

STUDIES IN
LANGUAGE
COMPANION
SERIES 121

Clause Linking
and Clause Hierarchy
Syntax and pragmatics

Edited by
Isabelle Bril

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Clause Linking and Clause Hierarchy

Syntax and pragmatics

Edited by

Isabelle Bril

CNRS-LACITO



John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Clause linking and clause hierarchy : syntax and pragmatics / edited by Isabelle Bril.

p. cm. (Studies in Language Companion Series, ISSN 0165-7763 ; v. 121)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Grammar, Comparative and general--Clauses. 2. Grammar, Comparative and general--Syntax. 3. Pragmatics. I. Bril, Isabelle.

P297.C546 2010

415--dc22

2010034699

ISBN 978 90 272 0588 9 (Hb ; alk. paper)

ISBN 978 90 272 8758 8 (Eb)

© 2010 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands

John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

Clause Linking and Clause Hierarchy

Studies in Language Companion Series (SLCS)

This series has been established as a companion series to the periodical *Studies in Language*.

Editors

Werner Abraham
University of Vienna

Elly van Gelderen
Arizona State University

Editorial Board

Bernard Comrie
Max Planck Institute, Leipzig
and University of California, Santa Barbara

William Croft
University of New Mexico

Östen Dahl
University of Stockholm

Gerrit J. Dimmendaal
University of Cologne

Ekkehard König
Free University of Berlin

Christian Lehmann
University of Erfurt

Brian MacWhinney
Carnegie-Mellon University

Marianne Mithun
University of California, Santa Barbara

Heiko Narrog
Tohoku University

Johanna L. Wood
University of Aarhus

Volume 121

Clause Linking and Clause Hierarchy. Syntax and pragmatics
Edited by Isabelle Bril

List of contributors

Evangelia Adamou

Lacito-CNRS, Centre André-Georges
Haudricourt
7, rue Guy Môquet
94800 Villejuif, France
adamou@vjf.cnrs.fr

Gilles Authier

Institut National des Langues et
Civilisations Orientales
2, rue de Lille
75007 Paris, France
gilles.authier@gmail.com

Balthasar Bickel

Institut für Linguistik
University of Leipzig
Beethovenstrasse 15
04107 Leipzig, Germany
bickel@uni-leipzig.de

Isabelle Brill

LACITO-CNRS,
Centre André-Georges Haudricourt
7, rue Guy Môquet
94800 Villejuif, France
ibril@vjf.cnrs.fr

Colette Cortès

Études Interculturelles de Langues
Appliquées
Université Paris 7- Denis Diderot
7, rue Watt
75013 Paris, France
colette.cortes@free.fr

Denis Creissels

Université Lumière- Lyon 2
Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage,
14, avenue Berthelot
69363 Lyon, France
Denis.Creissels@univ-lyon2.fr

William Foley

Department of Linguistics
The University of Sydney,
NSW 2006, Australia
william.foley@arts.usyd.edu.au

Zygmunt Frajzyngier

Department of Linguistics, Box 295
University of Colorado,
Boulder, CO 80309-0295, USA
Zygmunt.Frajzyngier@Colorado.EDU

Alexandre François

LACITO-CNRS,
Centre André-Georges Haudricourt
7, rue Guy Môquet,
94800 Villejuif, France
francois@vjf.cnrs.fr

Jacqueline Leroy

Université Paris-Descartes and
LACITO-CNRS,
Centre André-Georges Haudricourt
7, rue Guy Môquet
94800 Villejuif, France
leroy@vjf.cnrs.fr

Christiane Pilot-Raichoor

LACITO-CNRS,
Centre André-Georges Haudricourt
7, rue Guy Môquet,
94800 Villejuif, France
raichoor@vjf.cnrs.fr

Chris H. Reintges

Laboratoire de Linguistique Formelle-
CNRS,
Université Paris 7-Denis Diderot
175, rue du Chevaleret
75013 Paris, France.
chris.reintges@linguist.jussieu.fr

Stéphane Robert

LLACAN-CNRS
Centre André-Georges Haudricourt
7, rue Guy Môquet,
94800 Villejuif, France
robert@vjf.cnrs.fr

