『語用論研究』第 24 号(2022 年) pp. 37–58

〈Invited Papers〉［Research Papar］

Minimal Utterance Units and Unbreakable "Morphosyntactic" Structures for Asking, Answering, Denying, and Specifying*

Katsunobu Izutsu and Takeshi Koguma
Hokkaido University of Education and Kanazawa University

This paper presents a crosslinguistic analysis of utterances employed for asking and answering about an addressee's activity or an object in sight, drawing on parallel texts in Basque, Chinese, English, French, German, Japanese, Korean, and Welsh. The analysis casts new light on notable and seldom noticed discrepancies and commonalities among these languages, often overlooked in traditional macro-typological approaches. Micro-typological approaches to language enable us to see many more potential ways of classifications (groupings) of languages. Chinese and French/German are no less alike than Welsh and English are, while Basque and English are no more alike than Chinese and Welsh are.

Keyword: minimal utterance unit, unbreakable element, functional counterpart, macro/micro-typology, typical constituent order

1. Introduction

Mainstream linguistic typology, substantially established by Greenburg (1963) and now represented by the *WALS* and *Ethnologue* data base collections, has successfully classified the world's languages on formal characteristics such as the linear order and formal structures of morphosyntactic elements. Basic constituent order such as SVO, SOV, or VSO is one of such characteristics of languages, which, as Sornicola (2011: 361) says, can give us a "macroscopic" rather than "microscopic" view of how languages are alike or contrast with each other.

However, macroscopic views may suddenly get unreliable when we look into similarities and differences in more specific units of utterance employed for various discourse-pragmatic purposes. For instance, English can start "a recent experience report" in a conversation with an utterance like *You'll never guess where I went last week! Mexico!* or *Guess where I went last week? Mexico!*, while Spanish, another SVO language, can employ for the same purpose an expression literally meaning 'I just finish

* This study is partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI (Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) 18K00563).

being in Mexico and it was great,' as in (1a).[1]

(1) a. *Justo acabo de estar en Mexico y ha sido genial*.[2]
just finish of be in Mexico and has been brilliant
b. *sensyuu mekisiko-ni it-te-ki-ta-yo.*
last:week Mexico-to go-and-come-PST-FP
c. *jinanju megsiko-e ga bo-asseo.*
last:week Mexico-to go:and see-PST
(Adapted from Izutsu and Koguma 2019: 56–57)

Being both SOV languages, Japanese and Korean can achieve the same pragmatic purpose using so-called converb constructions, as illustrated in (1b–c).[3] Note, however, that (1b) and (1c) literally mean 'I went to Mexico and **came**' and 'I went to Mexico and **saw**,' respectively. The mainstream typology can say something about the use of converb constructions in both SOV languages, not in the SVO languages, but say almost nothing about the difference between 'went and came' and 'went and saw' in the particular discourse-pragmatic function of recent experience report. Likewise, the mainstream typology gives no account for the difference between the two SVO languages in this recent-experience-report function.

In the last decade, a growing number of studies have explored linguistic typology from perspectives of "typological pragmatics" (Ariel 2012), "cognitive typology" (Horie and Pardeshi 2009), and "pragmatic typology" (Floyd et al. 2020). They claim to analyze not only formal but also semantic and conceptual characteristics of linguistic expressions used for different pragmatic functions. Unfortunately, however, they are all more oriented towards a macroscopic view of linguistic typology in that they chiefly deal with abstract grammatical concepts of tense/aspect/modality and functions of complement/relative/adverbial clauses, rather than more specific discourse-pragmatic functions or purposes like recent experience reports.

A microscopic view of typology can elucidate and help explain many similarities and contrasts across different languages which a macroscopic view cannot see. As we observed in Izutsu and Koguma (2019: 61–62), there are at least three types of recent experience report expressions. They are not necessarily morphosyntactic counterparts

[1] Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 614) argue that a mental clause like *I think* or *I don't believe* serves "as the projecting part of a clause nexus of projection." Izutsu and Koguma (2019: 57) see *You never guess where* or *Guess where* as forming a similar clause nexus with the clause following them in the relevant utterances.

[2] We use the following abbreviations: ACC(usative), ADN(ominal), ADV(erb), AFF(irmative), AUX(iliary), CL(assifier), COP(ula), ERG(ative), EV(i)D(ential), F(ormal)N(oun), FOC(us), F(inal)P(article), GEN(itive), NEG(ative), N(o)M(ina)L(i)Z(er), NOM(inative), OBJ(ect), PART(itive), POL(ite), PREP(osition), PROG(ressive), PRON(oun), P(a)ST, QUOT(ative), SUBJ(ect), TOP(ic).

[3] Izutsu and Koguma (2019: 57) also call the converb construction "sequential verb construction" and subsume it into a larger category "verb-group type" with Spanish *acabar de* V.

but do count as significant counterparts in terms of discourse-pragmatic function. Each language can adopt one type or another, or a combination thereof, showing some favor for one of these. Japanese, Korean, and Spanish prefer a "verbal-group type," while English favors a "clause-nexus type"; and, at the same time, all the four languages exhibit diverse degrees of inclination to the "*and-it-was-great* type" (*ibid.*: 62). We can see that different languages are classifiable based on which type of expression and conceptualization they prefer for recent experience report.[4] What matters for crosslinguistic analysis of speech is comparison of functional rather than morphosyntactic counterparts.

Our view on basic constituent order differs from a widely accepted macroscopic typology. We highly value the fact that the so-called basic constituent order differs from one utterance type to another (declarative/interrogative/directive or affirmative/negative), and that typical utterance types differ depending on the person of the subject: declarative with first/third person and interrogative/imperative with second person. Based on these differences, MICRO-TYPOLOGY provides a more fine-grained classification and a broader taxonomy than MACRO-TYPOLOGY.

This paper analyzes specific utterances with first/second/third-person subjects, employed for questions and replies about an addressee's activity or an object in sight in Saint-Exupéry's famous French novel *Le Petit Prince* (1946) and its Basque, Chinese, English, German, Japanese, Korean, and Welsh translations. Often composed of comparable morphosyntactic elements across the languages, those utterances form MINIMAL UTTERANCE UNITS. However, the elements exhibit different sequential order and diverse degrees of unity; the languages have conventionalized different sequences as phonologically UNBREAKABLE ELEMENTS. Our analysis showcases how the languages, chosen for the variety of four SVO, three SOV, and one VSO, are alike and differ. Minimal utterance units and their unbreakable elements indicate some commonalities across SVO, SOV, and VSO types and some dissimilarities within each type. The commonalities can suggest a new typology grounded upon the linguistic structure and conceptualization of **utterance-unit** levels.

