Clause combining in Chechen

Jeff Good
University of California, Berkeley

Jeff Good
jcgood@socrates.berkeley.edu
1203 Dwinelle Hall #2650
Department of Linguistics
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-2650

Abstract:

Chechen exhibits three major strategies for the combination of clauses: coordination, chaining, and subordination. The major formal characteristics of these three traditional categories of clause linking are discussed with reference to their basic syntax and semantics as well as to more particular syntactic characteristics, including constituent order and behaviour with respect to negation and *wh*-questions. In addition, these clause combining strategies of Chechen are classified with respect to Foley and Van Valin's (1984) typology of clause linkage. A particularly useful result of this classification is that it permits a straightforward characterization of the use of the preverbal conjunctive enclitic *'a* as a marker of cosubordination.

0 Introduction

Chechen is a language spoken in the north central Caucasus belonging to the Nakh branch of the Nakh-Daghestanian family. Typologically it is head-final, suffixing, ergative, case-using, and dependent-marking. Basic word order is SOV, but other word orders are frequently instantiated. The placement of *wh*-words is syntactically free. It is closely related to Ingush with which it shares all major typological properties and many more idiosyncratic ones. Chechen exhibits a range of formal strategies to combine clauses into coordination, chaining, and subordination structures. These include coordinating conjunctions, converbs, nominalizing morphemes, and, perhaps, one subordinating conjunction. Clause combining in Chechen contrasts with clause combining in western European languages by its extensive use of converbs (non-finite verb forms which form clauses which can be combined with other clauses) and by its use of chaining constructions to string together clauses which bear a sequential, narrative relationship to each other.

The main purpose of this paper will be to give a descriptive overview of the grammatical properties of the traditional clause combining categories of coordination, chaining, and subordination in Chechen. Section 1 provides an overview of the clause combining constructions which will be discussed. Section 2 summarizes a range of grammatical facts of Chechen which will be useful in understanding the data and conclusions presented in the paper. Section 3.1 goes over important aspects of Foley and Van Valin's (1984) typology of nexus types, which will figure in some aspects of the description. Section 3.2 discusses the descriptive criteria which where used in making the distinction between coordination, chaining, and subordination for the various structures to be described. Sections 4, 5, and 6 are discussions respectively of coordination, chaining, and subordination, and section 7 offers a brief conclusion.

The choice of using Foley and Van Valin's framework to assist in the description was made because of its well-articulated formalism to describe clause linking. While this naturally means that this caused the discussion to highlight some aspects of the data more than others, this seemed appropriate since, as we will see, their framework works well for Chechen by adding to the

traditional categories of coordination and subordination a third category of clausal linking—cosubordination. It will be argued that the Chechen conjunctive preverbal particle *'a* offers strong support for the inclusion of this category in the typology of clause linkage, since its distribution is limited to precisely those clauses which can be classified on other grounds as instances cosubordinate linking.

The data in this paper comes both from elicitation and from unpublished texts. Examples marked with an "@" (for "attested") are taken from texts; all others were elicited. The elicitation was done with two consultants. Where relevant, differences in the grammaticality judgements of the two consultants will be noted. Not all sentences were tested on both consultants. The text examples come from various speakers. In some cases, transcription and morphology have been normalized so that the data could be more consistently presented throughout the paper.[1]

1   Brief overview of the three types of clause combining

1.1   *Coordination*

Though its use is somewhat more limited than in English or other western European languages, coordinate structures can be found in Chechen as in the example in (1) where the conjunction *t'q'a* 'and' conjoins two constituents which could otherwise be independent clauses in the language.

(1)   *Ahwmad ch'aara uecush   vu,   t'q'a Marjam cicig uecush   ju.*

    Ahmed   fish   buy:CVsim V:be:PRS and   Mary   cat   buy:CVsim J:be:PRS

    'Ahmed is buying a fish, and Mary is buying a cat.'

Coordination of sentences and verb phrases is covered in depth in section 4.

1.2   *Clause chaining*

A particularly striking feature of Chechen is its use of clause chaining. The formal properties of clause chaining will be covered in depth in section 5, and it will be contrasted with subordination in section 3.2. As a first approximation, however, clause chaining can be

understood as linking together clauses which have a narrative relationship into a syntactic structure consisting of any number of non-finite clauses embedded in a finite matrix clause. An example is given in (2).

