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1. Introduction

Both Dongolawi¹ and Kenzi² are Nile-Nubian languages, belonging to the Nubian language family. Along with Tama, Nyima, Nara, and the extinct Meroitic language, Nubian represents the Northern branch of the Eastern Sudanic language group.³ This group is ultimately part of the Nilo-Saharan language phylum.

The Dongolawi language area is situated around the town of Dongola in Northern Sudan, the Kenzi language area around Aswan and Kom Ombo, both in southern Egypt. In spite of being 800 km apart from each other, the Dongolawi and Kenzi languages show significant similarities to each other in all linguistic aspects. There are

¹ ‘Dongolawi’ is a term used by outsiders. The speakers call their language ‘Andaandi’ (meaning ‘which belongs to us’) but do not give a specific name to themselves. ‘Oshkir’ is another outsider term applied by Nobiin speakers. I use the term ‘Dongolawi’ as in other academic papers.

² ‘Kenzi’ as an ethnic group and ‘Kenzi’ as a language name are also terms used by outsiders. The people call their language and their ethnic group ‘Mattokki’ (with different interpretations of the term). In order to stay consistent with the term ‘Dongolawi’ I use the terms ‘Kenzi’ for the speakers and ‘Kenzi’ for the language.

³ Rilly, "The Linguistic Position of Meroitic."
different theories about the reason for that closeness depending on historical assumptions.

The early development in classification of the Nile Nubian languages is summarized by Herzog:

Die vor 1879 gedruckten Abhandlungen schwanken ausnahmslos nur zwischen zwei oder drei Gruppen, je nachdem, ob der Author die Kenuzi und Danagla als Einheit betrachtete.4

In the 20th century due to the similarities between the two languages most Western scholars and their publications regard Dongolawi and Kenzi as one single language.5

The latest edition of the Ethnologue regards Dongolawi and Kenzi as separate languages, for sociolinguistic reasons.6 Many speakers of Dongolawi and Kenzi believe that they speak different languages7 although they also realize that their languages are closely related. In the following I distinguish between Dongolawi and Kenzi providing evidence of some linguistic differences between both languages.

The most important study on the Dongolawi Nubian language in the 20th century is the grammar by Armbruster8 with other grammars written earlier. On Kenzi Nubian spoken in southern Egypt in the 20th century there are grammatical studies by Massenbach and the Kenzi mother-tongue speaker Abdel-Hafiz.9

This paper looks at coordination10 with goon and bisyndetic =gon11 in the context of adversative and contrast marking in both Dongolawi and Kenzi.

4 Herzog, Die Nubier, p. 24. Translated: "Studies published before 1879 vacillated without exception between only two or three [language] groups, depending on whether the writer regarded the Kenuzi and Danagla as a single entity." The third language group Herzog talks about are the Nobii.
6 During my travels I have never heard ‘Dongola’ used as a language name by any speakers of the language. Dongola plainly is the name of the most important town in the Dongola reach with Old Dongola being the capital of former Old Nubia and modern day Dongola being the seat of the present governorate.
7 A common exclamation among Kenuzi when listening to Dongolawi is: "That sounds like Fadidja Nubian." Fadidja Nubian is the other Egyptian Nile Nubian language.
8 Armbruster, Dongolese Nubian: A Grammar, based on data collected in the 1910s
9 Massenbach, Wörterbuch des nubischen Kunuz-Dialektes; Abdel-Hafiz, A Reference Grammar of Kunuz Nubian. Abdel-Hafiz continues publishing topics relating to the Egyptian Nile-Nubian languages unfortunately mainly in journals with limited availability, cf. Abdel-Hafiz, "Nubian Relative Clauses." His most recent publication is Abdel-Hafiz, "Coordinate Constructions in Fadicca and English."
10 Haspelmath, Coordinating Constructions, p. 4: "A coordinating construction consists of two or more coordinands."
11 In our case =gon occurring once in each of the two coordinands.
Besides conjunction and disjunction adversative coordination is one of the main types of coordination. Crystal defines adversative as follows:

**In grammar and semantics,** a form of construction which expresses an antithetical circumstance. Adversative meaning can be expressed in several grammatical ways (as ‘adversatives’), such as through a **conjunction** (*but*), **adverbial** (*however, nevertheless, yet, in spite of that, on the other hand*), or **preposition** (*despite, except, apart from, notwithstanding*). 12

Crystal’s definition is restricted to the English language. Other scholars look at the notion of adversativity from a typological perspective and suggest more refined terms and concepts of adversativity.

Both, Malchukov and Haspelmath 13 begin with a general definition describing adversative coordination simply as ‘but’-coordination.

Haspelmath considers the term concessive and its conceptual proximity to adversative: “In English, [...] concessive clauses with ‘although’ are often roughly equivalent to ‘but’ coordinations.” 14 That corresponds with Malchukov’s observation: “Many authors use the terms concessive and adversative interchangeably to refer to the function of denial of expectations,” 15 adding later “that the adversative meaning is more general than the concessive.” 16

A paraphrase of adversativity is presented by Zeevat: “The content has been suggested to be false in the context.” 17 exemplified by German ‘doch.’ I.e. adversativity challenges a previous assumption, corresponding to Malchukov’s ‘concessive.’ Further terms used to describe the concessive are “frustration” 18 and “countering.” 19

In the following I use ‘adversative’ in a general meaning with ‘concessive’ in a restricted notion, as Malchukov above.

A further category is contrast denoting “The new content addresses the old topic with its polarity inverted.” 20 Malchukov 21 emphasises the many similarities and few differences between the two propositions which make up the contrast. The contrast itself is established between one or more of the differences.

---

14 HASPELMATH, “Coordination,” p. 28.
16 Ibid., p. 180.
17 ZEEVAT, “Particles,” p. 100.
19 LEVINSOHN, Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis, p. 91.
20 ZEEVAT, “Particles,” p. 100.
Sometimes the term ‘contrast’ is used in a wider sense similar to the adversative in its general definition.\(^{22}\) In order to distinguish between ‘contrast’ in its general and its specific meaning Malchukov also speaks of “semantic opposition”\(^ {23}\) and Levinsohn of “prototypical contrast.”\(^ {24}\)

I use ‘contrast’ in its specific meaning. One way to test for specific ‘contrast’ in the English meta-language is to add ‘in contrast’ to the second coordinand.