Catherine Taine-Cheikh

LACITO-CNRS,
Centre André-Georges Haudricourt
7, rue Guy Môquet,
94800 Villejuif, France
cath.tainecheikh@gmail.com

Nicole Tersis

SEDYL-CELIA-CNRS,
Centre André-Georges Haudricourt
7, rue Guy Môquet,
94800 Villejuif, France
nicole.Tersis@vjf.cnrs.fr

Eleni Valma

LACITO-CNRS,
Centre André-Georges Haudricourt
7, rue Guy Môquet,
94800 Villejuif, France
evalma@vjf.cnrs.fr

Martine Vanhove

LLACAN-CNRS
Centre André-Georges Haudricourt
7, rue Guy Môquet,
94800 Villejuif, France
vanhove@vjf.cnrs.fr

Jean-Christophe Verstraete

Department of Linguistics
University of Leuven,
Blijde-Inkomststraat 21 - PO Box 3308
B-3000 Leuven, Belgium
jean-christophe.verstraete@arts.
kuleuven.be

Table of contents

List of contributors	VII
Editor's introduction. The syntax and pragmatics of clause linkage and clause hierarchy: Some new perspectives <i>Isabelle Bril</i>	1
PART I. Syntactic terminology and typological methods	
Clause linkage and Nexus in Papuan languages <i>William A. Foley</i>	27
Capturing particulars and universals in clause linkage: A multivariate analysis <i>Balthasar Bickel</i>	51
PART II. Clause-chaining, converbs, masdars, absolute constructions, etc.	
Specialized converbs and adverbial subordination in Axaxdərə Akhvakh <i>Denis Creissels</i>	105
Finite and non-finite: Prosodic distinctions on Budugh verb stems <i>Gilles Authier</i>	143
Converbs and adverbial clauses in Badaga, a South-Dravidian language <i>Christiane Pilot-Raichoor</i>	165
Coordination, converbs and clause chaining in Coptic Egyptian Typology and structural analysis <i>Chris H. Reintges</i>	203
PART III. Subordination, informational hierarchy and referential hierarchy	
Informational and referential hierarchy: Clause-linking strategies in Austronesian-Oceanic languages <i>Isabelle Bril</i>	269
Comment clause: Crossing the boundaries between simple and complex sentences <i>Zygmunt Frajzyngier</i>	313

Deixis, information structure and clause linkage in Yafi' Arabic (Yemen) <i>Martine Vanhove</i>	333
The role of the Berber deictic and TAM markers in dependent clauses in Zenaga <i>Catherine Taine-Cheikh</i>	355
Deixis and temporal subordinators in Pomak (Slavic, Greece) <i>Evangelia Adamou</i>	399
Correlative markers as phoric "Grammaticalised Category Markers" of subordination in German <i>Colette Cortès</i>	421
PART IV. Informational hierarchy and TAM markers' functions in clause-linkage	
Focus, mood and clause linkage in Umpithamu (Cape York Peninsula, Australia) <i>Jean-Christophe Verstraete</i>	451
Clause chaining and conjugations in Wolof: A typology of parataxis and its semantics <i>Stéphane Robert</i>	469
Pragmatic demotion and clause dependency: On two atypical subordinating strategies in Lo-Toga and Hiw (Torres, Vanuatu) <i>Alexandre François</i>	499
Tense-mood concordance and clause chaining in Mankon (a Grassfields Bantu language) <i>Jacqueline Leroy</i>	549
Clause dependency relations in East Greenlandic Inuit <i>Nicole Tersis</i>	581
Coordination and subordination: <i>Áma</i> in Bulgarian dialectal Greek <i>Eleni Valma</i>	603
Author index	619
Language index	623
Topic index	625

Editor's introduction

The syntax and pragmatics of clause linkage and clause hierarchy: Some new perspectives

Isabelle Bril

LACITO (Laboratoire des Langues et Civilisations à Tradition orale)

1. Presentation

This volume is the outcome of a research programme (2003–2007) conducted by linguists specializing in a wide array of language families, from varied theoretical backgrounds. We thankfully acknowledge the financial support of the *Fédération de Typologie et Universaux Linguistiques* of the CNRS (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique).¹ The research project was coordinated by the editor of the present volume.

