CHAPTER 8
Ordinary insubordination as transient discourse

Arienne M Dwyer
University of Kansas, Anthropology / Institute for Digital Research in the Humanities

Abstract

Insubordination—the conventionalized use of morphologically non-finite forms as finite ones—is an ordinary syntactic event in synchronic spontaneous discourse; it is also an ordinary stage of the grammaticalization of non-finite clauses as finite ones. This chapter explores the morphosyntactic typology of insubordination and its ontogeny in Inner Asian Turko-Mongolic languages. In so doing, I clarify criterial features of insubordination. I also consider whether insubordination is a transient phenomenon as part of a larger process of grammaticalization.

I hypothesize that spoken interactive discourse is the major source of candidate structures for insubordination. Inner Asian Turko-Mongolic insubordination occurs in cross-linguistically typical *if*-clauses, but it also occurs in several other morphologically nonfinite contexts such as purposive clauses (e.g. Uyghur ...*üčün* 'in order to...'), imperfective clauses (e.g. Southeastern Monguor ...*bari-ǰi* 'taking...'). I first survey the range of conventionalized insubordinate readings of such non-finites in a half dozen modern Turko-Mongolic languages. Turning to their ontogeny, I then show how contemporary examples of candidate utterances for insubordination often originate as co-constructed utterances in discourse.

The grammaticalization of nonfinite clauses as finite ones is a well-established phenomenon in Turkic and Mongolic. Looking at clause length, frequency, and recoverability of semantic content, some conventionalized examples of insubordination (for instance the Monguor imperfective clauses with -*ǰi*) are losing an insubordination reading and becoming grammaticalized as finite utterances. If insubordination criterially entails semantic and grammatical elision, such constructions become independent in the final phase of insubordination, and "it may not be possible to restore any ellipsed material" (Evans 2007: 370–376). But if insubordination is viewed as a short-term, discourse-based and fundamentally transient phenomenon, then Monguor imperfective nonfinites would be seen as "mature" examples of insubordination. Social and regional variation and even language contact contribute to the introduction of new candidates for insubordination, as well as for their loss.

1 Overview

This chapter posits that insubordination is an ordinary, nonexceptional phenomenon in spontaneous spoken discourse, and that the development of insubordination does not necessarily include a stage where an elided clause is recoverable (contra Evans 2007), at least in the languages under investigation here. I have two motivations for these claims.

First, communication is fundamentally dialogic. **In spoken discourse, subordinate clauses (a common source of insubordination) frequently cohere syntactically and pragmatically across speaking turns**: speakers co-create speaking turns and thus appear to be finishing each others' utterances. This structure suggests a path to insubordination, whereby candidate insubordinate clauses frequently arise in these adjacency pairs constructed by multiple speakers. If we can then find that these formerly subordinate adjacency-pair clauses occur with some regularity as insubordinations, we may well have evidence for this discourse path to insubordination. This major type of evidence, co-constructed utterances, which are typically absent from written and elicited texts, also highlights the need to include spontaneous discourse in any canonical grammar of a language. If we were to understand the second elements in co-constructed utterances instead as a series of finite utterances, then we would have to consider them ungrammatical. Instead, I will show that candidate insubordinations arise very frequently in adjacency pairs, and that there is some promising evidence of their being grammaticalized as insubordinations.

Second, **parallel diachronic developments in related and neighbouring languages appear to indicate that subordinate clauses becoming insubordinate utterances is a common**

process, just like any other grammaticalization process such as cliticization (Jespersen 1894) or case marking (Hopper 1991). Diachronically, most Turko-Mongolic nonfinite subordinate clauses came to be finite and insubordinate. Diachronic insubordination in Altaic and Japanese has undergone almost identical developments; English, German, Dutch, Spanish, Kayardild show similar processes (Evans 2007), and a number of chapters in the present volume widen the database substantially. The direction of change in insubordination (subordinate > main clause) is unusual (Evans 2007), unlike the more common grammaticalization, where the direction is main clause > subordinate clause (Lehmann 1982; Heine and Reh 1984; Campbell 1991; Hopper and Traugott 1993; Harris and Campbell 1995; Traugott and Heine 1991; Givón 2009). This chapter demonstrates that this direction of change is in fact not unusual, just less studied.

From the above observations, which were confirmed by pilot research, I ask the following questions:

- What is the relationship between the proposed stages of insubordination (Evans 2007) and dialogue co-construction?
- Synchronic evidence suggests that insubordination arises in adjacency pairs. To what extent do synchronic insubordinations in Turkic and Mongolic require pragmatic and syntactic parallelism in adjacency pairs?
- Although insubordination is common in spontaneous discourse, it is not possible with all non-finite clause types; with which non-finites do insubordinations occur, and why?
- Do different stages or "waves" of insubordinations co-occur in modern language varieties?
- Is insubordination sensitive to language contact situations?

The evidence adduced here leads to the conclusion that the insubordination cline may not be necessary, and that insubordinations may arise more directly in dialogic discourse and via language contact.

1.1   Insubordination Criteria

This chapter's central concern is the ontogeny of insubordinate utterances, specifically the structures and discourse conditions in which insubordination arises. A precondition to such an analysis is to review known types of insubordination, and define the criteria with which they are evaluated.

Insubordination types have been taxonomized by semantic and syntactic means. The semantic modality expressed is generally a threat, wish, or ironic dubitative, as can be seen in (1)–(3) below:

(1)   Deontic – permissive/threat:
        If you touch my car! (Implied: You will very much regret touching my car).

(2)   Deontic – volitive/wish:

(2a)   *On ira déjeuner au restaurant si tu ranges ta chambre.*
        'We'll lunch at the restaurant if you tidy up your room.'

(2b)   *Et quand tu auras terminé de nettoyer la cuisine?*
        And when you have finished cleaning the kitchen?
        (Implied: You should talk! And I wish you would clean the kitchen.)
        (Anne Dotter, p.c. 2013)

(3)   Irrealis - ironic dubitative:
If that's a beautiful jacket??!? (Nonfinite intonation; implied: the jacket is dreadfully ugly; Anna Berge p.c. 2011, cf. Spanish (Schwenter, this volume))

If an insubordination is irrealis, it is often a conditional clause, with the overall constructional reading coming from the if/when word. The clearest examples are those with realis morphosyntax but with insubordination reading.

Turko-Mongolic languages have abundant examples of all three types above (permissive, volitive, and ironic dubitative), in addition to several subjunctive (hedge) types for making polite requests, the latter in (7)–(8) below. Politeness strategies in Turkic and Mongolic languages entail the habitual elision of second-person actor referents in discourse, as well as the elision of second clauses bearing the burdensome outcomes of requests and criticisms. Further, speakers habitually signal their interpersonal deference and lack of omniscience by appearing to trail off with an insubordinated utterance; in many of these languages, speaker perspective is obligatorily marked. We therefore find many examples of imperfective insubordinate clauses, many with irrealis readings, which avoid a finite definite clause as a humilific strategy. When modals are recruited for insubordinated utterances (e.g. a wish or a barbed critique), these elided second clauses are often recoverable; when insubordinated utterances express a more generalized discourse presupposition, the elided clauses may not be recoverable.