Further categories of adversativity are

- ‘mirative’ dealing with new, unexpected, surprising, yet not necessarily unintentional information.\(^ {25}\) A good way for testing is to add the word ‘suddenly.’ It is related to the concessive and until recently not distinguished from it;
- ‘restrictive’ meaning “[…] the second conjunct refutes the inference that the event referred to in the first conjunct has been (completely and successfully) realized.”\(^ {26}\) For Longacre\(^ {27}\) ‘restrictive’ and ‘contrastive’ belong together, as indeed sometimes only the context makes a statement ‘restrictive’ or ‘contrastive’;
- ‘correction’ meaning “the content was denied in the common ground”\(^ {28}\), or defined as “not x, but y.”\(^ {29}\) Correction eliminates an assumption which usually is not made explicit.\(^ {30}\)

As specific data regarding mirative, restrictive and correction are limited, in the following I do not include it. That takes me closer to Horn\(^ {31}\) whose work on negation dates earlier than the other referenced works on adversativity and shows more limited differentiation, like regarding correction as part of the concessive. That leaves two kinds of adversativity I deal with:

- concessive\(^ {32}\) / denial of expectation;
- contrastive\(^ {33}\) / semantic opposition.

\(^{22}\) Cf. Blakemore, *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning*, p. 54: ‘… it [‘but’] encodes the information that there is some kind of contrast. The problem is that the nature of the contrastive relation seems to vary across contexts.’


\(^{24}\) Levinsohn, Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis, p. 92.


\(^{26}\) Ibid., p. 180.

\(^{27}\) Longacre, “Sentences as combination of clauses,” p. 378.

\(^{28}\) Zeevat, “Particles,” p. 100.


\(^{30}\) Horn, *A Natural History of Negation*, p. 404.

\(^{31}\) Ibid., pp. 404, 409.

\(^{32}\) As used by Malchukov, “Towards a Semantic Typology of Adversative and Contrast Marking,” p. 179. I do not employ the term ‘adversative’ in order to avoid misunderstanding. An English example sentence is: ‘Although I like Beethoven, my daughter does not enjoy any classical music.’ (I.e. I had expected that my daughter would like at least some classical music.)

\(^{33}\) An English example sentence is: ‘While I like Beethoven, you like the Beatles.’
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By looking at only two kinds of adversativity I have to rely less on context and intuition which varies across contexts.\textsuperscript{34}

In concessive and contrastive sentences there are two coordi-nands (coordinate clauses) which are coordinated by a marker\textsuperscript{35} (in the English meta-language ‘but,’ ‘although,’ ‘however,’ ‘while’). With changed intonation English concessive and contrastive sentences can be uttered without a marker, too.

While not excluding, Zeevat and Malchukov do not specifically include the discourse level. Whereas with most proverb collections proverbs are written down in isolation they belong to an oral discourse which needs to be taken into consideration.

For adversativity in the sense of ‘adversative passive’ and ‘malefactivity’ which “expresses an event that happens to the detriment of the subject argument” I refer to Payne.\textsuperscript{36}

The adversative markers discussed in this paper will be ‘mono-syndetic’ (occurring once) or ‘bisyndetic’ (occurring twice). If sub-/coordinators are omitted one speaks of ‘asyndetic’ coordination which is “especially [used] in order to achieve an economical or dramatic form of expression.”\textsuperscript{37} As proverbs are economical, asyndetic coordination is to be expected wherever possible.

Another reason for the existence of asyndetic coordination is provided by Levinsohn, speaking of a ‘connective’ instead of a marker:

If two propositions are in a countering relation, many languages do not mark the relation between them by means of a connective unless other conditions are fulfilled.\textsuperscript{38}

In the above mentioned Nubian grammars\textsuperscript{39} the term ‘adversative’ or any other related terms do not occur.

In Armbruster\textsuperscript{40} a Dongolawi coordinator expressing ‘but, on the contrary’ is listed under the heading ‘The Infixed Conjunction.’ Un-

\textsuperscript{34} Intuition in the related field of contrast and (non-)truth conditional meaning is discussed in Blakemore, Relevance and Linguistic Meaning, p. 37.

\textsuperscript{35} In this paper ‘marker’ means an explicate coordinator and subordinator. Haspel-math, “Coordination,” and others prefer the term ‘coordinator’ to ‘marker.’ However as its derivation ‘coordination’ includes constructions without a marker, I apply the term ‘coordinator’ when this paper branches out to adversative coordination without markers.

\textsuperscript{36} Payne, Describing Morphosyntax, p. 208. See also Tsuboi, “Malefactivity in Japanese.”

\textsuperscript{37} Crystal, A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics, p. 450. For the definitions of these terms see also Haspelmath, Coordinating Constructions.

\textsuperscript{38} Levinsohn, Self-Instruction Materials on Non-Narrative Discourse Analysis, p. 29.

\textsuperscript{39} Armbruster, Dongolese Nubian: A Grammar; Massenbach, Wörterbuch des nubischen Kunuzi-Dialektes; and Abdel-Hafiz, A Reference Grammar of Kunuz Nubian.

\textsuperscript{40} Armbruster, Dongolese Nubian: A Grammar, §§ 4484, 6093.
der the heading ‘The Single Positive Verb-Concretion’\(^4\) one finds a few clauses with adversative meaning without discussing their adversativity. In the chapter ‘Co-ordinate Sentences’\(^5\) there is no mentioning of any coordination I call adversative.

When looking at Kenzi grammatical structures representing German ‘obgleich’ (‘although’) Massenbach begins with the remark “Eigentümlicher Gebrauch.”\(^6\) She leaves it with two example sentences and one grammatical comment.

Abdel-Hafiz talks about ‘concession’ as part of ‘Adverb Clauses.’\(^4\) Just a little bit more detailed than Massenbach there are three example sentences and some short explanations.

In another publication Abdel-Hafiz looks at “Coordinate Constructions in Fadicca and English” with Fadicca or Fadidja being a Nile-Nubian language. A third of a page is dedicated to “adversative coordination”\(^5\) introducing Fadidja \textit{tan} as “coordinator” of “a concession subordinate clause.”\(^6\) In one example sentence \textit{tan} is interpreted as suffix, in another one as separate word. No other function of \textit{tan} is introduced. The paper does not research whether there are Fadidja “concession subordinate clauses” without \textit{tan}.

The same paper also talks about “contrastive coordination”\(^4\) meaning disjunction and not including the propositional level.\(^6\)

Adversative and related coordinate constructions analyzed in this paper are taken from Dongolawi and Kenzi proverbial data collected from 2009 onwards. Currently the corpus consists of about 225 Dongolawi proverbs\(^4\) and a similar number from Kenzi with \textit{gon} and bisyndetic \textit{gon} occurring regularly.\(^5\) In the following Dongolawi proverbs will be marked by dp and a running number; Kenzi proverbs by kp and a running number.

