

The semantics of clause linking in Galo

Mark Post

1. Introduction and grammatical sketch

Galo is a Tibeto-Burman language of the Tani branch spoken by around 30,000-40,000 hill tribespeople in central Arunachal Pradesh state, North East India. There are two major dialects, Lare (*larèè*) and Pugo (*puugóo*), and several minor dialects and subdialects; this paper is based on the majority Lare dialect, as described by Post (2007).¹ Galo's historical contacts with non-Tani languages appear to have been inextensive; within the last 50-60 years, contacts with Indo-European languages such as Assamese, English and most recently Hindi have increased dramatically.

Galo is morphologically synthetic and agglutinating, with pragmatically variable AOV/SV constituent order and accusative case-marking. It is suffixing and postpositional, with postposed classifiers and quantifiers, numerals and relator nouns. Referential and relational markers are likewise phrasal enclitics. Demonstratives are especially rich in Galo, often reflecting fusion of earlier simplex demonstratives with postpositions and incorporating erstwhile postpositional functions (such as ablative marking); however, unlike true postpositions, demonstratives occur pre-head *and* post-head, sometimes simultaneously. 'Grammatical' and 'phonological' words are often quite mismatched in Galo; phonological words are generally built around trochaic (head first) feet, are minimally bimoraic and usually disyllabic. Grammatical words may be smaller or (much) larger than this. Sequences of grammatical suffixes or particles which frequently co-occur

and form a single phonological word sometimes undergo “functor fusion” and reanalysis as morphologically independent forms; on the other hand, independent forms undergoing grammaticalization are often reanalysed as suffixes. There are two primary lexical tones High/Plain and Low/Tense, which interact with one another and with sentence intonation to produce surface tonal contours at both word and phrase levels. In this paper, only underlying lexical tones are represented.

Main clauses are *predicative* or *appositive*. Predicative clauses are headed by a finite (inflecting) verbal or adjectival predicate, and may have 0, 1 or 2 core arguments (S or A/O). Extended atransitive, intransitive or transitive clauses also occur (adding extension to core argument E). *Appositive clauses* include *copula* and *verbless* subtypes; both encode equative relations among nominal (V)CS and (V)CC, while copula clauses also handle attributive predication (with adjectival CC); existential/possession predicates are handled by intransitive verbs in Galo, not by copulas. Copulas (two: imperfective əə and perfective ee) do not inflect, but optionally host one or more of a small number of enclitics with aspectual, epistemic and/or discourse-functional values. In (1), the first bracketed clause is appositive, while the second is predicative. Clause heads are in **bold**.

- (1) [ɪlɪɪ = əə alàp = əə, komə tə]; [ín-dùu = bɔ́ rɪ-máa].
 stone=TOP slippery=COP.**IMPER** PLACE DIST.UP walk-IMPER=SUBORD **do**-NEG
 The stones are (so) slippery up at the Kome river; you can hardly walk.

Most types of non-main clause may be categorized as A) *non-final*, B) *adverbially subordinated*, C) *temporally subordinated*, or D) *nominalized*. Relative clauses are based

on nominalizations. Most complement clause types are marked by dedicated complementizing predicate suffixes, and are not considered further here.

A) *Non-final clauses* (a.k.a. ‘medial’, ‘chained’, ‘co-subordinate’...) are headed by verbal or adjectival predicates in *-lâa* ‘NFIN’. A non-final predicate in *-lâa* may occur directly adjacent to a final predicate (usually with a reduced realization of the non-final marker [lə ~ l̥ ~ l], and occurring closely within the same intonation contour). In this case, the two ‘chained’ predicates often combine semantically to denote two closely-linked events, or two analytically-distinct aspects of the same overall macro-event. This construction is basically describable as a *complex predicate*, as in *báa-lə dó-káa-kú* ‘roast-NFIN eat-PER-COMPL’ ‘roasted and ate it’.

In other cases, a non-final-marked predicate may occur more distantly from a final predicate (even utterance-finally, and with the non-final marker fully realized [laa]), and depicts a single, more or less self-contained event (but which may form part of a thematically-connected sequence of events). In this case, the overall construction is perhaps better described as a *clause chain*. Clause chains in Galo may be very long, extending over 20 or 30 clauses in some narratives, and include both uninflected and inflected, non-recursively-embedded non-final-marked predicates.

Although complex predicates and clause chains can thus be distinguished at their prototypical extremes, there are very often cases of seeming intermediacy; it may be that the complex predicate-clause chain distinction would be better represented as a *continuum* among non-final constructions rather than as formally distinct construction types per se. In (2) and henceforth, non-main clause-marking morphology is in **bold**.

(2) [ləkèn = nè zèe-làa...] [uugí = əə arék-làa...] [okkóə (...)]

once=IRR.TMP.PUNC green-NFIN back=TOP sharp.blade-NFIN CONJ

jobùu ahòo-làa] [rí-tùu-làa á-dùu = bə]

tail long/tall-NFIN tie.up.animal-DOWN-NFIN keep-IMPER=SUBJ

Sometimes it's green and...its spine...is sharp and... and also (...) its tail is long

(such that) it can be used to tie something up.

B) *Adverbially subordinated clauses* are directly subordinated to a single clause, and may be recursively embedded. They are inflected or uninflected (according to subtype) and are obligatorily marked by a predicate enclitic *bə* (identical to or homophonous with the Dative case marker). Subjects of adverbially-subordinated clauses are almost always ellipsed; if ellipsed, they are almost always understood as coreferential with higher clause subjects. Different subjects should be overt. Any overt subject of an adverbially-subordinated clause, whether same or different from the main clause subject, is obligatorily marked in the Genitive. Adverbially-subordinated clauses generally give information relating to manner, extent, quality, or purpose, and may occur in any position relative to other clause constituents (3).