To meaningfully compare Turko-Mongolic insubordination cross-linguistically, both semantic and structural criteria are necessary. In demonstrating how contemporary examples of candidate utterances for insubordination often originate as co-constructed utterances in discourse, the following syntactic, semantic, and prosodic criteria for insubordination have been used:

- The insubordinated clause must be able to occur as an independent clause
- The insubordinated clause must be interpretable as irrealis
- The insubordinated clause should have independent clause intonation, and may have special independent prosody (e.g. a boundary question)
- The conventionalized form is acceptable to speakers as grammatical (whether or not they can recover information)

Syntactic independence is criterial; we take up the diachronic issue of whether or not conventionalized ellipsis is necessary below. Evans attributes the development of insubordination primarily to ellipsis, especially of conditional consequences, imperative forms, and verbs of perception and thought. At first, the elided main clause of a subordinate construction is easily recoverable; later, the elided main clause becomes difficult to recover, as restrictions of interpretation (of the elided material) develop. Eventually, the formerly and formally subordinate clause becomes conventionalized as a main clause use of formally subordinate clause ("constructionalization"; Evans 2007: 370–376).

Ellipsis is frequent in the turn-taking of natural discourse, which would lead us to expect further examples of insubordination. Such ellipses arise from both topic-changing interruptions and topic-maintaining co-construction of utterances in natural discourse. I will argue that especially the latter—topic-maintaining utterances that are constructed across at least two speaker turns—are "candidate constructions" which may be taken further into insubordinations. (Candidate constructions are potential constructions for insubordination, or insubordination in development.) Insubordinations develop from candidate constructions where ellipsis has become conventionalized. I focus on spontaneous spoken language corpora both because they contain many examples of candidate constructions, and because this data type is generally overlooked (although see e.g. Ford and Thompson 1986, Stirling 1999).

Below, the range of conventionalized insubordinate readings of such non-finites in seven modern and early modern Turko-Mongol languages is surveyed.[1] The data here are based on my own corpora of the Turkic languages Salar (ISO 639-3: slr; in situ research during 1992–1994, 1999, 2006, 2011); Uyghur (uig; 2011–2012), Kazakh (kaz; 1993) and Kyrgyz (kir); the Mongolic languages Southeastern Monguor (mjg), Northern Monguor (mjg), and Baonan (peh; 2001–2006, 2011–2012), collected and analyzed with teams of native speakers.[2] I also refer to Kangjia (kxs), a Mongolic-based language variety of Inner Asia (Sechenchogt 1999) and Middle Turkic (Chaghatay).

1.2   Turko-Mongolic insubordination types

Insubordinated utterances have been categorized as belonging to a range of types, some of which are exemplified in (1)–(3) above. These include classification by modality (e.g. realis/irrealis, deontic, subjunctive, etc.), as modal recruitment is one important function of insubordination; but also classification via discourse presupposition such as sarcasm, irony, threats, hedges, wishes, and so on. Classification by syntactic type (conditional, imperfectives, etc.) is also possible, but as we will see below, several syntactic strategies are available in the contemporary languages to express a particular modal or discourse meaning, for example several different purposives can be deployed as hortatives. Thus, evaluating insubordinations primarily by modal type and discourse function facilitates cross-linguistic comparison; a secondary classification via syntactic type facilitates diachronic comparisons among these languages, which we take up in §4.

1.3   Nominalized and converbial types

Inner Asian Turko-Mongolic insubordination occurs in *if*-clauses, as is cross-linguistically typical, but it also occurs in several other morphologically non-finite contexts, which we'll explore shortly. First, the canonical subordination order is *subordinate clause – main clause*. Turko-Mongolic grammar maintains a crucial distinction between finite and non-finite clauses. Finite clauses are maximally marked for Tense-Aspect-Mood (TAM), inferentiality, and person-number agreement; they "prototypically function as the only predicate of an independent clause and through their morphological marking: they typically carry the maximum marking for such categories as tense and agreement markers permitted in the language" (Robbeets 2009: 62, citing Nedjalkov 1995, Nikolaeva 2008, and Trask 1993). Non-finite forms typically occur in dependent clauses and lack such tense and agreement marking.

Such non-finite clauses are prime candidates for insubordination. Non-finite clauses can be classed in two types, participial and converbial. The participial type consist largely of nominalized verbs, which in Turkic and Mongolic have more syntactic uses than in other families such as Indo-European. Examples (4)–(6) below illustrate non-insubordinate *candidate* constructions in nominalized, participial and conditional forms, respectively; (7)–(11) illustrate insubordinated constructions.

---

[1] Turkic and Mongolic can each be definitively reconstructed from the antecedent languages, Common Turkic and Common Mongolic. Turkic and Mongolic are also part of a broader Altaic language family. The debates that began in the 19th century about whether and to what degree the relationships between Altaic languages are ones of borrowing and/or common descent are irrelevant to the current chapter.

[2] These speaker-researchers provided preliminary analyses and semantic interpretations under the auspices of the U.S. National Endowment for the Humanities, the Humboldt Foundation, Volkswagen Foundation, and the U.S. National Science Foundation. Many thanks to these speaker-researchers and funders for their critical support. See Dwyer 2011–2015 for corpus details.

Nominalized type subordinate clause

(4) Salar (Turkic)
*Mundan älä=m atur-**iš**-i bil-mur*
this.ABL that.way=also exceed-**GER**-3POSS know-NEG.IMPF (slr199205)
'More than that I don't know.'[3]

The normal irrealis reading of the conditional is illustrated twice below, once in (5) in the canonical constituent order, and once in (6) with a postposed conditional clause as an afterthought (which is still conventionally subordinate):

Participial type – Normal irrealis reading of the conditional

(5) Southeastern Monguor (Mongolic)
*Chugu shulian wu-sang gui-**sa** ban ǰin*
yesterday evening drink-NZR.PERF exist.NEG.DIR-**COND** half pound

bao-qa-ø
go.down-CAUS-IMP

'**If** you did not drink last night, you'd better drink half a bottle now.'(mjg-se20030123-01)

(6) Southeastern Monguor
Du ni-ni bangǰian bura-ǰi ši-ǰiang a, ti
now 3SG-GEN money finish-IMPF come-PERF.INDIR PRT DEM

*nianshei-la-ni ǰi-**sa***
face-COM-ACC see-**COND**

'Well, it seems the money in his pocket is almost used up, looking at his face.' (lit, '**If** one looks at his face...'). (mjg-se20030123_1)

The postposed conditional clause in (6) is an afterthought. In (7)–(11), however, the main clause is absent, and we get an insubordinate, realis reading of the conditional clause. The subjunctive (hedge type) in (7) and (8) is the single most common method of making polite requests in these Turko-Mongolic languages:

(7) Subjunctive (hedge type) insubordinate (SE Monguor)
*Ni-si šiangxi či-n čingkuang-ni-g keli-ǰi hu-**sa.***
DEM-PL totally 2SG-GEN situation-ACC-INDEF.S say-IMPF BENEF-**COND**

---

[3] The harmonized orthography used to transliterate the Inner Asian data here include the use of the following glyphs: *š* [ɕ ʃ], *č* [tɕʰ tʃʰ], *ǰ* [tɕ dʑ dʒ], *ž* [ʒ], *sh* [ʂ], *ch* [tʂʰ], *zh* [tʂ] (palatals in Salar and Monguor, alveo-palatals in Uyghur). In Monguor, Baonan, Kanjia and Salar, initial obstruents contrast in aspiration, not voicing, e.g. *b* [p] : *p* [pʰ].

