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Abstract

The phenomena comprised by the notion ‘subordination’ are heterogeneous, but may be ordered according to the following six parameters:

1. The **integration** of the subordinate clause into the main clause. This includes the **hierarchical downgrading** of the former, from independent to governed clause, and the **syntactic level** of the main clause which the subordinate syntagm is attached to, from outside the main clause to inside the verbal constituent.

2. The **desententialization** of the subordinate clause, from full finite clause to verbal noun.

3. The **grammaticalization** of the main verb, from a full lexical verb to a grammatical operator in the form of a grammatical or derivational affix.

4. The **interlacing** of the two clauses, from complete semantic and structural disjunction to maximal overlap.

5. The **explicitness of linking**, from maximally explicit syndesis to asyndesis.

Examples from a variety of languages are considered to cover the relevant continua with material and to provide a background for the Latin situation. The strategies and limitations typical of the Latin language are highlighted.

1. Basic concepts

The aim of my contribution is twofold: first, to present the parameters which are constitutive for the subordinate constructions of the languages of the world and to show to what degree they correlate; second, to characterize the Latin system of subordination with respect to this general typological framework.

A syntagm X will be said to be **subordinate** only if the uppermost controller of dependency in X is a verbal form, which may be finite or non-finite. X is subordinate to Y iff X and Y form an endocentric construction Z with Y as the head. ‘Endocentric construction’ here has to be taken in a loose sense; a more adequate notion of subordination will emerge at the end of my contribution. Note that for X to be a constituent of Z does not imply that there be anything in Z or Y on which X depends. The definition is thus broad enough to guarantee that subordination be complementary to **independence**. Embedding is the dependency of a subordinate constituent.

The following semantosyntactic parameters are relevant for subordination and clause linkage across languages:

1. the integration of the subordinate clause into the main clause;
2. the desententialization of the subordinate clause;
3. the grammaticalization of the main verb;
4. the interlacing of the two clauses;
5. the explicitness of the linking.
These parameters will first be presented separately, as if they were independent of each other. In the final section we shall turn to possible correlations among them.

2. Integration

The integration of the subordinate syntagm into the main clause has two aspects: the **hierarchical downgrading** of the former and the **syntactic level** of the main clause which the subordinate syntagm is attached to. I will treat each of these in turn.

### 2.1. Hierarchical downgrading

Consider the following examples (brackets set off subordinate syntagms):

**E1.**  I was trimming a boomerang, there you came up.

**E2.** ŋatjulu-.lu lpa-na kalī tjantu-ṇu,

**WAL**  I-ERG PAST-SBJ.1 boomerang trim-PAST

  kutja-Ø-ya-nu-ṇu njuntu.

  [SR-AUX-SBJ.2 walk-PAST-hither you]

  "I was trimming a boomerang when you came up." (Hale 1976: 79)

**E3.**  [quei ager ex privato in publicum commutatus est], de eo agro siremps lex esto.

**LAT**  "Any land that has been converted from private into public, to such land the law shall apply in the same way." (CIL I² 585)

**E4.**  Nipe kaj al-ōm (hainō) ribō yaŋ ar-ōp.

**KOB**  [3.SG pig shoot-3.SG.SS] after river below go-PRT.3SG

  "He killed a pig and (later) went down to the river." (Davies 1981:36)

**E5.**  L. Petrosidius aquilifer ... pro castris [fortissime pugnans] occiditur.

**LAT**  "L. Petrosidius, the colour-bearer, is killed in front of the camp, fighting most bravely." (Caes. B.G. 5,37,5)

**E6.**  Telebois iubet [sententiam ut dicant suam].

**LAT**  "He orders the Teleboans to give their opinion." (Pl.Am. 205)

These examples differ gradually with respect to **hierarchical downgrading.** At the start of the continuum, there is no hierarchical relation between the two clauses forming the complex sentence. This is the pole of parataxis. At the end, there is a clear hierarchical relation between them, the subordinate clause being downgraded to a particular, well-defined constituent within the main clause. This is the pole of embedding. Between the poles, there are various constructions in which the subordinate clause is ever more downgraded.