(3) [[[jí dùu-bəə-kò garí = bə] káa-dùu = bə] rí-dùu]

person stay-HAB-NZR:LOC resemble=SUBORD look-IMPER=SUBORD do-IMPER

It looked as though people were living there. (lit., It was as though it looked as though it resembled a place where someone was living.)

C) *Temporally subordinated clauses* are apposed to, coordinated with or non-recursively embedded in a main clause, according to subtype and function. They are headed by an inflected predicate followed by a postposition, most often *əəm* (identical to or homophonous with the Accusative case marker); some subtypes are also optionally Topic-marked in *əə* ‘TOP’, and like adverbially subordinated clauses their subjects (if overt) are marked in the Genitive. Temporally subordinated clauses generally provide temporal/episodic or hypothetical background information; they usually precede the main clause, but may also occur within it (generally, with an intonational “bracket”) (4).

- (4) [mǎə-lèe = **əəm** = əə] [bɪ̃ kohùk = əəm jímǎ-làa-tó]
 think-SSEQ=ACC=TOP 3sg dried.leaf=ACC wife-take-PERV
 Thinking about that, he espoused a dried up leaf.

D) *Nominalized clauses* are most often headed by predicates suffixed in *-nà* (subject), *-nam* (realis action/non-subject core), *-há* (irrealis action/non-subject core) or *-kò* (locative/oblique). They often stand as argument noun phrase heads or adnominal modifiers (a.k.a. headless and externally/internally-headed relative clauses), but may also stand as adsentential “framing” clauses, usually giving information viewed as background to the event depicted in a main clause (5). More rarely, they may stand as final clauses under copula scope, usually with a factitive or declarative sense (see §2.1 ex. (7)).

- (5) [arò ogò káa-rǎp-kú-**nam** = əə]
 morning TMP.REAL look-INCEP-COMPL-NZR:REAL=TOP

[tatík = əə dùu-kú-máa]

frog=TOP stay-COMPL-NEG

The next morning, when he looked, the frog was not there anymore.

Table 1 summarizes the relevant set of clause types in Galo. The remainder of the paper discusses clause linking, first summarized in

Table 2.

<place Table 1 about here>

<place Table 2 about here>

2. Temporal (I)

2.1. Temporal succession (Is)

The most common means of depicting a simple, relatively close temporal sequence (as “got up and left”) is via *non-final clause* chaining. The non-final suffix *-lâa* does not semantically entail temporal succession in itself (see §5); however, a temporal-sequential *implication* is very often derived from predicate semantics and the order in which clauses appear (6). To ensure a sense of temporal succession, non-final predicates may be inflected in Perfective *-tó* and/or Completive *-kú*, either of which marks a given chained predicate as perfected or completed prior to the onset of the ensuing event. Non-final predicates may also take specialized “clause continuity” suffixes such as Subsequential *-lèè*, Perfective Sequential *-réè* and Additive concessive *-gərǝ*, some of which may also co-occur with the Perfective and/or Completive (7).

(6) *[rǝ-mò-pàa-lâa]*_{SC} *[ŋunù áa-lìk-lâa]*_{FC}.

live/exist-CAUS-ATTN-NFIN 1pl come-INTO-NFIN

Letting them be, we came to (this place). *or* We let them be **and (then)** came to (this place).

- (7) [lóo-ká=go dùu-tó-rée-kú-làa.]_{SC} [ɲunù tokkə̀
 CLF:DAY-six=IND stay-PERV-PSEQ-COMPL-NFIN 1pl DIST.ABL.UP
 ín-rə̀p-kú-nam = ə̀ə na]_{FC}
 go-INCEP-COMPL-NZR:REAL=COP.IMPER DEC

After staying for six days...we started heading back home.

In extended chains, it may not always be possible to clearly relate each mentioned event to each other mentioned event in terms of a direct semantic linking; rather, it may be a looser, discourse-level thematic relationship which binds them (cf. §1 ex. (2)). In cases where a clear supporting-focal relationship can be construed among non-final clauses, as in (6)-(7), the supporting clause *always* precedes.

A small number of demonstrative-derived conjunctions may also indicate temporal succession, generally at episodic boundaries and when preceding a focal clause. The most common and generalized is sentence conjunction *okkə̀ə̀*, which derives from fusion of Anaphoric ablative demonstrative/postposition *okə̀* with Topic marker *ə̀ə̀* (literally, ‘concerning (what is) from that’). In some uses, *okkə̀ə̀* retains a weak causal/result sense ‘and from that (now this)’, while in other uses the sense is closer to simple temporal succession (8).

- (8) [dó-káa-kú!]_{SC} [okkə̀ə̀... buddi cèn-lə̀ə̀-kú-máa.]_{FC}
 eat-PER-COMPL CONJ brains know-GRAD-COMPL-NEG

They ate it up! **And (so)**...their knowledge didn’t increase.

Other demonstratives indicating temporal succession include Anaphoric locative *ogò* ‘on that’ and Anaphoric individuative *əgə̀* ‘that one’, both of which also have more general sequential senses ‘so; then’.

2.2. Relative time (Ir)

A variety of devices encode relative time linking in Galo. The most common construction involves finite supporting clause subordination by *postpositions* whose primary function is to mark argument noun phrases (and which also mark temporal noun phrases with the same basic senses; note that a very similar set of constructions is found in Kham (Watters, Chapter 11)). General Locative postposition *lo* and Anaphoric locative demonstrative postposition *ogò* mark *non-perfect(ive)* supporting clauses as occurring *at the same time* as a focal clause. *lo* marks the supporting clause as a *range* at some point *within which* the event depicted in the focal clause occurs, while *ogò* indicates that the events are *fully overlapping* (9)-(10).