\(^4\) Ibid., §§ 5731–7.
\(^5\) Ibid., §§ 6337–44.
\(^4\) Abdel-Hafiz, \textit{A Reference Grammar of Kunuz Nubian}, p. 269.
\(^6\) Cf. ibid., I name the marker of a subordinate clause ‘subordinator.’
\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 7, 8.
\(^6\) Adversativity is not included in Werner’s \textit{Grammatik des Nobiin}.
\(^4\) In this paper I do not distinguish between proverbs and wise sayings.
\(^5\) Except for a proverb collection by a Dongolawi from Xannaag village (Hāmid Khabīr AlShaich, \textit{حكم و امثال نوبية من دنقلا; about 125 proverbs}) and another much smaller one from a Dongolawi from Magasasir Island (Taha A. Taha, “Proverbs in a threatened Language Variety in Africa”; about 10 proverbs) no published material was used. Some Nubians (the Dongolawi El-Shafie El-Guzuuli also from Xannaag village, the Fadidja Maher Habboob and the Kenzi Meikki Muhammad from Maharaga village) presented their own hand-written collections of proverbs to me. All these proverbs were checked and discussed with Dongolawi and Kenzi mother tongue speakers especially in order to discover their meanings and write them down according to orthographical rules (based on \textit{El-Guzuuli & Jaeger, “Aspects of Dongolawi Roots and Affixes”} and \textit{Jaeger & Hissein “Aspects of Kenzi-Dongolawi Phonology Related to Orthography”}) leading the co-investigators to remember further proverbs.
Finnegan observes some difference between proverbs and day-to-day speech:

[...] it is clear that some sort of heightened speech, in one form or another, is commonly used in proverbs: and that this serves to set them apart from ordinary speech.51

In our case where Dongolawi and Kenzi exhibit a strong Arabic influence, proverbs being more conservative may enable us to recognize certain Nubian grammatical features more clearly. Therefore keeping in mind that proverbs
- represent non-narrative text;
- employ a restricted amount of grammar only;
- have a tendency to be more conservative linguistically,
proverbs still provide a beneficial starting point of investigation into linguistic analyses and especially into adversativity. Proverbs contradict, challenge, convince, correct, and eliminate existing assumptions. Proverbs with 'but' coordinator point to a wider argumentative discourse as described by Reagan when discussing Shona proverbs: “The free use of tsumo [Shona proverbs] is the accepted way of winning an argument.”52

Therefore it is expected to encounter adversative coordinating among proverbs at least as frequently as among average narrative texts.

The next section reviews insights into adversativity from non-English/non-Nubian languages of different language phyla. Afterwards I deal with clauses coordinated by *goon* and bisyndetic *=gon*, followed by clauses without any marker, i.e. ‘juxtaposed clauses’ and a summary. That allows some insight into the use and non-use of these two coordinators. Where available, results from proverbial data are compared with narrative texts.53

2. Adversative in non-Nubian languages

In the Nile-Nubian languages any reference related to adversativity is sparse, as König laments in general:

Any attempt to give a cross-linguistic characterization of concessive relations and the way they are expressed in the world’s languages is constrained by the fact that we do not have enough relevant information from a representative sample of languages. ... Conces-

52 Reagan, *Non-Western Educational Traditions*, p. 64.
53 Taken from Massenbach, *Nubische Texte im Dialekt der Kunūzi und der Dongolawi*. 
sive relations have always aroused less interest than conditional or causal ones.\footnote{König, “Concessive connectives and concessive sentences,” p. 145.}

Fortunately since 1988 research into adversative and related coordination in languages besides English has been increased and published.\footnote{Kibrik, “Coordination in Upper Kuskokwim Athabaskan”; Malchukov, “Towards a Semantic Typology of Adversative and Contrast Marking”; Haspelmath, “Coordination”; Longacre, “Sentences as Combination of Clauses”; Levinsohn, Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis; and Ibid., Self-Instruction Materials on Non-Narrative Discourse Analysis. While Longacre, “Sentences as Combination of Clauses” does not speak explicitly about adversative, he deals “with underlying but relations. […] the notion of contrast requires paired lexical oppositions” (p. 378).}

While working on non-Indo-European languages the terminology for adversative functions has been refined from formerly two (concessive and contrastive) to the ones described in the preceding section.

Kibrik worked on the Upper Kuskokwim Athabaskan language in interior Alaska, belonging to the Eyak-Athabaskan language phylum. Its main adversative marker ˀedinh\footnote{Kibrik, “Coordination in Upper Kuskokwim Athabaskan” glosses it as ‘but.’} “tends to appear at the clause boundary, but in terms of intonation it may belong either to the first [placed at the end] or to the second clause [placed at the beginning].”\footnote{Ibid., p. 549.}

Malchukov starts with Russian which has different markers for denial-of-expectation and semantic opposition, while semantic opposition and additive have the same marker, using Malchukov’s terminology. Further language material is presented from Altaic-Tungusic languages from Eastern Russia:

- Manchu has different markers for the (non-adversative) additive and adversative (concessive), with contrast unmarked.
- Even uses the same marker for the whole spectrum of additive, contrastive and adversative.

The opposite of Even is Koryak (far Eastern Russia), a Chukotko-Kamchatkan/Paleosiberian language where different markers are used for the additive (non-adversative), the contrastive and the adversative.

Longacre worked on Ibaloi (Philippines), belonging to the Austronesian language phylum,\footnote{Language examples: Longacre, “Sentences as combination of clauses,” pp. 390, 392.} and on Wojokeso\footnote{Language examples: Ibid., p. 409.} (alternatively Safeyoka, Papua New Guinea) belonging to the Trans-New Guinean language phylum. Regarding Ibaloi he writes:

\footnote{Language examples: Longacre, “Sentences as combination of clauses,” pp. 390, 392.}
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The most characteristic conjunction in the Ibaloi antithetical sentence is nem 'but.' A further conjunction jey 'while, but' is also used here, and there is occasional absence of conjunction (juxtaposition).  

The coordinator nem occurs at the beginning of the second coordinate clause. In the example sentences it marks contrast yet not concessive.