(2) *Maliika, tykana   'a jaghna,   zhejna 'a iecna,   c'a   je'ara.*
    Malika   store:DAT & J:go:CVant book   & buy:CVant home J:come:WP
    'Malika went to the store, bought a book, and came back home.'

In (2) the two clauses set off by commas are non-finite and the final clause contains the finite verb. Chaining constructions overwhelmingly tend have a shared subject across the clauses, as seen here where each clause has the subject, *Maliika*.

In the discussion below, the term *chained clause* will be used exclusively to refer to a non-finite clause in a chaining construction.

1.3   *Subordination*

Chechen has a range of strategies for marking clausal subordination. The most prototypical ones involve converb suffixes which attach to a verb stem giving it particular adverbial semantics. An example, using the posterior converb *-lie*, is given in (3).

(3) *Maliikina   Ahwmad gaalie,   iza   dwa-vuedu.*
    Malika:DAT Ahmed   see:CVpost 3s:ABS DX-V:come:PRS
    'Before Malika sees Ahmed, he leaves.'

A list of the Chechen verbal suffixes, which includes the converbs, is given in section 2.1 and subordination itself is discussed in section 6.

2   Overview of pertinent aspects of Chechen grammar

2.1   *Verbal suffixes*

A range of verbal suffixes are central to many clause-combining constructions in Chechen. Since these forms will appear throughout the data in this paper, it will be worthwhile to first summarize their morphology and semantics.

The known non-finite verbal suffixes in Chechen are given in table 1. There are no verbal prefixes used in clause combining. A general glossing convention is to gloss all non-finite verbal forms which are still categorically verbs (as opposed to nouns or adjectives) as 'CV', for converb, followed by a qualifying abbreviation in lower-case letters (hence the gloss 'CVpost' for the posterior converb). This is meant to be helpful in interpreting the data. However, as is discussed immediately below, not all of these suffixes are, properly speaking, converbs.

[Table 1 goes here.]

A precise morphosyntactic categorization is not readily apparent for each of the verbal suffixes. Some of the suffixes form true converbs, a term I use following the general sense of Haspelmath (1995)—that is, they create a sort of "verbal adverb" (1995: 4). The most clearly converbal suffixes are the immediate anterior, the posterior, and the temporal. The irrealis could also be considered a converb, though its semantics make it a less central examples of this morphosyntactic type. The anterior and simultaneous suffixes can be used both as converb suffixes and "medial verb" suffixes (Haspelmath 1995: 20) since those suffixes are found marking verbs entering both into modificational and clause chaining constructions. The progressive anterior suffix is only found in clause-chaining constructions and is, therefore, properly a medial verb suffix. Finally, two of the suffixes in table 1, the nominalizer and the masdar, produce nominal forms from verbs, and one suffix, the participle suffix, produces adjectival forms of verbs. Nominal and adjectival verb forms, despite being formally different from true converbs, often are used in constructions with comparable semantics, as will be discussed in section 6.

In addition to a descriptive label, the gloss abbreviation, and a rough translation for each suffix, table 1 lists one other important property of each suffix—what verb stems it can attach to. The three stem forms which are relevant to the data in this paper are the infinitive stem, the present stem, and the past stem. The stems are typically related to each other via some form of ablaut. An example of a verb with variation across the three stems is 'see' which has the infinitive stem *ga-*, the present stem *go-*, and the past stem *gi-*.

Importantly, only one of the suffixes in table 1 the anterior converb *-na*, actually attaches directly to the past stem. All other converbs which are indicated in table 1 as attaching to the past stem actually attach to the past stem followed by the anterior *-na* suffix (for the verb 'see', this means they would attach to a stem of the form *gina-*).

Not all of the suffixes in table 1 will be addressed in detail here. In particular, the irrealis, examples of which are given in (4), will not be analyzed since a proper treatment of its uses would require a separate paper in their own right. Beyond taking on a wide range of semantic uses, the irrealis also formally differs from the other suffixes seen in table 1 in its ability to attach to verbs already marked with a range of other suffixes, including finite suffixes.