**E1** shows parataxis. In **E2** from Walbiri (Australia) we find what has been called an **adjoined clause** (Hale 1976). The subordinate clause, identifiable by the subordinative conjunction, cannot be embedded in the main clause, but has to either precede or follow it. This is the faint beginning of hierarchical downgrading and of subordination.

**E3** shows a **correlative diptych.** As Haudry (1973, §3) puts it, this is halfway between parataxis and hypotaxis. The relative clause in this example is subordinate, but
not embedded. As it stands, it could not even be embedded. Latin does, of course, have the alternative possibility of embedding similar clauses within the main clause.

E4 from Kobon (Papua New Guinea; see Davies 1981) shows clause chaining. Here the clauses of a complex sentence come in chains which can grow fairly long. All the non-final clauses are subordinate to the final one. They lack tense, aspect and mood categories and have a special set of person agreement suffixes (see §5). Although the non-final clauses are subordinate, they cannot be said to be embedded in the final clause.

Again, there is a small difference between this construction and the Latin conjunct participle of E5. This is clearly embedded in the main clause. However, its syntactic function is not crystal-clear (cf. Pinkster 1984, ch. 8). It is a blend, as it were, of an apposition and an adverbial, and thus not subject to government.

E6 finally shows a typical embedded clause, namely an object clause governed by the main verb. The hierarchical inequality of the two clauses cannot, in principle, become clearer than this.

The continuum of hierarchical downgrading is represented in F1.

F1. Hierarchical downgrading

parataxis <---------------------------------------------> embedding
independent adjoined correlative medial part. governed
clauses clause diptych clause coni. clause

2.2. Constituent structure level

A second aspect of the integration of the subordinate clause into the main clause, closely related to its hierarchical downgrading, is the variation according to the main clause syntactic level which the subordinate clause belongs to. The lower this level, the tighter the subordinate clause is integrated into the main clause. In E1 there are only independent clauses; they are thus on the text level. The subordinate clauses in E2 and E3 are not constituents of the main clause, but are on the same syntactic level as the latter; namely the sentence level. The subordinate clause in E4 occupies an intermediate position between being outside and inside the main clause. The conjunct participle of E5 is on some level between clause and VP. Finally, the subordinate clause in E6 is on the VP level.

This looks like a neat correlation between hierarchical downgrading and constituent structure level. However, there can be subordinate predications on very low constituent structure levels which are far from being governed by a main clause constituent.

E7. Nipe wañi bi së ud ar-öp.

KOB 3.SG [string.bag illicitly take] go-PRF.3.SG

"He stole the string bag." (Davies 1981:203)

E7 illustrates verb serialization. This involves the combination of verbals to complex verbals without the intervention of any connectives. Usually only the last verb in the series carries the finite inflection. The preceding verbal is not governed by the following one (or vice versa) and perhaps does not even depend on it. On the other hand, the main
clause constituent structure level on which the preceding verb is adjoined is certainly not above the VP.

This shows that although advanced hierarchical downgrading of the subordinate clause implies a low constituent structure level for it, the converse does not hold. Thus the relation between the continua of hierarchical downgrading and of constituent structure level is one of unilateral implication.

E8 to E11 are meant to show that the various processes of subordination are also operative at levels below the VP.

LAT "Cato used to say this."

E9. I will [go] to bed now.

E10. Ho fatto prendere a mio figlio un'altra professione.
ITA have:1.SG made [take:INF to my son an other profession] "I had my son choose another profession."

QUE Jose-TOP Juan-ACC poncho-ACC [weave]-CAUS-PAST(3.SG) "Jose had Juan weave a poncho." (Cole 1982:135)

The verbs on which the subordinate constructions depend here are operators forming complex predicates. Lat. soleo as in E8 may be regarded as forming a periphrastic habitual aspect by governing an infinitival. Engl. will as in E9 is an auxiliary which takes an uninflected verb as its complement. So here we are down to the level of the verbal or even the (analytic) verb form.