Levinsohn illustrates the 'countering connective' through language examples from the Niger-Congo language phylum. He exemplifies adversativity on discourse level by the marker ka from Lobala (Democratic Republic of Congo). ka is a marker of 'counter evidence' indicating "a backward countering relation between two utterances," occurring in narrative discourse:

\[
\text{ka always occurs in sentence-initial position. It never occurs midsentence between two clauses. As a result it never functions as a straight contrast marker. [...] ka commonly introduces narrator comment into the flow of action.} \]

Its effect is that the hearer is constrained "to access two optimally relevant assumptions that counter each other." Some of the above references describe where within the same function adversative markers are employed and where not. i.e. some adversative sentences are juxtaposed, others not, depending on the context. As Levinsohn observed in Kalinga (Philippines, Austronesian language phylum), the marker yakon "but [...] is not used in hortatory texts" and "in narratives [...] is used only when the countering proposition is important or relevant to what follows."

Even more complex rules of adversative marking are found in Bariai (Papua New Guinea, Austronesian language phylum) and Dungra Bhil (India, Indo-European language phylum).

Contrastive coordination does not necessarily occur through special markers. It also employs syntactic devises. In Mono (Dem-
ocratic Republic of Congo) the ‘prototypical contrast’ is achieved through left-dislocation.68

3. Clauses coordinated with goon

Two markers used for coordinating or subordinating Dongolawi and Kenzi proverbs consisting of at least two propositions are goon and =gon. Non-proverbal Dongolawi sentences with goon are:

duulen goon, meedigi unyurmun. – Although he is old, he knows nothing.

nog buun goon, elkori. – While walking, I found it.

In Kenzi one hears:

oddin goon, jellir juusu. – Although he was ill, he went to work.

boodbuun goon, digirsu. – While running, he fell down.

goon ends the first of two coordinated clauses. The same marker is used for adversative and non-adversative coordination. In the first example goon denotes concessive (rendered as ‘although’), in the second non-adversative temporal simultaneity (rendered as ‘while’).

While Massenbach’s and Abdel-Hafiz’s Kenzi grammars gloss goon as one morpheme, Armbruster interprets it as two suffixes: The object marker followed by -on. Armbruster writes gi+on as gon with short vowel. In Dongolawi conversation I hear both, long and short vowel. Altogether the vowel-length is difficult to determine as in spoken Dongolawi the final on (if long vowel) or final n (if short vowel) is dropped frequently. In Kenzi when pronounced properly, there is always a long vowel however the final on is dropped even more regularly than in Dongolawi leading Abdel-Hafiz to write go.73 As Kenzi always has long vowel and Dongolawi varies between long and short vowel I standardize and write goon in both.

68 Levinsohn, Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis, p. 92. His ‘prototypical contrast’ corresponds to the contrastive.
69 Dongolawi example sentences are provided by El-Shafie El-Guzuuli, p.c., also the following example sentences marked by ds. Kenzi example sentences from Abdel-Hafiz, p.c.
71 While otherwise I interpret =gi as accusative suffix when discussing Armbruster’s writings I employ his terminology (e.g. object). – Armbruster divides other suffixes beginning with g similarly, e.g., for him =ged also begins with an object marker followed by -ed.
72 As among speakers from Khannaag.
73 Abdel-Hafiz, A Reference Grammar of Kunuz Nubian, pp. 267, 269.
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In the following I distinguish the polarity of coordinated clauses; i.e. whether a proposition is in the affirmative or in the negative; ‘affirmative’ defined as ‘type of sentence or verb which has no marker of negation’\(^{74}\) or ‘absence of negation’\(^{75}\) and ‘negative’ being the opposite, resulting in at least four cases of polarity. I am aware that that distinction may not be sufficient:

Perhaps we simply need better criteria for distinguishing denials of truth from assertions of falsity.\(^{76}\)

Additionally I distinguish whether the subject remains or changes.

3.1 Affirmative–affirmative propositional order with same subject\(^{77}\)

\[\text{갑돈 앱닙 쌍돈, 이신 엽게 아른.}\]
\[gaalon attr buun goon, essin eerked diin.\]

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{gaalo}=n & \text{attr} & \text{buu}-n & \text{goon} \\
\text{jar}=\text{GEN} & \text{near} & \text{STAT}-2\text{SG} & \text{SUB} \\
\text{essi}=n & \text{eer}=\text{ged} & \text{dii}-n \\
\text{water}=\text{GEN} & \text{desire}=\text{INS} & \text{die}-2\text{SG} \\
\end{array}\]

“Although you are near the [water] jar, you die from thirst.”

\[\text{으르케 바늬 쌍돈, 오소요케 아믈린.}\]
\[urked buun goon, usudked imbelin.\]

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ur}=\text{ged} & \text{buu}-n & \text{goon} \\
\text{head}=\text{INS} & \text{STAT}-3\text{SG} & \text{SUB} \\
\text{usud}=\text{ged} & \text{imbel}-\text{in} \\
\text{anus}=\text{INS} & \text{stand.up}-3\text{SG} \\
\end{array}\]

“Although he rests with the head, he stands up with the anus.”

\(^{74}\) Crystal, A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics, p. 15.

\(^{75}\) Horn, A Natural History of Negation, p. 32. While this definition is very short on p. 30 he goes into more detail about contrasting affirmative and negative: “[…] the closest equivalent of the negative proposition within this system is predicate denial, in which a predicate […] is denied of a subject s.”

\(^{76}\) Ibid., p. 399. An alternative way would have been to distinguish between adversative coordinated clauses occurring simultaneously and occurring one after the other. However a quick run-through showed that results would show less consistency.

\(^{77}\) There are no example sentences where the subject is stated explicitly. Abbreviations used in the analysis of the proverbs are based on the Leipzig glossing rules: 1, 2 – 1st, 2nd, 3rd person; ACC – accusative; ALL2 – allative with =gir; CAUS – causative; COND – conditional; CONJ – conjunction; COORD – coordinator; COP – copula; DEF – definite; DUR – durative; FUT – future; GEN – genitive; IMP – imperative; INS – instrumental; INT – intensifier; LOC – locative; NEG – negation; NEUT – marker of the so-called present tense; NR – nominalizer; PASS – passive; PCPT – participle; POSS – possessive; PRTE – preterite with -ko(o); PRTE2 – preterite with -s; PL – plural; PST – with participles, the so-called past tense; REPT – repetitive; SG – singular; STAT – stative; SUB – subordinator; SUBJ – subject.
Although he stops at the west [bank], he asks for the news of the east [bank].

Although they see the hyena, they trace its footprint.

Although he owns five goats, his children do not find enough to eat.

Although he is satisfied, his hand does not drip water.