(4) a. *Dogha **daghahw**,   txo   looma   ghuur daac.*
       rain   D:go:INF:CVirr 1pe:ABS mountain:ADV go:FUT D:be:NEG
       'If it's raining, we won't go to the mountains.'

   b. *Ch'aara **iecnihwaara**,   dika xir   du.*
       fish   buy:CVant:CVirr:WP good be:FUT D:be:PRS
       'If you buy a fish, it would be good.'

   c. *As   shiena$_i$ ch'aara **iaccanashiahw**,   voelxuchyra   ca socura 'i$_i$.*
       3s:ERG 3s:RFL:DAT fish   buy:GEM:CVant:CVsim:CVirr V:cry:PRS:NZ:ABL NEG stop:WP 3s:ABS
       'Although I bought him a fish, he hasn't stopped crying.'

   d. @*Cyna˜ chulaacaman maewna hu˜ bu   hwuona aelcha,   daaxariahw 'a,*
        3s:GEN content   meaning what B:be:PRS 2s:DAT   say:CVtemp life:ADV   FOC

       *duezaliahw 'a, micchanhwaa 'a, hu˜-'a   lielosh   shaa **valahw**   'a,*
       family:ADV FOC everywhere   FOC what-FOC engaged-in:CVsim 3s:REFL V:be:CVirr FOC

       daggahw   caw   'a dyycush, bagahw   qi˜   dyycush volu
       heart:FOC:LOC one:NZ FOC say:CVsim mouth:ADV any-more say:CVsim V:be:PRS:PART

5

stag cq'aa 'a q'uonax xir vaac booxurg du iza.

person never FOC man be:FUT V:be:NEG:PRS say:NZ D:be:PRS that

'Its meaning is that in life, in your family, everywhere, no matter what you are engaged

in, anyone who thinks one thing and says another will never be a real person.'

Sentence (4a) gives a fairly typical use of the irrealis suffix in a hypothetical conditional. In (4b) the irrealis appears before the witnessed past finite verbal suffix—none of the other verbal suffixes in table 1 has been observed to cooccur with a finite verbal suffix. In (4c) the irrealis appears in combination with the simultaneous converb creating a verb with a conventionalized concessive reading. Finally in (4d) there is another case where the irrealis takes on a concessive reading. In this construction, a verb marked with the irrealis is followed by a focus marker with the form *'a* to create an irrealis concessive.

The examples in (4) are far from exhaustive in their illustration of the uses and behaviour of the irrealis suffix. They are simply intended to begin to illustrate its complex syntax and semantics.

Of the other verbal suffixes, the nominalizer, the masdar, and the participle have uses which go beyond the scope of this paper. However, since they also figure in several subordinate-like constructions, they will appear in the discussion in section 6.

Table 2 lists whether or not each of the suffixes which will be discussed below has chaining or subordinate uses. As mentioned above the anterior and simultaneous suffixes are noteworthy for being used both in chaining and subordinate constructions. There are no special suffixes employed for coordination which, most typically, involves the linking of two clauses headed by finite verbs.

[Table 2 goes here.]

2.2 *The particle* 'a

Enclitic particles with the form *'a* are ubiquitous in Chechen grammar. There are two very distinct uses of these particles. Central to this paper is the preverbal use of *'a*, which is found in clause chaining constructions and verb phrase coordination. This use of *'a* is exemplified below in sentence (5).

(5) *Kinchka **'a** iecna,   tyka **'a** jitna,   mashian t'e **'a** xi'na,   ca je'ara   Maliika.*
　　 book   &   buy:CVant store & J:leave:CVant car   in & sit:CVant not J:come:WP Malika
　　 'Having bought a book, left the store, and sat down in the car, Malika didn't go home.'

Preverbal *'a* will be glossed with a '&' as a mnemonic for the fact that it plays a role in "conjoining" verb phrases together.

In contrast to preverbal *'a*, there is also a focus use of *'a* . When used in this way, *'a* appears immediately after the focused constituent. This use of *'a* is not central to the paper, but it will appear in various examples. To avoid confusion between this use and the preverbal use of *'a*, focal *'a* will be glossed as FOC.

For an enlightening discussion of the peculiarites of *'a* in Ingush, highlighting both its preverbal and focus uses, see Peterson (2001). The characteristics of *'a* in Ingush are essentially the same as in Chechen. Conathan and Good (2001) discuss some aspects of *'a* in Chechen.

