

A Contrastive Analysis of Concessive Conditional Clauses in Marathi and Japanese

Satomi CHIDA

Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, Pune, India

Keywords: Marathi (Indo-Aryan language), Japanese, Linguistic Typology, Concessive Conditional Clauses

Abstract

This paper provides a basic description of the formal and functional features of the concessive conditional clauses marked by *-təri* in Marathi and by *-temo* in Japanese through a contrastive analysis. The major findings of the study are as follows: First, both languages have the same organisation of proposition i.e., p though $\neg q$ for the concessive conditionals. Second, both languages use a concessive conditional clause for other extensive expressions. Third, though Marathi concessive conditionals are considered as finite, its clauses exhibit features of non-finite languages like Japanese. Fourth, the difference between the structures of Marathi and Japanese concessive conditional is in the verb inflection.

1. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to make a contrast of concessive conditional clauses marked by *-təri* in Marathi and by *-temo* in Japanese. Though there is no genetic or geographical contact between Marathi and Japanese, similarities are observed in the sentence structure from the perspective of the word order typology. The framework used for the analysis is the typological classification proposed by Haspelmath and König (1998). The concessive conditional clauses are classified into three subtypes: a) scalar, b) alternative and c) universal concessive conditionals as in (1a-c).

- (1) a) Scalar concessive conditionals
Even if we do not get any financial support, we will go ahead with our project.
- b) Alternative concessive conditionals
Whether we get any financial support or not, we will go ahead with our project.
- c) Universal concessive conditionals
No matter how much financial support we get, we will go ahead with our project.

(Haspelmath and König (1998:563))

These three types are classified according to the meaning of the subordinate clauses. Haspelmath and König (1998) describe that the formal features of the three types of concessive conditionals are related to the finiteness of the language. The question is what kind of results will appear when comparing Marathi concessive conditionals, which is finite (Dhongde and Wali 2009, Davison 2006), and Japanese concessive conditionals, which is non-finite. In order to understand the formal and semantic features of concessive conditional clauses in both languages, we examine five parameters; 1) semantic proposition, 2) factuality, 3) clause linkage, 4) typological classification, and 5) the grammatical constraint within the subordinate clause.

2. Framework

Haspelmath and König (1998) classified the concessive conditional clauses into three types, i.e., scalar, alternative, and universal concessive conditionals. The scalar concessive conditionals (SCCs) indicate an extreme case in a subordinate clause and describe that the content of the main clause is satisfied in any case on a certain scale as in (1.a). The alternative concessive conditionals (ACCs) indicate two (or more) alternative scenes in the subordinate clause. It is stated that the content of the main clause holds true in both cases. As we can see in (1.b), a pair of positive and negative forms of the same predicate is often used. The universal concessive conditionals (UCCs) involve pronouns, adverbs, and adjectives that indicate doubts and

indeterminacy within the subordinate clauses as in (1.c). The researchers analysed these three types of concessive conditionals over 40 European languages and clarified the typological tendencies.

The framework of Haspelmath and König (1998) is a theory that demonstrates how semantic classification of subordinate clauses of concessive conditionals has typological tendencies across the languages. The researchers conclude that the parameter of finite subordination vs. non-finite subordination is responsible for one of the most striking typological divisions in Europe. This parameter is correlated with word order in European languages: verb-final languages tend to have non-finite subordinators, and verb-medial and verb-initial languages tend to have finite subordination (Haspelmath and König 1998; 584). Furthermore, it was clarified that the concessive conditionals are related to conditionals and concessive semantically and that there is a tendency to use the form of conditionals and concessive clauses when expressing the concessive conditionals.

In the present study, I divide the concessive conditional clauses in Marathi and Japanese into three types, i.e. scalar, alternative, and universal concessive conditionals. Then, I analyse the semantic and syntactic features of concessive conditional clauses in Marathi and Japanese based on the five parameters; 1) semantic proposition, 2) factuality, 3) clause linkage, 4) typological classification, and 5) the grammatical constraint within the subordinate clause. The parameters 1) to 4) are introduced in Haspelmath and König (1998) to examine the semantic properties and typological features of the concessive conditional clauses. The last parameter, 5) the grammatical constraint within the subordinate clause is introduced by Minami (1974) that clarifies the grammatical acceptability of the subordinator.