This collection of articles explores clause-linkage strategies in a cross-linguistic perspective. It concentrates on issues generally relating to coordination and subordination, with a greater emphasis on subordination, marked by a variety of constructions such as clause-chaining, converbs, masdars, correlative constructions, specific types of conjugations or verbal inflectional morphology, T.A.M. markers, as well as informational hierarchy and referential hierarchy strategies.

The choice of topics addressed was guided by their being comparatively less studied in the existing literature. This volume provides further documentation on such morphosyntactic phenomena from slightly different angles and perspectives; in particular, it explores the interaction between syntax, pragmatics and semantics in the architecture of complex sentences. These new data are analysed in the light of current debates relating to the typology of coordination and subordination.

2. Previous studies

Only over the last two decades, clause-linkage or clause-dependency and its related syntactic categories, coordination, subordination, and co-subordination (Olson 1981;

1. The editor is grateful to Jean-Michel Roynard for his help in editing the volume, and to Margaret Dunham who translated various articles and corrected the final version of the volume. Their invaluable help is much appreciated.

Foley & Van Valin 1984) have given rise to a wealth of studies from various theoretical perspectives (*inter alia*, Dik 1997; Culicover & Jackendoff 1997; Van Valin & LaPolla 1997; Cristofaro 2003; Bril & Rebuschi 2006; Rebuschi 2003 etc.). Some recent publications have focused on specific construction types cross-linguistically, such as clause chaining (Longacre 1985), converbial constructions (König & Haspelmath (eds) 1995), adverbial constructions (van der Auwera (ed.) 1998), coordination (Sag et al. 1985; Munn 1993; Johannessen 1998; Progovac 1998; Haspelmath 2004; Godard & Abeillé 2005). Typological studies have also focused on clause-linking in its various aspects (*inter alia*, Lehman 1988; Haiman 1988; Comrie 1989 and various contributors in Shopen (ed.) (1985, 2007): Keenan on relative clauses (1985), Noonan on complementation (1985, 2007), Haspelmath on coordination (2007), Thompson, Longacre & Hwang on adverbial clauses (2007), etc.

3. Aims

This collection of studies aims to bring new insights to a domain which has a long research tradition. Each of the eighteen chapters presents an in-depth study of clause-linkage and clause-relationships, in often lesser known and lesser documented languages.

The case-studies are based on first-hand data collected by the authors. A sample of 23 languages (and a survey of 17 others), from 12 different language families, are analysed (see Appendix 1). Though far from exhaustive, this sample enlarges the scope of previously available research.

Among the questions addressed are the following:

- What types of clause-linking structures, and what levels and degrees of hierarchy are distinguished in a given language?
- What is the range of morphosyntactic devices used for clause-linking and more specifically for subordination? For instance \pm finite verb forms, masdars, converbs, T.A.M markers, specific conjugations, case-marking systems, demonstratives and referential devices, informational hierarchy devices, etc.
- What categorical and functional domains do these morphosyntactic devices originate from?

Some more general theoretical and methodological questions are also addressed:

- Are coordination, subordination and co-subordination universal syntactic categories?
- Are there any clause-linking hierarchy universals?
- How should these notions be defined so as to have some cross-linguistic validity?
- What set of criteria could help define them?

- Are there mismatches between form, function and meaning of clause-linking devices?
- Are there areal clause-linking phenomena?
- Which functional and semantic types of clause-linking tend to be grouped or distinguished? Are they comparable?

The notion of language universals has been the centre of recent debates; some doubts have been expressed as to the possibility or even the relevance of presupposing universal constructions and categories, or any universal conceptual structures or formal categories (Dryer 1998; Croft 2001, 2003; Haspelmath 2007; Frajzyngier & Shay 2003; Evans & Levinson 2009). Despite such scepticism (see Newmeyer 2007 for a less sceptical approach and some counter-arguments), cross-linguistic typological studies and in-depth case-studies of (lesser known) languages contribute to (i) comparing and refining the understanding of syntactic constructions or categories, (ii) assessing their variability, and (iii) distinguishing language-specific and areal features or constructions from more invariant ones. This in turn leads to revising definitions and to proposing more refined sets of criteria. This approach is the main guideline of the volume's contributions.