2.3 *Nominal inflection and gender classes*

Chechen makes use of an extensive case system. The morphology of nominal inflection is far from regular, and it will not be possible to give a proper description of it here. However, all nouns do mark for case, making it useful in determining syntactic relationships. For ease in interpreting the example sentences, in table 3, I give the declension for the word *ch'aara* 'fish'. The absolutive case is morphologically unmarked. Therefore, absolutive nouns are not explicitly glossed as such.

[Table 3 goes here.]

7

In addition to being marked for case, each noun in Chechen has an inherent gender, which may be different for plural and singular forms of the noun. Of relevance to this paper is the fact that many (but not all) verbs in Chechen agree with the gender of their absolutive argument. While the majority of verbs do not agree with their subject, many of the most frequently used verbs do agree, meaning that agreement is prevalent in the examples in this paper.

The morphological realization of gender agreement on verbs in Chechen is a bit idiosyncratic. The first consonant of a verb showing agreement alternates between one of four consonants *b*, *d*, *j*, and *v* depending on the gender class of its absolutive argument. Taking the present tense stem of the verb meaning 'come' as an example, gender agreement will cause it to alternate between the forms *booghu*, *dooghu*, *jooghu*, and *vooghu*.

Since there are no coherent semantics to the four gender classes, agreement on the verb is simply glossed with capital letters corresponding to one of the four alternating consonants. However, there is at least one important correlation between semantics and gender which will be useful in interpreting the examples below. Singular human male referents are classified in the V gender and human female referents are classified in the J gender. Verbs always agree in gender with an absolutive noun in their clause.

3 The approach to clause combining employed in this paper

3.1 *Foley and Van Valin's (1984) typology of clause linkage*

Since it will be referred to often over the course of the description presented here, it will be useful to give an overview of Foley and Van Valin's typology of clause linkage. It is described in detail in Foley and Van Valin (1984: 238–320) and a more recent overview is provided in Van Valin (1993: 100–120).

Foley and Valin (1984: 239–44) distinguish between three types of *nexus*, where a nexus type refers to embeddedness and dependency relations between linked clauses (239). These three types are labeled coordinate, cosubordinate, and subordinate. Coordination, in their typology, refers to a type of nexus in which non-dependent, non-embedded clauses are linked together. Subordination

refs to the linking of a dependent, embedded clause within another clause. Cosubordinate nexus, on the other hand, refers to a type of linkage involving a dependent, but non-embedded, clause linked to another clause. Cosubordination, thus, in some sense, is a type of linkage which has some properties traditionally associated with coordination and others traditionally associated with subordination. The terms embedded and dependent are used by Foley and Van Valin with particular, technical meanings and should not be conflated with any traditional senses they may have.

Examples of coordinate, cosubordinate, and subordinate nexus in English sentences are given in (6). All examples are taken from Foley and Van Valin (1984).

(6) a. COORDINATION

The man bought some soap, and the woman will look for a new dryer. (239)

b. COSUBORDINATION

Fred has already left Santa Fe and should arrive in New Orleans tomorrow. (259)

c. SUBORDINATION

Because John kissed her, Mary burst into tears. (249)

In (6a) each of the two clauses in the sentence can serve as independent sentences—they are, thus, in a coordinate relationship to each other. In (6b), on the other hand, there is no embedding relationship between the two clauses because neither fulfills any argument role for the other. However, there is a dependency relationship, by Foley and Van Valin's criteria, between them since they cannot be independently specified for illocutionary force as the sentence in (7) indicates.

(7)*Has Fred already left Santa Fe and should arrive in New Orleans tomorrow?

So, in (6b) there is no embedding, but there is dependency, between the linked clauses. Thus, their relationship is one of cosubordination.

9

Finally, in (6c) the first clause of the sentence is an adverbial modifier of the second clause and is, thus, considered to be embedded. Furthermore, like with the cosubordinate structure in (6b), the two clauses in (6c) cannot be independently specified for illocutionary force, indicating that there is a dependency relationship in the linkage. The *because*-clause is, therefore, embedded and dependent, and the two clauses in (6c) form a subordinate nexus.