3. Semantic Analysis

This section provides the semantic proposition, factuality, and the clause linkage of Marathi and Japanese concessive conditional clauses.

We begin with the semantic proposition. According to Haspelmath and König (1998), the semantic propositions of the concessive conditionals are represented as: SCCs as ‘Even (λx [if x then q], not- p)’, ACCs as ‘If (p or not- p) then q ’, and UCCs as ‘($\forall x$) (if p_x then q)’. In the case of English concessive conditionals, there are different forms for each type, such as ‘*even if*’ for SCCs, ‘*whether...or...*’ for ACCs, and ‘*no matter...*’ for UCCs. It shows that a set of protases is related to an apodosis, as is illustrated by the representation (2).

(2) If $\{a \text{ or } b \text{ or } c \text{ or } d \dots\}$ then q (Haspelmath and König 1998; 585)

On the other hand, König and Siemund (2000) consider that concessive construction is a negation of the causal connectives. Hence, the presupposition of the concessive construction is illustrated as (3).

(3) $P \rightarrow \neg Q$

The representation (3) indicates that the causal connectives ‘*if p then q* ’ implied in the antecedent is not realized in the consequent. Ahn (1997) describes the representation (2) as an affirming the consequent type and (3) as a denying the consequent type. I assume that denying the consequent type is more appropriate to describe Marathi and Japanese concessive conditionals.

(4.a) Marathi: Scalar Concessive Conditionals

<i>jari</i>	<i>udya</i>	<i>paus</i>	<i>pəḍ-l-a</i>	<i>tari</i>	<i>apən</i>	<i>pikənik-la</i>	<i>ja-ṅar</i>	<i>aho-t.</i>
REL	tomorrow	rain	fall-PERF-MSG	COREL	we.incl	picnic-DAT	go-PROS	be-IPFV.1PL

Even if it rains tomorrow, we will have a picnic.

(4.b) Japanese: Scalar Concessive Conditionals

<i>ashita</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>ame</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>fu-tte-mo</i>	<i>ensoku</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>ik-u</i>
tomorrow	TOP	rain	NOM	fall-CONV-also,	picnic	DAT	go-NPST.

Even if it rains tomorrow, we will have a picnic.

The sentences (4.a) and (4.b) are scalar concessive conditionals in Marathi and Japanese. The causal connective indicated in the antecedent is ‘*if it rains tomorrow, we will not go for a picnic*’. However, the consequent

denies the causal presupposition, hence, it is concessive. Structurally, both languages insert a concessive marker *-təri* in Marathi and *-temo* in Japanese (both markers are indicating ‘though’ in English) between the antecedent and consequent. Based on the above, I suggest the representation of the concessive conditional clause as (5).

(5) p though $\neg q$

The representation (5) can apply for all three types of concessive conditional clauses in Marathi and Japanese. The variation of the concessive conditionals such as SCC, ACC, and UCC is seen within the subordinate clause.

Secondly, we discuss the factuality and clause linkage of concessive conditionals in Marathi and Japanese. Basically, the concessive conditional clauses make predictions about what has not happened yet but do not presuppose the facts that have already taken place. On the other hand, all three types of Marathi and Japanese concessive conditionals with *-təri* and *-temo* conjunctions can describe the factual events as in (6.a) and (6.b). Marathi *-təri* and Japanese *-temo* structures have two functions that indicates concessive conditional and concessive.

(6.a) Marathi: Alternative Concessive Conditionals (Factual)

<i>mi</i>	<i>kha-ll-ə</i>	<i>kinva</i>	<i>nahi</i>	<i>kha-ll-ə</i>	<i>təri</i>	<i>jad</i>	<i>vhayəco.</i>
I	eat-PERF-NSG	or	NEG	eat-PERF.NSG	COREL	fat	became

I gained weight whether I ate or not.

(6.b) Japanese: Alternative Concessive Conditionals (Factual)

<i>tabe-te-mo</i>	<i>tabe-naku-te-mo</i>	<i>futo-tta</i>
eat-CONV-also	eat-NEG-CONV-also	gain-PST

I gained weight whether I ate or not.