A causative construction may have the appearance of a complex sentence, with the verb of causation functioning as the main clause verb and the caused event being expressed by a subordinate clause governed by the verb of causation. The Italian causative construction illustrated in E10 comes close to this characterization, except that the subordinate clause is reduced to an infinitival. It also shows that the subordinate predicate has a tendency to attach directly to the verb of causation. This process is further advanced in E11 from Imbabura Quechua. The verb of causation here is reduced to a verbal suffix. The syntactic level we are dealing with is thus that of the verb.

F2 shows the continuum of the syntactic level:

---

F2. **Syntactic level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sentence</th>
<th>word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subordinate clause</td>
<td>complex predicate formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside main clause</td>
<td>inside main clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at margin</td>
<td>inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of main clause</td>
<td>inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside</td>
<td>verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb</td>
<td>serial-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serial-</td>
<td>peri-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peri-</td>
<td>deriva-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deriva-</td>
<td>phrasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrasis</td>
<td>tion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Desententialization of subordinate clause

The second of the parameters that structure a typology of clause linkage is the degree to which the subordinate clause is desententialized. First of all, a subordinate clause may not normally have its own illocutionary force, because one sentence, however complex, has only one illocutionary force. Look at the following examples:

E12. He believed [(that) I wrote a letter].
E13. Non temere est [quod corvos cantat mihi nunc ab laeva manu].
LAT "It is not by chance that the raven now croaks at me from the left side." (Pl. Au. 624)

The structure of the noun clauses in both of these sentences differs minimally from that of an independent clause. However, even with such a low degree of desententialization, one thing is missing, viz. the illocutionary force that the corresponding independent sentences would have. The same can be seen in all the examples so far given except for E1.

E14. ad Italiam accedet, [in qua nos sedentes quid erimus]?
LAT "He will approach Italy, where we will be sitting and doing what?" (Cic.Att.10,8,4)
E15. Perutiles Xenophontis libri sunt, [quos legite, quaeso, studiose]!
LAT "Highly useful are Xenophon's books; please read them thoroughly!" (Cic.Cat.M.59)

The only subordinate clauses which may have their own illocutionary force are of the kind represented in E14 and E15, viz. appositive relative clauses. Their semantosyntax is similar to that of parentheses. The relation linking them to a main clause constituent is not one of dependency, but of sociation, which means they are close to the left pole of the continuum of hierarchical downgrading. I predict that such cases will become rarer as we approach the right pole of this continuum.

A further consequence of the desententialization of the subordinate clause are constraints on its mood. It suffices to mention some relevant facts. In Latin the choice of mood is constrained by syntactic rules in most kinds of subordinate clauses. The subordinate clauses of E12 and E13 show an obligatory indicative, the one of E4 an obligatory subjunctive. In several languages, among them Accadic, all finite subordinate clauses are in the subjunctive. Such restrictions are intimately connected with the lack of illocutionary force in subordinate clauses. As soon as it comes to non-finite subordinate constructions, there is no longer any mood. Examples are E5, E8 - E11 and E16.

E16. [Cognito Caesaris adventu] Ariovistus legatos ad eum mittit.
LAT "When he learnt about Caesar's arrival, Ariovistus sent envoys to him." (Caes. B.G. 1,42,1)

The next verbal categories that get reduced and finally lost in desententialization are tense and aspect. We saw that in Kobon non-final clauses and serial verbs tense and aspect are missing and are understood to be those of the final clause or verb, respectively.
In the Turkish noun clause illustrated in E17, the tense-aspect system is reduced to a binary opposition between non-future (suffix -diğ-) and future (-eceğ). This opposition is bound up with voice in that the -diğ-form cannot function as an active participle, as can the -eceğ-form. Similarly, the Latin participle shown in E5 and E16 allows only of a three way tense opposition, with the perfect being bound up with passive voice. Similar observations apply to the dependent verbs in E8 - E11.