'Tell me something about yourself.' (lit, 'If you were to give some details about yourself...')
(mjg-se200102_pa)

The conditional is also commonly deployed to express a hortative 'let's', for example when a matchmaker, speaking with the groom's family, attempts to reach consensus on the next actions in (8):

(8)   Subjunctive (hortative type) insubordinate (Kangjia - Mongolic)
Da   čabau=ni   geǰe   kurge-ǰi   er-gi   ge-ǰi
and   tea.package=ACC   when   send-IMPF   come-FUT   discuss-IMPF

nixo=du   get-sa
a.bit=LOC   put-**COND**

'So **if we were to** set a time for when we send over the 'tea package' (dowry gifts)'
(kxs1999_wedding.25)

Beyond requests and hortatives, both the threat-type and wish-type deontic insubordinate utterances equivalent to English (1) and (2) are common in these languages, as can be seen from (9) and (10):

(9)   Deontic (threat type) insubordinate (Uyghur)
Qiz-ning   ata'ani-si-ning   qiz-i-ni   bu yigit-kä   bär-gü-si
girl-GEN   parents-POSS3-GEN   girl-POSS3-ACC   this boy-DAT   give-NZR-POSS3

bol-mi-sa.
become-NEG-**COND**
'**If** the girl's parent's didn't give the girl away in marriage to the boy.'

(Implied: ...the parents would expire from impatience to see her married off; the parents were determined to have her married). (uig20070211_il)

(10)   Deontic (wish type) (Uyghur, with rising intonation)
"Mušu   haraq   dä-gän-ni   ay-da   ič-sä-k=hä?"
this.here   liquor   say-NZR-ACC   month-LOC   drink-**COND**-1PL=huh

dä-pt=ikän
say-PST.INDIR=INDIR.EVID
'He said, "If we (could only) drink this booze every month, huh!" (Implied: I hope we do!)' (uig201106_joke2)

The ironic dubitative we observed in (3) is common in these Inner Asian languages:

(11)   Ironic dubitative (SE Monguor)
A či   dama=nang   lai=ghua-ǰi?   bi-sa   chuang! Heihei....
ah you face=REFL.POSS NEG.PERF=wash-IMPF COP.DIR-**COND** ever   ha.ha

'**It seems as if** you don't *ever* wash your face! Hee, hee…' (mjg-se19960405_zhch.20)

The above insubordinate readings of conditional clauses in Monguor and Uyghur fulfil the required criteria of being syntactically and prosodically independent and conventionalized. Elided clauses are roughly recoverable.

2 Insubordination types and modality

Insubordination, while frequently arising via realis readings of conditional clauses, also occurs in a range of other syntactically subordinate clauses in Turko-Mongolic languages.   The most common are in purposive clauses (e.g. SE Monguor =*la* and Uyghur *üčün* 'for' and *Gil(i)* 'in order to...') and imperfective participial clauses (e.g. SE Monguor-*ǰi* and -*ku*). Below, compare canonically subordinated purposives in (12a) and (13a), with an insubordinate reading of the purposive constructions in (12b) and (13b):

(12) Purposive (SE Monguor)
(12a) Same subject, subordinated (normal non-finite use)
> *Dasi   asi   dangla=**la**   you   wa*
> 1PL   livestock   herd=**PURP** walk   PRT.HORT
> 'Let's go herd the livestock.' (elicited)

(12b) Different subject, insubordinated; deontic necessity (SE Monguor)
> *Gansi   daoda-la   ri-ku   ma   zou   čindao   zou*
> they   call-PURP   come-PRTC.IMPF   and   then   relatives then
>
> *lai   di-ku-la*
> NEG   eat-PRTC.IMPF-PURP
>
> 'If they invite the new bride's family for a meal, then the relatives, well, in order not to eat...' (implication: 'In order not to have to eat, please tell them that we won't be coming.') (mjg-se20030123)

(13) Purposive (Uyghur)
(13a) Normal subordination
> *Mä   kitab-ni   el-**iš**   **üčün**   käl-di-m*
> 1SG.NOM   book-ACC   take-NZR   **PURP**   come-PST-1SG
> 'I came **in order to** get the book.' (elicited)

(13b) Insubordinate reading
> *Ašu-nin   ald-i-ni   el-**iš**   **üčün**?*
> DEM-GEN   front-POSS3-ACC   take-NZR   **PURP**
> 'In order to take first??' (i.e., 'You took it first **just for this**?') (elicited)

Uyghur also has an alternate means of expressing a purposive with the non-finite, normally subordinate verb suffix -*Gil(i)*. Example (14a) shows its normal use, while (14b) shows its insubordinate reading, where it is used as an imperative:

(14) Purposive   (Uyghur)
(14a) Normal subordination
> *Män   kitab-ni   al-**ghili**   käl-di-m*
> 1SG.NOM   book-ACC   take-**PURP** come-PST-1SG

'I came **in order to** get the book.' (elicited standard Uyghur)

(14b) Insubordinate reading
*Emdi	tamaša	qil-mi-**ghil!***
now	joke	make-NEG-**PURP**
'So don't make merry!' (lit., '**In order** not to joke around...')
(Kuchar variety, uig19561024_kc5t16.118)

Similarly, non-finite clauses marked for nonanterior tense-aspect show a similar pattern; (15a) shows normal subordination with an imperfective participle, while (15b) and (16) show insubordination with two different imperfective participles -*ǰi* and -*ku,* in SE Monguor:

(15)	Imperfective

(15a) *Bi	daola-ǰi	naku-lang*				(normal subordination)
1SG	sing-IMPF	ABIL-IMPF.INDIR
'I can sing.' (mjg-se20030123)

(15b) *Šiaošiao durasi-ni	he	ang	yao-**ǰi?***	(insubordination)
[Name]	liquor-ACC	take	where	walk-**IMPF**
'Šiaošiao, where'll you take the liquor to **and**…?' (no elision, nonfinite morphology)

Example (15b) above contains an implied request for the interlocutor to take action, but there is no specific elided clause to recover. Example (16) illustrates subjunctive impossibility ('were it only possible, but it's impossible'); the insubordinated element also has non-finite morphology:

(16)	Subjunctive impossibility (SE Monguor)
*Dagelie	wenduer shi	sai	yang	gher-gha-**ku**.*
originally	high	COND	NEG	what	go.up-CAUS-**PRTC.IMPF**
'It [the robe] was tall, it was not possible to pull it up again, **so**….'
(mjg-se20030123_01)

(Context: Granny's robe absolutely needed to be on right for the impending wedding of her grandson.)

Counterfactuals and necessitative insubordinations via conditional morphology are also common, as in (17) and (18):

(17)	Counterfactual (Uyghur, Lopnur variety)
*Daghut-qa	sat-qan	bol-**sa**-q!*
David-DAT	sell-PRTC	complete-**COND**-2PL
'If we had only sold them to Dawut!' (Tenishev 1984, uig19561004_ln26t116.37)

(18)	Necessitative (Uyghur, Dolan variety)
*obdar=raq	mezmulluq ejt-i	pe-**se**-k*
good=CMP	meaningful talk-CNV	BENEF-**COND**-1PL
'We must speak better and more meaningfully.' (lit, 'If we were to speak...')
(Tenishev 1984, uig19561105_as5t24.4)

Synchronically, therefore, a wide semantic and morphosyntactic spectrum of conventionalized insubordinate readings of non-finites commonly occur in the modern Turko-Mongol languages surveyed. The above examples show how discourse presupposition plays a major role in the recruitment of modals and other forms in insubordinations. Turning to their ontogeny, I now show how contemporary examples of candidate utterances for insubordination often originate as co-constructed utterances in discourse.