It should be noted that concessive expressions using Marathi *-təri* and Japanese *-temo* are kind of extensive application of the concessive conditionals because there are separate structures to indicate concessive in both languages, such as *əsunhi* in Marathi and *noni* in Japanese. Similarly, in terms of clause linkage, Marathi and Japanese concessive conditionals accept various types of expressions in the main clause. The clause linkage theory is introduced by Sweetser (1990). It says that the conditional, causal, and concessive connectives may establish a relationship between three different types of entities: (i) real or hypothetical situations (content level) as in (4) and (6), (ii) aspects of knowledge (epistemic level) as in (7), and (iii) speech acts (illocutionary level) as in (8).

(7.a) Marathi: Universal Concessive Conditionals (Epistemic)

<i>apən</i>	<i>kahi-hi</i>	<i>ke-l-e</i>	<i>təri</i>	<i>apəlya-la</i>	<i>kahi-hi</i>	<i>ho-ṅar</i>	<i>nahi.</i>
we.incl	what-EMPH	do-PERF-MPL	COREL	we.OBL-DAT	what-EMPH	be-PROS	NEG.

No matter what we do, nothing will happen to us.

(7.b) Japanese: Universal Concessive Conditionals (Epistemic)

<i>kare</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>nani</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>ya-tte-mo</i>	<i>seiko</i>	<i>suru</i>	<i>deshou</i>
he	TOP	what	ACC	do-CONV-also	success	do	probably

No matter what he does, he will succeed.

(8.a) Marathi: Scalar Concessive Conditionals (Speech act of seeking permission)

<i>məg</i>	<i>ləgna</i>	<i>nahi</i>	<i>ke-l-e</i>	<i>təri</i>	<i>calel</i>	<i>ka?</i>
then	marriage	NEG	do-PERF-FSG	COREL	fine	Q?

Is it fine even if I do not get married?

(8.b) Japanese: Scalar Concessive Conditionals (Speech act of seeking permission)

<i>toire</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>i-tte-mo</i>	<i>ii-desu</i>	<i>ka?</i>
toilet	DAT	go-CONV-also	fine-pol	Q?

Is it fine even if I go to the bathroom? (May I go to the bathroom?)

Sentences (7.a) and (7.b) express the epistemic level because the main clause indicates the unrealized event based on the speaker's thoughts. Sentences (8.a) and (8.b) are examples of the illocutionary level. Both sentences express the speech act of seeking permission. What became clear is that both languages express a wide range from the hypothetical and factual event, content level, epistemic level, and illocutionary level based on the prototype of concessive conditional, i.e., p though $\neg q$.

4. Syntax Analysis

This section considers the typological classifications and the grammatical constraints within the subordinate clauses of concessive conditionals in Marathi and Japanese.

According to Haspelmath and König (1998), the scalar concessive conditional clauses are typologically divided into two types: Type (i) concessive conditionals that consist of a conditional clause plus a scalar additive focus particle ('even'): and Type (ii) concessive conditionals marked by a subordinator that also marks concessive clauses.

Marathi SCCs are expressed using the correlative concessive pair *jəri/təri* 'even if' as in (9). According to Dhongde and Wali (2009), the correlative patterns mostly confirmed to finite clauses. Non-finite adverbial clauses utilize participial or infinitival verb form. Hence, the concessive conditional clause with *təri* marker is considered as a finite. The form of concessive conditional marker *jəri/təri* is similar to the form of conditional marker *jər/tər*. I observe that the /i/ sound of concessive conditional marker *jəri/təri* can be regarded as a focus marker. The concessive conditional marker *təri* sometimes can be used in the concessive clause indicating a factual event. Therefore, Marathi SCCs are considered as a type of (i) and partially (ii). On the other hand, it seems that Marathi SCCs do not support the Haspelmath and König's observation "in finite languages, the subordinating conjunction precedes the clause, and the focus particle generally precedes the conjunction (pp.585)". In Marathi SCCs, relative marker *jəri* can occur freely in the subordinate clause before the correlative marker *təri* but the focus marker /i/ is attached to after the conjunction.

(9) Marathi: Scalar Concessive Conditionals

<i>jəri</i>	<i>udya</i>	<i>paus</i>	<i>pəḍ-l-a</i>	<i>təri</i>	<i>apəṅ</i>	<i>pikənik-la</i>	<i>ja-ṅar</i>	<i>aho-t.</i>
REL	tomorrow	rain	fall-PERF-MSG	COREL	we.incl	picnic-DAT	go-PROS	be-IPFV.1PL

Even if it rains tomorrow, we will have a picnic.