While here goon is optional it is necessary in the following Kenzi proverb.
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kojir=$\ast gi$ kokki-$n$
ppeg=$\ast$ acc knock-3sg

"Although he has not bought a donkey, he hammers a peg."79

\[\text{KAMGI D\=AN M\=ENIN G\=ON, IPP\=IGI \=A S\=ANCOY.}\]
\[\text{kamgi jaan}^{80} \text{ meenin goon, irrigi aa jaansu.}\]

kam=$\ast$ gi jaan meen-in goon
camel=ACC buy be.not-3sg SUB
irri=$\ast$ gi aag jaan-s-u
rope=ACC DUR buy-PRT2-3SG

"Although he had not bought a camel, he bought a bridle."

\[\text{hanugi egir meenin goon, ossigi aa walagi.}\]
\[\text{"Although he does not ride the donkey, he shakes the leg."}\]

\[\text{tii jaan meenin goon, irrigi aa kaashra.}\]
\[\text{"Although they do not buy a cow, they search for the rope."}\]

\[\text{SHIBILLE U\=UWE M\=ENIN G\=ON, APIC D\=ADIN ADEMI\=GI \=A ORIGPIN.}\]
\[\text{shibille uuwe meen-in goon, aris d\=ajin ademig \=agogjirin.}\]

shibille uuwe meen-in goon
kite call be.not-3sg SUB
aris daaji-$n$ adem=i=$\ast$ gi aag
groom roam-3SG man=PL=ACC DUR
ogij-r-in invite-neut-3sg

"Although he did not call the kite, he roamed around inviting the men."

With some of the above proverbs the subject remains (or is related), the verbs and possible accusatives are related to each other with at least one item being contrasted using the proverbial stylistic features of parallelism through synonyms and antonyms. That speaks in favour of contrastive coordination. In my rendering I have decided for concessive coordination, with the assumption being challenged not made explicit, as that is nearer my co-investigators' ren-

79 A wooden (sometimes metal) peg is hammered into the ground in order to tether the donkey.
80 One Kenzi speaker said jaanin, conjugating the first verb, too. However, I stick with the standard form.
81 Taken from a narrative text in Massenbach, Nubische Texte im Dialekt der Kun\=uzi und der Dongolawi, p. 22. For the example sentences I use Massenbach's orthography. In the current orthography the second word would be uuwe meenin goon.
dering. In all the above Dongolawi proverbs *goon* is not optional, it is required.\(^{82}\)

In the Kenzi proverbs *goon* occurs negated as *meenin goon*\(^{83}\) in the same position as *goon* (i.e. at the end of the first clause) and with the preceding verb in the neutral tense like in a serial verb construction where only the last verb is inflected. Therefore *meenin* is interpreted as the last verb of a serial verb construction with *meen* being a kind of verb of negation meaning ‘not to be’ or ‘not to happen now’ as in:

\[
\text{ⲕⲗⲉ̄ ⲉⲛⲛⲁ ⲓ̄ ⲙⲉ̄ⲛⲉⲗⲅⲓ ⲁ̄ ⲃⲉ̄ⲣⲕⲙⲟⲩⲩⲓ.} \\
\text{kallee enna ii *meenelgi* aa beerkidmunu.}
\]

\[
\text{kallee enna ii } \text{meen-el=gi} \\
\text{droppings 2sg.poss hand be.not-pcpt.pst=acc} \\
\text{aag beer-kiddi-munu} \\
\text{dur be.satisfied-caus-neg.3sg}
\]

“He is **not** satisfied by the droppings of your hand.”

Inflection of tense-aspect is left to the verb in the second clause.

I conclude that in constructions with *goon*

- *goon* is a subordinator with the first clause subordinated to the second main clause;
- *goon* is always placed at the end of the subordinate clause (i.e. postpositive), following its verb.

In the proverbs *-in* and *-n* before *goon* represent 2/3SG or 3PL. In spoken Dongolawi and even more in Kenzi the final personal suffix consonant *n* is dropped clause-finally, however pronounced before *goon*. Therefore a possible interpretation of *-in* and *-n* would be as genitive marker, especially as other Dongolawi subordinators as *bokkon* and *illar* are preceded by the genitive clitic *=n*. There are two reasons against that interpretation:

- Dongolawi and Kenzi roots ending in a consonant and followed by a genitive marker are frequently contracted which is not observed before *goon*.
- The Kenzi genitive clitic before a following consonant is *=na*. However in both, Dongolawi and Kenzi, there is only *n* before *goon*, *na* is not possible.

---

82 El-Shafie El-Guzuuli, p.c.
83 Massenbach, *Wörterbuch des nubischen Kunuzi-Dialektes*, p. 136 §21C7, writes it as *mënkin-gon*. However I have never heard the *k* sound. Abdel-Hafiz does not discuss it at all. On the strength of Old Nubian data like *ir* ‘to give birth’ and *mir* ‘to be infertile’ *meen* could be analyzed as a negation prefix *m* plus the verb *en* ‘to be.’
Coordination with *goon* and Bisyndetic =*gon*

Regarding Fadidja Abdel-Hafiz offers an alternative explanation which could also be applied to Kenzi:

In Fadicca subordination, the clitic (-*n*) introducing the subordinate clause is attached to the verb at the end of the clause. The clitic is often preceded or followed by clause markers.\(^{84}\)

However, in order to standardize Kenzi with Dongolawi where the verb final -*n* is uttered more frequently I do not follow Abdel-Hafiz’s interpretation.

In a non-literal translation the literal adversative rendering of Kenzi *meenin goon* as ‘although … not’ is rendered as temporal sequential/consecutive ‘before’ or sometimes as ‘without’ as my Kenzi co-investigators did, i.e.:

“Before he buys a camel, he bought a bridle.” / *“Without buying a camel, he bought a bridle.”*  

“Before he rides the donkey, he shakes the legs.”  

“Before they buy a cow, they search for the rope.”

The Kenzi co-investigators prefer the temporal sequential rendering to the adversative one when translating a proverb into Arabic. However, in sentence MS:*K2* which has the same order ‘although … not’ cannot be replaced by ‘before’ as that would change the meaning.

The Kenzi construction *meenin goon* comes closest to Dongolawi *goon* with preceding negation suffix -*men*\(^{85}\) as in DP5. However, in rendering it behaves like MS:*K2* with rendering -*men goon* as ‘before’ being excluded.\(^{86}\)

*goon* is rendered temporally in the following proverbs\(^{87}\):

3.4 Affirmative–affirmative propositional order with same subject

\*ouskida ogirro Ϝ tā, toygaogrīpīn gōn, Ϝ nōgi.\*  

*uskid ogirro aa taa, tugurgirin goon, aa nogi.*

---

\(^{84}\) Abdel-Hafiz, “Coordinate Constructions in Fadicca and English,” p. 22. If one changes the analysis of the last of the four example sentences (i.e. 56d) where -*n* as subordinator follows the noun instead of the verb that theory makes sense. It would be possible to make -*n* follow the verb, too.