3 Ontogeny: discourse and diachrony

Spoken interaction is the major source of candidate structures for insubordination. Since linguistic analysis is too often performed exclusively on narrative texts or elicited, isolated sentences, it is difficult to see the effects of conversational structure on language change. By taking interactive texts as the primary material, the present analysis can more easily test whether such discourse features as afterthoughts, turn-taking, topic preservation vs. topic change, and prior context affect the development of insubordination. In particular, a wide range of contexts supporting an insubordinate use can be essential to freeing the form from the need for recoverability of the ellipsis. The effects of language contact are also easier to envision in this context, given the substantial influences of one well-learned language on another, no matter which is L1 or L2.

3.1   Interactive discourse pragmatics and utterance co-construction

A likely path to insubordination involves the common discourse techniques of foregrounding, backgrounding, and afterthoughts, all of which employ non-canonical clause ordering. We can observe an example of the latter in (19) below (repeated from (6) above), where the subordinate clause, which would normally precede the main clause in an OV language like the Mongolic one below, here follows the main clause:

> (19)   Conditional clause as afterthought (here, without insubordination)
> *Du   ni-ni   bangjian bura-ji   ši-jiang   a,   ti*
> now   3SG-GEN   money   finish-IMPF   come-PERF.INDIR   PRT   DEM
>
> *nianshei-la-ni   ji-**sa***
> face-COM-ACC   see-**COND**
> 'Well, it seems his money is almost used up, looking at his face.' (lit., 'If one looks at his face...')
> (SE Monguor, mjg-se20030123_1)

The speaker foregrounds the main clause event by fronting the main clause. The routinization of subordinate clauses in utterance final position as in (19) above could lead to the elision of the main clause and the insubordination of the formerly subordinate clause.

Another source of insubordinations for which there is ample evidence is dialogic discourse pragmatics, in which one speaker supplies the subordinate clause, and another the (canonically final) main clause. In the two dialogic pairs in (20) and (21) below, the two speakers co-construct non-insubordinate utterances. The main clause is provided (or recovered) by the second speaker. Yet if each of their speaking turns is analyzed separately, then the first of each pair (20a) and (21a) constitutes at least a candidate construction:

> (20)   Co-construction in Salar with insubordination
> (20a) Yusufu (talking about how boring cafeteria food is):

> *Inǰi   här   guni   u   vol-**sa***
> so   every   day   3SG   be-COND
> 'So it's that way every day.' (lit., 'So if it were that every day...')

(20b) Abdu:
> *Ani   iš-kun   kälä   me?*
> that.ACC   drink-NZR   need   INTER
> '(And) who wants to eat that?' (slr19920507_3)

In the co-constructed utterance in (20a)–(20b), there is no pause between the two speakers' turns, nor is there a clause boundary; turn-taking occurs mid-NP.

Similarly, in the Mongolic Kangjia language, a matchmaker negotiating with the bride's family elides the finite clause in (21a) (out of politeness), and the bride's family co-creates a plausible second clause to the matchmaker's utterance:

(21)   Co-construction in Kangjia with insubordination
(21a) Matchmaker:
> *Da   čabau=ni   geǰe   kurge-ǰi   er-gi   ge-ǰi   ǰügi-ǰi*
> and   tea.package=ACC   when   send-IMPF   come-FUT   say-IMPF   discuss-IMPF
>
> *nixo=du   get-sa…*
> a.bit=DAT   set-COND
> 'So if we were to set (a time for) when we send over the 'tea package'….'

(20b) Bride's family:
> *Anighe   uder=ni   ǰanggi-di?*
> which   day=ACC   set-FUT
> 'Which day should we set?' (Sechenchogt 1999: 308–321, l.25–26)

Examples (20)–(21) show that when two speakers are co-constructing utterances, it is easy to imagine how the second turn can be elided, leaving the first turn as an insubordination.

While it is likely that candidate constructions for insubordination arise in conversational discourse as above, these constructions also "migrate" to other less colloquial discourse genres, where they are easily conventionalized as insubordination. The following four utterances (a–d) in (22) are connected speech from a highly stylized Salar wedding speech, *Ürux söz* (Words of the Ancestors), a formal genre that is now extinct:

(22)   Salar wedding speech
(22a) *Dunya-da   ičo, gim-ni   ağïz   al-ğu   et-**sa**   di-**sa**?*
> world-LOC   all   who-ACC   respect   receive-NZR do-**COND**   say-**COND**
> 'In the human world, who is the most respected?' (lit., 'In all the world, **if** they say "**If** who were to be respected...?"')

(22b) *Ahun,   alin-ni   ağïz   al-ğu   et-sa   dir   i.*
> religious.leader   scholar-GEN   respect   receive-NZR do-COND   COP.EMPH   PRT.EVID
> 'It is our Akhund and scholars.' (lit., 'If Akhunds and scholars were to be respected')

(22c) *Nang-ni   yol-i-n-dän   di-**sa**?*
> what-GEN   road-POSS3-LNK-ABL   say-**COND**
> 'Why do they deserve our respect?' (lit., 'If you said by what road?') (slr19890101)

(22d) *Mutallin-ni   yol-i-n-dän   sulihani   gun-i-na,   omo   bandän-ë*
      scholar-GEN path-POSS3-LNK-ABL auspicious day-POSS3-DAT peace   devotee-DAT

      bašlaǧuči   a   dir.
      leader   PRT   COP.EMPH
      'They are the leaders of the faithful in a scholarly way on [this] auspicious day.'

Above, we can see that although the speech is a monologue, it is in a didactic question and answer format. The question utterances (in (22a) and (22c)) are formed with non-finite conditional clauses, even when finite and interrogative morphology is available for canonically grammatical utterances. The non-finite morphology, however (particularly the conditionals in (22a) and (22c)), mimics the lively co-constructed utterances we saw in conversational data above in (19) and (20). It also allows repetition of simple and highly salient morphology (*di-sa* say-COND).

3.2   The role of repetition

The repetition of insubordinate patterns can serve to conventionalize them, because repetition serves necessary pragmatic and perhaps cognitive functions. The repetition of salient elements of discourse serves a range of pragmatic functions in storytelling and conversation (Scollon and Scollon 1981, Tannen 1987), and in cohesion and discourse structure (beginning with Halliday and Hasan 1976), which have been studied in languages other than English (e.g. McCreedy 1989). Such functions and effects of repetition include the creation of a coherent and listener-expected pattern. Each repetition carries the listener further along the narrative. In the Uyghur example (23), the second speaker (Hewzihan in (23b)) echoes the gerundial clause that the first speaker (Hebibe in (22a)) has just uttered.

    (23)   Uyghur (Khotan variety; conversation)
    (23a) Hebibe:
        *Ašu-ning   ald-i-ni   el-**iš**   üčün?*
        DEM-GEN   front-POSS3-ACC take-**GER**   for
        'Just for this?'