Marathi ACCs consist of affirmative and negative verbs along with the concessive conditional marker *-təri* as in (10). The ACCs verb form is fixed as (V_{STEM}-PERF-phi (person, number, gender) + OR + NEG-V_{STEM}-PERF-phi +*təri*). Haspelmath and König describe that "non-finite languages appear to prefer structures that look like two successive SCCs (V-COND-even, V-COND-even) whereas this structure is rare in finite languages. Conversely, ACCs that are identical to subordinate alternative interrogatives, but differ markedly from conditionals seem to be confined to finite languages (pp.626)" In this respect, Marathi has both features of finite and non-finite concessive conditional clauses because Marathi ACC uses the same marker as SCC, i.e., *-təri*.

(10) Marathi: Alternative Concessive Conditionals

<i>paus</i>	<i>pəḍ-l-a</i>	<i>kinva</i>	<i>nahi</i>	<i>pəḍ-l-a</i>	<i>təri</i>	<i>apəṅ</i>	<i>pikənik-la</i>	<i>ja-ṅar</i>	<i>aho-t.</i>
rain	fall-PERF-MSG	or	NEG	fall-PERF-MSG	COREL	we.incl	picnic-DAT	go-PROS	be-IPFV.1PL

Whether it will rain or not, we will have a picnic.

Marathi UCCs consist of the form of (WH-EMPH + V-PERF-phi+ *təri*) as in (11). Haspelmath and König discuss that the structure "WH... V-COND-even" occurs only in non-finite language, whereas the structure "WH-marker V..." occurs mainly in finite language. It seems that Marathi UCCs have similar structure with non-finite language because the concessive conditional marker *-təri* is used after WH-marker. The form of Marathi ACCs is the same as SCCs, i.e., (V_{STEM}-PERF-phi+ *təri*). The only difference between the SCCs and UCCs is that WH-EMPH is placed in UCCs in the part where *jəri* is in SCCs.

(11) Marathi: Universal Concessive Conditionals

<i>kiti-hi</i>	<i>paus</i>	<i>pəḍ-l-a</i>	<i>təri</i>	<i>apəṇ</i>	<i>pikənik-la</i>	<i>ja-ṇar</i>	<i>aho-t.</i>
how much-EMPH	rain	fall-PERF-MSG	COREL	we.incl	picnic-DAT	go-PROS	be-IPFV.1PL

Whether it will rain or not, we will have a picnic.

Japanese concessive conditional clause with *-temo* marker is structurally typical non-finite clause. The sequence of Japanese SCCs are same as V-COND-even as in (12). The structure of Japanese ACCs shown as two successive of SCCs as in ‘... V-COND-even... (or) V-COND-even’ as in (13). The form of Japanese UCCs are also the same as a typical non-finite clause, as in WH... V-COND-even as in (14). In this way, all types of Japanese concessive conditionals follow what Haspelmath and König describes the concessive conditional clauses of non-finite languages.

(12) Japanese: Scalar Concessive Conditionals

<i>ashita</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>ame</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>fu-tte-mo</i>	<i>ensoku</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>ik-u</i>
tomorrow	TOP	rain	NOM	fall-CONV-also,	picnic	DAT	go-NPST.

Even if it rains tomorrow, we will have a picnic.

(13) Japanese: Alternative Concessive Conditionals

<i>ame</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>fu-tte-mo</i>	<i>fura-naku-te-mo</i>	<i>ensoku</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>ik-u</i>
rain	NOM	fall-CONV-also,	fall-NEG-CONV-also,	picnic	DAT	go-NPST.

Whether it will rain or not, we will have a picnic.

(14) Japanese: Universal Concessive Conditionals

<i>donnani</i>	<i>ame</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>fu-tte-mo</i>	<i>ensoku</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>ik-u</i>
how much	rain	NOM	fall-CONV-also,	picnic	DAT	go-NPST.

No matter how much it will rain, we will have a picnic.