\(^{85}\) See Armbruster, Dongolese Nubian: A Grammar, §5743.

\(^{86}\) El-Shafie El-Guzuuli, p.c.

\(^{87}\) For a discussion in Kenzi grammars see Massenbach, Wörterbuch des nubischen Kunuzidialektes, p. 169, and Abdel-Hafiz, A Reference Grammar of Kunuz Nubian, p. 267.
uskid ogir=ro aag taar-Ø
birth lap=LOC DUR come-3sg
tugur=gir-in goon aag nog-i
shroud=ALL2-COP3SG SUB DUR go-3sg
“The birth comes in the [mother's] lap, while he is in a shroud, he goes.”

3.5 Affirmative-affirmative propositional order with different subject

KP10 Tɔybara en GÓN, Tɔyboçroy.
tuubar en goon, tuubosru.

tuub-ar e-n goon tuub-os-r-u
wade-NR be-3SG SUB wade-DEF-NEUT-1/2PL
“While it is the 'wading' /tuubar season, you (pl.) wade indeed.”

KP11 jugrin goon, farte!
“While it is hot, take [it] out!”

MS:K488 Bɔyrwi ágran GÓN, ág Tósoyn.
burwi ágran goon, atójun.

buru-i aag-r-an goon aag too-ij-un
girl-PL sit-NEUT-3PL SUB DUR enter-INT-3SG
“While the girls are sitting, he enters (completely).”

KP12 consists of a conditional imperative with four coordinands where the first proposition has affirmative-affirmative, the second one affirmative-negative propositional order while the subject remains unchanged:

KP11 ágin go wiriškin, tēbin GÓN wirišminoy!
aagin goon wirijkin, teebin goon wirijminu!

aag-in goon wirij-ki-n
stay-2SG SUB naked-COND-2SG
teeb-in goon wirij-minu
stop-2SG SUB naked-NEG.IMP
“If while sitting you are naked, while standing do not be naked!”

I interpret both goon as non-adversative temporal simultaneous.

88 Massenbach, Nubische Texte im Dialekt der Kunäzi und der Dongolawi, p. 31. In the current orthography the second word is aagran goon.
Coordination with goon and Bisyndetic =gon

Dongolawi proverbs with goon and non-adversative function have not been attested that far. That goes along that goon as temporal marker is missing in Armbruster. However there is one Dongolawi sentence from a narrative text with negative-affirmative propositional order with same subject:

\[\text{ ámbāb bédrir elgon ēngi ēn=gi ēd-men} \text{ goon nugd-i=gi aag taajere-ko-n.}\

ambaab bedrir elgon ēngi ed-mengon nugdigi atājerēkōn.

1sg.poss.father early not yet
wife=ACC marry-NEG
goon nugd-i=gi aag taajere-ko-n

“My father, earlier, while he had not yet married the woman, he traded with slaves.”

In conclusion, goon marks concessive and temporal coordination however it is not always necessary. In Kenzi proverbs goon occurs much more frequently (12 times) than in Dongolawi ones (3 times only). In Kenzi proverbs concessive and temporal coordination is nearly always expressed by goon, in Dongolawi it is mixed. The difference cannot depend on the kind of co-investigator as both in Dongolawi and in Kenzi I worked with a broad variety of different speakers. Could it be that either Kenzi is more explicit or that there are cases where Kenzi employs and Dongolawi does not employ goon?

A final note regarding orthography: While goon cannot be separated from the preceding verb and in uttering is always connected to the verb-final consonant \(n\) I interpret goon as an orthographic word as readability after a verb and its verbal suffixes without word boundary would become difficult.

4. Clauses coordinated with bisyndetic =gon

The clitic =gon and its allomorphs =kon and =ton also cover adversative and non-adversative functions. Like goon Armbruster considers =gon as a complex morpheme composed of the object marker =gi plus the suffix -on.90

I write =gon and its variants with short vowel, both in Dongolawi and in Kenzi. While Massenbach writes it with a long vowel: gôn.

---

89 Ibid., p. 100. In the current orthography the fifth word is edmen goon.

kôn, similar as Ahmed Sokarno Abdel-Hafiz,\textsuperscript{91} I hear the short vowel in Kenzi, too.

\textit{=gon} can be monosyndetic and bisyndetic. Bisyndetic \textit{=gon} occurs on phrase (i.e. connected to two conjoined phrases) and clause level (i.e. connected to conjoined clauses). The typical use of bisyndetic \textit{=gon} on phrase level is shown in the following proverb:

\begin{verbatim}
torbal kub=gon tabid tuur=gon menillo neewe-munun.
\end{verbatim}

“The farmer does not rest except [at] the side of the boat and inside [the house of] the smith.”

\textit{=gon} joins similar noun phrases (in this case the two locations where a farmer finds rest) within a clause together. As \textit{=gon} is attached to phrases and not to words I interpret it as a clitic.

In the following I look at bisyndetic \textit{=gon} connecting clauses, not phrases. Bisyndetic \textit{=gon} on clause level is missing in Armbruster’s, Massenbach’s and Ahmed Sokarno Abdel-Hafiz’s grammars.

4.1 Affirmative–affirmative propositional order with different subject

\begin{verbatim}
uskelndi-ndi=gon tood=ir gaar=in
\end{verbatim}

“While the one who gave birth embraces the child, he [the child] embraces the wood belonging to the child.”

\begin{verbatim}
deski tabbel=gon densir anin, katregi tabbel=gon katre anin.
\end{verbatim}

“While the one who touched the fat, becomes full of goodness; the one who touched the wall, he becomes a wall.”
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jagadti, kashi weerkon inde widin, intille weerkon kiddigirin.
“The weak [person], while one stalk swims and carries [him], one needle makes [him] drown.”

MĒWON ā OYCKI, TEKKON ā TĀŚI.
meewgon aa uski, tekkon aa taaji.

meew=gon aag uski-Ø
pregnant=COORD DUR give.birth-3SG
ter=gon aag taaj-i
3SG.SUBJ=COORD DUR cry-3SG
“While the pregnant woman gives birth, he [her husband] cries.”

ingon bahti kinyima, weeri bahtigon kulugi aa toog.
“We While this one is without good luck, others [who have] good luck break the stone.”