    (23b) Hewzihan:
        *Ašu-ning ald-i-ni   el-**iš**,   ämdi ašu   kuli-ning kuli-din   nimä*
        DEM-GEN front-POSS3-ACC take-**GER** so   DEM   rope-GEN   rope-ABL   what

        kit-ti=kin   ämdi u-ni   öz-ingiz   bağla-š-tur-iwäl-ing
        leave-PST=EVID   so   3SG-ACC REFL-POSS2F tie-REC-CAUS-AUTOBEN-IMPER2

        'Right, just for this, but what that straw rope is for, you tie it up as it suits you.'
        (uig20060824_ht1, recorded by Gülnar Eziz)

From the frequent repetition (due to clarification, emphasis, coherence, and other pragmatic reasons), such utterances of the above type become easy candidates for insubordination. Indeed, in the history of Turkic and Mongolic, many former nonfinite morphemes have become finite (cf. Robbeets, this volume); it is to this topic that we now turn.

4 Diachrony: Grammaticalization of non-finite clauses as finite ones

Historically nonfinite clauses becoming grammaticalized as finite ones is a very common process in Turkic and Mongolic languages. As nonfinite verb forms, participles and verbal nouns prototypically function as arguments and nominal attributes, respectively. Finite forms are also subject to grammatical change.

This *path* provides a glimpse into how formerly insubordinate clauses become matrix clauses in the modern languages. Narratives in particular are littered with formerly nonfinite morphology now used as finite. The most common examples in Turkic are the past participle -*GAn* and the imperfect (aorist) -*Ar* (Proto-Turkic -*(X)r),* with its suppletive negative aorist form -*mAs*.[4] We can observe the historical functions of these suffixes in (24)–(27) below. Most of their historical non-finite uses persist in the modern languages, including their function as relativizers, for example:

(24) Chaghatay (Middle Turkic; Babur.3439)
*atlï   saχla-**ğan**   oğl-ï*
on.horseback   wait-**PRTC**   son-POSS3
'his son who waited on horseback'

(25) Chaghatay (Middle Turkic; Babur.33)
*Türkī   bil-**mäs**   kiši*
Turkic   understand-**IMPF.NEG**   person
'a person who doesn't understand Turkic'

Other nonfinite uses of -*GAn* include temporal clauses:
(26) premodern Kyrgyz (1891)
*ärkäk   öl-**gön**-dö*
man   die-PRTC-LOC
'When a man dies, ….' (Menges 1933)

Other common uses of this non-finite morphology are to create complex predicates, compound tenses and other grammatical functions, as we can see for the aorist -*Ar* in 19th century Turkic (here, premodern Kyrgyz):

(27) premodern Kyrgyz (1891)
*är-gä   bar-**ar**   bol-so*
man-DAT go-IMPF   be-COND
'If (a woman) wishes to marry a man, …' (Menges 1933)

In modern Turkic languages, these historically non-finite morphemes are frequently used as finites (anterior and nonanterior, for -*GAn* and -*mAs*), as we can see in the bolded parts of examples (28) and (29). A fragment of running text is given to show just how frequent these finite forms are.

(28) Salar   (connected discourse)

---

[4] Capital letters of these attested forms indicate allomorphs: G = *g*, *ğ* [ɣ], *k*, *q*; A = *a*, *ä*; X=harmonic vowel.

(28a) *Samur   vol-**ğan**   ar   a.*
     cook   be-FIN.ANT COP.INDIR   PRT
     '[There was a girl] who **was** a cook.'

(28b) *Inǰi   yoğmu   ǰare-**gen**   a.*
     so   slave   use-FIN.ANT   PRT
     'She **was** used as a slave.' (...)

(28c) *Bu   yoğmu   oy-te   toğ=ta   yarə-**mes**   ma.*
     this   slave   home-LOC   give.birth=CJR appropriate-NANT.NEG   PRT
     '**It wouldn't do** for this slave give birth at home.'

Above, the historically non-finite participle -*GAn* functions as a finite past tense suffix. Only affective discourse particles (*ar, a, ma)* follow -*GAn*, as is typical of finite inflection.

In diachronic insubordination, nominalizations are particularly common. In the following news broadcast we can observe the same morpheme -*GAn* co-occurring as a finite insubordination and a non-finite non-insubordination: Uyghur *qari-**ğan**-da* non-finite, subordinated, and Uyghur and *pilanli-**ğan*** finite form:

(29) Uyghur
    Šinxua   agentliq-i-ning   28-Yanwar-diki   xäwir-i-din
    Xinhua   news.service-POSS3-GEN   28-January-LOC.REL   news-POSS3-ABL

    *aškarilin-i-gä   qari-**ğan**-da,   Xitay   hökümit-i*
    revelation-POSS3-DAT   observing-NFIN.**PRTC**-LOC   Chinese   government-POSS3

    bu   yil-din   bashla-p
    this   year-ABL   start-CNV

    Uyghur el-i-de   yänä   23 milyon   mo   boz   yär   eč-iš-ni
    Uyghur country-POSS3-LOC again 23 million acre barren land open-NZR-ACC

    *pilanli-**ğan**.*
    plan-**FIN.ANT**

    '**According to** the Xinhua News Agency's 28 January broadcast, beginning this year the Chinese government plann**ed** to farm an additional 23 million *mu* of barren land in the Uyghur area.' (uig20070131_rfa)

The diachronic path of non-finites like -*GAn* and -*Ar* to finites is shown in (30) below:

(30)   participials > deverbal N suffixes > finite verb forms

The path from non-finites to finites is much older than merely the inflectional morphology of these languages: derivational morphology also shows evidence of an earlier 'wave' of finitization of verbs, as Ramstedt (1945), Ramstedt (1950), and Robbeets (2009) have shown. Turkic and Mongolic, together with Manchu-Tungusic, Japanese, and Korean share the nonfinite morphemes -*n, -m(V),* and -*rV*. These function as adnominals, nominals, and also developed into finite

markers, We can briefly survey examples of these non-finite morphemes in Mongolic (31) and Turkic (32):

    (31)   Proto-Mongolic *-*m* in Written Mongolian (WM) and Middle Mongolian (MM)
         adnominal: WM *jayilu-**ma***   *usu*
                          rinse-PRTC   water
                          'brook'

         nominal: WM *bari-**m***
                          seize-NZR
                          'grip'

         finite: MM *yabu-**m***
                          walk-NZR
                          'he goes, walks, walking'

    (32)   Proto-Turkic *-*(X)r* in Old Turkic (OT)
         OT nonfinite:
         al-ïp   *käl-**ir***   *sogïk*   *suv*
         take-CNV   bring-NANT.NFIN   cold   water
         'the cold water that is being brought'

         OT Verbal Noun (early finite usage):
         *amu-**r***
         rest-PRTC
         'rest, peace'

The finite uses of Proto-Turkic *-*(X)r* now predominate in the modern languages; the direction of change has been clearly non-finite to finite, as has been shown cross-linguistically.

(i)   all finite forms have corresponding nonfinite uses, not vice-versa;

(ii)   finite forms are often semantically very specialized, e.g. to avoid speaker responsibility, make habitual/generic statements, make an impersonal alternative to a proposition, e.g. MM -*m*, Old Turkic -*(A)r* (Robbeets 2009);

(iii)   nonfinite forms are often petrified, while finite ones are often still productive, just as low-frequency English verbs like *weep/wept* (now alternating with "*weeped*") have been regularized, while high frequency verbs tend not to regularize (*keep/kept*) (Bybee 2002:69).