2. Focus of *wh*-questions and answers

First, we consider utterances typically used when a speaker asks what activity the addressee is engaged in. (2F) is an excerpt from Saint-Exupéry (1946), in which the

[4] The speech event conception of recent experience report is identifiable as "recency, gist-giving, and intriguing facets" (Izutsu and Koguma 2019: 62). In Japanese and Spanish, all the facets are lexicogrammatically profiled, whereby the two languages compose a class of languages. In contrast, the gist-giving and intriguing facets are, but the recency facet is not activated in English, while only the recency facet is verbalized in Korean. These two languages can form different classes, respectively.

little prince questions a railway switchman, while (2B-E) and (2G-W) are its translations into Basque, Chinese, English, German, Japanese, Korean, and Welsh, respectively. Since the adverb 'here' ('there' in German) is optional in all the languages, the rest of the reported clause in each example comprises a **minimal utterance unit** in this case.[5] Without regard to the difference in basic constituent order, the *wh*-word 'what' directly precedes the verb 'do' in Basque, French, German, Japanese, and Korean, while 'do' precedes 'what' in Chinese. In English and Welsh, 'what' directly precedes the auxiliary *do* or *wyt* (2nd-person present of *bod* 'be'). These sequences of 'what' and a verb or auxiliary cannot be reversed; they are unbreakable elements in each utterance unit.

(2) B. *—**Zer egiten** ari zara hemen? — esan zuen printze*
what doing:in engage you:be here say he.had prince
txikiak. (74)[6]
little:ERG

C. *"nǐ zài zhèlǐ **zuò shénme**?" xiǎo wángzǐ wèn.* (100)
you at here do what little prince ask

E. *'**What do** you do here?' asked the little prince.* (73)

F. *—**Que fais**-tu ici? dit le petit prince.* (78)
what do-you here said the little prince

G. *»**Was machst** du da?« sagte der kleine Prinz.* (58)
what make you there said the little prince

J. *"koko-de **nani si**-teru-no"-to, oozisama-wa tazuneta.* (119)
here-at what do-PROG-FN-QUOT prince:POL-TOP asked

K. *"yeogi-seo **mweo-l ha**-goisseo?" eorin wangja-ga mureossda.* (75)
here-at what-ACC do-PROG little prince-NOM asked

W. *"**Beth wyt** ti'n ei wneud yma?" holodd y tywysog bach.* (74)
what be you.in its doing here asked the prince little

In Basque, "VERB+*ari izan*" (*zara* is 2nd-person absolutive present of *izan* 'be') serves as a construction that means 'be engaged in doing.'[7] In English, "auxiliary(AUX)

---

[5] In Chinese, if *zài zhèlǐ* 'at this place' is removed, the clause ends up in: *nǐ zài **zuò shénme**?*, where *zài*+verb serves as a continuative construction like English progressive.

[6] The parenthesized numbers following each example represent the page on which it is found in the original and translated texts: Saint-Exupéry (1946), Zubizarreta (2011), Zhāng (2010), Cuffe (1995), Leitgeb and Leitgeb (1950), Tanigawa (2006), Jeong (1994), and Dafis (2007). Some Chinese, English, Japanese, and Korean examples refer to other versions of translation: Woods (1943), Naito (1953), Bag (1989), and Zōng (1992). Those examples are indicated with the translator's initial letter before the page number: e.g., W90 for Woods (1971: 90).

[7] In (2), the prince is more likely interpretable as not asking the railway switchman what he is currently doing but what he is engaged in as a job. In other scenes, where the prince asks other characters (e.g., a drinker) what they are currently doing, he uses ***Zerten** ari zara?* ('what:in engaged you:be?') in Basque, and *What are you doing there?* in English. These languages employ different expressions for an action co-occurring with the speech event and a habitual activity not necessarily co-

+subject pronoun($\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$)" forms a functional unit, usually concatenated with the preceding 'what' in *wh*-questions.[8] In French and German, "VERB+$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$" forms a functional unit with the preceding 'what.'[9] In Japanese and Korean, "VERB+AUX" (*te(i)ru* and *goisseo* are aspectual instances of AUX) does.[10] Welsh shows a unit similar to English, in which 'what' is directly followed by the sequence AUX+$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$+preposition (PREP). These morphosyntactic sequences are substantially unbreakable in that they are normally pronounced in a row.

Table 1 summarizes the minimal utterance unit in each language, where unbreakable elements are hyphenated, along with the constituent order of the relevant *wh*-question and so-called canonical order.[11] Basque and Korean more likely subsume 'what' (*zer* and *mweo*) within the unbreakable elements because substantially no elements intervene between 'what' and VERB.[12] In contrast, Japanese allows such an

Table 1: Minimal utterance unit and constituent order in 'what do you do?'

	MINIMAL UTTERANCE UNIT	CONSTITUENT ORDER	
		WH-QUESTION	CANONICAL
Basque	'WHAT'-VERB(-VERB)-AUX	OV	SOV
Chinese	$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$-PREP(-NOMINAL) VERB-'WHAT'	SVO	SVO
English	'WHAT'-AUX-$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$ VERB	**O**v**S**V	**SVO**
French	'WHAT'-VERB-$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$; 'WHAT'-AUX-$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$ VERB	**OVS**; **O**v**S**V	**SVO**
German	'WHAT'-VERB-$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$	**OVS**	**SVO**
Japanese	'WHAT' VERB-AUX-FP	OVv	SOV
Korean	'WHAT'-VERB-AUX(-FP)	OVv	SOV
Welsh	'WHAT'-AUX-$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$-PREP VERB	**O**v**S**V	**VSO**

occurring with the event.

[8] Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 113) argue: "Subject and Finite are closely linked together, and combine to form one constituent which we call the Mood." Our AUX is an instance of their "Finite."

[9] French also has a colloquially more frequent option of complex-auxiliary construction: *wh*-word *est-ce que*. In this case, the *wh*-word forms a similar functional unit with *est-ce que* instead of VERB.

[10] In Korean, *mweo-l ha-seyo?* (what-ACC do-POL:FP) or *mweo-l ha-si-neungeo-ji-yo?* (what-ACC do-POL-EVD-FP-FP) is also possible, where the PROG marker is not used.

[11] In Table 1 and thereafter, V and v represent a verb and auxiliary, respectively. What count as unbreakable elements here are roughly *zer-egiten-ari-zara* 'what-doing:in-engaged-you:be' (Basque), *nǐ-zài zuò-shénme* 'you-at doing-what' (Chinese), *what-do-you (do)/que-fais-tu/was-machst-du* 'what-do-you' (English/French/German), *nani si-teru-no* 'what doing-are-you' (Japanese), *mweo-l-ha-goisseo* 'what-doing-are (Korean),' and *beth-wyt-ti'n* 'what-are-you'in (Welsh). In Japanese, the final particle *-no* is glossed as "you" because it can mark the 2nd-person uncoded subject in *wh*-questions (Izutsu and Kim 2018: 48).

[12] In Korean, for example, other elements like *neo* 'you' can hardly intervene between 'what' and the verb *hada* 'do': ***neo mweo*** *ha-neun geo-ya?* (you what do-ADN FN-FP) 'What are you doing?'; ??***mweo neo*** *ha-neun geo-ya?* ; ?***mweo-l neo-n*** *ha-neun geo-ya?* (what-ACC you-TOP do-AND FN-FP) (Izutsu et al. 2021: 4).

intervention (e.g., ***nani*** *koko-de* ***si****-teru-no*).[13]

Table 1 shows that the question about the addressee's engagement necessarily verbalizes the 'what-VERB' sequence in Basque, French, German, and Korean, the 'what-AUX' sequence in English, French, and Welsh, the 'VERB-what' sequence in Chinese, and the 'VERB-AUX' in Japanese and Korean. Each group forms a discourse-pragmatic type of language: the 'what'-VERB, 'what'-AUX, and VERB-'what' types along with the VERB-AUX type. Notice that the VERB-'what' type necessitates the VO order in *wh*-questions, while the other types can be viewed as requiring the OV order in *wh*-questions. The latter can be viewed as languages that put the focus of *wh*-question ('what') before the VERB.

