

Contrastive coordination and subordination in Catalan Sign Language

Alexandra Navarrete-González (Pompeu Fabra University)

Giorgia Zorzi (Western Norway University of Applied Sciences)

Introduction. In the existing literature, the notion of contrast has been mainly analyzed in coordinate structures. Less studies have been devoted to the analysis of its presence in subordination. Moreover, contrast in sign languages (SLs) has been mostly treated as a feature of focus and topic (van der Kooij et al. 2006, Wilbur 2012, Kimmelman 2014, Barberà 2015). In this paper, based on empirical evidence from LSC, we assume that contrast is a separate notion in information structure that can overlap with both topic and focus (Vallduví & Vilkuna 1998, Umbach 2004). We focus on the analysis of parallel contrast, in which the contrasted elements need to be semantically independent and have a common integrator (Umbach 2004). Interestingly, coordination and subordination in SLs sometimes are not easily distinguished due to the lack of overt lexical markers, so the analysis of contrast in these two structures can be a key factor in teasing them apart.

Goals. The goal of this paper is two-folded: i) we establish the criteria to identify the presence of contrast in Catalan Sign Language (LSC) in NP, VP and TP coordination, and different subordinate structures; ii) we explore how the differences between coordinate and subordinate structures in LSC are sometimes difficult to distinguish due to the lack of subordinate markers in some constructions and also due to other factors. We do so by analyzing the semantic interpretation of these structures, focusing on the differences and similarities between adversative and concessive clauses.

Contrast in coordination and subordination. The contrastive relation between elements in LSC is mainly expressed through specific non-manual markers (NMMs): head leans (hl) and body leans (bl), and the use of the opposite sides of the space. The contrast between elements is given by the alternation in the directionality of the NMMs listed towards the left and right side of the signing space (1). While it is clear that contrast can be present in coordination, this is not the case for subordination. In (2) the elements in the main clause and the subordinate clause are not contrasting and the combination of markers found for contrast in coordination are not present. However, it is possible to find contrast in subordination in LSC whenever there is semantic parallelism between the clauses, which can be detected through the presence of specific NMMs (3a). The peculiarity of (3a) is the absence of concessive subordinate overt markers, which leads to doubt whether it can be analyzed syntactically as a concessive subordinate clause or as an adversative coordinate clause. The same concessive meaning may be expressed by the lexical markers BUT and ALTHOUGH respectively in a coordinate and subordinate structure (3b-c). In the study of concessive subordination, it has been claimed that it is not clear whether a concessive is notionally different from an adversative (Izutsu, 2008). Following Haegeman (2003) we consider two more different contexts other than the concessive one: adversative and counterexpectational. In LSC adversative BUT and concessive ALTHOUGH can be also used in counterexpectational contexts like (4a-b), with a preference for the use of ALTHOUGH. Moreover, adversative BUT and the absence of any overt lexical marker can be found in adversative contexts (5a-b) (ALTHOUGH is not accepted since it always carries a concessive meaning).

Conclusions. In this paper, we show that parallel contrast may also be found in subordination. In both types of sentences, contrast is expressed through the same combination of markers. Additionally, this paper contributes to the study of structures that can be interpreted like subordinate clauses but have the form of coordinate structures. We show that adversative coordinate clauses in LSC can be used to express concessive meaning. By contrast, concessive subordinate clauses with ALTHOUGH cannot be used to express adversative meaning. When no

overt lexical markers are used (ALTHOUGH/BUT) only the context can disambiguate the meaning (adversative or concessive).