Finally, the predication expressed in an independent clause, and also in such relatively weakly desententialized subordinate clauses as those in E2 - E4, gets lost, and simultaneously the subject slot of the subordinate verb is either converted into an oblique slot or is entirely lost. The verb becomes non-finite. For verbs which conjugate for person when finite, this involves loss of personal inflection. The NP corresponding to the subject is not in the nominative, but in an oblique case. Often this is the genitive, as in E17. The possessive suffix on the subordinate verb here agrees with the syntactic possessor (corresponding to the subject).

In Latin, this is known as the genitivus subjectivus accompanying verbal nouns such as the one in E18.

The subject of the finite verb may also appear in the accusative when the verb becomes non-finite. This may happen to the causee in a causative construction, as in E11. It also happens in the accusativus cum infinitivo, as illustrated in E19 - E21.

The semantic subject going into the dative is illustrated in the causative construction of E10. Complete loss of the subject slot is shown by E8.

The subject is the first of the verbal actants to be affected by desententialization. On stronger nominalization, the whole verbal government is destroyed, so that NPs corresponding to the actants of the finite verb appear in the genitive or in adpositional phrases. We have seen the Latin genitivus objectivus in E18. The more a verb gets nominalized, the more it starts behaving like an ordinary noun. In this sense we speak of the increasing nominality of subordinate clauses reduced by desententialization.
We now have seen processes of desententialization which are operative inside the subordinate clause. Increasing nominality of a subordinate construction also endows it with the distributional properties of a noun. One such property is the combinability with adpositions and case affixes. The more a subordinate clause is nominalized, the more easily it combines with adpositions and case affixes.

No finite clause in Latin may be governed by a preposition, let alone take a case suffix. The relative clause in E3 cannot be governed by the preposition *de*. Instead, it must be reinstantiated as an anaphoric pronoun, and in this form it can combine with the preposition. It is only non-finite constructions such as the gerundive in E22 which may be governed by a preposition.

E22. palus ... Romanos [ad insequendum] tardabat.
LAT "A swamp detained the Romans in the pursuit." (Caes.B.G. 7,26,2)

In E6 the subordinate clause is the object of the main verb; but there is no way it could be in the accusative. Even the non-finite object clause of E21, directly comparable to the Quechua construction of E19, is not in the accusative. Instead of combining a whole subordinate construction with a case suffix (or a whole subordinate clause with a preposition), we have to choose an appropriate constituent as its representative and have this carry the case suffix (cf. Lehmann 1979). In E16 it is not the subordinate clause as a whole which shows the ablative, but rather the NP and the participle which correspond to the subject and predicate of a finite construction. Similarly in E21, the nouns corresponding to the subject and the predicate nominal are in the accusative, vicariously for the subordinate clause as a whole.

In finite subordinate clauses, case is shown on the subordinator. Many of the conjunctions, such as *quod, cum, qua, ut* etc. are old case forms of the relative pronoun which functioned as a general subordinator. All these are consequences of the fact that a language of the type Latin belongs to must show syntactic relations on the word.

When the pole of maximal nominality is reached, the whole sentence ceases to be genuinely complex (cf. Carvalho 1985, Helander 1985). E23.a is complex sentence, E23.b is not.

E23. a. Vicinus assum furatus est [quia pauper est].
LAT "The neighbour stole the roast because he is poor."

b. Vicinus assum furatus est [propter paupertatem].
"The neighbour stole the roast because of his poverty."

The inner and outer processes of desententialization are shown in F3 (cf. Lehmann 1982(N):76).
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F3. Desententialization

sententiality <-------------------------------------------nominality
clause non-finite construction verbal noun
no illocutionary force
constraints on illocutionary elements
constraints on loss of modal elements and mood
constraints on loss of tense and aspect
dispensability of complements
loss of personal conjugation
conversion of subject into oblique slot
no polarity
conversion of verbal into nominal government
dispensability of subject
constraints on complements

combinable with adposition / agglutinative case affix / flexive case affix

4. Grammaticalization of main verb

In the preceding section we saw that a subordinate clause may be reduced to its core, the predicate. In the following we will see that there is a reduction process in the main clause, too, namely the grammaticalization (see Lehmann 1982(T) for details) of the verb governing the subordinate clause. This can be illustrated by the superordinate predicate of causative constructions.