- (9) *[káa-bók-dàk=lo]_{SC} [ikìi=əə (...)] kirkii akkə̀*
 look-DOWN-COS=LOC dog=TOP window DIST.ABL.SLEV
ò-lòo-káa-kú]_{FC}
 fall-DESCEND-PER-COMPL

When they looked down [i.e. **at some point within the period** of their looking down],
 the dog (...) fell down from the window.

- (10) *[mootùm=bé dóo-dàk ogò]_{SC} [maazí=bé*
 jungle=DAT be.settled-COS TMP.REAL very.much=AVZR

*pátáa-kobùu = əə hottúm-horə = əə maazí = bə rə-tó]*_{FC}

bird-rodent=TOP bear-boar=TOP very.much=AVZR live/exist-PERV

When we lived in the jungle [i.e. **throughout the time during** which we lived in the jungle], lots and lots of wild animals of every kind were there.

A span *since* or *until* which the event depicted in a focal clause is construed to endure is indicated by supporting clause marking in general Ablative *lokə* or *lobə* respectively, the latter reflecting a fusion of Locative *lo* with Dative *bə*.

Accusative postposition *əəm* also marks finite supporting clauses, but has a wider distribution and set of constructional subtypes. Generally speaking, it marks a supporting clause as temporally and/or episodically subordinate to a focal clause, with the relative time relationship as simultaneous or sequential derived from the interaction of supporting and focal clause aspect-marking (i.e., supporting clause Perfective marking indicates subsequence, while supporting clause Stative or Imperfective marking indicates different qualities of simultaneity). A supporting clause in *əəm* is very often also topic-marked, possibly increasing a sense of “backgrounding” to the information; however, topic-marking is not obligatory (11)-(12).

(11) [*acín* *dó-tó = əəm = əə*]_{SC} [*ŋó* *ì-rə-kú*]_{FC}

cooked.rice eat-PERV=ACC=TOP 1sg descend-IRR-COMPL

After I eat, I’ll go back down (to my home). (lit. After I ate, I’ll go back down.)

- (12) [bì-kə̀ ìi-dak = əəm]_{SC} [háa mò-laaná.]_{FC}
 3sg-GEN descend-COS=ACC tea make-IMP.SOFT

When he comes down, make tea (for him).

Predicate stem derivations may also play a role in establishing the relative time of supporting and focal clauses. Procedural derivation *-ŋoohí* establishes a supporting clause as a process at some point during which a focal clause event occurs, and Completive nominalizer *-ròo* casts an supporting clause event as one completed prior to the onset of a focal clause event; in the latter case, the nominalized supporting clause is expressed as a Dative oblique (13).

- (13) [tí-ròo = bə́]_{SC} [dó-rə́.]_{FC}
 imbibe-NZR:COMPL=DAT eat-IRR

I'll eat **when** [i.e., **after**] I've finished drinking (this cup of rice beer).

Nominalized clauses may also be followed by the relator noun *kookɛ̀*. When functioning as a head noun (with any modifiers marked in the Genitive), *kookɛ̀* has the spatial sense 'back (side of something)'. When postposed to a distinct nominal head (which can include a nominalized clause), *kookɛ̀* has the temporal sense 'after'. In the latter case, there is *no* Genitive marking on the head nominal. *kookɛ̀* also very often occurs with anaphoric Ablative/Genitive demonstrative *okə̀* 'from/of that' with the overall sense 'after that' (14).

- (14) *[okə kookɨ = bɛ... əəm dɔ-rò kookɨ = bɛ = kú...]*_{SC}
 ANAP.ABL **back**=DAT ANAP.ACC eat-NZR:COMPL **back**=DAT=COMPL
*[bulù attɨr = əə doogəə akèn = lo akèn go = bɛ jùp-làa dɔo-tó]*_{FC}
 3pl group=TOP bed one=LOC one IND=DAT sleep-NFIN lie.down-PERV
After that, **after** finally finishing eating that...they all went to sleep as one in the same
 bed. (lit., By the **back** of that...by the **back** of the completion of eating of that...)

Given these fairly rich means of indicating relative simultaneity and subsequence in Galo, it is perhaps surprising that there are few means of indicating supporting clause precedence (i.e., ‘before’). The only structure I have attested involves a negated adverbially subordinated supporting clause in Achievement -*dáa*. A rough literal translation would be ‘not yet-ly’ (15). As with all cases of adverbial subordination clauses in Galo, the supporting clause preferentially precedes the main, focal clause.

- (15) *[bool = əə áa-máa-dáa = bɛ]*_{SC} *[jòp-còo.]*_{FC}
 ball=TOP come-NEG-ACHV=SUBORD jump-FIRST
 He jumped (to head the ball) **before** the ball came. (lit., ≅ The ball **not** come **yet-ly**, he jumped first.)

2.3. Conditional (Ic)

Conditional linking is most often handled by a marker (-)*boolo*, which seems to reflect fusion of an earlier (now non-occurring) nominalizer **boo* plus Locative postposition *lo*. In modern Galo, (-)*boolo* occurs as a predicate suffix, as well as an adclausal nominal-subordinating enclitic (not a

suffix) with the same semantic value. Most often, (-)*boolo* marks irrealis/hypothetical supporting clause conditions (16); it may also mark counterfactual copula clauses in which a nominalized predicate occurs as perfective copula complement; here too, (-)*boolo* is analysed as an enclitic (17).