On the other hand, I assume that the types of (i) and (ii) of SCCs classification can be partially applied to the Japanese concessive conditional clauses. This is because Japanese concessive conditional marker *-temo* is a combination of a converb *-te* and a focus particle *-mo* (Tomura 1988:132). Matsui (2009) describes that the concessive conditionals in Japanese consist of an antecedent clause that contains a verb in the ‘gerundive’ form and the particle *mo* (pp.358). Tomura (1988) considers that the converb *-te* of concessive conditional *-temo* functions as a description of the situation. Based on above, I understood that converb *-te* do not indicate the condition. Secondly, *-temo* marker sometimes function as a concessive expression. However, the marker do not cover all concessive expression as there is another concessive marker *-noni*.

In sum, we observed that Marathi concessive conditional clauses exhibit features of non-finite languages though the clauses are considered as finite, whereas Japanese concessive conditional clauses follow what Haspelmath and König describes the concessive conditional clauses of non-finite languages. We also discussed that Marathi SCCs are considered as type (i) concessive conditional that consist of a conditional clause plus a scalar additive focus particle (‘even’): and partially applicable to type (ii) concessive conditionals marked by a subordinator that also marks concessive clauses. On the other hand, the types of (i) and (ii) can be partially applied to Japanese scalar concessive conditional clauses as in ‘te-form (converb) + focus particle’, and also marks ‘concessive’.

Next, we move to the grammatical constraints on concessive conditionals within the subordinate clause. The major difference between Marathi and Japanese concessive conditionals is the verb inflection. In Marathi, as the marker *-təri* is considered as a finite adverbial marker, it can be attached to various grammatical morphemes, such as verb stem (with the form of Verb_{STEM}-PERF-phi+ *təri*), negation, and volitional form. In case *-təri* attaches to noun, adjectives and auxiliaries, the verb takes the form of (*asə*-PERF-phi+ *təri*). In this respect, Marathi concessive conditional marker *-təri* is attached after the set of verb inflection. Sentence (15) and (16) are examples of Verb_{STEM}-PERF-phi+ *təri* and *asə*-PERF-phi+ *təri* structure.

(15) Marathi: Universal Concessive Conditionals ($V_{STEM-}PERF-phi+t\bar{a}ri$)

<i>tya-la</i>	<i>koṇi-hi</i>	<i>kahi</i>	<i>bolā-l-ə</i>	<i>tāri</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>nimutāpāṇe</i>	<i>āik-un</i>	<i>ghe-t-o.</i>
he.OBL-DAT	who-EMPH	some	say-PERF-FSG	COREL	he	intently	listen-CP	take-IPFV-MSG

He listens quietly to what anyone says to him.

(16) Marathi: Scalar Concessive Conditionals ($əṣə-}PERF-phi+t\bar{a}ri$)

<i>canglya</i>	<i>goṣṭi</i>	<i>əṣə-lya</i>	<i>tāri</i>	<i>ānek</i>	<i>gāriḃa-pāryāntā</i>	<i>mādat</i>	<i>poḃcāt</i>	<i>nahi</i>
good	story	be.OBL	COREL	many	poor-until	help	reaching	NEG.

Even if it is a good thing, the help does not reach many poor people.

Japanese concessive conditional marker *-temo* is a non-finite subordinator. According to Minami (1974), *-temo* can be attached to morphemes of; verb stem, negation, noun, adjectives, causative, passive, benefactive, and respect. On the other hand, *-temo* cannot directly connect to the morphemes such as verb past and non-past forms, inflective word + expletive nouns, and volitional forms. Also, the concessive conditional marker *-temo* itself changes its form according to *onbin* system¹. Sentence (17) is a grammatical sentence which *-temo* is attached to the verb stem form. On the other hand, sentence (18) is ungrammatical because *-temo* conjunction attaches to the verb past form.

(17) Japanese: Universal Concessive Conditionals (Benefactive Verb_{STEM-}*temo*)

<i>pureſent</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>nani</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>mora-tte-mo</i>	<i>ureshi-i</i>
present	TOP	what	ACC	receive-CONV-also	happy-NPST

I am happy to receive any gifts.