E24. sol efficit [ut omnia floreant]
LAT "the sun makes everything blossom" (Cic.n.d.2,41)

E10. Ho fatto prendere a mio figlio un'altra professione.
ITA have:1.SG made [take:INF to my son an other profession]
"I had my son choose another profession."

QUE Jose-TOP Juan-ACC poncho-ACC [weave]-CAUS-PAST(3.SG)
"Jose had Juan weave a poncho." (Cole 1982:135)

In E24 the verb of causation is a full lexical verb which, however, belongs to the closed class of verbs which govern an ut-clause. The causative verb of E10 is much more grammaticalized. It combines directly with the subordinate verb to yield an analytic causative verb. The valency of the latter derives in a regular way from the valency of the dependent verb plus a causator-subject introduced by the verb of causation. In E11, the verb of causation is grammaticalized to a suffix on the semantically subordinate verb. The latter thus becomes a causative verb. Its valency is again increased by the causator-subject, the former subject being downgraded to a causee-object.

Standard Indo-European languages such as Latin lack the grammatical means of forming causative verbs in such regular ways. Instead, this is a matter of the lexicon, as illustrated in E25.
E25. Miles picem fervefecit.
LAT "The soldier boiled the pitch."

The formation of causative verbs by composition with *facere* never was very productive. It was exclusively based on intransitive verbs, but extended to such bivalent verbs as *assuescere*, whose ablative, dative or prepositional complement remains unaffected by the derivation of *assuefacere*. On the other hand, it is certainly no accident that the historically identical verb *fare* forms the totally productive analytic causatives seen in E10.

Both the grammatical causatives of E10 and E11 and the lexical causative of E25 prove the point which is essential here: To the degree that the main clause predicate gets grammaticalized, the whole sentence ceases to be syntactically complex (cf. Brettschneider 1984, 5; Drossard 1984, 4). In E11 and E25, there is only one clause, the latter being undebatably a simple one. This is schematized in F4.

5. Interlacing

Another parameter structuring subordination is the degree to which the linked clauses are interlaced. (Szantyr (1972: 526) seems to be using the term *synsemy* for this phenomenon. The older term ‘synsemanticity’ has had too many applications to be recommendable.) The semantic aspect of interlacing is that the two propositions share some elements of their meanings. Its syntactic correlate are the non-specification of the common elements in one of the clauses and/or the syntagmatic interweaving of the two clauses.

One kind of interlacing concerns tense and aspect. The categories of the subordinate clause are partly or wholly determined by those of the main clause. One form of partial dependence is known as *consecutio temporum*. The subordinate constructions of E5, E19 and E20, on the one hand, and of E16, on the other, signal only simultaneousness with and temporal priority to the main clause, respectively, the tense itself being determined by the main clause. Similarly, the subordinate verbs of E17 and E6 only show that their time is not posterior and not prior, respectively, to main clause time. Complete dependence of subordinate tense and aspect can be seen in the Kobon examples E4 and E7, as well as in the infinitives of E8 - E10 and E21.
We now turn to the interlacing of actants of the main and subordinate clauses. I will skip here the whole issue of relative clauses and just observe that the correlative diptych, as in E3, is essentially held together by anaphora, i.e. by the fact that the two correlative clauses share an actant (or another nominal or adverbial concept).

Many languages make a distinction in the inflection of a non-final verb depending on whether the subject of the following clause is the same or distinct. Kobon finite medial verbs have two opposite paradigms of personal endings, one signalling ‘same subject’, the other ‘different subject’; cf. E4. Quechua signals sameness vs. difference of subject at the end of most of its subordinate clauses, e.g. in E26.