(16) [nó *hagìi-boolo*] [*hagìi-ré*]

2sg sigh-COND sigh-IRR

If you sigh, (it too) will sigh. (NyPB, LAT 270)

(17) [ɲó *traak=əəm l̩àa-nà=go=ee=boolo*]_{SC} [agér *r̩-há=ee*]_{FC}

1sg truck=ACC take-NZR:SU=IND=COP.PERV=COND work do-NZR:IRR=COP.PERV

If I had bought a truck, I'd have had a lot of work-to-do. [but I didn't, so I don't]

(-)*boolo* also marks a supporting clause whose event is not viewed as a condition to be met, but rather as a future/irrealis event which would coincide with that of the (also future/irrealis) focal clause; such clauses are usually best translated by 'when' (18).

(18) [izi=nè *acín dó-boolo*]_{SC} (...) [*koodàa batàk=əəm r̩èe-ré*]_{FC}

now=TMP.IRR.PUNC cooked.rice eat-COND balcony flooring=ACC lay-IRR

In a minute **when** we've eaten (...) we'll lay out the balcony flooring.

Likewise, an irrealis supporting clause in *-ré* which is temporally subordinated in Accusative *əəm* (§2.2) – having the literal sense of setting an irrealis context within which an

irrealis focal clause is construed to occur – can take on a conditional reading. However, unlike a supporting clause in *(-)boolo*, a clause in *-rǝ = əəm* cannot give a counterfactual reading. The conditional reading may therefore be viewed here as an emergent property of the literal *irrealis* + *temporally coincident* sense of the overall structure.

- (19) *[càa-rûu-lapə* *mǝǝ-rǝ = əəm]*_{SC} *[càa-làa-rǝ.]*_{FC}
 ascend-CERT-COMP:PURP/INT think-IRR=ACC ascend-ABIL-IRR

Should they definitely want to move in, they'll be able to. (lit., In the unreal/hypothetical case of their definitely wanting to move in...)

3. Consequence (II)

3.1. Cause (IIc) and Result (IIr)

Cause is usually handled via a *nominalized* supporting clause followed by relator noun *lǝgàa* (usually in a Dative oblique). When standing as a head noun (preceded by Genitive-marked modifiers), *lǝgàa* has the context-dependent senses 'reason' and/or 'purpose/benefit'. When following a nominalized clause in absence of genitive marking, it has the sense 'because' (20).

(20) *[tór-nam káa-nam ləgàa = bə]SC [bì-əəm*

be.strong-NZR:REAL have/exist-NZR:REAL **reason**=DAT 3sg-ACC

rí-laacìn jəə = cìn rí-túu-làa-máa-dùu.]FC

tie.up.animal-CONC who=ADD tie.up.animal-STOP/DOWN-ABIL-NEG-IMPER

Because of [the mithun's] having (such) strength, even if you tie it up, no-one can tie it down (firmly so that it won't escape).

When following Anaphoric ablative/genitive demonstrative *okə* in a focal clause-introducing oblique noun phrase, *ləgàa = bə* can be analysed as having a *result* sense, as [SC;] [*okə ləgàa = bə*, FC.] '[SC;][therefore/that's why/because of that, FC.]'

Another nominalization-based construction employs the Locative/Oblique nominalizer - *kə* plus Locative postposition *lo*. If the subject is marked in the genitive, this construction would have a spatial sense 'in the place where'; a nominative subject gives the cause sense 'because' or 'due/owing to' (21). It is possible that -*kə* and *lo* are in the process of fusing as a specialized marker of this construction, although this cannot at present be demonstrated with certainty.

(21) *bì pá-tó-káa ém-kə = lo]SC, [ŋo pá-dùu-nà = əə]FC.*

3sg chop-IMP.ODIR-ADVS tell-NZR:LOC=LOC 1sg chop-IMPER-NZR:SU=COP.IMPER

Because he told me to chop (the wood), (that's why) I cut it. (lit., On his saying "chop the wood", I chopped it.)

Direct speech report verb ém- 'say; tell' has extended functionality in Galo, which relates to its ability to refer anaphorically to an entire phrase or clause (*as* a speech report or *as though* it

juu]SC [*ʒm-nam = əə* *rì-ləə-lèe-làa* *higì,* *rì-lòo-làa*]FC

REP **say-NZR:REAL=TOP** do-GRAD-SSEQ-NFIN SPRX.IND do-DESCEND-NFIN

This plains area was said to be a nice place to live; **so (having heard that)**, we **therefore** gradually filtered down here.

Finally, in a functionally similar use, sentence conjunction *okkəə* often carries a weak result sense which is almost certainly derived from its etymological value ‘from that=TOP...’ (see §2.1, ex. (8)).

3.2. Purpose (IIp)

Purpose linking is generally handled by various subtypes of *adverbially subordinated* clause. The most commonly-attested and general is based on a predicate (uninflected) stem-subordination bearing an Incipient derivation *-tə*; such constructions are usually best translated via English *to*-complements (24). Finite purpose clauses usually occur in Stative *-doo* (25).

(24) [*ɲó* [*bì-əəm* *káa-tə = bə*]SC *ín-tó.*]FC

1sg 3sg-ACC look-**INCP=SUBORD** go-PERV

I went **to** see him.³

(25) [*ogò = eí* *jùp-doo = bə*]SC [*bulù* *attír = əə*

ANAP.LOC=EMPH sleep-**STAT=SUBORD** 3pl group=TOP

pár-lìk-hí-káa.]_{FC}

divide.up.labour-INTO-REFL-PER

In order (to make preparations) **to** sleep *right* there, they all divided themselves into various functions.

