

Elli, Marly Vea Clarisse L.

2012-68819

ON THE STUDY OF TAGALOG, KAPAMPANGAN, IBANAG AND ITAWIS

COORDINATING CONSTRUCTIONS

This paper presents a typological-functional outline of Tagalog, Kapampangan, Ibanag and Itawis languages. The discussion of coordination starts with a description of what coordinators are available in each of the languages and their position, focusing on the semantic types: conjunctive, disjunctive, and other possible coordination. An illustration of phrasal coordination, then clausal (sentential) coordination is given. Following this, cross-linguistic comparison on the languages based on a set of parameters and a discussion on the issue of linguistic universals is presented.

This paper focuses on the formation of coordinating constructions and the position of the coordinators and their functions. Other types of coordination like adversative, causal and emphatic functions are also examined. Subordination is mentioned, however not expounded in this paper.

According to Haspelmath (2007), "Coordination refers to syntactic constructions in which two or more units of the same type are combined into a larger unit and still have the same semantic relations with other surrounding elements." The units may be nominals, phrases, subordinate clauses, or in full sentences. These relations will be discussed by their semantic types.

A. Coordinating constructions by semantic types

a. Conjunctive

It pertains to the combination terms or phrases or independent clauses having equal rank (co-ranking). This equal ranking refers to the sameness of the function of the units in the phrase or clause (e.g. Noun-coordination-Noun).

i. Phrasal

1) Tag: ang nanay **at** ang tatay (NP+ conj + NP)

Kap: ing ima **ampong** ing tatang (NP+ conj + NP)

Ibg: y inno **anna** y ammo (NP+ conj + NP)

Itw: Ina **en** ama (N+ conj + N)

Yo ina **entere** yo ama (NP + conj + NP)

mother and father

‘mother and father’

- 2) Tag: ang masipag **at** ang mabait (AP+conj + AP)
 Kap: ing masipag **ampong** ing maganaka (AP+conj + AP)
 Ibg: y masippo **anna** y malappo (AP+conj + AP)
 Itw: Nasimpat **en** nalappat (Adj + conj + Adj)
 Yo nasimpat **entere** yo nalappat (AP + conj + AP)
 diligent and good
 ‘diligent and good’
- 3) Tag Nagbabasa ako **at** kumakain (VP + conj + VP)
 Kap: Mamasa ku **ampong** mamangan (VP + conj + VP)
 Ibg: Mabbibbig nga **anna** kuman (VP + conj + VP)
 Itw: Mabbibbig nak **entere** mangan (VP + conj + VP)
 do-read 1st.sg.pron conj do-eat
 ‘I am reading and eating.’
- 4) Tag: Bumili ako ng tinapay, kape, **at** asukal. (VP + NP +, + NP+, + conj + NP)
 Kap: Sinali kung tinape, kape **ampong** mayumu
 Ibg: Giminatang nga tu pan, kafe, **anna** asukar.
 Itw: Naggatan nak kang tinapay, kafe **en** asukar.
 Did-buy 1st.sg.pron objM bread, coffee, conj sugar
 ‘I bought bread, coffee, and sugar.’

ii. Clausal (Sentential; Clause + conj + Clause)

- 5) Tag: Natulog ang dalaga **at** umuwi ang binata [(VP + NP) + conj + (VP + NP)]
 Kap: Metudtud ya ing dalaga **ampong** minuli ya ing bayintawu.
 Ibg: Nakkatrug y maginganay **anna** lumubbe y bagitolay.
 Itw: Nakkaturug yo maginganay **entere** nallubbet yo bagitolay.
 did-sleep SubjM maiden conj went-home SubjM young man
 ‘The maiden slept and the young man went home.’

Tagalog	At
Kapampangan	Ampong
Ibanag	Anna
Itawis	En commonly used between words; Entere for phrases or clauses (however en can also be used in phrases or clauses)

Table 1. Conjunctive coordinators in Tagalog, Kapampangan, Ibanag, and Itawis

All these languages exhibit the VSO pattern in their word order.

6) Tag: Bumili ako ng tinapay, kape, at asukal.

V S O (coordination at phrasal/nominal level)

Kap: Sinali kung tinape, kape ampong mayumu.