Next, we turn to expressions used as answers to the prince's question in (2). (3B-W) are the sentences that follow (2B-W) in Saint-Exupéry (1946) and its published translations. The boldface highlights the VERB and a nominal that collectively compose the relevant answers.

(3) B. *—****Bidaiariak*** *milakako multzotan* ***sailkatzen*** *ditut—*
travelers by:the:thousands in.a.bunch classifying:in I.have.them
esan zuen orratzzainak —. (74)
say he.had pointsman:ERG

C. *"wǒ zài* ***fēnpèi lǚkè****, měi cì yīqiān rén," bāndào*
I PROG divide passenger every time a:thousand person switch
gōng shuō. (100)
worker say

E. *"I* ***sort the passengers*** *into bundles of one thousand,' said the pointsman.* (73)

F. *—Je* ***trie les voyageurs****, par paquets de mille, dit*
I sort the passengers by packets of thousand said
l'aiguilleur. (78)
the'pointsman

G. *»Ich* ***sortiere die Reisenden*** *nach Tausenderpaketen«, sagte der*
I sort the passengers after thousands:packets said the
Weichensteller. (58)
pointsman

J. *"****senro-o****,* ***kirikae****-teiru-nda-yo. zyookyaku sennin-bun matome-te,*
rail-ACC switch-PROG-EVD-FP passenger thousand-amount sum.up-and
kisya-ga iku-hookoo-ni-ne."-to, pointogakari-ga kotaeta. (119)[14]
train-NOM go-direction-to-FP-QUOT pointsman-NOM answered

---

[13] Similarly, *What here are you doing?* can also be tolerated. In contrast, *Qu'ici fais-tu?* and *Was da machst du?* seem more or less difficult.

[14] Naito (2000: 117) translates the reported clause in (3F) into Japanese as follows. Here again, the VERB and the object nominal follow the canonical order of the language (OV), as indicated in boldface.

K. *"han ggureomi-e cheonyeo myeongssig dwe-neun* ***gicha***
one pack-to thousand.or.so person.each become-ADN train
sonnimdeul-eul *ggureomibyeollo* ***garyeonae****-goisseo.* [...]*"*
passengers-ACC pack.by.pack sort-PROG
jeoncheolsu-ga malhaessda. (75)
pointsman-NOM said

W. *"Rwy'n* ***dosbarthu'r teithwyr*** *yn fwndeli o fil," meddai*
be:I'in distribute'the passengers in bundles of thousand said
dyn y rheilffordd.
man the railway (74)

Table 2 summarizes the minimal utterance unit with unbreakable elements in each example alongside the answer's and the canonical constituent order.[15] In every language, the relevant constituents follow the canonical order: SVO (Chinese/English/French/German), VSO (Welsh), and OV (Basque/Japanese/Korean).[16] This stands in clear contrast with the case seen in (2).

Table 2: Minimal utterance unit and constituent order in 'I sort passengers'

	MINIMAL UTTERANCE UNIT	CONSTITUENT ORDER	
		ANSWER	CANONICAL
Basque	$\text{NOMINAL}_{\text{OBJ}}$ VERB-AUX	OVv	SOV
Chinese	$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$-PREP-VERB $\text{NOMINAL}_{\text{OBJ}}$	SVO	SVO
English	$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$-VERB $\text{NOMINAL}_{\text{OBJ}}$	SVO	SVO
French	$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$-VERB $\text{NOMINAL}_{\text{OBJ}}$	SVO	SVO
German	$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$-VERB $\text{NOMINAL}_{\text{OBJ}}$	SVO	SVO
Japanese	$\text{NOMINAL}_{\text{OBJ}}$ VERB-AUX-FP	OVv	SOV
Korean	$\text{NOMINAL}_{\text{OBJ}}$ VERB-AUX(-FP)	OVv	SOV
Welsh	AUX-$\text{PRON}_{\text{SUBJ}}$-PREP-VERB $\text{NOMINAL}_{\text{OBJ}}$	vSVO	VSO

It should be noted here that English, French, German, and Welsh do not place the focus of answer before VERB, unlike in *wh*-question. In contrast, Basque, Japanese, and Korean consistently put the focus before VERB in both *wh*-question and answer

(i) *"**ryokaku-o**, sennin-zutu nimotu-ni-si-te, **eriwake**-teru-nda-yo.* [...]*"*
passenger-ACC thousand:person-each package-to-do-and sort-PROG-EVD-FP

[15] The unbreakable elements largely correspond to *sailkatzen-ditut* 'sort-I.have.them' in Basque; *wǒ-zài-fēnpèi (lǚkè)* 'I-am-sorting (passenger)' in Chinese; *I-sort (the-passengers)/Je-trie (les-voyageurs)/Ich-sortiere (die-Reisenden)* 'I-sort (the-passengers)' in English/French/German; *kirikae-teiru-ndayo* 'switching-am-I.say' and *garyeonae-goisseo* 'sorting-am' in Japanese and Korean; *rwy'n-dosbarthu'r (teithwyr)* 'am-I-in-sorting'the (passengers) in Welsh.'

[16] Here Welsh assumes, as it were, a hybrid order, vSVO, which could be viewed as either VSO (if the auxiliary is viewed as a VERB) or SVO (if it is viewed as differing from VERB). We will tentatively take the first view for the present analysis.

utterances, and Chinese invariably positions the focus after VERB.

This can be confirmed in another scene, where a merchant talks about the pills he sells, 'If you swallow one each week, you no longer feel you need to drink, and you can save fifty-three minutes every week.' The prince asks, 'What do I[you] do with those fifty-three minutes?', and the sentences in (4) show the merchant's answer in each language. The sequence of the verb 'do' and the focus of answer ('(one's) want' in Basque; 'what' in Chinese; *whatever you like* in English; 'what one wants' in French/ German; 'what (you) want to do' in Japanese and Korean; 'anything as you like to' in Welsh) follows the canonical order of each language. The positioning of the answer focus is consistent with that of the *wh*-question focus in Basque, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean but are not in the four other languages.

(4) B. *—**nahi** dena **egin** daiteke...* (76)
want all do he.can

C. *"suíbiàn **zuò shénme** dōu xíng."* (102)/*"ài zuò shénme jiù **zuò** **shénme**..."* (Z108)
no.matter do what all be.OK love do what then do what

E. *'You **do whatever you like**...'* (75)/ *"Anything you like..."* (W90)

F. *—On en **fait ce que l'on veut**... »* (80)
one of.which makes that which the'one wants

G. *»Man **macht** damit, **was man will**...«* (75)
one makes that:with what one wants

J. *"**si-tai-koto-o** **suru**-no-sa..."* (N121)/*"nandemo osukina-koto-o..."* (122)
do-want.to-thing-ACC do-FP-FP whatever
POL:like-thing-ACC

K. *"**ha-gosip-eun** **geo**-l **ha**-ji...* (77)
do-want.to-ADN thing-ACC do-FP

W. *"Gall **wneud beth a fynno**..."* (76)
can do what whether ever

3. Focus of negation and affirmation

We first examine utterances usually used when one speaker asks another about the **identity** of something in their sight and this second speaker answers the question. (5F) is another excerpt from Saint-Exupéry (1946), in which the little prince asks the first-person narrator. (5B-E) and (5G-W) are Basque, Chinese, English, German, Japanese, Korean, and Welsh translations of (5F), respectively. The focus of *wh*-question 'what' immediately precedes the copula verb/auxiliary (COP) in Basque (*zer da*), English (*what is*), French (*qu'est-ce que*), German (*was ist*), Korean (*mweo-ya*), and Welsh (*beth yw*)

and follows it in Chinese (*shì shénme dōngxī*). These phrases form unbreakable elements in the minimal utterance unit found in the first line of each example. In Japanese, the relevant translation is a verbless predicate (*naani*).