It is also possible for a purpose clause to be followed by speech report verb *ém-* ‘say; tell’; in this case, the resulting clause takes on a flavour of *both* purpose *and* cause (schematically, \cong ‘because to/for...’). This construction is particularly interesting in that it also enables subordination of purposive/intentional complements to supporting main clauses indicating a volitional action (26).

(26) *[togùu* *zùr-lapè* *ém-làa]*_{SC}
 mithun.sacrifice.ritual priest.perform.ceremony-COMP:PURP/INT **say-NFIN**

[itè *bár-dùu]*_{FC}

ritual.chant intone-IMPERV

In order to perform the ceremony, he intoned a chant. (lit., Saying “I intend to perform the ceremony”...)

In Galo, it seems preferable in most cases to analyse the purpose clause as *supporting* a focal main clause, rather than the reverse (see Dixon, Chapter 1); seemingly, they occur most often to explain or otherwise illuminate the setting for a particular activity. Note that *cause* linkages in Galo often employ a similar grammatical structure, and may be similarly understood: schematically, [because of x]_{SC}, [y]_{FC} (cause) and [in order to x]_{SC}, [y]_{FC} (purpose).

4. Possible consequence (III)

Possible consequence is not well-developed in Galo. There is no dedicated morphology, and very little in the way of periphrastic expressions which might serve as equivalents. The closest we find is a negative conditional form of speech verb *ám-* ‘say; tell’ (in an anaphoric function; see §3), with the basic sense ‘if not that’ and the implication ‘otherwise; or else’ (27).

(27) *[ogò he abó-taní nó-kə alíi = əə*

ANAP.LOC EMPH father-mankind 2sg-GEN clan=TOP

nén-rə-nà = əə]FC [ám-máa-boolo nó t̄ir-rə-kú.]SC

progenerate-IRR-NZR:SU=COP.IMPER **say-NEG-COND** 2sg die.out-IRR-COMPL

Then only will your line proceed, Abo Tani; **otherwise** it will be extinguished. (lit., if that is not said...)

In this construction, a possible consequence need not be undesirable. However, the two expressed events should in some way be viewed as mutually exclusive (schematically, for example, *I’ll go; otherwise/(or) if not, he can go*).

5. Addition (IV)

5.1. Unordered (IVu)

Unordered addition is usually handled via uninflected *non-final* clause chains. In (2), we find a chain of adjectival non-final predicates describing a set of properties which are unordered for temporality or episodic prominence (and which may be freely reordered or extended indefinitely).

The same is possible for verbal predicates. Although this construction is formally identical to a non-final clause chain depicting event sequences (§2.1), it is usually prosodically somewhat different; in unordered addition, a lilting intonation (often followed by a pause) attends the non-final marker (28).

- (28) [udúu-əə líi-lìk-làa,] [udúu-óo
bamboo.section-bamboo propagate-INTO-NFIN bamboo.section-vegetable
líi-làa...] [taók-takò líi-làa...]
propagate-NFIN Mountain.serdang.fan.palm-pandanus propagate-NFIN
We planted materials for construction⁴...we planted household necessities, we planted
plants for domestic use...(and so on).

5.2. Same-event (IVs)

Same-event addition is also handled by a non-final construction. In this case, however, we are usually dealing with close predicate-subordination to another predicate, with the two predicates usually falling under the same intonation contour (i.e. a “complex predicate”); it is not entirely clear whether “clause-linking” is the appropriate description in this case (29).

(29) [ɲó izì mèn-cék-làa] [mèn-dùu] or

1sg now speak-SHORTEN-NFIN speak-IMPER

[mèn-cék-làa mèn-dùu] ??

speak-SHORTEN-NFIN speak-IMPER

I'm just briefly laying (the story) out now (lit., ≅ I'm short-sayingly saying it).

5.3. Elaboration (IVe)

Elaboration addition involves apposition of two structurally parallel main clauses, which combine to denote different aspects of the same overall event. This is a relatively well-coded construction in Galo, inasmuch as two main clauses would otherwise only very rarely occur in immediate sequence (most Galo clause-sequences involve at least one non-main clause). In the canonical form of the construction, the two apposed clauses share all arguments and TAM. The first, supporting clause hosts any overtly-expressed noun phrases or adverbials, and generally presents a more “basic” construal of the event. The second, focal clause usually consists of a predicate bearing a parallel set of inflections, but with a different head; this clause presents an elaboration on what has already been said. Although there is no direct entailment of cause or result, etc., the focal clause in an elaboration apposition would usually be difficult or impossible to interpret in absence of the preceding focal clause; hence, the order of clauses is important in this construction.

(30) [roksín = əə ò-lòo-ée-kú-báa]_{SC} [ɲée-kú-báa]_{FC}

chicken.liver=TOP fall-DESC-AWAY-CMPL-PERV.DRCT be.lost-CMPL-PERV.DRCT

(I experienced that) the chicken liver fell; (I experienced that) it got lost.

5.4. Contrast (IVc)

Contrast addition is relatively rich in Galo. The typical construction involves suffixation of one of two (basically synonymous) Concessive markers (-)*dakkòm* or (-)*laacìn* to a supporting clause predicate (31). It is also possible to use either Concessive suffix together with speech verb *ám-* (§3), effectively deriving a dedicated linker which is a functional constituent of the focal clause (32). As with Conditional linker (-)*boolo* (§2.3), both Concessive markers may be used as adclausal subordinating enclitics to an anaphorically-referring pronoun, as *əgə dakkòm/laacìn...* ‘that (fact) notwithstanding...’. Historically, (-)*dakkòm* and (-)*laacìn* derive from similar fusions of predicate inflections with Additive particles – in the case of (-)*laacìn*, Non-final suffix -*làa* plus Additive particle *cìn*, and in the case of (-)*dakkòm*, Change of state suffix -*dàk* plus the Minyong-derived particle *kòm* ‘Additive’.⁵

(31) [*èn-cém-máa-dakkòm*]_{SC} [*ɲó dó-múm-dùu*]_{FC}

feel-LIKE-NEG-CONC 1sg eat-ONLY-IMPERV

Although I don’t like it, I just go ahead and eat it.