V S O (coordination at phrasal/nominal level)

Ibg: Giminatang nga tu pan, kafe, anna asukar

V S O (coordination at phrasal/nominal level)

Itw: Naggatan nak kang tinapay, kafe en asukar

V S O (coordination at phrasal/nominal level)

One coordinator is used for all forms of coordination in each language, except Itawis in which it has conjunctions used in words and another in phrases or clauses. But all has one coordinator in one sentence. This type of coordination is called monosyndetic (Haspelmath, 2007). The position is always between the two coordinands [A conj B]. It is also shown that the coordinator is postpositive, appearing only after a given coordinand.

In phrasal coordination, the coordinator only connects two of the same category: nouns to nouns, verbs to verbs, so on. There is no limited number of coordinands to be used in the sentential form like in example 4. The punctuation mark is used to illustrate the enumeration of the equal ranking coordinands without using the coordinator to avoid repetition or redundancy.

In sentential coordination, two independent clauses with equal ranking are to be linked. Equal ranking pertains to the “wide scope” coordination in which the predicate linked with coordinators in the sentence can be separated to form two sentences, however using the same subject or object. The subject of object distributes its function on both the predicates. InTagalog “Nagbihis at lumabas ng bahay si Maria.”, it can be separated into two sentences, “Nagbihis si Maria.” And “Lumabas ng bahay si Maria.” Since both sentences have the same subject, they can be formed into one sentence by using a coordinator. The predicates of these sentences are of equal ranking and all pertains to “Maria” as the subject.

The relationship of the verbal units with each other has two types. Co-occurrence verbs like in Phrasal 3, since both actions ‘reading’ and ‘eating’ are done at the same time. This portrays simultaneous action or events. Another is succession verbs. Example of a succession verb is:

- 7) Tag: Nagbihis at lumabas ng bahay si Maria.
Kap: Memiblas ya ampong linwal bale i Maria.
Ibg: Nattali anna nallawan ta balay si Maria.
Itw: Nattali en nallawan kang balay i Maria.
Did-dress up conj did-go outside locM house SubjM Maria
‘Maria dressed up and left the house.’

The verb ‘dress up’ is done first before moving on to the next action, ‘leaving the house’ since they cannot occur simultaneously.

However, there are other constructions in Tagalog and Kapampangan which are quite problematic because they do not appear to be acting as conjunctions. One example is the connective adverb ‘mabuti at’ It displays emotion and describing an event using an adverb. These are the emphatic conjunctions.

- 8) Tag: Mabuti **at** dumating ang pari. (AP + conj + VP)
Good conj(?) did-arrive SubjM priest
‘Thank God the priest arrived.’
- 9) Tag: Ha! At may balak ka pang pumunta doon, di ba?
Kap: aro at atin ka pang balak munta keta e wari?
ExclM conj(?) EXIST 2nd sg.pron adv.part plan did-go there, right?
‘Oh! And you still have plans to go there, right?’

It is clearly shown that ‘at’ in example 8 and 9 does not function as conjunction on equal ranking because the coordinands belong to different grammatical and semantic categories.

Also, in Tagalog, there are additive focus particles given which exhibit conjunction. Morphemes like ‘also’, ‘pati’, and ‘saka’ are used in addition or in placement of ‘at’. Ibanag, and Itawis also used the same ‘pati’. It functions the same as ‘and’, however it can also function as a connective adverb to link related clauses.

- 10) Tag: ang nanay **pati** ang tatay
Ibg: y inno **pati** y ammo
Itw: yo ina **pati** yo ama
‘the mother and the father’

In Kapampangan there is a morpheme ‘kayi’ which means ‘and then’ and it exhibits successive action only. It replaces the morpheme ‘ampong’ and illustrates that the second coordinand (VP2) happens because of the first

one (VP2), or that after starting the VP1, then comes VP2, whereas ‘ampong’ can mean both successive and simultaneous action.

11) Kap: Meko ya ing bayintau, **kayi** mendilu ne man ing dalaga.

Meko ya ing bayintau, ampong mendilu ne man ing dalaga. (both can mean successive or simultaneous)

Did-go x-ref.pron SubjM young man, and then did-take a batch 3rd sg.pron adv.part SubjM maiden

‘The young man left, and then the maiden took a bath.’

In Ibanag, there is also additive focus particle like ‘pati’ in Tagalog, ‘gapa’. However ‘gapa’ also functions as an adverb, like in Tagalog ‘naman’ (see example 12).

12) Ibg: Kurug nga nabasa y bagitolay kunne **gapa** ta papeles ira nga nevalu na.