(5) B. *—**Zer da** gauza hori?* (15)
what is thing this
*—**Ez da gauza bat**. Hegan egiten du.* ***Hegazkin bat da**. **Ene***
not is thing a flying do it.have.he airplane a is my
***hegazkina da**.*
airplane is

C. *"nà **shì shénme dōngxī**?"* (31)
that be what thing
*"nà **bùshì dōngxī**. tā huì fēi, **shì yī jià fēijī**, **wǒ de fēijī**."*
that not:be thing it can fly be one CL airplane I of airplane

E. *'**What is** that thing over there?'* (12)
*'That **is not a thing**. It flies. It's **an aeroplane**. It's **my aeroplane**.'*

F. *«**Qu'est-ce que** c'est que cette chose-là?* (19)
What'is-that that that'is that that thing-there
*—Ce **n'est pas une chose**. Ça vole. **C'est un avion**. **C'est mon***
that not'is not a thing that fly that's a airplane that's my
***avion**. »*
airplane

G. *»**Was ist** das für ein Ding da?«* (13)
what is that for a thing there
*»Das **ist kein Ding**. Das fliegt. Das **ist ein Flugzeug**. Es **ist mein***
that is no thing that flies that is a airplane it is my
***Flugzeug**.«*
airplane

J. *"sore, **naani**? sono sinamono?"* (N17)[17]
that what that thing
*"**sinamono-zyanai-yo**. kore, tobu-nda. **hikooki-na-nda**. **boku-no***
thing-be:TOP:not-FP this fly-EVD airplane-be-EVD I- GEN
***hikooki-na-nda**."*
airplane-be-EVD

[17] Another version of Japanese translation (Tanigawa 2006: 20) renders the same part as follows:
(i) *"kono henna-no naani?"*
this strange-NMLZ what
"henna-no-zyanai-yo. kore-wa tobu-mono-de hikooki-tte iu-nda. boku-no
strange-thing-be:TOP:not-FP this-TOP fly-thing-be airplane-QUOT say-EVD I-GEN
hikooki-da."
airplane-be

K *"i mulgeon-i **mweo-ya**?"* (B18)
this thing-NOM what-be
*"geugeo-n **mulgeon-i aniya**. geugeo-n naladani-neun geo-ya. **nae** **bihaenggi-ya**."*[18]
that-TOP thing-NOM not:be that-TOP fly.go-ADN thing-be my airplane-be

W. *"**Beth yw'r peth yma?"*** (15)
what is'the thing here
*"**Nid peth** yw hi. Mae honna'n hedfan. **Awyren yw** hi. **Fy** **awyren i**."*
not thing is she is this'in fly airplane is she my airplane I

In Japanese, Korean, and Welsh, the focus of answer (affirmation or negation) as well as of *wh*-question immediately precedes the copula (*hikooki-na-nda*; *nae bihaenggi-ya*; *awyren yw hi*). In Chinese, English, French, and German, unlike the focus of *wh*-question, the focus of answer immediately follows the copula (*shì yī jià fēijī*;*'s an aeroplane*; *est un avion*; *ist ein Flugzeug*). In Basque, the focus immediately precedes the copula in the affirmative answer along with the *wh*-question focus but follows the copula in the negative answer (*hegazkin bat da* but *ez da gauza bat*).

Table 3 outlines the minimal utterance units with unbreakable elements in the affirmative and negative answers to the identity *wh*-question.[19] Here the relevant constituents are the copula (v) and a focal element. Note that the focal elements ('what'/FOC_{AFF}/FOC_{NEG}) are objects (O) in (2) through (4) but complements (C) in (5). The order of the copula and the focal element is consistent across *wh*-questions and answers in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Welsh, while a marked order is found in Basque negative answers (vC) and in French, English, and German *wh*-questions (C(v) V). Of a further notice is the order of negation marker (NEG) and V/v. The marker precedes the copula in Basque, Chinese, Korean, and Welsh (NEG-COP) and follows it in the other languages (COP-NEG). In French, NEG can occur both before and after COP.

---

[18] Another version of Korean translation (Jeon 1994: 14) renders the same part as follows:
(i) *"geugeo-n mulgeon-i aniya geugeon-n naradani-neun geo-ya. bihaenggi-ji, nae bihaenggi-ya."*
that-TOP thing-NOM not:be that-TOP fly:go-ADN thing-be airplane-FP my airplane-be

[19] The unbreakable elements of the negative answers to the identity question are *ez-da (gauza-bat)* 'not-is (thing-a)' in Basque, *bùshì (dōngxī)* 'not:is (thing)' in Chinese, *that[it]-is-not (a-thing)* in English, *ce-n'est-pas (une-chose)* 'that-not'is-at.all (a-thing)' in French, *das-ist (kein-Ding)* 'that-is (no-thing)' in German, *(sinamono-)zyanai-yo* '(goods-)is:TOP:not-I.say' in Japanese, *(mulgeon-i-)aniya* '(thing-NOM-)not:is' in Korean, and *nid-peth-yw-hi* 'not-thing-is-she' in Welsh.

Table 3: Minimal utterance unit and constituent order in 'what's that/it's (not) a thing[airplane].'

	MINIMAL UTTERANCE UNIT	CONSTITUENT ORDER		
		WH-QUESTION	AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
Basque	NEG-COP **FOC$_{NEG}$**; **FOC$_{AFF}$** COP	Cv	Cv	vC
Chinese	NEG-COP **FOC$_{NEG}$**; COP **FOC$_{AFF}$**	VC	VC	VC
English	PRON$_{SUBJ}$-COP-NEG **FOC$_{NEG}$**; PRON$_{SUBJ}$-COP **FOC$_{AFF}$**	CvV	vC	vC
French	PRON$_{SUBJ}$(-NEG)-COP-NEG **FOC$_{NEG}$**; PRON$_{SUBJ}$-COP **FOC$_{AFF}$**	Cv	vC	vC
German	PRON$_{SUBJ}$-COP-NEG-**FOC$_{NEG}$**; PRON$_{SUBJ}$-COP **FOC$_{AFF}$**	Cv	vC	vC
Japanese	**FOC$_{NEG}$**-COP-TOP-NEG-FP; **FOC$_{AFF}$**-COP-FP	C(v)	Cv	Cv
Korean	**FOC$_{NEG}$**-NOM-NEG-COP(-FP); **FOC$_{AFF}$**-COP(-FP)	Cv	Cv	Cv
Welsh	NEG-**FOC$_{NEG}$** COP-PRON$_{SUBJ}$; **FOC$_{AFF}$** COP-PRON$_{SUBJ}$	Cv	Cv	Cv

In answers, the order of the copula and a focal element is consistent across affirmative and negative answers in Chinese/English/French/German (COP-FOC) and Japanese/Korean/Basque (FOC-COP).[20] In Basque, the order is reversed between the two types of answers.