TŌD AӮYON MOZAMMEA WĂTIP ĖL EMĪN, KINNAON MOZAMMEA WĂTIP ET TĀĪĪB.
Tōd duulgon Mohammed Shātir el Emīn, kinnagon Mohammed Shātir et Tayyib.

tood duul=gon [...] kinna=gon
son big=COORD small=COORD
“The older son (was named) Mohammed Shātir el Emīn, and the younger one Mohammed Shātir et Tayyib.”

In the above proverbs and the narrative sentence =gon is exclusively attached to an explicit subject noun/noun phrase with animate referent. The two events occur simultaneously. Both =gon are rendered by a single English word, ‘while.’

Frequently in the above proverbs the contrastive function is realized through antithetical lexical items which are typical for proverbs. In dp14 (‘parent’ – ‘child’) the antithetical lexical items are explicit, in kp14 (‘pregnant woman’ – ‘non-pregnant relative’) implicit.

There is one Kenzi sentence where as the subject is implicit both =gon are attached to the object with the object showing no accusative marker as Massenbach observes: “Sehr oft fehlt es (gi) hinter gôn.”

92 Massenbach, Nubische Texte im Dialekt der Kunūzī und der Dongolawi, p. 61.
93 Of course, ‘while’ is also a temporal clause marker. However, here =gon is used adversatively.
A similar case from Upper Kuskokwim Athabaskan is discussed in Kibrik, “Coordination in Upper Kuskokwim Athabaskan,” p. 550.
94 Massenbach, Wörterbuch des nubischen Kunuzi-Dialektes, p. 116. Translated: ‘Most times gi after gon is missing.’
4.2 Affirmative–negative propositional order with same subject

In all the above proverbs and narrative sentences bisyndetic \(=\)gon expresses the contrastive (except narrative sentence ms:k1 where it is restrictive). There is one Dongolawi proverb where the two clauses connected by bisyndetic \(=\)gon are additive:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{zooli malle}=\text{gon} & \quad \text{uuwe} \text{-ed} \quad \text{taa-s-um} \\
\text{people all}=\text{coord} & \quad \text{call-cpl} \quad \text{come-PRT2-3SG} \\
\text{shibille}=\text{gon} & \quad \text{uuwe-koo-mnun} \\
\text{kite}=\text{coord} & \quad \text{call-PRT1-NEG.3SG} \\
\text{“He invited everybody, (only) the kite he did not invite.”}
\end{align*}
\]

That indicates that like goon bisyndetic \(=\)gon only in specific contexts gains a contrastive meaning. Both markers are not adversative markers by themselves. However it also demonstrates that in contrast to goon, \(=\)gon is a coordinator: While the subordinate clause with goon does not carry tense and aspect, both clauses are inflected in bisyndetic \(=\)gon constructions.

5. Juxtaposed clauses

As proverbs aim to be short and precise, economical and dramatic, proverbs with asyndetic coordination are presumed. I begin by looking at juxtaposed clauses which have adversative character similar to coordinated clauses with goon, e.g. they present a concessive, yet without a marker. For the purpose of rendering denial-of-expectation I add ‘but’:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{argon} & \quad \text{bi adem andu}, \quad \text{welligon} \quad \text{argi bi uukiran}. \\
\text{1pl=coord} & \quad \text{fut} \quad \text{man become-neut-1pl} \\
\text{wel-li}=\text{gon} & \quad \text{ar}=\text{gi} \quad \text{bi} \quad \text{uukki-r-an} \\
\text{dog-pl}=\text{coord} & \quad \text{1pl=acc} \quad \text{fut} \quad \text{bark-neut-3pl} \\
\text{“We will become a [rich, important] man, and the dogs will bark at us.”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{95 Massenbach, Nubische Texte im Dialekt der Kunũzi und der Dongolawi, p. 22. When El-Shafie El-Guzuuli, p.c., rendered ms:k1 in Dongolawi it was unmarked.}\]
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5.1 Affirmative–affirmative propositional order with different subject

ⲙⲁ ⲧⲉⲛⲇⲓ ⲱⲁⳡⳡⲓⲛ, ⲓⲣⲓⲛⲇⲓⲅⲓ ⲛⲟ̅ϩⲕⲓⲣⲓⲁⲛ.

kaa tendi wanynyi-in, irindigi nuurkirin.

kaa  tendi  wanynyi-in  3sg.poss  be.without.roof-3sg
iri-ndi=gi  nuur-kir-in
people-poss=acc  roof-caus-3sg
“His house is without a roof, [but] he roofs the [other] people’s
[houses].”

 Bernardino  ⲫⲅⲉⲗ Ⲃⲧⲓ ⲇⲟⲩⲕⲕⲓⲙⲟⲩⲛ.

joogel aagin, dukkelgi edkoran.

joog-el  aag-in  grind-pcpt.pst  stay-3sg
dukki-el=gi  ed-ko-r-an
bake-pcpt.pst=acc  marry-prt196-neut-3pl
“She who ground [the flour], stays [unmarried]; [but] they married
the one who baked [the bread from the flour].”

Note that in dp19 even without concessive goon only the second
clause carries the tense marker.

5.2 Affirmative–negative propositional order with same subject

ⲙⲁ ⲧⲉⲛⲇ ⲃⲟ̄ⲇⲓⲛ, ⲅⲟⲩⲧⲁ̄ⲣⲓ ⲇⲟⲩⲕⲓⲙⲟⲩⲛ.

ten kaj bood-in, gutaarki dukkimun.

ten  kaj  bood-in  3sg.poss  horse  run-3sg
gutaar=gi  dukki-mun
bake.pcpt.pst=acc  extract.neg
“His horse runs, [but] it does not make a sand storm.”

“The sparrow eats [a lot], [but] it does not become a turtle dove.”

I gloss -ko and -r as separate morphemes, cf. Armbruster, Dongolese Nubian: A Grammar,
§2975ff: “The stem of the perfect is formed by adding -ko- to the simple stem. I realize that
alternatively both morphemes could be glossed as one suffix. As this paper deals with the
adversative I leave the decision regarding glossing of tense-aspect markers to further
research.”
“He pierces him, [but] he does not bring the blood.”

In each proverb with affirmative-affirmative propositional order the two subjects change, in each proverb with affirmative-negative order the two subjects remain. While with all proverbs with affirmative-affirmative propositional order goon cannot be added, with all proverbs with affirmative-negative propositional order from a purely grammatical point of view goon is optional and could be added at the end of the first clause without changing its meaning.\(^7\)

No juxtaposed Kenzi proverb with concessive function has been found thus far. Alternatively I present one Kenzi sentence with concessive function from a narrative text:

\[ \text{anna id adem an-os-s-um, aa bany-munum.} \]

That example indicates that creating the concessive function in Kenzi without goon is possible.