(32) [*nunù ardé-máa-dóo*]_{SC} [*ám-laacìn tazí-kú-máa!*]_{FC}

2pl clever-NEG-STAT say-CONC believe-COMPL-NEG

You (young folks) aren’t so clever, **and yet** you don’t believe us! (lit., You aren’t so clever; **despite** that being said, you don’t believe us!)

Additive concessive suffix *-gərǎ*, when occurring within a predicate which clearly forms an element of a narrative sequence, usually contributes to a sequential reading ‘and then/moreover’ (§2.2). However, when marking a supporting clause which contrasts thematically with a following focal clause (often, when they are headed by the same predicate in different polarities), its sense is in turn contrastive ‘and yet’ (33).

- (33) *[zoon = gə agóm = əəm tà-gərǎ]_{SC} [ŋó-kə agóm = əəm tà-máa.]_{FC}*
 NAME=GEN speech=ACC obey-ACNC 1sg-GEN speech=ACC obey-NEG

So you’ll do what John tells you to do, **and yet** you won’t listen to me (is that how it is?).

Finally, a relatively rare predicate/clause-marking particle *daram* ‘although’ is also available as a supporting clause contrast marker. Semantically identical to the Concessive suffixes exemplified above, it has the ability to mark a finite clause, but cannot occur as a predicate suffix (34). The etymology of *daram* is not yet certain, although it may derive from a fusion of Galo Contrastive particle *da* (cf. the focal clause of (34)) with an earlier but currently non-productive subordinating morpheme.

- (34) *[turgʰ káa-máa = ee daram] [arúm go = da túr-làa*
 roofpost have/exist-NEG=COP.PERV CNCS.DISJ evening IND=CNTR be.alive-NFIN
rǎ-káa-làa] [óm-làa mǎə-dàk]
 live/exist-TENT-NFIN say-NFIN think-COS

Although I’ve got nothing left to lean on, (seeing you) I think I’ll try to make it through one more night.

It is worth noting that inasmuch as the Galo construction is limited to cases of wonderment or questioning, it does not directly refute statements made on this topic in Dixon (Chapter 1) to the effect that closed disjunction is logically a somewhat artificial linguistic construct, since cases considered by Dixon in this context mainly concern declarative clauses (i.e., situations in which one is *asserting* that in such-and-such a case, only two options are available). I have not been able to attest a construction which clearly represents disjunct declarative alternation in Galo; the closest approximation would be a periphrastic construction of the form ‘*x*; if not that, *y*’; i.e., ‘*x*; otherwise, *y*’ (see §4, (27)).

6.2. Rejection (Vr) and Suggestion (Vs)

Rejection is not well-represented in Galo grammar, neither as the content of a clause linking construction nor as the function of an adjunct noun phrase (such as *instead of Mary*). Most functionally comparable constructions are monoclausal, and involve the use of applicative predicate derivations; schematically, *I’ll go-instead-of you* (in which *you* is an added syntactic O).

Suggestive speech-act functions are similarly handled monoclausally, via predicate inflections and/or particles such as Proposal modal inflection *-dèe* and Inclusive hortative particle *zù*, among others. Their existence may at least in part explain the lack in Galo of relevant biclausal constructions.

7. Manner (VI)

Real and hypothetical manners are both handled by adverbial subordinations in Galo. As was also noted in §1, adverbial subordinator *bǎ* is homophonous with the Dative marker *bǎ*, and Dative *bǎ*

also marks noun phrases with semantic similarity to manner clause-subordinations, such as Translative complements of becoming (*he became (as) a dog*), Similative complements of perception or cognition (*I think of him as a fool*), and as a marker of oblique nominalized clauses expressing manner (\cong *It went along **hoppingly***).

As an adjectival enclitic, Adverbial subordinator *bɔ́* derives a manner adverbial. As marker of a finite clause in Imperfective *-dùu* or Negative *-máa*, it derives a manner subordination; both types appear in (37).

(37) [*ácc-accôo = bɔ́* [*níi káa-pàa-kò-máa = bɔ́*]_{SC} *ulùu = lo*

quiet.very=AVZR person look-ATTN-RVS-NEG=SUBORD boat=LOC

áa-éé = káa]_{FC}

enter-IMP.AWAY=ADVS

“Go carefully to the boat **without** being seen by anyone.” (i.e., \cong **in such a manner as to** not be seen)

Hypothetical manner is built on the same basic set of constructions, but involves a distinct predicate type *garɛ̃* ‘resemble’. One of the strangest lexemes in the language, *garɛ̃* takes two unmarked nominal arguments – resembler and resembled – neither of which may take any case-marking. *garɛ̃* may stand as predicative head of a finite clause *or* as copula complement (the only bivalent predicate in the language with this capacity); however, it is more often found subordinated in *bɔ́* (38) (cf. also (3)).

- (38) *[ɲunù = əəm jaamée gadə = əə mèn-zí-laacìn [mó-nà*
 1pl=ACC boy group=TOP speak-BEN-CONC lie-NZR:SU
garì = bó = í] tá-dàk-kú.]
resemble=SUBORD=EMPH listen-COS-COMPL

Even if we tell it to them, young people listen to us just **as though** we were liars.