    These examples above show that Turko-Mongolic and related languages underwent at least three distinct stages of insubordinations. Taking them chronologically, we observe: (i) **Early historical nominalizations** like those in (31)–(32) from non-finite to finite; (ii) **Premodern nominalizations** as in (24)–(29) and (iii) **Modern insubordinations** as in (20)–(23) and all other cited examples in this chapter. The non-finite and finite forms co-exist in all three stages as seen in (24)–(29); some of the modern insubordinations are at present transient, immature, and potentially unstable.

5 Contemporary discourse and insubordinations

5.1   Participial and nominalized types

Above, we've seen the routine independent use of nonfinite clauses as finites, which close speaking turns in contemporary dialogic discourse, in two main forms: the participial type (with candidate insubordinate clauses in aspect participles e.g. the conditional Turkic *-sA*), and the nominalized type (e.g. Turkic *-(I)š*). The first, participial type can be exemplified by SE Monguor's non-finite imperfective suffix *-ǰi*, commonly used as an independent finite construction as in (33):

(33)
(33a) Speaker A (SE Monguor):

> *Ning-du   yueluo-ni   he   lou   gan   ting-du   zhaola-ǰi?*
> here-LOC matchmaker-ACC take PRT.dub 3SG   there-LOC   film-**IMPF.DIR**
> 'Is she videotaping the matchmaker over there?' (lit. 'She films there, (and)...')

(33b) Speaker B:

> *Yueluo-ni   he-lang   ge-ǰi*[5]   *bi   han   gan-ni   quainuo*
> matchmaker-ACC   take-PROG   QUOT-**IMPF.DIR**   1SG   still   3SG-GEN   behind

> *bai-ǰi.*
> hide-**IMPF.DIR**

> 'I thought she was videotaping the matchmaker, so I just hid behind him immediately.'
> (lit., 'So I again hide behind him, (and)...') (mjgse20030123_01)

Turko-Mongolic participles are often insubordinated; in one Turkic (Salar) corpus, conditional clauses were insubordinated in 20 out of 355 utterances. Candidate constructions become routinized as insubordinations; these insubordinate clauses become typed as finite via sentential particle morphology.

For example, in Uyghur, the clause-final clitic *ču* is hosted typically by a non-finite element; it forms an echo question, and thus types a finite utterance as illustrated in (34).

(34) *Kino-ğa   bar-i-män.   Siz=**ču**?*
> movie-DAT   go-PRS-1SG   2SG=**PRT.echo**
> 'I'm going to the movies. And (how about) you?'

In insubordinate clauses used in conjunction with the conditional, the echo clitic *ču* has a counterfactual reading:

(35) (context: 'Suddenly, there was a downpour.')
> *Esit   künlük   bol=ğan   bol-**si**=**ču**!*
> unfortunately umbrella   be=PRTC.PST   be-**COND**=**PRT.echo**
> 'If only there had been an umbrella!'

---

[5] In SE Monguor, verbs of saying (like the quotative *ge-ǰi* above) are more commonly non-finite than finite (Slater 2003).

Since -*sA* clauses are routinely insubordinated in Turko-Mongolic (as we have seen in (5)–(10), (17), (19), (20), and (22)), insubordination processes probably preceded clause-typing (here with the clitic *ču*). Hosting a clause-typing clitic reinforces the utterance's finiteness.

Besides the conditional type above, the second type of candidate clause is a nominalized type. In modern Turkic, nominalized -*(X)š* clauses are most typically insubordinated; other lower-frequency nominalizations occur as well.

For example, the historically non-finite Turkic composite suffix -*mAKtA* (composed of the non-finite nominalizer -*mAK* + locative +*DA*) can be seen in its erstwhile non-finite form in Middle Turkic (Chaghatay):

(36)   Middle Turkic (Chaghatay)
  ...*ne*   *oltur-**maqta**,   *ne*   *bar-**maqta** *qarār-ïm*   *bar*   *edi.*
  ...neither   sit-**NFIN**   nor   go-**NFIN**   volition-POSS1   EXIST   XPST.3SG
  '…I was neither sitt**ing** nor walk**ing** of my own volition.' (chg1530_Babur1.2346)

In modern Turkic (Uyghur), by contrast, the use of -*mAKta* forms an imperfective *finite* form as in (37):

(37)   Modern Uyghur
  Xitay   *hökümit-i*   *Internet-ning*   *päqät*   *soda*   *wä* *ilim-texnika*
  China   government-POSS3   Internet-GEN   solely   business   and science-technology

  iš-lir-i-di=la   *qollin-il-iš-i-ni*   *ümid*   *qil-**maqta**.*
  matter-PL-POSS3-LOC=LIMIT   use-PASS-NZR-POSS3-ACC   hope   do-**FIN.IMPF**

  'The Chinese government hopes that the Internet will be used exclusively for business, science, and technology.'   (uig20101014_rfa)

Nominalizations like those with the suffixes -*(X)š* and especially -*mAKta* appear to increasingly occur in formal discourse, at least in modern Uyghur. Nominalizations with -*mAK* are otherwise extremely rare in modern Uyghur, and -*mAKtA* nominalizations are even low frequency in non-diaspora broadcast media, but the diaspora broadcasters appear to be codifying -*mAKtA* insubordinations to index formality and cosmopolitan prestige (Dwyer 2013b).

5.2   Insubordinations emerge in co-constructed utterances

Besides conversations, any spoken-language genre in dialogic form is likely to show insubordination in higher frequency, such as certain song forms and speeches. For example, if we examine the Kazakh (Turkic) dialogic song *ölöng* (also known as *aitys*), which in (38) has the following structure: two lines (a–b) sung by a man, two response lines sung by a group of women (c–d), and a refrain (e) sung by all. While the man's first clause is a regular subordinate reading of conditional -*sA,* his second clause in (b) is an insubordinate use of the purposive -*mA* (expected would be -*mA* followed by a finite predicate). Further, we can observe insubordinate clauses in each finite utterance, i.e. in lines (b), (d), and (e):

(38)
Man:
(38a) *šiŋ*   *aqïn*   *ölöng*   *dä-sä*   {*yay*}
    two   bard   dialogic.song   say-COND   {PRT.filler}
    'If two bard singers sing continuously,...   (regular subordinate reading)

(38b) *är   žiğit   čiŋ   siğin   ǰasɨra-**ma**   dɨ*
       manly   man   severe   heart   sacrifice-**PURP**   PRT   (insubordinate)
       '...a man can be of savage heart.'   (lit., 'a manly man in order to sacrifice a savage heart')

Women's response:
(38c) *ǰüz-üng   mänän   ärip-täs   {ay}   ayt-ɨs-uw   {ğayay}*
       face-2POSS   with   remain-NZR   {EX}   sing-REC-NZR   PRT
       'What face do you have left... (lit., 'with what face remaining, ay, singing together, ğayay')

(38d) *äriptes   ayt-ɨs-uw-ğa   bar-**ma**   žayɨn-dɨ   to*
       remain.NZR   sing-REC-NZR-DAT   go-**PURP**   contest-LOC   PRT
       ...to sing in contest with me?' (lit., 'remaining to go in a contest to sing together')

The refrain—repeatedly sung by both men and women—is unambiguously to be interpreted as a finite utterance:

(38e) *bajtä   yängä   sal-dur-**may***
       ?   girl   put.down-CAUS-**NEG.CNV**
       'Don't leave the girl behind' (lit., 'not leaving the girl behind,...')
(kaz19920127_olang)

Candidate insubordinations here are in origin also canonical non-finite clauses. The sequential converb insubordinated as (38e) above is uncommon in this corpus; it shows that not all insubordinations are the result of nominalizations, but they also derive from a range of ordinary subordinate clauses: converbs, imperfectives (as in Monguor *-ǰi*), and purposives (as in Uyghur (-*Gil(i)* and *üčün*). These insubordinations arise quite naturally within conversational and sung dialogue.

