guest-PL-TOP   breakfast-ACC   eat-PST-AND   green_tea-ACC

       masy-ess-ta

       drink-PST-DECL

       'Guests ate breakfast and drank green tea.'

    c. Scrambling

       cohun   cip-ul   Swun Mi-nun   caki   aphatu-lul

       good   house-ACC   Swun-Mi-TOP   own   apartment-ACC

       phal(*-ass)-ko   sa-ss-ta.

       sell(-PST)-AND   buy-PST-DECL

       'Sun Mi sold her apartment and bought a good house.'

    d. Nesting

       Swun   Mi-nun   cohun   cip-ul   caki   aphatu-lul

       Sun   Mi-TOP   good   house-ACC   own   apartment-ACC

       phal(*-ass)-ko   sa-ss-ta.

       sell(-PST)-AND   buy-PST-DECL

       'Sun Mi, after she had sold her apartment, bought a good house.'

    e. Wh-question

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

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

       'The guests had breakfast and drank what tea?'

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

Table 3. Kwon and Polinsky's (2008) properties of Korean -*ko* linkages

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

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

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

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

    a. *John-i*   *Jane-ul*   *cohaha-ko*   *Mary-lul*   *salangha-ess-ta*
       John-NOM   Jane-ACC   like-AND   Mary-ACC   love-PST-DECL
       'John likes Jane and loves Mary.'

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

c. Backwards pronominalisation (=cataphoric reference) impossible

*caki_i-ka   Sue-lul   cohaha-ko   Tom_i-i   John-ul   silhehay-ss-ta
self-NOM   Sue-ACC   like-AND   Tom-NOM   John-ACC   like-PST-DECL
('He_i liked Sue and Tom_i disliked John.')

d. Topicalisation in only one clause impossible

*Mary_i-nun John-i   Jane-ul   cohaha-ko Tom-i   ___i   cohaha-n-ta
Mary-TOP John-NOM Jane-ACC like-AND   Tom-NOM   like-PRS-DECL
('Mary, John likes Jane and Tom likes.')

e. Relativisation out of only one clause impossible

*John-i   Jane-ul   cohaha-ko Tom-i   _____i   cohaha-n   Mary_i
John-NOM   Jane-ACC   like-AND   Tom-NOM   like-REL   Mary
('Mary_i who John likes Jane and Tom likes _____i.')

f. Centre embedding impossible

*Mary-ka   [John-i   yakwu-lul   cohaha-ko]   nongkwu-lul
Mary-NOM   John-NOM   baseball-ACC   like-AND   basketball-ACC
silheha-ess-ta
hate-PST-DECL
('John liked baseball and Mary disliked basketball.')

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

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

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

b. Permutation changes meaning

Mary-ka   tochakha-ko Tom-i   cip-ey   o-ass-ta
Mary-NOM   arrive-AND Tom-NOM   house-LOC   come-PST-DECL
'After Mary arrived, Tom got home.'

c. Backwards pronominalisation possible

caki₍ᵢ₎-ka silswu-lul ha-ko Tom₍ᵢ₎-i na-eykey hwa-lul nay-ss-ta
self-NOM error-ACC do-AND Tom-NOM 1SG-DAT anger-ACC give-PST-DECL
'Tom got mad at me after he made an error.'
(= 'He$_i$ made a mistake and Tom$_i$ got mad at me.)

d. Topicalisation in one clause possible

Taycen₍ᵢ₎-ulo-nun, John-i hankwuk-ey ipkwukha-ko(se)
Daejeon-to-TOP John-NOM Korea-LOC enter-AND

Tom-i _____₍ᵢ₎ isaha-ess-ta
Tom-NOM move-PST-DECL
'As for Daejeon, after John entered Korea, Tom moved (to it).'

e. Relativisation possible

[Mina-ka phyenci-lul ssu-ko(se) _____₍ᵢ₎ ka-n] hakkyo₍ᵢ₎
Mina-NOM letter-ACC write-AND go-ADN school
'The school that Mina went to after she wrote a letter.'

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

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

a. *John-i hakkyo-ey ka-ko Mary-ka John-uy pang-ey*
John-NOM school-to go-AND Mary-NOM John-GEN room-to
mollay tule ka-ess-ta
sneak enter go-PST-DECL
'John went to school and Mary sneaked into John's house.'

b. *Mary-ka [John-i hakkyo-ey ka-ko] John-uy pang-ey*
Mary-NOM John-NOM school-to go-AND John-GEN room-to
mollay tule ka-ess-ta
sneak enter go-PST-DECL
'Mary, after John went to school, sneaked into John's house.'

c. *Inho-nun olaystongan TV-lul po-ko Mina-eykey malha-ess-ta*
Inho-TOP long TV-ACC watch-AND Mina-DAT talk-PST-DECL
'Inho watched TV and talked to Mina for a while.'

d. *Inho-nun Mina-eykey₍ᵢ₎ [olaystongan TV-lul po-ko] _____₍ᵢ₎ malhay-ss-ta*
Inho-TOP Mina-DAT long TV-ACC watch-AND talk-PST-DECL
'Inho watched TV for a while and then talked to Mina.'