In addition to nexus type, Foley and Van Valin consider there to be another parameter to clause linkage, the "level" of the linking (Foley and Van Valin 1984: 77-80). Of their three levels, nuclear, core, and peripheral, the focus here is on linking at the peripheral level (the clause linking in all the examples in (6) was at the peripheral level). Nexus at the nuclear level will not be discussed at all here since it involves the linking of predicates (typically verbs) and is outside the scope of this paper which involves the combining of clauses. The core level of a clause consists of a predicate plus its obligatory arguments. This is also generally outside the scope of this paper. (However, it will be argued in section 6 that one construction which superficially resembles subordinate nexus is actually an instance of core cosubordination.) The peripheral level of a clause includes certain clause-level operators, like tense and illocutionary force, and oblique verbal arguments, like temporal expressions. Subordinate clauses, in their traditionally understood sense, occupy oblique argument roles in their clauses.

Peripheral clause linking will be the focus of the discussion here since it is the only type of nexus which has been examined systematically for Chechen and the available data indicates that Chechen shows a formal distinction between coordinate, cosubordinate, and subordinate clause linkage at the peripheral level. Thus, Chechen offers support for the inclusion of cosubordination as a type of clause linkage along with the traditionally recognized types of coordination and subordination.

With respect to the sections below, most of the linked clauses described in section 4 are examples of coordinate nexus. The interesting exceptions are those cases which involve cosubordinate nexus and make use of the preverbal enclitic particle *'a*, which is more typically seen in chaining structures. Clause chaining, discussed in section 5, is the primary example of

cosubordinate nexus in Chechen. Most of the phenomena discussed in section 6 are examples of subordinate nexus. Justification for these classifications will be given at the end of each of section.

Here, a warning to the reader is appropriate: There is the potential for confusion in terminology. The domain of investigation is across structures which would traditionally be labelled coordination, chaining, and subordination. However, within Foley and Van Valin's system, chaining is not a well-defined term and coordination and subordination are sometimes used differently than in traditional descriptions. The general convention of the paper will be to always qualify any terms when they are used in the sense of Foley and Van Valin (1984). When unqualified, they should be understood in their traditional sense.

3.2 *A comparison of the syntax of coordination, chaining, and subordination*

The syntactic properties of coordination, chaining, and subordination will be covered in detail in each of the three in the following sections. Before giving these descriptions, it will be worthwhile to give a comparative overview of these three types of clause combining, stressing the criteria by which they have been distinguished from each other.

Coordinate structures in Chechen take on three basic shapes: sentential coordination (exemplified in (8a)), verb phrase coordination (exemplified in (8b)), and a type of coordination allowed in periphrastic tenses where an inflected auxiliary has scope over more than one main verb (exemplified in (8c)).

(8) a. *Ahwmada   ch'aara iicara, t'q'a Marjamas cicig doexkira.*
    Ahmed:ERG fish   buy:WP and   Mary:ERG cat   sell:WP
    'Ahmed bought a fish, and Mary sold a cat.'

  b. *Maliikas   ch'aara 'a iecara, cicig 'a doekhkira.*
    Malika:ERG fish   & buy:WP cat   & D:sell:WP
    'Malika bought a fish and sold a cat.'

11

c. *Ahwmad ch'eeri iecna   t'q'a Marjam cicigash iecna   ju.*

Ahmed   fish:PL buy:CVant and   Mary   cat:PL   buy:CVant J:be:PRS

'Ahmed has bought fish, and Mary has bought cats.'

The formal characteristics of clausal coordination which distinguish it from chaining and subordination are fairly straightforward. The coordinated clauses are always headed by verbs of the same morphological class. In (8a) and (8b) the conjoined clauses are headed by finite verbs, while in (8c) the conjoined clauses are headed by the anterior form of the verb which is part of a periphrastic tense construction where a finite form of the verb 'be' serves as an auxiliary.

As will be seen below, both chaining and subordinate structures involve some asymmetry in the verb forms in the combined clauses, which is what makes coordinate structures easily identifiable.

Although it would seem to be a theoretical possibility, it is difficult to find unambiguous cases of coordinated chained clauses or subordinate clauses. Chained structures with the semantics of a coordinate structure are formally indistinguishable from more typical chains, as indicated in the example in (9a) where a coordinate translation and narrative translation are both possible for the bolded verb phrases. Potentially coordinated subordinate clauses, like the pair of clauses headed by posterior converbs in (9b), do not appear with an overt coordinating conjunction. As will be seen in section 4, asyndetic coordination is possible in Chechen. So (9b) could be an instance of coordination, but it could also be two separate adjunctions of subordinate clauses. No test has yet been discovered to distinguish between these two possibilities.