6 Discussion

6.1   Interactive discourse as a source: Insubordinating clause types, modality and discourse coherence

The data set examined here is largely dialogic and interactive, reflecting the fact that language itself is fundamentally dialogic. We have observed that insubordinations arise with a subset of non-finite clauses, generally nominalized and participial clauses. Most frequently, insubordinations are conditional and imperfective participles (with non-conditional readings): the Mongolic imperfective *-ǰi*, Turkic conditional *-sA*, Turko-Mongolic purposives *-la* and *mA*, Turkic imperfective (aorist) *-Ar/mAs*, and the Turkic abilitative *-(y)Ala*. Incipient insubordinations may well be tied to these forms of modality.

In future research, we can learn more about insubordination via the properties of non-finite clauses that do not undergo insubordination. What we know now is that serial verb clauses (marked in Turkic with *-A* and *-(X)p,* unmarked in SE Monguor and Salar) are virtually never insubordinated.[6] Why should this be so?

---

[6] Exceptionally, the negated form of the serial (sequential/simultaneous/optative) converb *-mAy* is insubordinated in the Kazakh example in (38e) above.

Insubordination (or candidate insubordinations) in adjacency pairs contributes to discourse coherence: speakers offer the floor to their interlocutors, who are then compelled to complete the adjacency pair for the sake of discourse coherence (cf. chapters in this volume by Floyd, Gras, and Evans and Watanabe). There is a weak tendency for pragmatic and syntactic parallelism in adjacency pairs. Adjacency is not required, but it facilitates insubordinations.

6.2   Language-contact induced insubordination: L2 as a source

While spoken discourse appears to be the main context in which insubordination arises, language contact coupled with social variation appears to contribute to the introduction of new candidates for insubordination, as well as to their loss. These emergent phenomena are unconventionalized, yet worth examining for insight into insubordination processes. The example of nominalization provided here is from Uyghur-Chinese contact. Both Standard and Diaspora Uyghur show evidence of widespread and systematic nominalization in clause chaining. Such utterance chains as in (39) below are currently only subordinate, but are candidates for insubordination. These are likely due to contact with Chinese (which typically has clauses conjoined with conjunctions), since Uyghur and other Turkic languages otherwise typically conjoin two or more simultaneous or sequential nonfinite clauses not with nominalizations, but with the converbial suffix *-(X)p*, as in (39) below:

(39) *Güzelnur xizmät-kä ber-**ip** gezit   kör-**üp** on-da yeğin qatnaš-ti.*
     Güzelnur work-DAT go-**CNV** newspaper read-**CNV** ten-LOC meeting attend-PST.3SG
     'Güzelnur went to work, read the paper and attended a meeting at ten.'

In formal registers of Uyghur, by surveying a corpus of radio news broadcasts, I found that in both Standard and Diaspora Uyghur, clauses are most frequently chained with a long series of verbal nominalizations based on the *-(X)š* gerund (cf. example (40)). Typically in Standard Uyghur, *-(X)š* gerunds facilitate the embedding of non-finite complements, e.g.:

(40) *Män siz-n   kör-**üš** üčün kel-d-im*
     I   you-ACC see-**GER** for   come-PST-1SG
     'I came to see you.'

In the Turko-Mongolic languages, such gerunds do not form finite clauses, nor do they function in clause chaining. Nonetheless, we can observe in the sentence below that quasi-finite clauses are chained with *-(X)š* gerunds: only the first clause in (41a) is chained with the *-(X)p* converb, and thereafter in (41b)–(41e) we have chaining with four *-(X)š* gerunds. In (41e), the series of gerunds is resolved as a complement construction and closed with a finite verb:

(41) Uyghur (uig20130828_wsh_RFA1)
(41a) *Dölet-ning   bixeterlik-i   we jemi'et muqimliq-i-ni   qorğda-**p**,*
     country-GEN safety-POSS3 and   society stability-POSS3-ACC defend-**CNV**
     'Defending the country's safety and social stability,

(41b) *baldur   zerbe   bér-**iš**,*
     early   crack.down   give-**GER**
     'preemptively cracking down,

(41c) *weqe   čongay-may   tur-up   ujuqtur-**uš***
     incident   increase-CNV.NEG   DUR-CNV silence-**GER**
     'silencing further incidents before they increase,

(41d) *béš-i-ni*   *čiqar-ǧan*   *haman*   *uruš-qa*   *oxšaš,*
head-POSS3-ACC   force.out-REL.PST   at.once   conflict-DAT   be.same

siyaset-ler-i-ni   *qet'i*   *dawamlaštur-**uš**-ni,*
politics-PL-POSS3-ACC   firmly   remain-**GER**-ACC

'the politics of heading off sudden conflict and the like,

(41e) *we*   *térrorči-lar-ǧa*   *qattiq*   *zerbe*   *bér-**iš**-i-ni*   *telep*   *qil-ǧan.*
and   terrorist-PL-DAT   hard   strike   give-**GER**-POSS3-ACC   request   make-PRTC
'and striking hard against the terrorists, this is the request (he) made.'

Each conjoined clause in Mandarin could occur as an independent finite clause; each conjoined Uyghur clause with *-(X)š* is currently subordinate, but is a candidate insubordination analogous to *el-**iš*** 'taking' in (23a)-(23b). Such *-(X)š* clauses are not yet insubordinated (only *-(X)š üčün* is), but native speakers hearing this and similar examples confirm this potential. (They also confirm that the *-(X)š* forms are odd for Uyghur and prefer *-(X)p* forms.) Whether or not these examples are a contact-induced change is uncertain, since the Uyghur trend towards gerunds (i.e. another nominalized structure) does not exactly match the Chinese V-O clauses strung together with conjunctions. Turkic languages including Uyghur have acquired conjunctions, largely from Arabic, but they are typically deployed in syntactically parallel clauses that are less complex. Nonetheless, nominalizations like (41b) and (41c) represent a striking change for the language, from a converbial chain to a nominalized chain. Gerund *-(X)š* and locative *+DA* as candidate insubordinations must be considered a very provisional analysis, but one worth continuing to observe. These forms have similar analogues in existing insubordinations in the language.

6.3   Diachronic processes

I have identified different stages or "waves" of insubordinations, which co-occur in modern language varieties in addition to the transient, unstable insubordinations: (i) **Early historical nominalizations**, from non-finite to finite (e.g. Turko-Mongol *-n* and *-m*, cf. Turkish *dondurma* (freeze-CAUS-NOM **-m*) lit., 'the result of freezing') (ii) **Premodern nominalizations** (e.g. Turkic *-GAn*, *-GU* such as in Uyghur *atalǧu* (name-NOM 'name'), in which non-finite and finite forms co-exist; and (iii) **Modern insubordinations**, which are at present transient, immature, and potentially unstable. In contemporary Turko-Mongolic languages, nominalizations are an ongoing process.