- (1) $\frac{\text{left hl+bl}}{[\text{ROSA EMAIL OPEN}]_{\text{LEFT}}}$ $\frac{\text{right hl+bl}}{[\text{JORDI COOK}]_{\text{RIGHT}}}$.
 ‘Rosa checks her emails and Jordi cooks.’
- (2) $\frac{\text{left ht}}{[\text{GIORGIA CAKE FRUIT BURN}]_{\text{CENTRAL}}}$ $[\text{ALTHOUGH EFFORT}]_{\text{CENTRAL}}$
 ‘Although Giorgia burnt a fruit cake she made a great effort.’
- (3) *Concessive context:* There is a dessert contest. The jury doubts if Giorgia should win or not because...
- a. $[\text{GIORGIA CAKE FRUIT CL: FRUITS+++ BURN CL: CAKE}]_{\text{RIGHT}}$ $[\text{CHOCOLATE VERY-GOOD}]_{\text{LEFT}}$.
 ‘Although Giorgia burnt a fruit cake, she made a very good chocolate cake.’
- b. $\text{GIORGIA CAKE FRUIT CL: FRUITS+++ BURN BUT CHOCOLATE CAKE VERY-GOOD}$
 ‘Giorgia burnt a fruit cake, but she made a very good chocolate cake.’
- c. **ALTHOUGH** $\text{GIORGIA CAKE FRUIT BURN, CHOCOLATE BEST THAT’S-IT.}$
 ‘Although Giorgia burnt a fruit cake, she made the best chocolate cake.’
- (4) *Counterexpectational context:* Dessert contest for couples. Giorgia and Jordi won the contest (we expect them to have done all desserts very well).
- a. **ALTHOUGH** $\text{GIORGIA CAKE CHOCOLATE HANDS VERY-GOOD, JORDI FRUIT CL: FRUIT BURN.}$
 ‘Although Giorgia made a very good chocolate cake, Jordi burnt a fruit cake.’
- b. $\text{GIORGIA CAKE CHOCOLATE HANDS VERY-GOOD ALTHOUGH JORDI FRUIT CL: FRUIT BURN.}$
 ‘Giorgia made a very good chocolate cake, although Jordi burnt a fruit cake.’
- (5) *Adversative context:* There was a dessert contest. Giorgia bakes different cakes but ends up losing the dessert contest. I ask you why Giorgia lost the contest.
- a. $\text{GIORGIA CAKE CHOCOLATE VERY GOOD BUT FRUIT CL: FRUITS+++ BURN}$
 ‘Giorgia baked a very good chocolate cake, but burnt a fruit cake.’
- b. $\text{GIORGIA } [\text{CAKE CHOCOLATE VERY GOOD}]_{\text{RIGHT}} [\text{FRUIT CL: FRUITS+++ BURN}]_{\text{LEFT}}$
 ‘Giorgia baked a very good chocolate cake (but) burnt a fruit cake.’
- c. **#ALTHOUGH** $\text{GIORGIA CHOCOLATE CAKE VERY-GOOD CL: FRUIT FRUIT BURN.}$
 ‘Although Giorgia baked a very good chocolate cake, she burnt a fruit cake.’

Selected references. Barberà, G. 2015. *The Meaning of Space in Sign Language. Reference, Specificity and Structure in Catalan Sign Language Discourse.* ■ Haegeman, L. 2003. The syntax of adverbial clauses and its consequences for topicalisation. 61-90. ■ Izutsu, M. 2008. Contrast, concessive, and corrective: Toward a comprehensive study of opposition relations. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40. 646-675. ■ Kimmelman, V. 2014. *Information Structure in Russian Sign Language and Sign Language of the Netherlands.* ■ Umbach, C. 2004. On the Notion of Contrast in Information Structure and Discourse Structure. *Journal of Semantics* 21:155–175. ■ Vallduví, E. & Vilkuna, M. 1998. On rheme and kontrast. *The limits of syntax* 29. ■ van der Kooij, E. et al. 2006. Explaining prosodic body leans in Sign Language of the Netherlands: Pragmatics required. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(10). Wilbur, R. 2012. *Information Structure.* In R. Pfau, M. Steinbach & B. Woll (eds.), *Sign Language. An International Handbook*, 462–489. De Gruyter Mouton.