Finally, we consider utterances used for denying or refusing something one speaker is given by another. (6) is a further excerpt from Saint-Exupéry (1946) and its translation into the seven languages. In this scene, the little prince is refusing a drawing of an elephant inside of a boa that the 1st-person narrator has just made for him.[21] The significant difference from the negative answers in (5) is that the focus of negation falls upon an object instead of a complement.

(6) B. *"—Ez! Ez! Nik* ***ez dut elefanterik nahi*** *boa baten*
no no I.ERG not it.have.I elephant:PART want boa one:GEN
barnean. [...]*"* (14)
within

C. *"bùduì! bùduì! wǒ* ***bùyào*** *dà măngshé dùzi lǐ de* ***dà***
not:be.so not:be.so I not:want big python belly inside of big
xiàng. [...]*"* (31)
elephant

E. *'No! no! no! I don't want an elephant inside a boa constrictor.* [...]*'* (10)

[20] The unbreakable elements are *hegazkin-bat-da* 'airplane-a-is' in Basque; *shì-yī-jià-fēijī* 'is-one-item.of-airplane' in Chinese; *It's an-aeroplane/C'est un-avion* 'that'is an-airplane'*/Das-ist ein-Flugzeug* 'that-is an-airplane' in English/French/German; *hikooki-na-nda* 'airplane-is-I.say' in Japanese; *bihaenggi-ya* 'airplane-is' in Korean; *awyren-yw-hi* 'airplane-is-she' in Welsh.

[21] The Korean example in (6K) adopts a lexical negation ('hate' < 'not like') rather than a grammatical negation, but the Korean negation marker *an(i)* normally precedes verbs and copulas. Although the negation marker *anhda* follows verbs, it derives from *ani* + *hada* 'do.'

F. *«Non! Non! Je* ***ne veux pas d'un éléphant*** *dans un boa.* [...]*»* (18)
no no I not want at.all of'a elephant in a boa

G. *»Nein! Nein! Ich* ***will keinen Elefanten*** *in einer*
no no I want no elephant in a
Riesenschlange. [...]*«* (11−12)
large.snake

J. *"tigau, tigau-yo! boa-ni nomikomareta-****zoo-nante***
differ differ-FP boa-by was.swallowed-elephant-TOP
ira-nai*-yo.* [...]*"* (17)[22]
need-not-FP

K *"anya, anya, boa gureongi sog-eui* ***koggiri-neun silheo****.* [...]*"*(12)
not:be not:be boa snake inside-GEN elephant-TOP hate

W. *"Na, na! Dwyf i* ***ddim eisiau eliffant*** *mewn neidr boa.* [...]*"* (14)
no no am I not want elephant in snake boa

As with the negative answers in (5), the negation marker precedes the verbal (VERB/AUX/COP) in Basque (NEG-AUX(...)-VERB) and Chinese/Korean (NEG-VERB), follows it in English (AUX-NEG) and German/Japanese (VERB-NEG; AUX-NEG), and occurs both before and after VERB in French (NEG-VERB-NEG_{ADV}).[23] In Welsh, the negation marker follows the auxiliary and precedes the full verb (NEG-VERB), as in (6W), but precedes the copula (COP), as in (5W).

Table 4 sketches the minimal utterance units with unbreakable elements of the negative utterances in (6).[24] Here the relevant constituents are the verb 'want/need' and the focus of negation (the object 'elephant'). A comparison of (5) and (6) reveals that the order of the verbal (VERB/AUX/COP) and the focus of negation (FOC_{NEG}) are consistent across the utterances with O and with C in Basque/Chinese/English/French/German/Japanese/Korean. In Welsh, the order of the verbal and the focus of negation in the utterances with O (vSVO) differs from their order in the utterances with C (Cv). In Basque, the order of the verbal and the focus of negation with either O or C (vOV and

[22] Naito (2000: 14) renders the same part as follows:
(i) *"tigau, tigau! boku uwabami-ni nomareteru-zoo-nanka iyada-yo.* [...]*"* (N14)
differ differ I python-by have.been.swallowed-elephant-TOP hate-FP

[23] NEG_{ADV} stands for the negative adverb in French, which typically exemplifies itself in *pas* 'at all,' *rien* 'anything/nothing,' *jamais* 'ever/never,' and so forth.

[24] The minimal utterance units with unbreakable elements hyphenated are: *ez-dut elefanterik-nahi* 'not-have elephant:any-want,' *wǒ-bùyào (dà-mǎngshé-dùzi-lǐ-de) dà-xiàng* 'I-not:want (big-python-belly-inside-of) big-elephant,' *I-don't-want an-elephant*, *Je-ne-veux-pas d'un-éléphant* 'I-not-want-at.all any'one-elephant,' *ich-will keinen-Elefanten* 'I-want no-elephant,' *zoo-nante ira-nai-yo* 'elephant-like want-not-I.say,' *koggiri-neun silheo* 'elephant-any hate,' and *dwyf-i-ddim-eisiau eliffant* 'am-I-not-want elephant.' In Basque and Welsh, the auxiliary (AUX) used with content verbs like *nahi* and *eisiau* in (6) largely coincides with the copula.

vC) differs from the canonical order (OV).[25]

Table 4: Minimal utterance unit and constituent order in 'I don't want an elephant.'

	MINIMAL UTTERANCE UNIT	CONSTITUENT ORDER		
		NEGATIVE WITH O	CANONICAL	NEGATIVE WITH C
Basque	NEG-AUX **FOC$_{NEG}$**-VERB	vOV	SOV	vC
Chinese	PRON$_{SUBJ}$-NEG-VERB **FOC$_{NEG}$**	SVO	SVO	VC
English	PRON$_{SUBJ}$-AUX-NEG-VERB **FOC$_{NEG}$**	SvVO	SVO	vC
French	PRON$_{SUBJ}$-NEG-VERB-NEG$_{ADV}$ **FOC$_{NEG}$**	SvVO	SVO	vC
German	PRON$_{SUBJ}$-VERB(-NEG) **FOC$_{NEG}$**	SVO	SVO	vC
Japanese	**FOC$_{NEG}$**-TOP VERB(-NEG)-FP	O[C]V	SOV	Cv
Korean	**FOC$_{NEG}$**-TOP (NEG-)VERB-(-FP)	O[C]V	SOV	Cv
Welsh	AUX-PRON$_{SUBJ}$-NEG-VERB **FOC$_{NEG}$**	vSVO	VSO	Cv

4. Macro- and micro-typology

The description above reveals that the eight languages have minimal utterance units shown in Table 5 available for asking about the addressee's engagement ('What do[are] you do(ing)?') or the identity of something in the speaker and the addressee's sight ('What is this?'), answering those questions ('I sort the passengers.'; 'You[I] do whatever you[I] like.'; 'It is not a thing.'; 'It is an airplane.'), and refusing something the speaker is given by the addressee ('I don't want an elephant.').[26] The morphosyntactic sequences of the units are schematically represented using English glosses with their unbreakable elements being hyphenated as 'what-doing-are.'

