63. Noun Phrase Conjunction

Leon Stassen

1. Defining the values

This map shows the distribution of the variation in the encoding of noun phrase conjunction. The basic distinction is between those languages which use a different marker for noun phrase conjunction and comitative phrases (so-called AND-languages; Stassen 2000) and those languages in which the markers for noun phrase conjunction and comitative phrases are the same (WITH-languages). A clear example of an AND-language is English. As the examples in (1) demonstrate, in this language the marker of noun phrase conjunction (*and*) is different from the marker of comitative phrases (*with*). In contrast, the example in (2) shows that Nkore-Kiga (Bantu; Uganda) is a WITH-language: the item *na* can be translated as either 'and' or 'with'. An alternative way of stating this is to say that WITH-languages like Nkore-Kiga lack the structural option of noun phrase conjunction.

(1) a.   *John and Mary went to the movies.*
     b.   *John went to the movies with Mary.*

(2) Nkore-Kiga (Taylor 1985: 58)
     n-ka-za-yo   *na*   *Mugasho*
     1SG-REC.PST-go-there   and/with   Mugasho
     'Mugasho and I went there./ I went there with Mugasho.'

Accordingly, the following two values are shown on the map:

@	1.	AND-languages: 'and' and 'with' are not identical	131
@	2.	WITH-languages: 'and' and 'with' are	103

identical		
	total	234

2. Variation in noun phrase conjunction marking

Among the languages which have the option of structural noun phrase conjunction, it is possible to subcategorize conjoined NP-structures on the basis of the linking device which they employ. First of all, there are languages with **juxtaposition** or **zero-marking** of such structures. Traditionally, the term **asyndeton** is employed to refer to such constructions. Quite a few languages can be shown to have this encoding possibility as at least one of their options. However, closer inspection reveals that asyndetic NP-conjunction is nonetheless a minor strategy. Obligatory use of this variant is very rare. This option can be documented only in a few languages, among which no significant areal cohesion can be defined. An example is Awtuw (Lower Sepik-Ramu; Papua New Guinea).

(3)   Awtuw (Feldman 1986: 67)
        Yowmen   Yawur   du-k-puy-ey
        Yowmen   Yawur   DUR-IMPF-hit-IMPF
        'Yowmen and Yawur are hitting (someone).'

Zero-marked NP-conjunction appears to be absent from Africa and from at least the western part of Europe. In all other parts of the world it must have been an old encoding option. However, the general trend all over the world is that zero-conjunction tends to be marginalized into specific functions or is replaced altogether by overt marking strategies (see Mithun 1988a).

    By far the most prominent option in overt marking of noun phrase conjunction is the use of a **medial connective**, i.e. a conjunctional item which stands between the two noun phrases. This strategy is illustrated by the English item *and* (see1a). Noun phrase conjunction via a medial connective can be encountered

all over the globe. In some areas, notably sub-Saharan Africa, the strategy is a minor one, but there is hardly any major linguistic area in which it is totally lacking.

In comparison to medial connectives, other overt conjunction strategies are fairly rare. All the strategies at issue feature postposition or suffixation of the connective item or items. Among these options, **polysyndeton** (i.e. the use of two conjunction markers) appears to be the most popular. This strategy can be found in a number of unconnected linguistic areas such as the Caucasus, northeastern Africa, Australia and New Guinea, southern India and northeastern Asia. In addition, we find isolated examples in the Americas, in West Africa, and in Myanmar. An example of the strategy is Tamil (Dravidian; southern India):

(4)   Tamil (Asher 1982: 69)
       akkaa-yum   tangkacciy-um
       elder.sister-and   younger.sister-and
       'elder sister and younger sister'

Monosyndetic postposing of conjunction markers (whether to the first or to the second conjunct) is low in frequency. Moreover, languages which present this option typically also allow a construction of the polysyndetic type, so that these monosyndetic constructions are best regarded as variants in which one of the markers in the polysyndetic construction is optionally deleted. Given this, it will be clear that the two monosyndetic variants occur in roughly the same areas as the polysyndetic construction. An example of the "first-NP" subtype is Beja (Cushitic; Sudan), while the "second-NP" subtype is illustrated by NP-conjunction from Tubu (Nilo-Saharan; Chad and Niger).

(5)   Beja (Reinisch 1893: 195)
       a.   *ani-wa   baruk-wa*

        1SG-and   2SG-and
        'you and I'

    b.   *mek-wa*   *laga*
        donkey-and   calf
        'a donkey and a calf'

(6)   Tubu (Lukas 1953: 166)
    a.   *túrku* *ye*   *mɔlɔfúr*   *ye*
        jackal and   hyena   and
        'the jackal and the hyena'
    b.   *wúdɛn*   *arkɔ́* *ye*
        antelope   goat and
        'the antelope and the goat'

In the map, variation in the encoding of noun phrase conjunction has not been taken into account.

3.   Variation within the comitative strategy

In contrast to noun phrase conjunction, the encoding of comitative phrases is much more formally uniform across languages. In the overwhelming majority of languages, the comitative strategy manifests itself by way of an oblique marker 'with' on the noun phrase. Depending on the general morphosyntactic features of the language the comitative marker may take the form of an adposition or an affix.

    Although "dependent marking" (Nichols 1986) is the predominant encoding option in comitative constructions, there are some languages which deviate from this pattern. A "head-marking" strategy, in which the comitative marker is incorporated into the predicate, is encountered in Northwest Caucasian languages such as Ubykh.