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

(22) Relativisation out of the converb clause, Kwon and Polinsky (2008: 95)
    a. *[Mina-ka   _____ᵢ   hapkyekha-ess-ko   emeni-ka   kippum-uy
       Mina-NOM   pass-PST-AND   mother-NOM   joy-GEN
       nwunmwul-ul   *hulli-n]*   *tayhak*
       tear-ACC   shed-ADN   college
       ('The college that Mina got into and her mother shed tears of joy.')
    b. *[sonyen-i*   _____ᵢ   *namki-ko*   *hakkyo-lo*   *ttena-n]*   *phyenciᵢ*
       boy-NOM   leave-AND   school-to   leave-ADN letter
       'A letter that the boy left and went to school.'

In sum, these are the main findings that research on Korean -ko clauses has reported on:

(23) Main findings on Korean -ko linkages
    a. A non-successively interpreted event relationship in a -ko linkage correlates with 'coordinate' properties.
    b. A successively interpreted relationship correlates with 'subordinate' properties.
    c. 'Coordinate' -ko clauses allow for tense inflection, while 'subordinate' -ko clauses do not.
    d. Properties only cluster into these two extremes.

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

3. Characteristics of Jejuan –ko clause linkages

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

3.1. Tests and criteria applied

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

(24) Tests applied in this section:
   a. Centre embedding of a *-ko* clause in the final clause (henceforth 'nesting')
   b. Topicalisation within a *-ko* clause
   c. Relativisation of converb clause, or final-clause constituents
   d. Cataphoric reference establishment from final clause into *-ko* clause
   e. Change of syntactic order of clausal events

The tests follow those applied in the literature described in section 2. As mentioned, the possibility or impossibility of tense was tested in each of the above environments. The topicalisation test slightly differs from Kwon and Polinsky (2008), as structures tested in (19d) and (20d) run into a conflation of nesting and topicalisation: there, constituents are displaced to the left edge of the entire clause linkage. This is in spite of the possibility that both the final clause or converb clauses may retain their own positions for topicalisation, instead of having to resort to an extraposed topic position. A structure identical with (19d) for Jejuan *-nti* clauses in Kim S-U (2018b: 140, see Table 1) was judged ungrammatical by consultants. Discussed in some detail in Kim S-U (2018b: 86), I solely examine the possibility of topicalisation within a *-ko* clause. Furthermore, I adopt Rudnitskaya's (1998) factors of semantic interpretation, subject reference and tense marking (see Table 2) as contexts for syntactic tests. Note that I do not apply Across-the-Board topicalisation/relativisation tests. See Table 4 for a summary of results.

3.2. Syntactic characteristics of Jejuan *-ko* linkages

As mentioned, *-ko* linkages exhibit flexible subject reference. Nesting of *-ko* clauses leads to ungrammaticality, regardless of subject reference or semantic interpretation. Below I link to non-nested counterparts shown earlier (final-clause verb morphology may differ; proper names have sometimes been amended to avoid confusion).[9]

---

9) According to Reviewer 1's intuition, examples (25a), (25b), (26b) and (26d) would be uniformly ungrammatical in Korean as well, contrary to what Kwon and Polinsky (2008) and Rudnitskaya (1998) have found. Reviewer 3 judges ex. (26b) and (26d) as 'perfectly grammatical' (*pace*

(25) Different-subject *-ko* clauses

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

        *sʰumi=ka   [jəŋhii=ka   t͡ɕɔps͡ɔlkɔlul=il kɔla   o-ko]

        Sumi=NOM Yeongheui=NOM rice:flour=ACC grind come-AND

        ʈək=il   t͡ɕit͡ɕə-n

        rice_cake=ACC   fry-PST

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

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

        *sʰumi=ka   [jəŋhii=ka   palisʰkʷeki=lil   t͡ɕaŋman

        Sumi=NOM   Yeongheui=NOM   fish=ACC   prepare

        hə-ko]   t͡ɕilimʈək=il   t͡ɕit͡ɕə-msʰə-la

        do-AND   rice_cake=acc   fry-PROG-EV.IPF-DECL

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

(26) Same-subject *-ko* clauses

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

        toŋsʰu=ka   naŋ=il   at͡ɕə-ŋ   o(a-sʰ)-ko   t͡ɕʰəlsʰu=jəŋ

        Dongsu=NOM tree=acc pick_up-AND   come(-PST)-AND Cheolsu=COM

        hɔnti   kɛt͡ɕip=il   t͡ɕisʰə-n

        together   dog.house=ACC   build-PST

        'Dongsu brought wood and built a dog house together with Cheolsu.'