(18)*Japanese: Universal Concessive Conditionals (Benefactive Verb_{PST-}*temo*)

<i>*pureſent</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>nani</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>mora-tta-te-mo</i>	<i>ureshi-katta</i>
present	TOP	what	ACC	receive-PST-CONV-also	happy-PST

**I was happy to I received any gifts.*

Based on the above description, it seems that the grammatical constraints of concessive conditional markers in Marathi and Japanese follow the feature of finite or non-finite languages. We observe that the difference between Marathi and Japanese concessive conditional lies in the verb inflection. When the concessive conditional marker attaches to verbs, Marathi is always accompanied by the inflection of aspect and agreement, whereas in Japanese, the conjunction is directly attached to the verb stem.

5. Summary

The present discussion is summarized in Table 1.

	Parameters	Marathi <i>-tāri</i>	Japanese <i>-temo</i>
1	Semantic Proposition	p though $\neg q$ Denying the consequent type	p though $\neg q$ Denying the consequent type
2	Factuality	Hypothetical, Factual	Hypothetical, Factual
3	Clause Linkage	Content, Epistemic, Speech Act.	Content, Epistemic, Speech Act.
4	Typological classification	Finite clause, but non-finite like structure. 'conditional + focus particle', and marks 'concessive'	Non-finite structure. 'te-form (converb) + focus particle', and marks 'concessive'
5	Constraints	Finite construction with Verb inflection (Verb _{STEM-} PERF-phi)+ <i>tāri</i>	Non-finite construction Verb _{STEM-} <i>temo</i>

Table1: Similarities and differences of Concessive Conditional Clauses in Marathi and Japanese.

In this paper, we compared the formal and functional features of concessive conditional clauses marked by *-tāri* in Marathi and by *-temo* in Japanese based on the classification proposed by Haspelmath and König (1998). Semantically, it was understood that both languages have the same proposition i.e., p though $\neg q$ for the

concessive conditionals. It was also clarified that both languages use a concessive conditional clause for other extensive expressions, such as factual events, epistemic level, and illocutionary level. From the typological point of view, though Marathi concessive conditionals with *təri* marker are considered as finite, its clauses exhibit features of non-finite languages like Japanese. The difference between the structures of Marathi and Japanese concessive conditional is the verb inflection. While Marathi has a complex verb inflection for the formation of the concessive conditional clause, Japanese conjunction *-temo* can directly be attached after the verb stem along with *onbin* system.

In the present study, we focused on the comparison of concessive conditional markers *-təri* in Marathi and *-temo* in Japanese. However, both languages have different expressions to imply concessive conditionals, such as zero marked concessive conditionals in Marathi, and *-youto*, *-tokorode* and other conjunctions in Japanese. Hence, this output is just a part to describe the concessive conditionals in the languages. In order to pursue the contrastive analysis of concessive conditional clauses in Marathi and Japanese, it is necessary to shed light on uniqueness of the languages.

References

- Ahn, Soun-ju. 1997. *A Study on Concessive conjunctions: Regarding Their Logical Organization*. In: Departmental Bulletin Paper, Tsukuba journal of applied linguistics. University of Tsukuba: 55 – 68
- Davison, Alice. 2006. Word order, parameters, and the Extended COMP projection. In J. Bayer, Tanmoy Bhattacharya and Hany Babu (eds.), *Linguistic Theory and South Asian Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 175-198.
- Dhongde, Ramesh V. and Wali, Kashi. 2009. *Marathi*. Vol. 13. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Haspelmath, Martin and König, Ekkehard. 1998. Concessive conditionals in the languages of Europe. In: Johan van der Auwera (ed.) *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*. De Gruyter Mouton: 563–640.
- Matsui, Ai. 2009. Constructing concessive conditionals: In case of Japanese. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*: Vol. 13, No. 2: 357-370.
- Minami, Fujio. 1974. *Gendai Nihongo no Kozo* (Structure of Modern Japanese). Taishukan Shoten.
- König, Ekkehard and Siemund, Peter. 2000. Causal and concessive clauses: Formal and semantic relations. In: Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Bernd Kortmann (eds.) *Cause – Condition – Concession – Contrast. Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*. Mouton de Gruyter: 341-360.
- Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics - Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. University of Cambridge.
- Tomura, Kayo. 1988. Nihongo ni okeru futatsu no taipu no jōho bun -noni and -temo (On the Two types of Japanese concessive clauses). *Studies in language and literature. Language*15: 123-133.

ⁱ *onbin* is a modification of the form of the morpheme to assimilate the pronunciation when combining two morphemes.