‘Siguradong nabasa ang binata, **pati** ang dala niyang papeles.’

Nanaw y bagitolay anna nazzigu **gapa** y maginganay.

‘Umalis ang binata at naligo **naman** ang dalaga.’

These languages exhibit the same VSO pattern, but they can also express VOS and SVO pattern by using inversion markers like ‘ay’ in Tagalog and Ibanag, and ‘eh’ in Itawis, the only exception is Kapampangan where there is no inversion marker.

13) Tag: Sina joan at maria **ay** nanunuod ng tv. (SVO)

Kap: Manalbe lang tv dila joan ampong maria. (no inversion, VSO)

Ibg: Si Joan anna Maria **ay** maggigiraw tu tv. (SVO)

Itw: Maggira kang t vi Maria enni Joan. (VOS)

Almost all the languages are monosyndetic. The position of the coordinator is always between the two coordinands [A conj B], and that it is postpositive, appearing only after a given coordinand.

There is a construction on Ibanag where same coordinator appears twice in a sentence, and also functions as Tagalog ‘habang’.

14) Tag: Nanunuod ako ng tv habang nagbabasa at kumakain.

Nanunuod ako ng tv **at** nagbabasa **at** kumakain.

Ibg: Maggigiraw nga tu tv **anna** mabbibbibbig **anna** kukkuman.

b. **Disjunctive**

This type of coordination provides alternative on the given independent clauses having equal rank (co-ranking). This type of phrases or clauses functions to elicit a response from the hearer, or to make a guess, leaning towards making a choice on either of the linked phrases or clauses..

i. Phrasal

15) Tag: ang nanay **o** ang tatay (NP+ conj + NP)

Kap: ing ima **o** ing tatang (NP+ conj + NP)

Ibg: y inno **o** y ammo (NP+ conj + NP)

Itw: yo ina o yo ama (NP + conj + NP)

mother or father

‘mother or father’

16) Tag: ang masipag **o** ang mabait (AP+conj + AP)

Kap: ing masipag **o** ing maganaka (AP+conj + AP)

Ibg: y masippo **o** y malappo (AP+conj + AP)

Itw: Yo nasimpat o yo nalappat (AP + conj + AP)

diligent or good

‘diligent or good’

17) Tag Kain **o** tulog (VP + conj + VP)

Kap: Mangan **o** matudtud (VP + conj + VP)

Ibg: Kuman o kattrug (VP + conj + VP)

Itw: Mangan o makkaturug (VP + conj + VP)

do-read 1st.sg.pron conj do-eat

‘I am reading and eating.’

ii. Clausal (Sentential; Clause + conj + Clause)

18) Kap: (Pota) Matudtud ya **o** mandilu ya i Joan. [(Adv) + VP + CRpron + Ø] + disj + (VP + CRpron + NP)

did-sleep SubjM maiden conj went-home SubjM young man

‘The maiden slept or the young man went home.’

19) Itw: Iggina yo unna **onu** yo ultimo? (QM/NP + AP + disj + AP?)

Siya ba ang kauna-unahan o kahuli-hulihan?

For the Tagalog and Ibanag sentences, there is no sentential clause seen in the data. The disjunctive is usually seen between two phrases (noun, verbal, adjectives), and it is ungrammatical if used between clauses pertaining to same subject or object. However if given a pause or made into a new sentence before the second coordinand and used in discourse, it can be grammatical.

20) Tag: Si Joan ay natutulog o naliligo?

*Si Joan ay natutulog o naliligo siya?

Si Joan ay natutulog? O naliligo siya?

Tagalog	O
Kapampangan	O
Ibanag	O [mother-father pair words]; onu
Itawis	O; Onu [o kaya]

Table 2. Disjunctive coordinators in Tagalog, Kapampangan, Ibanag and Itawis

Sentence constructions analyzed were also similar to that of the conjunctions; however there is noticeably a change in word order.

Also, like in conjunctive, one coordinator is used for all forms of disjunction in almost all languages, with the exception of Ibanag which uses the morpheme ‘o’ in the pair ‘mother or father’. This describes either the usage of ‘o’ in pair words, or exhibiting borrowing from other language.

In phrasal coordination, the coordinator only connects two of the same category: nouns to nouns, verbs to verbs, and so on. There is a limited number of coordinands to be used in all the constructions unlike the conjunction where there are serial phrases, using the punctuation mark comma as a phonological value and to avoid repetition.