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

        *toŋsʰu=ka   kɛt͡ɕip=il   [naŋ=il   at͡ɕə-ŋ   o-ko]

        Dongsu=NOM   dog:house=ACC wood=ACC pick_up-AND come-AND

        t͡ɕʰəlsʰu=jəŋ   kɔt͡ɕi   t͡ɕisʰə-n

        Cheolsu=COM   together   build-PST

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

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

        t͡ɕʰəlsʰu=nɨn   atəl=il   wənsʰəŋ hə(jə-sʰ)-ko   ʈɔl=il

        Cheolsu=TOP   son=ACC   blame   do(-PST)-AND   daughter=ACC

        akʲawa   hə-n-ta

        cherish do-PRS-DECL

        'Yeongsu blamed/blames his son and cherishes his daughter.'

---

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

*ʨʰəlsʰu=nɨn   ʈɔl=il   [atəl=il   wənsʰəŋ   hə-ko]
Cheolsu=TOP   daughter=ACC   son=ACC   blame   do-AND

aḵawa   hə-n-ta
cherish   do-PRS-DECL

('Yeongsu, blaming his son, cherishes his daughter.')

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

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

(27) Different-subject
   a. Successive, topicalisation of (7)   [jeju0147, 00:27:46]
      ʨʰɔpsɔlkɔlul=in   jəŋhii=ka   kɔla   oa(-sʰ)-ko   sʰumi=ka
      rice:flour=TOP   Yeongheui=NOM   grind   come(-PST)-AND   Sumi=NOM

      ʈək=il   ʨiʨɜ-sʰʨɜ
      rice_cake=ACC   fry-PST-DECL

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

   b. Non-successive, topicalisation of (6)   [jeju0138, 00:24:27]
      palisʰkʰwʲeki=nɨn   jəŋhii=ka   ʨaŋman   hə(jə-sʰ)-ko
      fish=TOP   Yeongheui=NOM   prepare   do(-PST)-AND

      sʰumi=ka   ʨilimʈək=il   ʨiʨɜ-sʰ-u-ta10)
      Sumi=NOM   rice_cake=ACC   fry-PST-POL-DECL

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

_____

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

(28) Same-subject   [jeju0153, 00:50:39]

   a. *ʨʰəlsʰu=ka*   *moɲə*   *sʰɔsʰneʥi=lil*   *ʥo(a-sʰ)-ko*

       Cheolsu=NOM   first   cord=ACC   braid(-PST)-AND

       ʂisʰmaŋtʰeɲi=lil   *ʨola-n*

       seed:basket=ACC   weave-PST

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

   b. Successive, topicalisation of (28a)[11]   [jeju0153, 00:51:05]

       *sʰɔsʰneʥi=nin   *ʨʰəlsʰu=ka*   *moɲə*   *ʥo-ko*

       cord=TOP   Cheolsu=NOM   first   braid-AND

       ʂisʰmaŋtʰeɲi=lil   *ʨola-n*

       seed:basket=ACC   weave-PST

       ('The strap - Cheolsu braided that first and then he wove the seed basket.')

   c. Non-successive, topicalisation of (26c)   [jeju0153, 01:22:19]

       *atəl=in   *ʨʰəlsʰu=ka*   *wənmaŋ*   *hə-ko*   *ʦɔl=il*

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

       aʥawa   *hə-n-ta*

       cherish   do-PRS-DECL

       ('Cheolsu blames his son and cherishes his daughter.')

The above examples show how the topicalisation behaviour of Jejuan *-ko* clauses differs according to subject reference, yet not according to the semantic interpretation of a *-ko* linkage. This contrasts with the Korean findings from Kwon and Polinsky (2008, see ex. (19d) and (20d)), where topicalisation is said to be impossible in non-successive contexts, yet possible in successive ones.[12]

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

---

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

12) Reviewer 1 opines that Korean *-ko* linkages would in fact behave not at all differently from Jejuan here, *pace* Kwon and Polinsky (2008) and Kwon (2004). While I thank Reviewer 1 for this contribution, I refer to foonote 10.

(29) Different-subject, successive

    a. Relativisation of final-clause object in (7)   [jeju0147, 00:23:05]

        [jəŋhii=ka   *ʂɔlkɔlul=il*   *kɔla*   *oa(-s^h)-ko*

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

        s^{h}umi=ka   _____   *t͡ɕit͡ɕ-in]*   *ʈək*

        Sumi-NOM   fry-ADN   rice_cake

        'The rice cake that Sumi fried after Yeongheui bought the rice flour.'

    b. Relativisation of converb clause object   [jeju0140, 00:25:39]

        *ki   *[jəŋhii=ka*   _____   *kɔla*   *o-ko*   *s^{h}umi=ka*

        that   Yeongheui=NOM   grind   come-AND   Sumi=NOM

        ʈək=il   *t͡ɕit͡ɕ-in]*   *t͡ɕ^{h}ɔpʂɔlkɔlul*

        rice_cake=ACC   fry-ADN   rice:flour

        ('That rice flour that Sumi fried rice cake with after Yeongheui bought it.')