4. Some properties of coordination and subordination and some distinctive tests

Coordination is generally distinguished from subordination by a number of tests and properties with variable cross-linguistic validity. Among the subordination tests, to which coordination reacts negatively, are the following (summarised in Yuasa & Sadock 2002; and Haspelmath 2004 for instance):

- i. Permutability of the clauses without any logico-semantic change (i.e. only additive coordination allows it, other coordination types do not);
- ii. embeddedness;
- iii. possible pronominal cataphora (coreferential with a NP in the following clause);
- iv. possible extraction (Ross 1985 [1967]).

Among common features distinguishing main clauses from subordinate clauses are:

- i. Imperviousness to the illocutionary force of the matrix clause and disjunct illocutionary scope (see Foley & Bickel this volume); this is in contrast with 'conjunct illocutionary scope' found in some clause-chaining or converbial constructions, in which the dependent clause falls under the scope of the illocutionary operators in the main clause;

- ii. T.A.M dependency of the dependent clause on the main clause (found for instance in the medial verb forms in clause-chaining), while unconstrained tense marking can be found both in coordinate or subordinate constructions;
- iii. unequal assertive clauses status (with possible non-assertive status for some subordinate clauses, through various morphosyntactic and pragmatic devices);
- iv. deranked, unasserted clauses, possibly displaying non-finite verb forms (vs. co-ranking coordinate clauses), nominalised clauses, participial forms, case-markers and adpositions;
- v. possible restrictive focalisation of subordinate clauses (with one restriction: a term may not be focused within the dependent clause);
- vi. Use of topic markers as indicators of subordinate clauses (Papuan, Oceanic languages);
- vii. Use of case-markers functioning as topic markers and projecting a case functional head above the subordinate clause (Foley, this volume).

– *Subordinate clauses as islands*

Subordinate clauses are impervious to the illocutionary force of their main clauses. They are islands, their features cannot percolate up to the level of the main clause, nor can the main clause's Inflectional features (tense, mood or polarity) move down into them (see Foley, this volume). Besides, they usually are presupposed statements, which accounts for some other features investigated in this volume, which are related to the pragmatic structuring and informational structure of complex clauses, and also involve constructions based on the contrast between presupposition vs. assertion.

– *Distinctive features among subordinate clauses: nexus and juncture layer*

Other distinctive features among subordinate clauses involve the layer at which the subordinate clause operates (as developed in Foley & Van Valin 1984; Van Valin 2005, Bickel this volume). They may operate (i) at the predicate-verb layer (as ad-V clauses), (ii) at the clause layer (ad-Clause), (iii) at the whole sentence layer (ad-Sentence) as detached, topic subordinate sentences for instance, or (iv) they may operate beyond the sentence, at utterance level. The layer at which they operate then determines their specific syntactic functions (argument function in complement clauses, modification, adjunction), or specific discourse functions when subordinate clauses operate beyond the sentence (see the contributions by Tersis, Robert this volume).

– *Properties and structure of coordination*

In contrast with subordination, coordination is usually considered to be a logically structurally symmetric relation, in that if $\langle x \text{ is coordinated with } y \rangle$, then $\langle y \text{ is coordinated with } x \rangle$. Although coordination may contain some logical and formal symmetry, at least in some of its instances or at some abstract level, this does not mean that it is

syntactically or semantically unconstrained (Progovac 1998): for instance, some coordinate constructions are subject to causal relations and readings, and are thus sensitive to order (as in *I was angry and he left the house* vs. *he left the house and I was angry*). Conjuncts have also been considered as having co-ranking status, but a co-ranking analysis of coordination has been challenged by numerous cases of morphosyntactic asymmetries between conjuncts (Johannessen 1998), not to mention the many cases of form-function-semantic mismatches (Yuasa & Sadock 2002). In Johannessen's analysis of coordination, the conjuncts are in a hierarchic specifier-complement configuration; the first conjunct (in VO languages) stands structurally apart, while the conjunction heading the other conjunct(s) (i.e. the 'complement') forms a structural unit (Johannessen 1998; Progovac 1998). The conjunctive head may be transparent in allowing symmetric marking of the non-initial conjuncts, or it may assign different morphosyntactic features to the complement conjuncts; these may be different \pm finite properties on VPs; or they may be different case-marking on NPs, either default cases or cases selected by the conjunctive head (as with comitative coordinators) (Sag 2005; Bril & Rebuschi 2007: 10–12). Asymmetric features resulting from the properties of the coordinator itself provide evidence of some hierarchical structure in the coordinate phrase. Cross-linguistic studies thus show that conjuncts with symmetric properties are just one possible option of coordinate constructions.