Disjunction coordinators in Tagalog and Kapampangan also has the morpheme additive ‘kaya’ in ‘o kaya’ which adds meaning of wonderment, or sudden realization. In Itawis, it can also be the ‘o’ plus ‘nu’.

21) Tag: Si Maria **o kaya** si Joan ang pumunta sa bahay.

Si Joan ay natutulog **o kaya** naliligo.

Kap: I maria **o kaya** i joan ing minta king bale

Spec Maria disj.conj Spec Joan SubjM did-go locM house

‘It is Maria or Joan who went to the house.’

In the first example, ‘Maria’ is the first guess and points out that the speaker may have believe the probability that it is Maria indeed who made the action, however a few seconds later added ‘Joan’ to be the second guess because of a sudden realization. This is the same as with the second example where the speaker was so sure that Joan is sleeping, but then changed his mind because maybe Joan is taking a bath after all.

There is also the phrase ‘kung hindi’ which exhibits contrast or alternative in Tagalog, even in Kapampangan ‘nung aliwa’ and Ibanag ‘nu ari’. This conjunction exhibits the position of the coordinator [conj A B], and that it is prepositive, which is a marked feature. This ‘kung hindi’ is usually used in subordination, however we will only focus on the coordination and its phrasal position. Subordination is different to coordination since it is asymmetrical in clauses, because in construction [A conj B], either A or B is the head and the other element is syntactically dependent on the latter.

22) Tag: **Kung hindi** si Maria, si Joan ang pumunta sa bahay. (Si Maria o si Joan)

Kap: **Nung aliwa** I Maria, I joan ing minta king bale. (I Marie o I Joan)
 Ibg: **Nu ari** si Maria, si Joan y minay ta balay. (si Maria o/onu si Joan)
 Ite: **Nu akkang** kanni Maria, i Joan yo minang kang balay (Maria o Joan)

This sentence illustrates the favorability of ‘Joan’ who is likely the one who went to the house. A word and comma combination is used in illustrating the disjunction.

In sentential coordination, only Kapampangan portrays two independent clauses. It is by using its cross-referential pronoun ‘ya’ pertaining to ‘Joan’, that of which if divided [Matudtud ya] o [mandilu ya i Joan], the two clauses can stand alone. In the other languages, they are used in phrasal only.

- 23) Tag: Si Joan ay baka natutulog o kaya naliligo. (VP conj VP)
 Kap: Pota matudtud ya o mandilu ya I joan. (can be separated into two sentences)
 Ibg: Si Joan ay wayya na tu nakakatrug onu mazzizigu. (VP conj VP)
 Itw: I Joan eh makkaturug o nu mazzivut. (VP conj VP)

B. Rule of Coordinate Deletion

In this section, deletion of noun phrases, adjectival phrases, and verbal phrases is to be introduced. Since we are discussing on symmetric coordination, phrases which are identified as the common integrator of the coordinands is dropped.

i. Conjunction

- 24) Tag: Mabait (ang babae) **at** masayahin ang babae - (AP + Ø) + conj + (AP + NP)
 Nagbihis (si Maria) **at** lumabas ng bahay si Maria.- (VP + Ø) + conj + (VP + NP)
 Sina joan **at** maria ay nanunuod ng tv. (NP + Ø) + conj + (NP + VP)
- 25) Kap: Maganaka ya ing babayi **among** masayain ya
 (AP + CRpron + NP) + conj + (AP + CRpron + Ø)
 Manalbe la(ng tv) dila joan **among** maria
 [VP + CRpron(NP) + NP] + conj + (Ø + NP)
 Memiblas ya **among** linwal ya bale I Maria.
 (VP + CRpron + Ø) + conj + (VP + CRpron + NP)
- 26) Ibg: Masippo y babay **anna** magayayya. (AP + NP) + conj + (AP + Ø)
 Nattali anna nallawan ta balay si Maria. (VP + Ø) + conj + (VP + NP + NP)
- 27) Itw: Mabbibbig nak entere mangan. (VP + NP) + conj + (VP + Ø)
 Nattali en nallawan kang balay i Maria (VP + Ø) + conj + (VP + NP)