Next I look at juxtaposed clauses which are similar to the coordinated clauses with bisyndetic =gon as discussed in the preceding section, e.g. they present a contrastive. There is only one example from Dongolawi. For the purpose of rendering I add ‘but.’

5.3 Affirmative-negative propositional order with different subject

\[ \text{wicciirn iir dab-in, bany-nyid n iir dab-munun.} \]

\(^7\) El-Shafie El-Guzuuli, p.c. However proverbs do not do it as thereby they would become less economical.

\(^8\) Massenbach, Nubische Texte im Dialekt der Kunūzi und der Dongolawi, p. 30. There is a similar construction on p. 46: Zōlanossu abainmunu. (Although he became a human being, he did not speak.)
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“The mark of the stick disappears, [but] the mark of talking does not disappear.”

Besides concessive, *goon* expresses temporal simultaneity as shown above. For the purpose of rendering juxtaposed proverbial clauses having non-adversative temporal simultaneity I add temporal ‘while’:

Affirmative–affirmative propositional order with different subject

*saale dessen togoor aagiru, tenn baram addo tub toon.*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>saale</th>
<th>dessen=n</th>
<th>togoor</th>
<th>aag=r-u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sant.acacia</td>
<td>green=GEN</td>
<td>under</td>
<td>stay-NEUT-1PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenn</td>
<td>baram</td>
<td>ar=do</td>
<td>tub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.POSS blossoming</td>
<td>1.PL=LOC sweep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toor-n enter-3SG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“[While] We stay under the green acacia tree, its blossoming sweeps and enters [falls] on us.”

Note that Kenzi proverb kp10 and narrative sentence ms:k4 which have the same order do not omit *goon*.

Negative–negative propositional order with same subject

Both Dongolawi and Kenzi have one proverb where both verbs in both main clauses are negated; additionally the Kenzi proverb has both verbs in both clauses in the past tense. In order to express the additive function ‘neither’ instead of ‘not’ is used in the rendering:

Kalṭīgi kalmūn, essīgi nīmūn.  
kalti=gi kal-mun essi=gi nii-mun

food=ACC eat-NEG water=ACC drink-NEG

“He does not eat the food, neither does he drink the water.”

Miċci nalḵōmnu, ouloɣ gijirḵōmnu.  
missi nalkoomnu, ulug gijirkoomnu.

missi nal-koo-munu ulug  
eye see-PRT1-NEG.3SG ear  
gijir-koo-munu hear-PRT1-NEG.3SG
“The eye did not see, neither did the ear hear.”

Note that in KP25 both clauses carry the preterite tense. This corresponds with bisyndetic $=gon$ constructions and is different to DP19.

### 6. Summary

The example sentences of the last three sections are gathered and presented in tables in order to support analysis:

#### Concessive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st prop.</th>
<th>2nd prop.</th>
<th>subj.</th>
<th>realized by</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aff</td>
<td>aff</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>goon</td>
<td>DP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>goon</td>
<td>KP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aff</td>
<td>aff</td>
<td>different</td>
<td>X$^{99}$</td>
<td>DP18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aff</td>
<td>neg</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>X but goon possible</td>
<td>MS:K3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg</td>
<td>different</td>
<td>X but goon possible</td>
<td>DS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg</td>
<td>aff</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>goon</td>
<td>DP$^{100}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Contrastive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st prop.</th>
<th>2nd prop.</th>
<th>subj.</th>
<th>realized by</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aff</td>
<td>aff</td>
<td>different</td>
<td>$=gon =gon$</td>
<td>DP14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$=gon =gon$</td>
<td>KP14, MS:K6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aff</td>
<td>neg</td>
<td>different</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>DP23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-adversative temporal simultaneity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st prop.</th>
<th>2nd prop.</th>
<th>subj.</th>
<th>realized by</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aff</td>
<td>aff</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>goon</td>
<td>KP9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aff</td>
<td>aff</td>
<td>different</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>DP24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>goon</td>
<td>KP10, MS:K4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg</td>
<td>aff</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>goon</td>
<td>MS:D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg</td>
<td>neg</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>DP25, KP25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{99}$ X means that propositions are juxtaposed. A missing marker is confirmed by DP26.11 and two further proverbs not listed; i.e. four proverbs altogether.

$^{100}$ In this row I do not list the Kenzi proverbs with same order and meenin goon, as co-investigators tended to render it temporally.
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### Non-adversative additive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st prop.</th>
<th>2nd prop.</th>
<th>subj.</th>
<th>realized by</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aff</td>
<td>aff</td>
<td>different</td>
<td><em>=gon =gon</em></td>
<td>DP17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that in contrast to the collection of Dongolawi proverbs, in Massenbach’s Dongolawi narrative texts *goon* and bisyndetic *=gon* realising adversative aspects have not been discovered, the same as in Dongolawi narrative texts I collected myself. Kenzi concessive *goon* has also not been discovered in Kenzi narrative texts. Either the adversative is much less used in narrative texts or the behaviour of *goon* and bisyndetic *=gon* correspond the Kalinga marker yakon ‘but’ which “is not used in hortatory texts” and “in narratives [except] when the countering proposition is important or relevant to what follows.”

The concessive function is usually marked by postpositional *goon* after the first clause. In a few propositional orders there is no marker.

The contrastive function is marked by bisyndetic *=gon* when the propositions are affirmative–affirmative, otherwise it stays unmarked.

The non-adversative temporal simultaneity (‘while’) is marked in a similar way as the concessive (as far as data are available). In Dongolawi the affirmative–affirmative proposition with different subject is not marked in both, concessive and temporal simultaneity. There is one difference: In juxtaposed clauses the preterite tense-aspect marker occurs in both clauses in opposition to the concessive clauses. The affinity between the concessive function and temporal simultaneity is interpreted as *goon* putting the emphasis more on simultaneity which is also present in proverbs with concessive function, than on adversativity.

The non-adversative additive (‘and’) is marked in a similar way as the contrastive (as far as data are available). As in Dongolawi and Kenzi, in Russian contrast and additive have the same marker. *goon* and bisyndetic *=gon* are not the only markers used in ‘but’ coordination in Dongolawi and Kenzi. Further markers are borrowed from Arabic. I leave a discussion of non-indigenous adversative markers and adversativity on discourse level for a further paper.

---

101 Gertrud von Massenbach did not get the opportunity to visit the Dongola area herself, she worked with Dongolawi living in the Kenzi area. Therefore Kenzi may have had some influence. However I checked the data with El-Shafie El-Guzuuli.
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