5. Outlook of content

The volume is subdivided into four parts devoted to more specific topics relating to clause-linkage; however, the various contributions within each part interact more than the subdivisions suggest.

- Part I presents some theoretical reassessment of terminologies from syntactic and typological perspectives (Foley), as well as the quest for typological methods based on statistical methods and on sets of variables allowing comparability (Bickel). These are illustrated by case-studies in various languages, mostly Papuan and Tibeto-Burman.
- Part II deals with issues and morphosyntactic strategies relating to the syntax and semantics of clause-chaining, conjunctive conjugations, converbial constructions, masdars.
- Part III centers on issues relating to the interaction between syntax, pragmatics and the semantics of clause-linking strategies and subordination, mostly in relation to (i) informational hierarchy and the contrast between presupposed vs. asserted propositional contents (Bril, Vanhove) (ii) to referential hierarchy (based on deictics or anaphorics) (Bril, Vanhove, Taine-Cheikh, Adamou), and (iii) to correlative constructions (Cortès).

- Part IV presents insights in the clause-linking and subordinating functions of some T.A.M. markers and conjugation systems, which occur via informational hierarchy (Verstraete), via “situational dependency” effects between clauses (Robert), or via the backgrounding effects and lack of illocutionary force of specific aspect and mood forms (François). Complex verbal inflectional categories and conjugations are also shown to be at work in the syntax (Leroy) and discourse functions (Tersis) of clause-linkage.

The origin and evolution of clause-linking morphemes or strategies is a topic of investigation in many contributions (see Akhvakh, Greek, Coptic Egyptian, Oceanic languages, Yafi' Arabic, Zenaga, Pomak). (Poly)grammaticalisation of adpositions, demonstratives, verbs, etc. is a frequent process which gives rise, among other things, to clause-hierarchy and subordinating morphemes.

Part I. A reassessment of terminology and typological methods

A. A reassessment of the theory of nexus

W. Foley (Chapter 2) presents a revision of the theory of nexus (first developed in Foley & Van Valin 1984), which distinguished three categories of nexus, subordination, coordination and cosubordination, and which is now reduced to only subordination and coordination.

– Clause-chaining and cosubordination

Clauses in a cosubordinate nexus were defined as being in a dependency relationship for a specific inflectional category or operator such as tense, mood or illocutionary force, a dependency which did not occur in coordinate nexus. But some analyses of clause chaining (in Papuan languages) and converbial constructions (of central and south Asian languages, Haspelmath & König 1995), which were formerly identified as prototypical cases of cosubordinate nexus, show that illocutionary force, the highest peripheral operator or I feature, need not be shared across the clauses; hence they cannot exemplify cosubordinate nexus. Foley thus proposes a revised theory of nexus based on functional categories like I (inflectional features) and their projection IP (Inflection Phrase) and restricted to two nexus, subordination and coordination. The cosubordinate nexus is re-analysed as a type of coordinate nexus that differs from normal clausal coordination in the type of constituents coordinated. Clause chaining is thus distinguished from standard coordinated clauses by the nature of the coordinated constituents, S versus IP. In clause chains, S constituents are coordinated under a single IP node; the verbs in the coordinated S constituents are non-finite, they have no intrinsic I feature specifications, tense is only indicated on the final clause's verb and it has scope over the preceding medial or dependent clauses. In Foley's view, the inflectional I categories of the final clause's verb belong to the structure as a whole, rather than to the final clause only.

– *Assessment of I-features: Polarity, illocutionary force, mood, tense*

Foley also points out cross-linguistic differences in the treatment of polarity as either belonging or not to I features. Thus, in some Papuan languages like Usan, negation in the final clause is an I feature with scope over all coordinated S constituents under it, while in Tauya, the scope of negation only spreads to clauses sharing the same subject. On the other hand, illocutionary force is an I feature in Tauya with scope over the whole series of coordinated constituents. The conclusion is that polarity is a lower level I category, while illocutionary force remains a feature of the highest IP projection.