(9) a. *Maliika,* **jish   liaqa 'a liaqna   xelxa 'a jella,**   *c'a   je'ara.*

Malika   song sing & sing:CVant dance & J:put:CVant house J:come:WP

'Malika sung and danced and then went home.'

'Malika sung, and then danced, and then went home.'

b. *Maliika c'a   jallalie,   Aadam dwa-vaghalie,*

Malika house J:come:CVpost Adam   DX-V:go:CVpost

Ahwmad samuq'a della   vara.

Ahmed   amused   D:give:CVant V:be:WP

'Before Malika come home and Adam left, Ahmed was happy.'

Overt coordination, in general, is less used as a strategy for clause combining in Chechen than it is in English. So, the lack clearly of coordinated chained or subordinate clauses is unsurprising. Of particular relevance to this issue is that the basic sentential coordinating conjunction *t'q'a* seen in (8) has a much smaller functional range than English *and*, which makes completely unambiguous instances of coordination fairly uncommon.

While distinguishing coordination from chaining and subordination is fairly straightforward, understanding why chaining structures are different from subordinate ones is somewhat more subtle. I give an example each of chaining and subordinate structures, for the sake of discussion, in (10). A short clause-chaining structure appears in (10a), and a sentence with a subordinate clause appears in (10b).

(10) a. *Ahwmad, zhwala 'a iecna,   vilxira.*

       Ahmed   dog   & buy:CVant V:cry:WP

       'Ahmed bought a dog and cried.'

    b. *Ahwmada   zhwala ieccha,   Marjam jilxira.*

       Ahmed:ERG dog   buy:CVtemp Mary   J:cry:WP

       'When Ahmed bought a dog, Mary cried.'

Unlike coordination, both chaining and subordination involve asymmetric clause combining. Specifically, both chained clauses and subordinate clauses are non-finite and must be combined with a matrix clause in order to be fully interpreted for certain semantic features, like tense. However, despite this overarching similarity, there are formal differences between chaining and subordination which justify positing two separate clause combining categories in Chechen. There is a certain flexibility to Chechen syntax which has made it impossible to find a single feature which unambiguously distinguishes chaining structures syntactically from subordinate structures.

13

However, a cluster of prototypical properties for each type makes the need for a distinction fairly clear.

Five features have been identified which, together, distinguish between these two broadly coherent classes of clause combining structures. Here I will sketch those features with an emphasis on comparison. Their details will be made clearer in the discussions of chaining and subordination in section 5 and section 6 respectively.

The first feature which can be used to distinguish chaining structures from subordinate ones are the verbal forms that head the two types of clauses. Only three verbal forms can head chained clauses. One of these, the present anterior is exclusive to chaining constructions. However, the other two, the simultaneous and anterior, are found in some subordinate constructions. Thus, the form of the verb alone can not be used to consistently distinguish chained clauses from subordinate ones. Subordinate clauses can be headed by a range of converb forms as indicated in table 2.

The second formal feature which is helpful in distinguishing chained clauses from subordinate ones is that chained clauses are always marked with preverbal *'a* (this can be seen in the first clause in (10a)). However, this feature, too, is not unique to chained clauses since, as seen in (8b), preverbal *'a* also takes part in finite verb phrase coordination. Importantly, preverbal *'a* is not a feature of any subordinate constructions. This means that a chained clause can always be identified by looking at two features: the form of its head verb and whether or not the clause contains preverbal *'a*.

The third formal feature distinguishing the two clause combing structures is that typical chaining constructions contain several chained clauses strung together in one sentence. For example, the sentence in (11), taken from a text, contains three chained clauses followed by the matrix clause. Typical subordinate structures, on the other hand, follow the pattern in (10b) where only one subordinate clause is associated with the matrix clause. (The chained clauses in (11) are in square brackets.)

(11) @*Jaghana, cuo,*   [*cwa hwoqa 'a be'ana,*]   [*doogha 'a duoxiina,*]

     J:go:CVant 3s:ERG one   stick   & B:come:CVant lock   & D:break:TR:CVant

     [*chu 'a jaghana,*] *ju'urg swa-iicara.*

     in   & J:go:CVant food   DX-take:WP

     '(Having Gone) she took the stake and broke the lock and went and took the food.'