(30) Same-subject, successive

    a. Relativisation of final-clause object in (26a)   [jeju0153, 00:19:29]

        [toŋs^{h}u=ka   *naŋ=il*   *at͡ɕən*   *o(a-s^h)-ko*   *t͡ɕ^{h}əls^{h}u=jən*

        Dongsu=NOM   tree=ACC   pick_up:AND   come(-PST)-AND   Cheolsu=COM

        kɔt͡ɕi   _____   *t͡ɕis^h-in]*   *kɛt͡ɕip=i*   *mak*   *k^{h}əla*

        together   build-ADN   dog:house=NOM   very   be_big:EV.IPF:DECL

        'The dog house, that Dongsu brought wood for and built together with Cheolsu, was very big.'

    b. Relativisation of converb clause object   [jeju0153, 00:22:34]

        *[toŋs^{h}u=ka   _____   *at͡ɕən*   *o-ko*   *t͡ɕ^{h}əls^{h}u=jən*

         Dongsu=NOM   pick_up:AND   come-AND   Cheolsu=COM

        kɔt͡ɕi   *kɛt͡ɕip*   *t͡ɕis^h-in]*   *naŋ=i*   *mak*   *hulk-ə-la*

        together   dog:house   build-ADN   tree=NOM   very   thick-EV.IPF-DECL

        ('The wood that Dongsu brought and built a dog house with, was very thick.')[13]

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

---

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

(31) Different-subject, non-successive   [field notes, EQ2015-12-03, (5)]

    a. *sʰumi=nɨn*   *ʨʰəlsʰu=lil*   *sʰɔlaŋ*   *hə-ko*   *toŋsʰu=nɨn*

       Sumi=TOP   Cheolsu=ACC   love   do-AND   Dongsu=TOP

       jəŋhii=lil   *sʰɔlaŋ*   *hə-n-ta*

       Yeongheui=ACC   love   do-PRS-DECL

       'Sumi loves Cheolsu and Dongsu loves Yeongheui.'

    b. Relativisation of converb clause object

       [sʰumi=ka _____ sʰɔlaŋ hə-ko toŋsʰu=ka jəŋhii=lil

       Sumi=NOM   love do-AND Dongsu=NOM Yeongheui=ACC

       sʰɔlaŋ   *hə-nɨn]*   *ʨʰəlsʰu*

       love   do-ADN   Cheolsu

       ('Cheolsu who Sumi loves and Dongsu loves Yeongheui'.)

    c. Relativisation of final clause object

       [sʰumi=ka ʨʰəlsʰu=lil sʰɔlaŋ hə-ko toŋsʰu=ka _____

       Sumi=NOM Cheolsu=ACC love   do-AND Dongsu=NOM

       sʰɔlaŋ   *hə-nɨn]*   *jəŋhii*

       love   do-ADN Yeongheui

       ('Yeongheui who Sumi loves Cheolsu and Dongsu loves'.)

(32) Same-subject, non-successive

    a. Relativisation of converb clause object   [jeju0153, 01:19:00]

       [jəŋsʰu=ka _____ wənmaŋ hə-ko ʈɔl=il[14] aƙawa

       Yeongsu=NOM   blame do-AND daughter=ACC cherish

       hə-nɨn]   *atəl*

       do-ADN son

       ('The son who Yeongsu blames and cherishes his daughter'.)

    b. Relativisation of final clause object   [jeju0153, 01:18:22]

       [jəŋsʰu=ka atəl=il wənmaŋ hə-ko _____ aƙawa

       Yeongsu=NOM son=ACC blame do-AND   cherish

       hə-nɨn]   *ʈɔl*

       do-ADN daughter

       ('The daughter who Yeongsu blames his son and cherishes'.)

---

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

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

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

Cataphoric reference tests mostly lead to ungrammaticality, with some caveats to be discussed below. In the following I show examples employing the deictic phrase (*ki*)*kə* (that is, *ki=kə*, THAT=THING), as well as the pronominal *iɲək*, 'oneself'.

(33) Cataphoric reference

    a. Successive   [jeju0147, 00:32:07]

        jəɲhii=ka   *kikə=l$_{*i/\checkmark j}$*   *t͡ɕit͡ɕ-i-ko*   *sʰumi=ka*

        Yeongheui=NOM   that=ACC   fry-EP-AND   Sumi=NOM

        t͡ɕilimʈək=il$_i$ *məkə-sʰt͡ɕə*

        rice_cake=ACC   eat-PST-DECL

        ('Yeongheui fried that$_{*i/\checkmark j}$ and Sumi ate the rice cake$_i$.')

    b. Successive   [jeju0153, 00:33:32]

        iɲək=i$_{*i/\checkmark j}$ *koʰsʰ=il*   *sʰa-ko*   *kə=l*   *sʰumi$_i$*   *t͡ɕip*

        self=NOM   flower=ACC   buy-AND   that=ACC   Sumi   house

        apʰita   *noa-n*

        front-LOC   put-PST

        ('She herself$_i$ bought a plant and put it in front of Sumi's$_i$ house.')[15]