ii. Disjunction

- 28) Tag: Si Maria **o** si Joan ang pumunta sa bahay. (NP + Ø) + conj + (NP + VP)
Si Joan ay natutulog **o** naliligo. (NP + invM + VP) + disj + (Ø + VP)
- 29) Kap: I maria **o (kaya)** I joan ing minta king bale (NP + Ø) + disj + (NP + VP + NP)
(Pota) matudtud ya **o** mandilu ya I joan
[(Adv) + VP + CRpron + Ø] + disj + (VP + CRpron + NP)
- 30) Ibg: Si Maria **onu** si Joan y minay ta balay. (NP + Ø) + disj + (NP + VP + NP)
Si Joan ay makakatrug onu mazzizigu. (NP + invM + VP) + disj + (Ø + VP)
- 31) Itw: I Maria o i Joan yo minang kang balay (NP + Ø) + disj + (NP + VP + NP)
I Joan eh makkaturug o nu mazzivut. (NP + invM + VP) + disj + (Ø + VP)

Redundant phrases are as much as possible avoided in complex sentences, which is why dropping or deletion of Common Integrator is being used. It employs simplification in syntax. This term is also called a rule of ‘ellipsis’ of identical elements (Haspelmath, 2007). This is used to test if the sentence is coordination or subordination. The functional motivation of the ellipsis is that identical material need not be repeated, for reasons of economy. A much more difficult question is being imposed by Haspelmath (2007) on why certain ellipsis processes are restricted to coordination. However, semantically, reciprocal relationship between coordinands does not use deletion. Disjunction does not play a role in reciprocal relationship since the context does not show the alternative, but both coordinands are needed in the verb.

- 32) Tag: Nagkita sina Maria at Joan. (*Nagkita si Maria at nagkita si Joan)
Kap: Mikit la di Maria ampong Joan. (*Mikit la i Maria ampong mikit la i Joan)

In ellipsis, there are forward and backward types, and since all the languages have certain free word order, both are being used.

33) Forward ellipsis:

Tag: Nagbabasa ako at kumakain [].
Kap: Mamasa ku ampong mamangan []
Ibg: Si Joan ay makakatrug onu [] mazzizigu.

34) Backward ellipsis:

Tag: Nagbabasa [] at kumakain ako.
Kap: Mamasa [] ampong mamangan ku.
Ibg: si Maria [] onu si Joan y minay ta balay.

C. Other Coordinators

All languages given have coordinators which are obligatory. Adversative conjunctions often are optional or zero-morpheme coordinators in these languages. In Tagalog, there are coordinators like ‘pero’, ‘kaso’, ‘kaya lang’, ‘subalit’, ‘datapwat’, ‘bagkus’, and ‘ngunit’. In Kapampangan, it is the word ‘oneng’, and in both Ibanag and Itawis is the word ‘ngem’.

- 35) Tag: Dumating si Joe, (**pero**) hindi dumating si Sally.
Kap: Dinatang ya i Joe, (**oneng**) e ya dinating i Sally.
Ibg: Dumattal si Joe (**ngem**) ari nga dumattal si Sally.
Itw: Nallubbet i Joe, (**ngem**) mari nallubbet i Sally.
Did-arrive SubjM Joe, advs NEG did-arrive SubjM Sally
‘Joe arrived, but Sally didn’t.’

There are also causal conjunctions in these languages. However in here, Tagalog can also use the conjunctive ‘at’ to illustrate reason or cause. Tagalog, though, has many causal coordinators like ‘dahil’ and ‘kasi’. In Kapampangan, it is ‘uling’ or also ‘ba(ng)’. In Ibanag and Itawis, it is the word ‘ta’.

- 36) Tag: Umalis ka na **at** gusto ko nang matulog.
Kap: Mako na ka, **uling** bisa nakung matudtud.
Ibg: Manaw ka ngana **ta** kaya ku y makkatrug.
Itw: Mapanaw kan **ta** ikayat ku makkaturug.

D. On Linguistic Universals

On the discussion on word order, Stassen (2000) proposed that postposed copulative conjunctions of the type ‘X Y -and’ correlate with OV order, whereas VO order correlates with preposed coordinators of the type ‘X and Y’. Since based on the results of the data that the word orders are usually VSO, VOS and SVO, in terms of the expressed conjunctions, they follow the ‘X and Y’ constructions indeed.