QUE [Quito-ALL arrive-ADVLR.NN]-VAL acquaintance-ACC see-PAST-1SG
"When I arrived in Quito, I saw a friend."

b. ňuka Kitu-man chaya-jpi-mi riji riku-wa-rkni.
[I Quito-ALL arrive-ADVLR.DS]-VAL acquaintance see-OBJ.1-PAST(SBJ.3)
"When I arrived in Quito, a friend saw me." (Cole 1982: 61)

The examples illustrate a fairly general phenomenon called switch-reference. In standard Indo-European languages such as Latin, the distinction between ‘same subject’ and ‘different subject’ is not grammaticalized in such a general way. Nevertheless, something close to it is operative in several areas of clause linkage. The distribution of the conjunct participle and the ablativus absolutus is mainly governed by the identity or distinctness of the subjects of the matrix clause and the non-finite construction: if they are identical, the conjunct participle is in order, while if they are distinct, the ablativus absolutus is needed (details in Hoff 1985). The conjunct participle is, more generally, possible as a predicative adjunct to just any NP in the matrix clause (see Pinkster 1984, ch.8.2).

Another place in Latin where the subordinate construction is sensitive to subject identity vs. distinctness is in object complementation. Subordinate clauses with subject control differ systematically in their structure from subordinate clauses without subject control. E27 shows cupere, an optional control verb.

E27. a. [ut ... nuntium accipias] ... cupio (Cic. Tu. 1,17)
LAT "I wish for you to receive the message"

b. Misere cupis ... [abire]. (Hor. Sat. 1,9,14)
"You are struggling pitiably to get away."

As in many other languages, the object clause of such a verb may (or even must) be finite if it has its own subject (E27.a), whereas it must reduce to an infinitive if the subordinate action is one of the higher subject (b). The optional control construction is just the same as the one appearing with obligatory control verbs. Cf. E27.b with E28.

E28. brevior iam in scribendo incipio [fieri
LAT "I already start getting briefer in writing." (Cic.Att.5,6,2)

Incipere cannot but govern an infinitive complement. The important observation here is just like above for tense and aspect: If main and subordinate clause are interlaced by
sharing an element of their structure, this will be left unspecified in the subordinate clause, the specification being supplied by the main clause.

The last example also displays the structural counterpart of semantic interlacing, namely syntagmatic interweaving. This is much more pronounced in prolepsis (cf. Christol 1985). Observe the following examples:

E29. non fuit Iuppiter metuendus, [ne iratus noceret]
LAT "It was not to be feared that Jove might be pernicious in his anger." (Cic. off. 3,104)

E30. Viden me [ut rapior]?
LAT "Don't you see how I am being kidnapped?" (Pl. Rud. 869)

This kind of interweaving presupposes the complement status of the subordinate clause. It is particularly common when the subordinate subject has some direct relation to the superordinate verb, as is clearly the case in the two examples.

I conclude that two clauses may be more or less interlaced, variation being between a pole of complete disjunctness of the two clauses and a pole of maximal identity. The tightness of the linking depends mainly on the amount of material that the two propositions have in common. A similar principle is operative above the sentence level and there provides for text cohesion (cf. Thompson & Longacre 1978, II.4).

6. Explicitness of linking

We are now coming to the problem of syndesis and asyndesis. I should like to stress that the presence or absence of a connective device between two clauses has nothing to do with parataxis vs. hypotaxis, but is exclusively a question of syndesis. In particular, it is not the case that either the concept of hypotaxis or the concept of subordination require the use of a conjunction, as has been claimed variously. Let us look first at paratactic, then at hypotactic constructions.