---

15) Reviewer 3 is sceptical of glossing *-n* as a *-*PST marker, as they point out it is formally identical with a *-n* converb form, a 'realis mood variant' of a *-ŋ* converb (Hong J-R 2001), cf. (1). They claim that when used sentence-finally, the utterance is a result of 'truncation', with a subsequent final clause being omitted, adding that in these contexts, the *-n* would be 'freely interchangeable' with the past tense form *-usʰə*, -PST-ILLOC. This is precisely the point: the clause with a *-n* pst form can carry illocutionary force just like one with a *-usʰə*, -PST-ILLOC form. The tense reference of the *-n* converb is relative, but the tense reference of an independent utterance with a *-n* PST suffix is absolute. Also, the converb form varies with a *-ne* form, while the past tense marker does not. The intonation takes on a typical sentence-final intonation (see Ko Y.-L 2009), whereas for the converb one will have one typical for linked clauses.

c. Non-successive [jeju0138, 01:52:18]

*?inək=in*ᵢ *ʨipʨujən=il* *wənsʰəŋ* *hə(jə-msʰ)-ko* *ʨipʨujən=in*
self=ACC landlord=ACC blame do(-PROG)-AND landlord=TOP

*toŋsʰu=lil*ᵢ *akawa* *hemsʰʨə*
Dongsu=ACC cherish do:PROG:DECL

('Himselfᵢ blames the landlord, and the landlord appreciates Dongsuᵢ.')

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

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

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

(34) Same-subject, successive

a. *sʰumi=ka* *ˌsɔlkɔlul=il* *kɔla* *o(a-sʰ)-ko* *ʨilimʈək* *ʨiʨə-sʰu-ta*
Sumi=NOM rice:flour=ACC grind come(-PST)-AND rice_cake fry-PST-POL-DECL
'Sumi brought the rice flour and fried the rice cake.'

b. #sʰumi=ka ʨilimʨək ʨiʨe(ə-sʰ)-ko sɔlkɔlul=il kɔla oa-sʰ-u-ta

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

  #'Sumi fried rice cake and brought the flour for it.' / ✓'Sumi fried rice cake and brought rice flour for something else.'

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

4. Discussion of findings

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

Table 4. Morphosyntactic properties of Jejuan –ko linkages

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

As mentioned in section 3.2, there are some caveats regarding cataphora tests that I am simplifying at this place. While Kwon and Polinsky (2008) do not systematically differentiate between different-subject (DS) and same-subject (SS above) reference, their generalisation is such that correlating with non-successive and successive interpretation of events in a –ko linkage, syntactic properties will show clear-cut 'coordinate' or 'subordinate' behaviour. This view is shared by almost all authors

working on the Korean -*ko* linkage, although those working in generative frameworks may differ in arguing whether a 'coordinate' or 'subordinate' structure is to be regarded the underlying 'one' (= 'the underlying one').

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

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

1. Jejuan -*ko* clauses resist syntactic embedding altogether, while Korean -*ko* clauses are reported to be embeddable in successive contexts, yet not in non-successive contexts.
2. Cataphoric reference is generally disallowed in a Jejuan -*ko* linkage, albeit subject to discourse-pragmatic 'porousness'. Korean -*ko* clauses allow such reference in successive contexts, yet not in non-successive contexts.
3. Jejuan -*ko* clauses do not impose a syntactic ban on converbal tense marking, whereas Korean -*ko* clauses are said to disallow tense marking in successive contexts, while it is optional in non-succesive contexts.

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

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

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

6. Topicalisation is possible in different-subject contexts, yet not in same-subject contexts. In Korean -*ko* linkages, semantic interpretation is the decisive factor in this regard.

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

Linear order change effects in clause linkage have been observed widely under the topic of iconicity in grammar (Haiman 1980, Givón 1985), and named 'tense iconicity' by Haiman and Thompson (1984). Here, we are talking about how extra-linguistic, ontological conditions of temporality and cause-and-effect are iconically represented in linear ordering in syntax. Restrictions on extraction, on the other hand, have to do with syntactic island effects now widely known through Ross's (1967) seminal work on the Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC). The Jejuan data suggests that -*ko* clauses in successive linkages are syntactic islands, where in non-successive contexts, the entire linkage constitutes a syntactic island similar to what we traditionally know under coordination.

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

    a. 'coordinate' construal

*minswu-ka	*wuyu-lul*	*kacye*	*o-ko*		*nay-ka*
Minsu-NOM	milk-ACC	have:INF	come-AND		1SG-NOM

sa-ss-te-n	*ppang-i*	*masiss-e-yo*
buy-PST-RETR-AT	bread-NOM	taste-ILLOC-POL

    ('The bread I bought and Minsu brought milk is tasty.')

    b. 'adverbial' construal

✓*minswu-ka*	*wuyu-lul*	*kacye*	*o-ko*	*(na-n*	*twi-ey)*
Minsu-NOM	milk-ACC	have:INF	come-AND	exit-AT	behind-LOC

nay-ka	*sa-ss-te-n*	*ppang-i*	*masiss-e-yo*
1SG-NOM	buy-PST-RETR-AT	bread-NOM	taste-ILLOC-POL

    'The bread I bought after Minsu brought milk is tasty.'