[25] However, if vOV is seen in terms of V rather than v, it follows the canonical order.

[26] The capitals B, C, E, F, G, J, K, and W in the tables below represent the initial letter of each language.

Table 5: Morphosyntactic sequences of minimal utterance units for certain pragmatic functions

PRAGMATIC FUNCTION	MINIMAL UTTERANCE UNIT	B	C	E	F	G	J	K	W
Asking about the addressee's engagement: 'What do[are] you do(ing)?' (2)	'what(-)doing-are'	○					○	○	
	'what-are[do]-you do(ing)'			○					○
	'you-are doing-what'		○						
	'what-do-you'				○	○			
Answering a question: 'I sort the passengers.' (3)	'passenger sorting-am'	○					○	○	
	'I-am-sorting passenger'		○	○					
	'am-I-sorting passenger'								○
	'I-sort passenger'				○	○			
Answering a question: 'You[I] do whatever you[I] like.' (4)	'whatever do'	○					○	○	
	'do whatever'		○	○	○	○			○
Asking about the identity of something in sight: 'What is this?' (5a)	'what-is-this?'	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
	'this-what-is?						○	○	
	'this-is-what?'		○						
Answering a question: 'It is not a thing.' (5b)	'not-is thing'	○							
	'it-is(-)not(-)thing'		○	○	○	○			
	'thing-is-not'						○		
	'thing-not-is'							○	
	'not-thing is-it'								○
Answering a question: 'It is an airplane.' (5c)	'airplane(-)is'	○					○	○	○
	'it-is(-)airplane'		○	○	○	○			
Refusing what the speaker is given by the addressee: 'I don't want an elephant.' (6)	'not-am elephant-want'	○							
	'I-not-want elephant'		○		○				
	'I-do[am]-not-want elephant'			○					
	'I-want-not elephant'				○	○			
	'elephant want-not'						○	○	
	'am-I-not-want elephant'								○

Table 6 shows the number of morphosyntactic sequences shared by each pair of the eight languages. It tells us that, as far as the relevant utterance units are concerned, Basque is the closest to Japanese/Korean, while Chinese is the closest primarily to English and secondarily to French/German. Furthermore, Basque does not share any utterance units with Chinese, which in turn, shares no utterance units with Japanese and Korean. These findings match the traditional view of linguistic typology based upon the distinction between SOV and SVO languages.

Table 6 also reveals that Welsh is the closest to English and more or less similar to the other six languages. Notice that it shares at least one utterance unit, two on average, with each other language. This fact is usually not taken into account in the

Table 6: Interlingually shared morphosyntactic sequences

	B	C	E	F	G	J	K	W
B		0	1	1	1	5	5	2
C	0		4	3	3	0	0	1
E	1	4		4	4	1	1	3
F	1	3	4		7	1	1	2
G	1	3	4	7		1	1	2
J	5	0	1	1	1		7	2
K	5	0	1	1	1	7		2
W	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	

discussion of SOV/SVO languages, because VSO languages are treated as a distinct category. If one VSO language (e.g., Welsh) shares a larger number of utterance units with certain SOV (e.g., Japanese/Korean) as well as SVO languages (e.g., French/German) than with certain SVO languages (e.g., Chinese), it cannot be reduced to a matter of distinction between the two fixed categories of SVO and SOV languages. The number of shared utterance units does not necessarily contribute to such a macro-typological categorization of languages. Rather it suggests many more possibilities of grouping languages into more fine-grained types, which constitutes a micro-typological point of view on languages.

First of all, the morphosyntactic variations found in utterances (4), (5a), and (5c) are comparatively small. (4) and (5c) have only two variations: 'whatever do' or 'do whatever'; 'airplane-is' or 'is-airplane.' (5a) finds three variations, but the essential distinction is two-fold: 'what-is?' 'is-what?'. Biases for such bi- or tri-partite differences are very likely to develop classification into only a few types, which has presumably been responsible for traditional versions of linguistic typology (or macro-typology) represented by categorizations between SVO/SOV(/VSO) languages. Remember that OSV or VOS languages are almost always out of mainstream discussions on basic constituent order.

In contrast, utterances (2), (3), (5b), and (6) exhibit fairly larger numbers of variation in morphosyntactic sequences. The first two utterances give four variations: 'what-doing-are,' 'what-are[do]-you-do(ing),' 'you-are doing-what,' and 'what-do-you' in (2); 'passenger sorting-am,' 'I-am-sorting passenger,' 'am-I-sorting passenger,' and 'I-sort passenger' in (3). In (5b), five variations are found ('not-is-thing,' 'it-is-not-thing,' 'thing-is-not,' 'thing-not-is,' and 'not-thing-is-it'), while in (6), six variations are attested ('not-am elephant-want,' 'I-not-want elephant,' 'I-[do]am-not-want elephant,' 'want-not elephant,' 'elephant want-not,' and 'am-I-not-want elephant'). Such multiple variations alert us to the potential oversimplification of categorizing languages into a few types and thus encourage us to appreciate the importance of grouping languages into more fine-grained, multiple types, as illustrated in Table 7.

A cursory look at Table 7 shows that the grouping of BJK and CEFG as well as JK and FG are robust, and, at the same time, that B, E, C, J, K, and W can occasionally stand alone, namely be grouped with no other languages. The CE and CF groupings can be as interesting as the EW, FG, and JK groupings since areal affinity often noticed for the latter does not apply to the former.

A closer look at the ordering of ‘not’ and ‘is’ further suggests the BK grouping, as in Table 8. This microscopic view implies that Korean can share more morphosyntactic sequences of utterance units with Basque than Japanese does. Welsh differs from both the BK and CEFGJ groups, but it can be seen as closer to the BK group in that ‘not’ precedes rather than follows ‘is.’ If we abstract away from the intervention of ‘thing,’ there emerges the BKW grouping.

Table 7: Viable grouping of the eight languages

UTTERANCE TYPE	VIABLE GROUPING
(2)	BJK; EW; C; FG
(3)	BJK; CE; W; FG
(4)	BJK; CEFGW
(5a)	BJKEFGW; (JK); C
(5b)	B; CEFG; J; K; W
(5c)	BJKW; CEFG
(6)	B; CF; E; FG; JK; W

Table 8: Local structure of utterance (5b)

		B	C	E	F	G	J	K	W
‘It is not a thing.’ (5b)	‘not-is’	◯						◯	
	‘is(-)not’		◯	◯	◯	◯	○		
	‘not-thing-is’								◯

As illustrated so far, micro-typology, based on grouping languages in reference to shared utterance structures, can elucidate diverse similarities as well as differences found among languages, which have seldom received sufficient attention in macro-typology, grounded on canonical constituent order. Language studies have benefitted a lot from higher-level abstraction of morphosyntactic structure, phonological structure, and conceptual structure. However, such abstraction might have de-emphasized important procedures of collecting and assorting far more interesting commonalities and diversities found among the world’s languages. Micro-typological approaches to languages can encourage such rudimentary but eventually fruitful procedures in language studies.