Other Papuan languages show variation in other I features like mood and tense. In clause chaining constructions, many Papuan languages inflect the verbs in medial clauses for realis vs. irrealis mood, while the verb of the final clause bears the full inflectional possibilities of tense and illocutionary force. Foley thus points out that it cannot be assumed “that clause chaining always corresponds to the same types of structures across languages; minimal S constituents may be coordinated using this structure, but so can fully specified, essentially independent IP constituents”. As these features do not have the same status cross-linguistically, ranking them on a gradient proves a useful undertaking.

B. Statistical methods for typological comparability: A multi-variate approach

Some of the syntactic criteria (listed in paragraph 4 above) stand more as statistical rather than as absolute features. This is the main thrust of Bickel's contribution, also pointed out in various contributions where form-function mismatches occur, and where clearly assigning a given construction to either the coordinate or the subordinate type often proves uneasy: in Papuan clause-chaining (Foley), some converbal constructions in Akhvakh (Creissels), Budugh (Authier), Badaga (Pilot-Raichoor) and Coptic (Reintges).

B. Bickel (Chapter 3) thus raises the question of cross-linguistic comparability of structures which are at best similar, but never identical. Mismatches are due to the fact that language-specific structures are analysed with terminologies whose definition is based on other languages, or are theory-dependent. Thus, due to the amount of structural variation in feature functions, and to the difficulty in establishing robust comparative notions and criteria proving impervious to language specific variation, some other method is needed.

Bickel advocates the use of statistical methods standard in other disciplines for the analysis of diversity, and the recourse to a multi-variate approach based on sets of variables (or parameters) in order to capture variation and probabilistic assessment of clusters and to establish typological prototypes. Taking the pattern of adjoined (non-embedded) clause linkage across languages as a sample case, he decomposes features of various structures of adjoined clause linkage into sets of variables (parameters) that allow precise measurement of cross-linguistic similarities and differences, as well as the discovery of typological patterns based on statistical techniques.

This study, based on two dozen languages, isolates a set of twelve analytical variables (ranging from the scope of illocutionary force operators to extraction constraints) that are applied to a representative selection of clause-linkage structures. The analysis supports Foley's view that 'cosubordination' is not a distinct prototype, while there is a cross-linguistic prototype of subordination characterised by disjunct illocutionary scope, local tense scope, flexible positions, and with less probability a ban on question formation or focusing inside the dependent clause. Furthermore, there is a cross-linguistic cline between more vs. less tightly constrained types of clause adjoining, specifically between three types of coordination-like structures varying according to the extent to which tense marking and tense scope is constrained. Finally, while a tentative prototype of subordination seems to emerge from this pilot database, no coordination prototype does.

Part II. Converbs, masdars, clause-chaining, conjunctive conjugations

Converbs, masdars, clause-chaining constructions and conjunctive conjugations are the focus of Part II.

A. Converbs

Three papers are concerned more or less centrally with converbial strategies in Daghestanian (Creissels, Authier), Dravidian languages (Pilot-Raichoor) and Coptic (Reintges). They generally follow Nedjalkov's (1995) distinction between specialised and general-polyfunctional converbs.

D. Creissels (Chapter 4) discusses the rich converbial morphology of Northern Akhvakh, which he deems to be an ancient feature among Nakh-Daghestanian languages. The term 'converb' is used after Nedjalkov's definition (1995), to refer to non-autonomous verb forms, different from infinitives, masdars/verbal nouns or participles, in that that they do not occur in complement clauses or in relative clauses. If specialised converbs may be defined as essentially marking adverbial subordination, the multipurpose 'general converb' occurs in constructions analyzable as clause coordination, but it has two other main functions in clause-linkage: (i) it may specify the manner of an event encoded by an independent verb form, (ii) it may encode an event viewed as the first stage of a complex event whose second stage is encoded by an independent verb form. Some of its syntactic properties are thus interpretable as coordination, while others are interpretable as cases of subordination. Thus, in many constructions using the general converb, the type of coreference found between full NPs and pronouns is commonly considered incompatible with coordination; other facts such as linear order, embedding, relativization, and negation are also incompatible with coordination. Another particularly strong argument in favour of subordination is that, in some complex constructions, the general converb in Akhvakh may show external suffixal