In Jendraschek and Shin's (2018: 1119) functional take, the divergent relativisation

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Conclusion

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

Clearly, one needs to find a way to accomodate the fact that Jejuan -ko clauses do not show all properties of either traditional coordination or subordination. Moreover, if Jejuan behaves differently from Korean, it may be that other Koreanic varieties may show some variation in this respect as well. Thus a less conflicting model of clause linkage should ensure for variety-specific peculiarities to be captured, without having to call into question major categorial distinctions that turn out to

have been ill-conceived in the first place. Inspired by the typological literature that debates issues of cross-linguistic comparability (see section 2.1 cf. Plank 2016, Brown et al. 2013, Bickel 2010, Lehmann 1988), I would either suggest a more open approach such as Jendraschek and Shin's (2018) that allows us to place individual linguistic phenomena on a continuum between subordination and coordination, or recommend decomposing the categories of 'coordination' and 'subordination' into a multidimensional array of defining properties (cf. Bickel 2010 or Haiman and Thompson 1984), each of which can operate theoretically independently.

Abbreviations

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

References

Barnes-Sadler, Simon. (2017). *Central Asian and Yanbian Korean in Comparative Perspective*. Ph.D thesis (4458). SOAS University of London.

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

Brown, Lucien and Jaehoon Yeon. (2015). Varieties of contemporary Korean. In Lucien Brown and Jaehoon Yeon, eds., *The Handbook of Korean Linguistics*, 439−458. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

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

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

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

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

Culicover, Peter W. and Ray S. Jackendoff. (1997). Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28(2), 195-218.

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

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

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

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

Gippert, Jost, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann and Ulrike Mosel, eds. (2006). *Essentials of Language Documentation*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Givón, Talmy. (1985). Iconicity, isomorphism, and non-arbitrary coding in syntax. In Haiman, John, ed., *Iconicity in Syntax*, 187−220. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haegeman, Liliane. (2010). The internal syntax of adverbial clauses. *Lingua* 120(3), 628-648.

Haegeman, Liliane. (2003). Conditional clauses: external and internal syntax. *Mind and Language,* 18(4), 317-339.

Haiman, John. (1980). The iconicity of grammar: isomorphism and motivation. *Language* 56, 515−540.

Haiman, John. and Sandra A. Thompson (1984). "Subordination" in Universal Grammar. In Brugman, Claudia and Monica Macauley, eds., *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 510-523. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. (2007a). Coordination. In Shopen, Timothy, ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic Description II: Complex Constructions*, 1-51. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. (2007b). Pre-established categories don't exist: Consequences for language description and typology. *Linguistic Typology* 11(1), 119-132.

Haspelmath, Martin. (2004). Coordinating constructions: an overview. In Haspelmath, Martin, ed., *Coordinating Constructions,* 3-40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haspelmath, Martin. (1995). The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. In Haspelmath, Martin and Ekkehard König, eds., *Converbs in Cross-linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms―Adverbial Participles, Gerunds*, 1-55. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Haspelmath, Martin. and Ekkehard, König., eds. (1995). *Converbs in Cross-linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms―Adverbial Participles, Gerunds*, 1-55. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Hong, Jisup. (2012). *Connective Polysemy and Clause Linkage Typology in Korean*. Ph.D. dissertation. UC Berkeley. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/58z7r4dg [Accessed 2019-08-22]

Hong, Jong-Rim. (2001). Ceycwupangen Yenkyelemi '-n, -ŋ'ey tayhaye [About the Connective Suffixes '-*n*', '-*ŋ*' in Ceycwu Dialect]. *Enehak [Linguistics]* 38, 271-304.

Hyun, Pyeong-Hyo and Young-Bong Kang. (2011). *Ceycwue Cwosa Emi Sacen* [A Dictionary of Jejuan Suffixes and Particles]. Jeju City: Gak Book Publishing.

Jendraschek, Gerd. and Yong-Min Shin. (2018). Korean converbs between coordination and subordination. *Linguistics* 56(5), 1099-1139.

Jendraschek, Gerd. and Yong-Min Shin. (2011). Suffixal clause-linking in Korean on the subordination-coordination continuum. *Presentation held at the 44th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea in Logroño, Spain, 2011-09-11.*

Jones, Mari. C. and Sarah Ogilvie, eds. (2013). *Keeping Languages Alive: Documentation, Pedagogy And Revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kang, Young-Bong. (2007). *Ceycwue* [Jeju language]. National Folk Museum, Jeju Special Self-Governing Province.

Kazenin, Konstantin. I. and Yakov G. Testelets. (2004). Where coordination meets subordination: Converb constructions in Tsakhur (Daghestanian). In Haspelmath, Martin, ed., *Coordinating Constructions*, 227-240. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kim, Jee-Hong. (2017). Non-canonical ending systems in Jeju Korean. *Pangenhak,* 26, 229‒260.