This chapter has shown that the diachronic process of nonfinite subordinate clauses becoming insubordinate and finite are one regular path to insubordination, with interactive discourse phenomena and contact serving as a source of incipient and conventionalized insubordinations. As we have seen, subordinate clauses expressed as an afterthought as in (19) may become syntactically independent and conventionalized, as in (22). And the ellipsis canonically required for insubordination is common in turn-taking in interactive discourse. When two speakers co-construct an utterance, a second speaker may either supply the elided clause as in (20), or omit the elided clause and use his/her contextual knowledge to further the conversation, as in (21). Sometimes the speaker iterates the previous speaker's utterance, as in (23). In all of these examples, the single speaking turns become conventionalized as finite, while the discourse topic is maintained. Besides conversational discourse, language contact is another locus of insubordination. The historical conventionalization of formerly non-finite nominalizations as finite in Turko-Mongolic (e.g. of *-GAn* constructions) appears to have been supplemented by a

contact-induced high-frequency usage of contemporary nominalizations (e.g. in -*š* constructions as in (41)). These factors appear to contribute more to insubordinations than other diachronic processes.

6.4   Conversational discourse-led grammaticalization

Ongoing insubordination is both incipient and conventionalized. Conventionalization is signalled by a high ratio of insubordinated to non-insubordinated clauses for any one marker; many candidate clauses never go through the process of insubordination. Discourse-turn adjacency aids in the conventionalization process, and clause-typing particles (such as the Uyghur echo question particle *ču* in (34) and (35)) reinforce the finiteness of the insubordinated utterance.

Most centrally, we have seen many examples of non-elliptical insubordination in discourse. The co-construction of dialogue is a path to insubordination, one that does not require ellipsis. So we may wish to make a more nuanced grammaticalization cline.

Situating the typology of insubordinations within a discourse context is a promising avenue of research. Nominalized complements are almost always used when they express the information given in the previous discourse (Maslova 2003). We've seen here that, synchronically, insubordinations occur primarily with conditional converbs (with non-conditional readings), and imperfective participles.

Insubordination is also a grammaticalization process that may be sensitive to contact situations. Social and regional variation, areal contact and prestige languages contribute to the introduction of new candidates for insubordination.

Spoken-language genres are a particularly important source of data. Conversations, songs, and broadcasts have revealed incipient and conventionalized insubordinations at a much higher frequency than expected.

Abbreviations

ABIL	abilitative
ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
ANT	anterior
AUTOBEN	autobenefactive
BENEF	benefactive
CAUS	causative
CJR	conjunctor
CMP	comparison
CNV	converb
COM	comitative
COND	conditional
COP	copula
DAT	dative
DEM	demonstrative
DIR	direct
DUR	durative
EVID	evidential
EX	exclamation
F	formal
FIN	finite
FUT	future

GEN	genitive
GER	gerund
HORT	hortative
IMP	imperative
IMPER2	imperative, second person
IMPF	imperfective
INDIR	indirect
INTER	interrogative
LNK	link
LIMIT	limitative
LOC	locative
LOC.REL	locative relativizer
NANT	non-anterior
NEG	negative
NFIN	non-finite
NOM	nominative
NZR	nominalizer
PASS	passive
PERF	perfective
POSS	possessive
PRT	particle
PRTC	participle
PST	past
PURP	purposive
REC	reciprocal/comitative
REFL	reflexive
REL.PST	relative past
XPST	past auxiliary

References

Bybee, Joan L, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, Lyle. 1991. Some grammaticalization changes in Estonian. Traugott and Heine (eds.), vol.1, 285–300.

Dwyer, Arienne M. 2013a. Tibetan as a dominant Sprachbund language: Its interactions with neighboring languages. *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on the Tibetan Language*, 258–280. New York: Trace Foundation.

Dwyer, Arienne M. 2013b. Desinicizing Modern Uyghur. ms.

Dwyer, Arienne M. 2011–2015. *Interactive Inner Asia*. NSF-BCS 1065524. Online: https://iaia.ittc.ku.edu.

Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), 366–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ford, Cecilia and Sandra Thompson. 1986. Conditionals in discourse: A text-based study from English. *On conditionals*, Elizabeth Traugott, A. ter Meulen, J. S. Reilly, C. A. Ferguson (eds.), 353–372. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Givón, T. 2009. Multiple routes to clause union: The diachrony of complex verb phrases. *Syntactic complexity: Diachrony, acquisition, neuro-cognition, evolution*, T. Givón and M. Shibatani (eds.), 81–118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. Harlow: Longman.

Harris, Alice C. and Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heine, Bernd and Mechthild Reh. 1984. *Grammaticalization and reanalysis in African languages*. Hamburg: Büske.

Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticalization. Traugott and Heine (eds.), vol.1, 17–36.

Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jespersen, Otto. 1894/1909. *Progress in language with special reference to English*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

Lehmann, Christian. 1982. Thoughts on grammaticalization: A programmatic sketch. Köln [*Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-Projekts* 48.1].

Maslova, Elena. 2003. *A grammar of Kolyma Yukhagir.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

McCreedy, Lynn. 1989. Cohesion and discourse structure in three genres of Navajo discourse. *Athabaskan linguistics: Current perspectives on a language family.* E-D. Cook and K. Rice (eds.), 439–486. Berlin: Mouton.

Menges, Karl H. (ed.). 1933. *Volkskundliche Texte aus Ost-Türkistan. Aus dem Nachlass von N. Th. Katanov herausgegeben.* Aus den Sitzungsberichten der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 1933. Berlin.

Pak, Miok D. 2008. Types of clauses and sentence end particles in Korean. *Korean Linguistics* 14: 113–156. http://benjamins.com/series/kl/14/art/06mdp.pdf.

Ramstedt, Gustav J. 1945. Das deverbale Nomen auf -*i* in den altaischen Sprachen. *Studia orientalia edidit Societas orientalis fennica* 11(6): 6.

Ramstedt, Gustav J. 1950. Das deverbale Nomen auf -*m* in den altaischen Sprachen. *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 98: 255–264.

Robbeets, Martine. 2009. Insubordination in Altaic. *Вопросы филологии* 1: 61–79.

Sadock, Jerald M. and Arnold Zwicky. 1985. Speech act distinctions in syntax. *Language typology and syntactic description*, Tim Shopen (ed.), 155–196. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

Scollon, Ron and S. Scollon. 1981. *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Sechenchogtu. 斯钦朝克图. 1999. 康家语研究 [*Research on the Kangjia language*]. Shanghai: 远东出版社 Far East Publishing.

Slater, Keith. 2003. *The grammar of Mangghuer: A Mongolic language of China's Qinghai-Gansu Sprachbund*. London and New York: Routledge.

Stirling, Lesley. 1999. Isolated if-clauses in Australian English. *The clause in English,* Peter Collins and David Lee (eds.), 273–294. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tannen, Deborah. 1987. Repetition in conversation: Towards a poetics of talk. *Language* 63 (3): 574–605.

Tenishev, E. R. 1984. *Uygurskie Teksty*. Moscow: Nauka.

Thackston, W. J. (ed.). 1993. *The Baburnama: Memoirs of Babur, prince and emperor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. and Bernd Heine (eds). 1991. *Approaches to grammaticalization*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.