5. Unbreakable elements as functional counterparts

A micro-typological approach to languages, focusing on minimal utterance units and their unbreakable elements, can have further implications on crosslinguistic studies. Such units or elements largely correspond to “prepatterned, prefabricated aspects of speech” (Hopper 1998: 167).[27] More importantly, unbreakable elements often coincide with functional counterparts between different languages.

[27] Insofar as trying to speak rather than write target languages, learners do not have to build basic utterance units from scratch. They may concentrate on mastering some frequently used parts (unbreakable elements) of the units and putting them together to shape utterances for their intents.

The minimal utterance units for asking the addressee's engagement like (2), for instance, consist of the predicate for the **event questioned** and the **focus** of the question. As Table 9 shows, the focus precedes the predicate, as in (2B, E-W) and note 12 (n12K), or else the predicate precedes the focus, as in (2C). This contrast indicates a possible grouping of focus-first and predicate-first types of languages. The predicate can be in either a simple form, as in (2E-G) and (n12K), or a continuative form, as in (2B-E, J-K, W). This cross-cutting difference implies a possible grouping into simple-verb and continuative-verb types of languages.

Table 9: Utterance unit structure of *wh*-question about addressee's engagement

	FOCUS	EVENT QUESTIONED	FOCUS		VERB FORM
(2B)	*Zer*	*egiten ari zara*		*?*	continuative
(2C)		*nǐ zài zuò*	*shénme*	*?*	continuative
(2E)	*What*	*do*[*are*] *you do(doing)*		*?*	simple/continuative
(2F)	*Que*	*fais-tu*		*?*	simple
(2G)	*Was*	*machst du*		*?*	simple
(2J)	*nani*	*si-teru-no*		*?*	continuative
(2K)	*mweo*	*ha-goisseo*		*?*	continuative
(n12K)	*mweo*	*ha-neun geo-ya*		*?*	simple
(2W)	*Beth*	*wyt ti'n ei wneud*		*?*	continuative

This internal structure of utterance unit encourages us to view focus and predicate, respectively, as functional counterparts. However, they are not necessarily morphosyntactic counterparts; e.g., *si-teru-no* or *ha-goisseo* is 'doing-are(-you),' not '(you-)are-doing'; *egiten ari zara* is 'doing-in-you.are'; *wyt ti'n ei wneud* is 'are-you-in-its-doing.'

Table 10: Utterance unit structure of *wh*-question about addressee's engagement (alternative)

	FOCUS	EVENT QUESTIONED	
(2B)	*Zer egiten ari zara*		*?*
(2E)	*What do*[*are*] *you*	*do(doing)*	*?*
(0F)	*Qu'est-ce que*	*tu fais*	*?*
(2F)	*Que fais-tu*		*?*
(2G)	*Was machst du*		*?*
(2J)	*nani*	*si-teru-no*	*?*
(2K)	*mweo ha-goisseo*		*?*
(n12K)	*mweo ha-neun geo-ya*		*?*
(2W)	*Beth wyt ti'n*	*ei wneud*	*?*

As pointed out in Table 1, certain strings form unbreakable elements and thus exhibit slightly different phonological groupings of focus or event questioned, as in Table 10.[28] In view of this, too, each language's functional counterpart is far from a morphosyntactic counterpart.

[28] (0F) and (0J) in Tables 10 and 11 are a French and Japanese example not given in the discussion so far.

Table 11: Utterance unit structure of identity question

	FOCUS	THING QUESTIONED	FOCUS	
(5B)	*Zer da*	*gauza hori*		*?*
(5C)		*nà shì*	*shénme dōngxī*	*?*
(5E)	*What is*	*that thing*		*?*
(5F)	*Qu'est-ce que*	*c'est*		*?*
(5G)	*Was ist*	*das*		*?*
(0J)	*na(a)ni*	*sore*		*?*
(5J)		*sore*	*na(a)ni*	*?*
(5K)		*i mulgeon-i*	*mweo-ya*	*?*
(5W)	*Beth yw*	*'r peth*		*?*

On the other hand, the utterances for asking about the identity of something in the speaker/addressee's sight like (5) are composed of the **focus** of *wh*-question and the phrase for the **thing questioned**, as in Table 11. The focus either precedes the phrase, as in (5B, E-G, W) and (0J), or follows it, as in (5C) and (5J-K). The contrast implies another grouping into focus-first and predicate-first types, where Japanese and Korean are grouped with Chinese. Here as well, neither the focus nor the phrase of thing questioned are morphosyntactic counterparts. For example, the Basque, French, German, and Chinese morphosyntactic counterparts of Japanese *na(a)ni* are *zer*, *que*, *was*, and *shénme* rather than *zer da*, *qu'est-ce que*, *was ist*, and *shénme dōngxī*. However, they are certainly functional counterparts.

Likewise, the positive answers to the identity question are made out of two parts: the predicate of **specification** and its **focus**, as shown in Table 12. The focus precedes the predicate in (5B, J-W) and follows it in the other languages. The difference suggests a further grouping into focus-first and predicate-first types, in which English, French, and German are grouped with Chinese. The focus and the predicate are inclined to comprise a phonologically unbreakable element, as indicated in Table 3 above. Such inclination is the strongest in Japanese and Korean, whereby the two parts have merged, as seen in Table 12.

Table 12: Utterance unit structure of positive answer to identity question

	FOCUS	SPECIFICATION	FOCUS	
(5B)	*Hegazkin bat*	*da*		.
(5C)		*shì*	*yī jià fēijī*	.
(5E)		*It's*	*an aeroplane*	.
(5F)		*C'est*	*un avion*	.
(5G)		*Das ist*	*ein Flugzeug*	.
(5J)	*hikooki-na-nda*			.
(5K)	*nae bihaenggi-ya*			.
(5W)	*Awyren*	*yw hi*		.

The negative answers seem slightly more liable to consist of three rather than two parts, as shown in Table 13: the **given** element, the predicate of **denial**, and its **focus**.[29] The given elements ordinarily come first in most of the languages but last in Welsh alone. The focus either follows the predicate, as in (5B-G, W), or precedes it, as in (5J-K). Here again, the focus and the predicate of denial tend to form an unbreakable element.[30] Such tendency is especially remarkable in English, German, Japanese, Korean, and Welsh; therefore, the two parts have merged in Table 13. Interestingly, none of the eight languages puts the focus before the predicate as a separate element. This implicates that the focus of denial is more apt to merge into the predicate than the focus of specification.

Table 13: Utterance unit structure of negative answer to identity question

	GIVEN	FOCUS	DENIAL	FOCUS	GIVEN	
(5B)			*Ez da*	*gauza bat*		.
(5C)	*nà*		*bùshì*	*dōngxī*		.
(5E)	*That is*		*not a thing*			.
(5F)			*Ce n'est pas*	*une chose*		.
(5G)	*Das ist*		*kein Ding*			.
(5J)		*sinamono-zyanai-yo*				.
(5K)		*mulgeon-i aniya*				.
(5W)			*Nid peth*		*yw hi*	.

It should be noted, here as well, that what serve as functional counterparts are mostly not morphosyntactic counterparts. In morphosyntactic terms, the English counterpart of German *kein Ding* and Welsh *Nid peth* is *no thing*. Likewise, Basque *es da* and

[29] For "pragmatic roles" like "given," "topic," and "focus," see Comrie (1989: 62–65).