Kim, Jee-Hong. (2016.) Ceycwu pangenuy senemalemiwa cwongkyelemi cheykyey [The pre-final suffixes and final suffixing system of the Ceycwu dialect]. *Hankul* 313, 109-171.

Kim, Jee-Hong. (2014). *Ceycwu Pangenuy Thwongsa Kiswulkwa Selmyeng: Kipwonkwumunuy Kineungpemcwu Pwunsek* [The Description and Explication of Ceycwu Dialect Syntax: the analysis of functional categories within a basic clause]. Seoul: Kyungjin.

Kim, Soon-Ja. (2010). *Tolkak Tolkak Minyeng Ssameng Ulin Nulkescwu – Aywelup Pwongsengli Kangcisuk Halmeni Sayngay Kwusul* ["Well, we would work the cotton again and again, that's how we got older" – a life history of Ms Kang Cisuk from Aewol-Eup Bongseong-Ri]. Jeju: Jeju National University, National Language Institute.

Kim, Soung-U. (2018a). *A Multi-Modal Documentation of Jejuan Conversations.* London: SOAS, Endangered Languages Archive. Retrieved from https://elar.soas.ac.uk/deposit/0351. Accessed on [2019-08-10].

Kim, Soung-U. (2018b). *Finiteness in Jejuan Adverbial Clauses: a Canonical Typology Approach.* Ph.D thesis. SOAS University of London (4617).

Ko, Dong-Ho, Sang-Jo Song, Chang-Myeong O, Sun-Deok Mun and Seung-Hun O (2016). *Ceycwusmaluy ihay* [On the Jeju lect]. Jeju City: Jeju Studies Research Centre at Jeju Development Research Institute.

Ko, Young-Lim. (2009). Ceycwu pangenuy tayhwachey tamhwaey nathanan ekyang yenkwu – 70tay isang kwolyeng hwacalul chwungsimulwo [Intonation characteristics in conversational discourse of Cheju dialect - case study on speakers older than 70]. *Hankwukenemunhwa* 40, 5-28.

Kroeger, Paul. (2004). *Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kwon, Nayoung and Maria Polinsky. (2008). What does coordination look like in a head final language? In Lewandowski, Barbara, ed., *Asymmetric Events*, 87–102. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kwon, Nayoung. (2004). Syntactic and semantic mismatches in the Korean ko-construction. In Schmeiser, Benjamin, Vineeta Chand, Ann Kelleher and Angelo Rodriguez, eds., *WCCFL 23 Proceedings*, 101-114. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Lee, Ki-Mun. and S. Robert Ramsey. (2011). *A History of the Korean Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, Jenny. S. (2014). Adjoined koP in Korean clausal coordination: implications for the Across-the-Board analysis. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 20(1). Retrieved from https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol20/iss1/21 [retrieved 2019-02-21].

Lee, Sean. (2015). A Sketch of Language History in the Korean Peninsula. Mokrousov, Igor, ed., *PLoS ONE* 10.5.

Lehmann, Christian. (1988). Towards a typology of clause linkage. In Haiman, John and Sandra A. Thompson, eds., *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, 181-226. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, Daniel. and Young-Cheol Yim. (2002). Regional differences in the perception of Korean dialects. In Long, Daniel and Dennis R. Preston, eds., *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology* II, 249-275. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Longacre, Robert. E. (2007). Sentences as combinations of clauses. In Shopen, Timothy, ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic Description II*, 372–420. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, John. (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matthewson, Lisa. (2004). On the methodology of semantic fieldwork. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 70(4), 369-415.

Moseley, Christopher, ed. (2010). *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, 3rd ed. UNESCO Publishing.

Mun, Sug-Yeong. (2006). Ceycwupangenuy '-emsi-'uy pemcwuwa kwanlyentwoyn myech muncey [On issues regarding the categories related to '-emsi' of the Ceycwu dialect]. *Hyengthayron* 8(2), 393-403.

Mun, Sug-Yeong. (2004). Ceycwu pangenuy hyeoncaysicey hyengthayswoey tayhaye [On the present tense morphology of the Ceycwu dialect]. *Hyengthayron* 6(2), 293-316.

Mun, Sug-Yeong. (1998). *Ceycwutwo panenguy sisang hyengthayey tayhan yenkwu [On the tense-aspect morphology of the Ceycwu dialect]*. Masters dissertation, Seoul National University. Retrieved from http://s-space.snu.ac.kr/handle/10371/53637 [retrieved 2019-08-13]

Nikolaeva, Irina. (2013). Unpacking finiteness. In Brown, Dunstan, Marina Chumakina, and Greville G. Corbett, eds., *Canonical Morphology and Syntax*, 99-122. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nikolaeva, Irina. (2010). Typology of finiteness. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4(12), 1176-1189.