8. A note on bridging linkage

In §1, it was noted that adsentential nominalized clauses often provide ‘background’ information with respect to the event depicted in a final clause. The most commonly-attested use of such nominalized clauses by far is in what is in this volume called ‘bridging’ (a. k. a. ‘tail-head’) linkage. In the Galo construction – described as a ‘framing clausal nominalization’ in Post (2007) – a clausal nominalization in Realis event/action nominalizer *-nam* precedes a main clause in a ‘Topic slot’, also obligatorily marked in Topic marker *əə*. Often, the framing nominalization repeats or recapitulates information contained in the preceding (usually final) clause predicate (39). Or it may be headed by a semantically ‘light’ verb *rɪ̃*- ‘do’ or *ám*- ‘say’ (both of which refer anaphorically to preceding events) (40).

- (39) *okə kookì = bó bulù áúm = əə jùp-tà = bó*
 ANAP.ABL back=DAT 3pl three=TOP sleep-INCP=SBRD

áa-póm-tó-kú. áa-làa jùp-tà-nam = əə...

come-AS.GROUP-PFV-COMPL **come-NFIN** **sleep-INCP-NZR:REAL=TOP**

After that the three of them came together to sleep. **After coming to sleep...** [lit., **their having come to sleep being the case...**]

(40) *borík jòo! acín dó-kò zâa = lo upái kâa-mâa!*

Borik what cooked.rice eat-NZR:LOC CERT=LOC means(<Asm) have-NEG

rî-nam = əə ŋunù namó hogò ìi-lâa-kú...

do-NZR:REAL=TOP 1pl house SPRX.LOC descend-NFIN-COMPL

Borik, oh, man! When it comes to eating rice, there's no stopping him! **Anyway**, we came back down here and... (lit., **That having happened being the case...**)

The function of framing nominalizations is basically one of *discourse continuity*, marking a *transitional point* between one episode and another. Inasmuch as the events described from one episode to another are thematically related – and their common relationship to an overall narrative line are discernible – a framing clausal nominalization can take on overtones of *temporal succession* and *cause/result*. However, such overtones are probably not best described as *clause linking structures* in the strict sense; rather, what is ‘linked’ here is *entire discourse episodes*.

9. Conclusion

The number of dedicated syntactic clause-linkers is extremely small in Galo; most seem to derive from the set of anaphoric demonstratives. The bulk of clause-linking functions are handled by

predicate morphology and/or by particular *predicate/clause-subordinating constructions*, chief among them *non-final* and *adverbially subordinated* clauses. Predicate stem-internal derivations and word-level inflections may also play roles, particularly in the establishment of relative temporal and procedural event-relations.

Outside the predicate, *postpositions* whose primary functions relate to *noun phrase relational marking* also perform clause linking functions, and a small number of *relator nouns* (also principally noun phrase constituents) are able to link one nominalized clause to another clause (of any type). Almost all such constructions mark supporting clauses.

In addition, *periphrastic expressions* exist which usually represent conventionalized forms of non-final, subordinated or nominalized predicate-headed constructions; often, they employ semantically ‘light’ heads such as *ɾɿ-* ‘do’ and *ʒm-* ‘say’ and produce meanings like ‘that being so’ and ‘it having happened like that’. Such constructions may develop causal and/or temporal implications; however, care must be taken to recognize when these are analysable as clause linkers in the strict sense, and when they may be better-described as *discourse-level* linkers which only resemble clause linkers in terms of some implied, rather than inherent, semantic features.

References:

Burling, Robbins. 2004. *The Language of the Modhipur Mandi (Garo). Volume I: Grammar.*

New Delhi: Bibliophile South Asia.

Gallagher, Steve and Peirce Baehr. 2005. *Bariai grammar sketch*. Vol. 49, *Data papers on Papua*

New Guinea languages. Ukarumpa: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Noonan, Michael. 2006. 'Direct speech as a rhetorical style in Chantyal.' *Himalayan Linguistics*

Journal 6:1-32.

Post, Mark. 2007. *A Grammar of Galo*. PhD Thesis. Research Centre for Linguistic Typology.

Melbourne: La Trobe University.

Saxena, Anju. 1988. 'On syntactic convergence: The case of the verb 'say' in Tibeto-Burman.'

Proceedings of the 14th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 375-388.

Table 1 – Simplified summary of Galo clause types (not including relative and complement clauses)

Type	Subtype A	Subtype B	Comments
Main	Predicative	Verbal	Obligatorily inflected
		Adjectival	Obligatorily inflected
	Appositive	Verbless	Uninflected
		Copula	Uninflected
Non-main	Non-final	Complex predicate	Uninflected
		Clause chain	Optionally inflected
	Adverbially subordinated	Verbal/adjectival	Uninflected
		Clausal	Obligatorily inflected
	Temporally subordinated	Various	Obligatorily inflected
	Nominalized	Various	Optionally inflected

Table 2 – Summary of attested clause-linking types in Galo

Code	Type	Structural type	Marker	Meaning	Marks	Remarks
Is	Temporal succession	Non-final predicate suffix	PRED- <i>làa</i> ‘NFIN’	‘and’	SC	No clear succession unless predicate is inflected, but often implied regardless
		Demonstrative-derived sentence conjunctions	<i>okkáə</i> ‘CONJ’	‘and; from that’	FC	May include causal implication
			<i>əgə</i> ‘ANAP.IND’	‘that one’		
			<i>ogò</i> ‘ANAP.LOC’	‘on that’		
Ir	Relative time	Non-final predicate suffixes	PRED- <i>lèe</i> ‘SSEQ’	‘after’	SC	Force sequential reading in clause chain, whether or not predicate is inflected
			PRED- <i>gə̀rə̀</i> ‘ACNC’	‘after/moreover’		