[30] In the English utterance, the GIVEN can be *That* with the denial *isn't a (thing)*, as in *That isn't a thing*.

Chinese *bùshì* correspond to Japanese *zyanai-yo* and Korean *aniya* instead of *sinamono-zyanai-yo* and *mulgeon-i aniya*.

In conceptual terms, *wh*-questions prompt the addressee to fill in a gap (a participant, location, or setting in the event conception he or she has in mind).[31] Chinese is the type of language that requires speakers to specify the event conception before the gap, while the other seven languages are the type that requires speakers to designate the gap before the event. The positive answer helps the addressee to "bring in" an appropriate entity to the gap, while the negative answer allows the addressee to "remove" an inappropriate entity from the gap (Izutsu 2014: 68).[32]

A micro-typology reveals further groupings of languages. Basque, French, German, and Korean are a type of language that conflates the focus of *wh*-question and the event questioned (Table 10). Japanese and Korean are a language type that puts the focus before the predicate of specification and denial with no break between them (Tables 12 and 13), whereas Basque, Chinese, English, French, and German are another type that puts the focus after the predicate with a permissible break between them (Table 12).[33] Welsh is a language that lies between these two types (Tables 12 and 13). Chinese, English, and German form a language type that encourages speakers to mention the given elements before the predicate and focus of denial, while the others do not necessarily (Table 13).

6. Conclusion

This paper demonstrated that crosslinguistic instances of minimal utterance units are far from being morphosyntactic counterparts. In many cases, they can be best seen as counterparts in pragmatic function and consist of unbreakable elements that usually coincide with phonological or prosodic units. In crosslinguistic and typological investigations, therefore, we need to pursue functional rather than morphosyntactic counterparts.

Our micro-typology differs from a widely accepted macro-typology in the view of basic constituent order. The notion of canonical order in macro-typology neglects the differences in the person of subject entity and the mood or speech-act of utterances. Assuming that the typical constituent order in utterances varies with a first/second/third-person subject, we picked up an interrogative utterance with a second-person subject, declarative utterances with a first/second-person subject, and similar utterances with a

[31] For "conceptual archetypes" like "participant," "location," and "setting," see Langacker (2008: 355).

[32] For such a discourse-based conception of an entity "brought in" or "introduced" to the event conception evoked, see Izutsu and Kim (2020: 118, 131−132).

[33] German hardly permits a break between the predicate and focus of denial. Basque puts the focus before predicate of denial. Some languages thus treat denial and specification differently in predicate-focus alignments.

third-person subject from parallel texts of eight languages with different basic constituent order.

Minimal utterance units and unbreakable elements employed in specific occasions are more or less likely stored, on their own, in speakers' mind as "prefabricated," "prepatterned," "formulaic," "constructional," or "idiomatic" items. Although such units and elements are often analyzable in terms of abstract morphosyntactic organization, the order of grammatical elements like S, V, and O *per se* does not provide us so realistic an overall picture of language as human practice. Micro-typology referencing to functional counterparts both on the level of utterance and on the level of pragmatic roles (e.g., given/predicate/focus) can help develop a more feasible theory and viable practice of typological language studies. There is a lot more work to be done in continuing this kind of micro-typological research, which reveals more similarities in languages that have been disguised by macro-typological classifications of languages into oversimplistic categories like SVO/SOV/VSO.

References

Ariel, M. 2012. "Research Paradigms in Pragmatics." In Allan, K. and K. M. Jaszczolt (eds.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics*, 23−45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bag, J. 1989. *Eorin Wangja.* Seoul: Jageun Pyeonghwa.

Comrie, B. 1981 [1989]. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology* (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cuffe, T. V. F. 1995. *The Little Prince.* London. Penguin.

Dafis, L. 1975 [2007]. *Y Tywysog Back.* Neckarsteinach: Edition Tintenfass.

Floyd, S., G. Rossi, and N. J. Enfield (eds.). 2020. *Getting Others to Do Things: A Pragmatic Typology of Recruitments.* Berlin: Language Science Press.

Greenberg, J. H. (ed.). 1963 [1966]. *Universals of Language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. and C. M. I. M. Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.

Hopper, P. J. 1998. "Emergent Grammar." In Tomasello, M. (ed.) *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure*, 155−175. Mahwah and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Horie, K. and P. Pardeshi. 2009. *Gengo no Taiporoji: Ninchi Ruikeiron no Apurochi* [Linguistic typology: a cognitive-typological approach]. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Izutsu, K. 2014. "The Japanese Auxiliary *-Noda* and Its Comparable Linguistic Forms in Korean and Ainu: A Force-Dynamic Account." In Nam, S., H. Ko, and J. Jun (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 21, 59−73. Stanford: CSLI.

Izutsu, K., M. N. Izutsu, and Y. Kim. 2021. "Grammatical Relation Sensitivity: Some Different Conceptions of Pre/Post-Predicative Structures." In Jeon, H-S., P. Sells, Z. You, S. Kita, and J. Yeon (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 28. Stanford: CSLI. (Full paper available at https://web.stanford.edu/group/cslipublications/cslipublications/ja-ko-contents/JK28/jako28-posters.shtml.)

Izutsu, K. and Y. Kim. 2018. "Who I am Asking about: What the Sentence Endings Imply about

the Unexpressed Subjects in *Wh*-Questions." *Investigationes Linguisticae* 41, 43−56.
Izutsu, K and Y. Kim. 2020. "Linguistic Manifestations of Fictive Change Participants: Apparent Alternations between the Accusative and the Dative/Comitative Cases in Korean and Japanese." *Asian Languages and Linguistics* 1, 107−146.
Izutsu, K. and T. Koguma. 2019. "Experience Report Starters and Their Evoked Speech Event Conceptions: Conceptual Overlap of Interpersonal and Ideational Metafunctions." *Ningen Bunka* 46: 56−63. The University of Shiga Prefecture.
Jeong, S. 1973 [1994]. *Eorin Wangja.* Seoul: Munye Chulpan.
Langacker, R. W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Leitgeb, G. and J. Leitgeb. 1950 [1998]. *Der Kleine Prinz.* Düsseldorf: Karl Rauch Verlag.
Naito, A. 1953 [2000]. *Hoshi no Ojisama.* Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
Sornicola, R. 2011. "Interaction of Syntactic and Pragmatic Factors on Basic Word Order in the Languages of Europe." In Bernini, G. and M. L. Schwarts (eds.) *Pragmatic Organization of Discourse in the Languages of Europe*, 357−544. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Saint-Exupéry, A. 1946 [1999]. *Le Petit Prince.* Paris: Gallimard.
Tanigawa, K. 2006. *Hoshi no Ojisama.* Tokyo: Popurasha.
Woods, K. 1943 [1971]. *The Little Prince.* Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
Zhāng, J. 2010. *Xiǎo Wángzǐ.* Táiběi: Mùmǎ Wénhuà.
Zōng, B. 1992. *Xiǎo Wángzǐ.* Táiběi: Zhìwén Chūbǎnshè.
Zubizarreta, P. 2001 [2011]. *Printze Txikia.* Donostia: Elkar Argitaletxea.