Nikolaeva, Irina, ed. (2007). *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

O'Grady, William. (2014). Jejueo: Korea's other language. *Paper presented at the 7th World Congress of Korean Studies, 5th─7th Nov 2014, at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa*. Retrieved from http://congress.aks.ac.kr/korean/files/2_1413765292.pdf [Accessed 2019-08-22]

Olson, Michael. (1981). *Barai Clause Junctures: Toward a Functional Theory of Interclausal Relations*. Canberra: Australian National University dissertation.

Pak, Dong-Ho. (2013). A study of the Korean clausal connectives '-ese' and '-ko' of temporal sequence. *Acta Koreana* 16(1), 5-21.

Pangenyenkwuhoy. (2001). *Pangenhaksacen* [A Dictionary of Dialectology]. Seoul: Taehaksa.

Plank, Frans. (ed.). 2016. *Linguistic Typology* 20(2).

Roberts, John. R. (1988). Amele switch-reference and the theory of grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19(1), 45-63.

Ross, John. R. (1967). *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Rudnitskaya, Elena. (1998). Syntactic properties of the altaic coordination construction in Korean. *Sprachtypologische Universalienforschung* 51(2), 179-198.

Silva, David. (2010). Death, taxes, and language change: The inevitable divergence of Korean varieties as spoken worldwide. In Fouser, Robert J., ed., *Contemporary Korean Linguistics: International Perspectives – In Honor of Professor Sang-Oak Lee*, 300─319. Seoul: Taehaksa.

Sohn, Ho-Min. (2009). The semantics of clause linking in Korean. In Dixon, Robert M. W. and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, eds., *The Semantics of Clause Linking. A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, 285-317. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sohn, Ho-Min. (1999). *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Song, Sang-Jo. (2011). *Ceycwumaleyse Ttaykalimswo '‑ng, ‑n'kwa Ssikkuthtuluy Hwoung* [The morphemes -ŋ, -n of temporal distinction and the interaction of suffixes]. Seoul: Hankookmunhwasa.

Williams, Edwin. (1978). Across-the-board rule application. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 31-43.

Yang, Chang-Yong and Wonbo Kim. (2013). Ceycwue 'key'uy tamhwacek kinungey tayhan kwochal [A study on the discourse functions of *-key* in the Jeju language]. *Language and Linguistics,* 59, 143-164.

Yeon, Jaehoon. (2012). Korean dialects: a general survey. In Tranter, Nicholas, ed., *The Languages of Japan and Korea*, 168-185. Abingdon: Routledge.

Yoon, James. (1997). Coordination (A)Symmetry. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 7, 3-30.

Yoon, Jeong-Mee. (1996). Verbal coordination in Korean and English and the checking approach to verbal morphology. *Ene* 21(4), 1105-1135.

Yuasa, Etsuyo. and Jerry M. Sadock. (2002). Pseudo-subordination: A mismatch between syntax and semantics. *Journal of Linguistics,* 38(1), 87-111.

Soung-U Kim
Research Fellow
Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures
SOAS University of London
10 Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square, London WC1H 0XG, United Kingdom
E-mail: sk138@soas.ac.uk

Appendix: Transliteration conventions

'Han'=Hangeul, 'JIPA'='Jejuan IPA transliteration' devised by the author, 'Y'='Yale romanisation','RR'='Revised Romanisation'.

Han	JIPA	Y	RR	Han	JIPA	Y	RR
ㄱ	k	k	g/k	ㅗ	o	(w)o	o
ㄴ	n	n	n	ㅓ	ə	e	eo
ㄷ	t	t	d/t	ㅏ	a	a	a
ㄹ	l	l	r/l	ㅣ	i	i	i
ㅁ	m	m	m	. (alay-a)	ɔ	o	-
ㅂ	p	p	b/p	ㅜ	u	wu	u
ㅅ	sʰ	s	s	ㅡ	ɨ	u	eu
ㅇ (initial)	-	-	-	ㅐ	ɛ	ay	ae
ㅇ (final)	ŋ	ng	ng	ㅔ	e	ey	e
ㅈ	t͡ɕ	c	j	ㅛ	jo	yo	yo
ㅊ	t͡ɕʰ	ch	ch	ㅕ	jə	ye	yeo
ㅋ	kʰ	kh	k	ㅑ	ja	ya	ya
ㅌ	tʰ	th	t	ㅠ	ju	yu	yu
ㅍ	pʰ	ph	p	ㅒ	jɛ	yay	yae
ㅎ	h	h	h	ㅖ	je	yey	ye
ㅃ	p̚	pp	pp	.. (double alay-a)	jɔ	-	-
ㅉ	t͡ɕ̚	cc	jj	ㅘ	wa	wa	wa
ㄸ	t̚	tt	tt	ㅟ	wi	wi	wi
ㄲ	k̚	kk	kk	ㅚ	we	woy	oe
ㅆ	s̚	ss	ss	ㅙ	wɛ	way	wae
ㄹㄹ	lː	-	-	ㅞ	we	wey	we
냐/녀	ɲa/ɲə	-	-	ㅝ	wə	we	wo
				ㅢ	ɨi	uy	eui