On the category-sensitivity of coordinating constructions, most of the Western languages like English have the coordinators ‘and’ and ‘or’ which can link a diverse range of categories: noun phrases, verb phrases, clauses, etc. but the coordinator ‘but’ is mostly confined to clauses. In the given languages, disjunctions were used even in phrasal structures, especially in an interrogative manner.

Universalist claims that “All natural languages have forms that are equivalents of logical connectives”. However, Haspelmath (2007) paraphrased it into “All natural languages grammaticize logical connectives”. However, languages like Maricopa are said to have no coordinator indicator (Haspelmath, 2007). In this sense, Haspelmath (2007) does not believe that cross-categorial uniformity of coordination is not a universal feature of

natural languages. If I may analyze the content of my gathered data, coordination is not uniform in all languages in terms of the morphemes used (different words, free or bound, zero). However, on semantic purposes, there is a need for coordination. You never know if a sentence is in combination, along with, contrast, or even alternative in meaning.

According to The Universal of Coordination (Winter, 1995), Conjunction is syncategorematic, and disjunction is categorematic. In layman's term, it is saying that conjunctions are function words, and that disjunctions are content words. Syncategorematic is a term that cannot stand as the subject or the predicate of a proposition but must be used in conjunction with other terms (adverb, preposition), while categorematic can stand alone as the subject or predicate of a proposition. Conjunctive morphemes like 'and' are better treated as lacking any denotational contribution to meaning. This is the same as that of Haspelmath's that coordination is not at all present in all languages. However, with the logical connectives, even if some are asyndetic, it means all languages value the function of coordination.

According to Ross (1967)'s Coordinated Structure Constraint, in a coordinate structure, no conjunct may be moved, nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct. This is sometimes used as a test for coordination, where there might be some doubt over the coordinate status of a construction (versus subordination). This prohibits extraction of the answer in interrogative words from coordinate structures like that in Tagalog.

37) Tag: Kinausap ni Maria si Joan **at** umalis siya ng bahay.

*Sino ang kinausap ni Maria **at** umalis siya ng bahay?

The extraction of Joan cannot be used, since it will be ungrammatical. All coordinands surrounding the coordinator should not be moved away from the coordinator itself. This is also related to Distance Principle of Iconicity of Haiman (1985), in which linguistic distance between expressions (whether syntactic or morphological) reflects the conceptual distance between them.

38) Tag: *Mabait si Maria at masipag.

The sentence is not prototypical since the coordinands are away from each other, thus seemingly make it ungrammatical.

Lastly, the earliest approach to coordination in generative syntax can be found in Chomsky (1957).

“One of the most productive processes for forming new sentences is the process of conjunction. If we have two sentences $Z+X+W$ and $Z+Y+W$, and if X and Y are actually constituents of these sentences, then we can generally form a new sentence $Z-X+and+Y-W$...If X and Y are, however, not constituents, we can generally not do this.”

(Chomsky 1957, p. 35)

In this approach, Chomsky introduced the idea of conjunctions, especially that of semantic coordinations. Nevertheless, the introduction of economy of the sentences by combining two independent clauses is relevant to the contribution of language universals.

References:

- Constantino, E. (1965). The sentence pattern of twenty-six Philippine languages. *Lingua*, 15, 71-124.
- Dita, Shirley. (2010). A reference grammar of Ibanag. Saarbrücken, Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing..
- Drellishak, S. (2004). A Survey of Coordination Strategies in World's Languages. University of Washington.
- Forman, M. (1971). Kapampangan grammar notes. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Haspelmath, M. (2007). Coordination. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.) Language typology and syntactic description, vol. II: Complex constructions. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-51
- Jalotjot, E. (1937). Diskripsyong klose na verbal ng wikang Itawit.
- Lim, K. C. (2013). A Phrase Structure Grammar of Verbal Core Sentences in Itawis. Undergraduate thesis, UP Diliman.
- Mithun, M. (1989). Grammaticization of Coordination. University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Ross, J. R. (1967). Constraints on variables in syntax. Ph.D. dissertation. MIT. Distributed 1968 by the Indiana University Linguistics Club; published 1986 as *Infinite Syntax*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Stassen, Leon. 2000. "AND-languages and WITH-language", *Linguistic Typology*, 4.1: 1-55.
- Winter, Y. (1995). Syncategorematic Conjunction and Structured Meanings. *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 5, pp 387-404. Retrieved from
<<http://journals.linguisticsociety.org/proceedings/index.php/SALT/article/viewFile/2704/2450>>