(7)   Ubykh (Dumézil 1931: 17)
    go-u-ji-k'ä-qa

3SG-2SG-WITH-come-PERF
'He came with you.'

In some cases, this incorporation leads to transitivization of the predicate, so that the "comitative" NP takes on the syntactic status of a direct object. Assorted languages of the Americas present this option; the example is from Selknam (Chon; Patagonia, Argentina).

(8)   Selknam (Tonelli 1926: 58)
        Kokoš   telken   okel-enen
        Kokoš   boys   with-go
        'Kokoš goes with the boys.'

The transitive patterning of comitatives is manifested even more explicitly in languages where the comitative NP is constructed as the direct object of a verb 'to accompany/to have/to hold/to take/to follow' in a serializiation construction. Clearly, such cases will be found in areas where verb serialization is rampant anyway. Thus, West Africa, eastern Austronesian, and Sino-Tibetan are the places to look for this phenomenon. An example is Igbo (Igboid; Nigeria).

(9)   Igbo (Welmers 1973: 369)
        há   sò   anyí gá-á   Ábá
        they accompany.STAT us   go.to-NARR Aba
        'They went to Aba with us.'

Again, this variation in the encoding of comitative phrases is not reflected on the map.

4.   Shift of WITH to AND

Although both for WITH-languages and for AND-languages clear instances can be found, the typological status of these two types

is probably not equally well-established. In particular, there is a notable discrepancy in the stability of the types. In general, AND-languages can be said to be stable diachronically and "pure" in their synchronic state: there is a sharp delineation between the two available strategies. On the other hand, "pure" instances of WITH-languages are relatively rare. For a considerable number of such languages, some process of "diachronic drift" of the comitative encoding can be attested. The general outcome of this process is to effectuate a shift from one-strategy to two-strategy status. These languages tend to introduce a secondary differentiation into the structural features of the comitative strategy, by changing one or more features of that strategy towards the features of the conjunctional strategy. In this way, the language acquires a two-strategy encoding of the domain, in which one of the strategies is still purely comitative, while the other is some sort of hybrid between the comitative and the conjunctional strategy.

The "shift" of the comitative strategy in WITH-languages is a gradual process. Moreover, the structural features which are changed in the course of this process are different for different groups of WITH-languages. Among the possible "paths" involved in the shift, we encounter cases in which

(i) The comitative NP can be moved from its canonical position to a position adjacent to the other conjunct, so that the two conjuncts now form a constituent. An example is Babungo (Bantoid; Cameroon).

(10) Babungo (Schaub 1985: 87)
    a. *Làmbí gə̀ táa yìwìŋ ghɔ́ Ndùlá*
        Lambi go.PFV to   market with Ndula
        'Lambi went to the market with Ndula.'
    b. *Làmbí ghɔ́ Ndùlá gə̀ táa yìwìŋ*
        Lambi and/with Ndula go.PFV to   market
        'Lambi and Ndula went to the market.'

(ii) There is differentiation in person/number agreement (mainly between singular and dual/plural). An example is Tolai (Oceanic; New Britain, Papua New Guinea).

(11) Tolai (Mosel 1984: 176)
  a. *nam ra tutana i ga rovoi ma ra pap*
     DEM ART man 3SG PFV hunt with ART dog
     'That man went hunting with his dog.'
  b. *Terengai dir rovoi ma ra pap*
     Terengai 3DU hunt and/with ART dog
     'Terengai and his dog went hunting.'

(iii) There is doubling of the comitative marker when used as a conjunction, thereby overtly indicating the equality in rank of the two noun phrases. A case in point is Japanese.

(12) Japanese (Hinds 1986: 97, 94)
  a. *Taroo wa Akiko to Nara e ikimashita*
     Taroo TOP Akiko with Nara to go.PST
     'Taroo went to Nara with Akiko.'
  b. *Taroo to Akiko to wa Nara e ikimashita*
     Taroo with Akiko with TOP Nara to go.PST
     'Taroo and Akiko went to Nara.'

Since, however, in all these "shift"-languages the markers for coordination and comitatives remain identical, such languages have been coded as WITH-languages for the purposes of this map.

5.   Geographical distribution

As the map demonstrates, the distinction between the two language types shows clear areal features. Concentrations of WITH-languages can be found in two large linguistic areas. First, we find such languages in East and Southeast Asia and the

islands of Indonesia, Melanesia and Polynesia. Secondly, most of the languages of Africa in and below the Sahara (with the notable exception of Khoisan) have WITH-status.

Opposed to this, AND-languages appear to be the rule in a mega-area which might roughly be called "Eurasia". This area comprises all the languages of Europe, Central Asia and Siberia; in the east, it also includes some, though not all, of the Austronesian languages of the Philippines. To the southeast, the area stretches as far as India. Finally, it includes the Middle East and northern Africa. A second mega-area of AND-languages is formed by (most of) the languages of Australia and the central highlands of New Guinea.

Outside of these two main AND-areas, AND-encoding can be found in several other places, in particular in the Americas, but the distribution of AND-languages and WITH-languages seems to be rather haphazard here. North America seems to have a predominance of AND-status, whereas at least the languages of the southern part of Central America and the eastern part of South America appear to tend towards WITH-encoding.