	Predicate stem-internal derivations	PRED { <i>-ηοοήí -ròo...</i> (etc.) }	‘during, after...’	SC	Assist with relative time relations, but do not encode relative time directly
	Locative/temporal postpositions and demonstratives with temporal clause-subordinating capabilities	{ <i>lo</i> ‘LOC’, <i>ogò</i> ‘ANAP.LOC’, <i>əəm</i> ‘ACC’, <i>bə</i> ‘DAT’, <i>lokə</i> ‘ABL’, <i>lobə</i> ‘DLMT’ }	‘at/on, when, from, since, until’	SC	Marked clause inflection also plays role in determining relative time
	Relator noun	{ <i>kookî</i> = <i>bə/lo</i> }	‘afterward’	SC	Post-modifies nominalized clause
	Subordinated predicate suffixal complex	PRED- <i>máa-dáa</i> = <i>bə</i> ‘NEG-ACHV=SBRD’	‘before’	SC	Rare

Ic	Conditional	Predicate suffix/noun subordinator	<i>(-)boolo</i> ‘COND’	‘if/when’	SC	Includes both conditional and simultaneous readings, and counterfactuals
		Temporally subordinated irrealis clause	PRED- <i>rǎ</i> = <i>əəm</i> ‘-IRR=ACC’	‘if (in hypothetical case of)’	SC	Irrealis temporal simultaneity with strong conditional (but not counterfactual) implications
IIc	Cause	Relator noun	<i>lǎgàa</i> = <i>bǎ</i> ‘reason=DAT’	‘because of’	SC	Post-modifies nominalized clause
		Locative nominalization plus Locative postposition	PRED- <i>kò</i> = <i>lo</i> ‘-NZR:LOC=LOC’	‘because of’	SC	--
		Non-final speech report verb	<i>ǎm-làa</i> ‘say-NFIN’	‘that being so (because of that)’	SC	--

IIr	Result	Speech report predicate ‘that being said’	<i>ém-nam = əə</i> ‘say-NZR:REAL=TOP’	‘that being so (because of that)’	FC	--
		Periphrastic expression ‘for that reason’	<i>okə ləgàa = bə</i> ‘ANAP.ABL reason=DAT’	‘for that reason’	FC	--
IIp	Purpose	Adverbially subordinated clause subtypes	PRED- <i>tà = bə</i> ‘INCP=SBRD’	‘to do PRED’	SC	SC may be better understood as clause-internal adverbial than as “linked” clause <i>per se</i>
			PRED- <i>dóo = bə</i> ‘STAT=SBRD’	‘in order to do PRED’		
III	Possible consequence	Speech report predicate	<i>ém-máa-boolo</i> ‘say-NEG-COND’	‘if not what was just said’	FC	--
IVu	Unordered addition	Non-final predicate suffix	<i>-làa</i> ‘NFIN’	‘and’	N/A	May include ‘lilting’ intonation

IVs	Same-event addition	Non-final predicate suffix	<i>-làa</i> ‘NFIN’	‘and’	N/A	May represent complex predicate formation rather than clause linking
IVe	Elaboration	Apposition among structurally parallel main clauses	N/A	‘and moreover’	N/A	--
IVc	Contrast	Concessive predicate suffixes	<i>(-)dakkòm</i> ‘CONC’ <i>(-)laacìn</i> ‘CONC’	‘although, despite’	SC	--
		Additive concessive predicate suffix	<i>-gərə</i> ‘ACNC’	‘moreover’		
		Concessive particle	<i>daram</i> ‘CONC’	‘although’		
Vd	Disjunction	Apposed, and semantically opposed, clauses	<i>máa</i>	‘Is it x? Is it y?’	N/A	Occurs in wondering/questioning clauses
Vr	Rejection	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Occurs monoclausally
Vs	Suggestion	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Occurs monoclausally

VIr	Real manner	Imperfective/negative adverbially subordinated clause	PRED- <i>dùu/-máa = bó</i> 'IMPER/NEG=SBRD'	'in a PRED way'	SC	--
VIh	Hypothetical manner	Adverbially subordinated predicate capable of taking a nominalized clause complement	CLAUSE <i>garîî = bó</i> 'resemble=DAT'	'like/resembling CLAUSE'	SC	--

Endnotes:

¹ Transcription follows IPA except where $c = [tɕ]$ and $z = [dʒ]$. Tones are High/Plain ˊ or Low/Tense ˋ. I

thank my primary Galo consultants *miilɰ nodù*, *igò ribáa* and *tomóo ribáa*.

² See Saxena (1988) for a general overview of quotative constructions in Tibeto-Burman languages, and Noonan (2006) for a discourse-oriented explanation.

³ Note that the subordinate clause may be in any position here, potentially preceding the subject or following the predicate (see §1).

⁴ The argument noun phrases here consists of semi-lexicalized coordinative compounds in which each element prototypically exemplifies the type denoted by the whole.

⁵ In some Galo dialects, loanword *kòm* and native *cìn* freely vary, while in the variety of Lare Galo being described here, only native Galo *cìn* occurs as an Additive particle. It would thus seem that the presence or absence of the Additive particle source formative in a given Galo dialect thus has no bearing on the presence or behaviour of the Concessive linker (-)*dakkòm*.

⁶ This basic construction is found in other Tibeto-Burman languages of North East India, such as Garo (Burling 2004: 314), as well as, seemingly, in Austronesian languages (Gallagher and Baehr 2005: 133, cited in Dixon (Chapter 1)).