E31. [Several chapters on a repelled assault of the enemy. First sentence of new section:] His rebus gestis cum omnibus de causis Caesar pacatam Galliam existimaret atque ita hieme in Illyricum profectus esset, quod eas quoque nationes adire et regiones cognoscere volebat, subitum bellum in Gallia coortum est.
"These things being done, Caesar had every reason to assume that Gaule was now pacified. Thus in the winter he set off for Illyria, because he wanted to visit those peoples, too, and to learn about the area. There a sudden war broke out in Gaule."
(Caes. B.G. 3,7,1)

E32. Todas essas ações do departamento evidentemente não tinham outro motivo do que não dificultar ou ainda impossibilitar o meu trabalho. Assim sendo, eu prefiro pôr o meu posto a disposição.
"All those actions of the department obviously had no other motive than to render my work difficult or even impossible. This being so, I prefer to vacate my post."
The logic inherent in this series is this: We start with over-explicit syndesis, pass through a continuum of decreasing explicitness and end up with asyndesis. Two things need to be noted here. First, the explicit linking devices have a clear anaphoric internal structure. *His rebus gestis* in E31 starts with the proximal deictic pronoun which conventionally refers back to preceding text. The following examples feature *assim* "thus" (E32), *ciò* "that" (E33) and *des* "of that" (E34). Each of these anaphoric pronouns takes up preceding propositions, thus representing them in the sentence so introduced. The sentences are hooked to one another, as it were. The verbs contained in the connective locutions of E31 and E32 are also anaphoric. Recall what was said at the end of the last section on the function of semantic overlap in text and sentence cohesion.

Second, the connective phrases themselves in E31 - E33 are clearly reduced adverbial clauses. It is intriguing to observe that in order to connect two paratactic sentences explicitly, we use a subordinate clause (cf. Thompson & Longacre 1978, II.4.5.). The linking element in E34 is still an adverb. In the following examples we find connective particles (see Pinkster 1984, ch.12.2.5 for adverbs, connectors and coordinators).

Here is the corresponding series of examples for subordination:

E37. O estudante comprou um monte de livros especializados, *[a fim de que] o professor o tivesse por inteligente*.

*"The student bought a heap of specialized books in order that the professor should consider him intelligent."*

E38. *[Nonostante] l’opera fosse molto rumorosa], mi addormentai nel secondo atto.

*"Although the opera was very noisy, I fell asleep in the second act."*
The principle underlying this series is the same as above: The connective and subordinating device is maximally elaborated at the start and then is gradually reduced to zero. The linking phrases are again adverbial in nature. Only in the last two examples do the subordinating devices have no adverbial character. Conjunctions of adverbial nature tend to be found in adverbial clauses, while mere subordinators are found in complement clauses.

Let me conclude this section with the continuum of the explicitness of linking.

F5. **Explicitness of linking**

\[
\text{syndesis} \leftarrow \text{anaphoric subordinate clause} \leftarrow \text{gerundial verb} \leftarrow \text{prepositional phrase} \leftarrow \text{connective adverb} \leftarrow \text{specific conjunction} \leftarrow \text{universal subordinator} \leftarrow \text{non-finite verb} \leftarrow \text{form}
\]

7. **Towards a typology of clause linkage**

The following five parameters have been found relevant to the understanding of clause linkage and subordination:

1. the integration of the subordinate clause into the main clause (F1 and F2);
2. the desententialization of the subordinate clause (F3);
3. the grammaticalization of the main verb (F4);
4. the interlacing of the two clauses;
5. the explicitness of the linking (F5).

Each of these five parameters is construed as a continuum extending between two opposite poles. The five continua are directed in a parallel way. Always looking from left to right, we find the two continua corresponding to the parameter of integration extending from parataxis to embedding and from sentence to word level, respectively. The continuum of desententialization is between the poles of maximal sententiality and nominality. The continuum of the grammaticalization of the main verb starts from an independent predicate and ends with a grammatical operator. Interlacing of the two clauses varies between their total disjunctness and their maximal identity. Finally, the continuum of explicitness of the linking has explicit syndesis at its left and asyndesis at its right pole. This survey makes us see, at least intuitively, the common denominator underlying the various continua: all of them extend between a pole of maximal elaboration to a pole of maximal compression of lexical and grammatical information.
There are correlations and implicational relations between most of these parameters, which I cannot discuss here. I must content myself to combine the five continua in the following synopsis:

\textit{F6. Parallelism of clause linkage continua}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{elaboration} & \textbf{compression} \\
\textbf{weak} & \textbf{strong} \\
\textbf{parataxis} & \textbf{embedding} \\
\textbf{Syntactic level} & \\
\textbf{high} & \textbf{low} \\
\textbf{sentence} & \textbf{word} \\
\textbf{Desententialization} & \\
\textbf{weak} & \textbf{strong} \\
\textbf{clause} & \textbf{noun} \\
\textbf{Grammaticalization of main predicate} & \\
\textbf{weak} & \textbf{strong} \\
\textbf{lexical verb} & \textbf{grammatical affix} \\
\textbf{Interlacing} & \\
\textbf{weak} & \textbf{strong} \\
\textbf{clauses disjunct} & \textbf{clauses overlapping} \\
\textbf{Explicitness of linking} & \\
\textbf{maximal} & \textbf{minimal} \\
\textbf{syndesis} & \textbf{asyndesis}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

F6 is a complex continuum which provides a framework for a typology of clause linkage and subordination. Types may be found on this continuum to the degree that the properties and processes assembled on the five parameters tend to cluster. There are two extreme types of clause linkage, at either of the two poles of the continuum. On the one hand, we have a combination in which both the two clauses and the linkage are maximally elaborated. They are both independent and syntactically equal, each of them is a full clause. They are linked by an explicit connective device; and this contains all that is semantically common to the two clauses. This type may be represented by E31.

On the other hand, we have one clause containing, apart from the main predicate, a reduced predication. This may be the subordinate clause. It is then embedded into the main clause on a low constituent structure level, strongly nominalized and interlaced with the main predication and lacks any specification of the relation linking it to the latter. This type is represented by E27.b. Or again the matrix predication may be the reduced one. Then this is grammaticalized, but the other characteristics of the reduced type hold as well. E11 embodies this type.

Between these extreme types, there is a great variety of intermediate and concomitant types. The intermediate types differ from the extreme types merely in that all the parameters are developed to a non-extreme, but parallel degree. The concomitant types result from the fact that correlation among the parameters is not perfect. For
example, we quite freely get completely asyndetic clauses, which otherwise show no signs of reduction. Some of these intermediate and concomitant types are well represented in the languages of the world. Among them are, from left to right in F6:

- the correlative diptych illustrated by E3;
- the weakly desententialized noun clause introduced by a universal subordinator, as in E12 and E41;
- the more strongly nominalized noun clause with a subordinating verb suffix illustrated in E17;
- the strongly nominalized adverbial clause represented by such absolute constructions as in E16;
- the infinitival depending on a modal verb, as in E42;
- verb serialization as exemplified in E7.

Similarly as a subordinate construction type emerges from the clustering of positions from each of the five parameters, the combination of various such construction types within one language system may be seen as instantiating a global subordination type. Accordingly, the Latin system of subordination may be characterized as follows:

First, there is one type of subordinate construction which is weakly integrated and desententialized. It does not presuppose any degree of grammaticalization of the superordinate predicate or any interlacing of the two clauses. The clauses are linked by conjunctions of medium explicitness. (This includes, among others, the relative clause. This does require interlacing in the sense that a nominal outside the subordinate clause must have a role inside it; but there is no degree of control.)

Second, there is a type of subordinate construction which is tightly integrated and highly nominalized. It appears when the superordinate verb is grammaticalized and there is a high degree of interlacing. The subordinate construction is linked to the main clause either by case suffixes or not at all.

Thus, on a high level of typological abstraction, Latin may be said to possess two types of subordinative constructions each near the poles of F6, with little in between.

The final step in typological analysis consists in the integration of such a domain type into a global language type. We are far from the accomplishment of this step. Here I may just mention that Latin in general has very few grammatical strategies and categories of a medium degree of grammaticalization, which elsewhere form phrases with the help of clitic and agglutinative formatives. Accordingly, the syntactic level of the phrase is underdeveloped in Latin, the main burden of the grammar being carried by the word and the finite clause.
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