This formal diagnostic, though clearly valid, is weaker than the first two since it is far from obligatory. The sentence in (10a) shows that chaining constructions containing only one chained clauses are perfectly grammatical, and the sentence in (9b) shows that multiple subordinate clauses combined with one matrix clauses are also found (though this example might be an instance of coordination as mentioned above).

The fourth formal diagnostic distinguishing chaining constructions from subordinate ones is that chaining structures, but not subordinate ones, show an overwhelming tendency to share a subject across each of the chained clauses as well as with the finite matrix clause. For one of the two consultants used in this study, this property of chaining constructions was obligatory. The second consultant accepted sentences like (12) when they were constructed, but did not offer them naturally. I have never observed a series of chained clauses without a shared subject across the clauses in a text. By way of comparison, both speakers preferred the sentence in (10b), which makes use of subordination, to express the semantics of the sentence in (12).

(12) *Ahwmada   zhwala 'a iecna,   Marjam jilxara.*

     Ahmed:ERG dog   & buy:CVant Mary   J:cry:WP

     'Ahmed bought a dog and Mary cried (because she didn't want him to).'

The pair of sentences in (9), thus, form a sort of minimal pair where the chaining construction can be employed when Ahmed both buys the dog and cries while the subordinate construction is employed when Ahmed buys the dog but Mary cries.

While it is the case that subordinate clauses can have a different subject from their matrix clause, this is not obligatory, as the sentence in (13) shows. Thus, chaining constructions are more

restricted in terms of argument sharing than subordinate ones.

(13) *Ahwmad c'a   vallalie,   irs   dolush   vara.*

    Ahmed   house V:come:CVpost happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

    'Before Ahmed got home, he was happy.'

The fifth diagnostic which can be used to distinguish chained clauses from subordinate ones involves long-distance reflexivization. (It will not be possible to explore long-distance reflexivization in depth here, but Nichols (2001) provides more information on the phenomenon in both Chechen and Ingush.)

Many of the sentences seen above, and which will appear below, involve clauses which completely lack a subject argument if it is coreferential with a subject argument elsewhere in the clause. However, it is generally possible to insert a pronominal argument in these clauses without altering the interpretation or grammaticality of the sentence. Interestingly, under certain conditions, Chechen allows this argument-filling pronoun to be reflexive even though its antecedent is outside the clause where the reflexive pronoun appears.

An example of long-distance reflexivization is seen in (14a). In this sentence, the reflexive pronoun *shaa* in a subordinate clause headed by the immediate anterior converb is coreferential with the overt subject, *Ahwmad*, of the main clause. The sentence in (14b) shows that the reverse situation, where a reflexive pronoun in the main clause is coreferential with the subject of a subordinate clause, is not possible. (Sentence (14b) has no grammatical reading.)

(14) a. ***Shaa**_i*   *c'a   jallalc,*   ***Ahwmad**_i irs   dolush   vara.*

      3s:RFL:ABS home J:come:CVuntil Ahmed   happy D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

      'Until he_i came home, Ahmed_i was happy.'

   b.****Ahwmad** c'a   jallalc,*   ***shaa**   irs   dolush   vara.*

      Ahmed   home J:come:CVuntil 3s:RFL:ABS happy D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

The pair of sentences in (14) which contain subordinate clauses contrasts with the pair below which shows the behavior of long-distance reflexivization in chaining constructions.

(15) a. ***Ahwmad***$_i$ *tykana   'a vaghna,   c'a   ve'ara   **shaa***$_i$.

      Ahmed   store:DAT & V:go:CVant house V:come:WP 3s:REFL

      'Ahmed went to the store and came home.'

    b. ***Shaa***$_i$ *tykana   'a vaghna,   c'a   ve'ara   **Ahwmad***$_i$.

      3s:REFL store:DAT & V:go:CVant house V:come:WP Ahmed

      'Having gone to the store, Ahmed went home.'

As can be seen, while subordinate constructions show an asymmetry where an overt subject in a matrix clause can control a reflexive subject in a subordinate clause but not vice versa, chaining constructions show no such asymmetry. That is, the finite matrix clause of chaining constructions is not "privileged" with respect to controlling long-distance reflexivization.

Long-distance reflexivization would seemingly be one test which could clearly distinguish subordinate structures from chaining ones except for the fact that one converb, the temporal converb, shows the reflexivization pattern of chaining constructions, as seen in (16). This is the only subordinate construction that has been observed to behave this way.

(16) a. ***Ahwmad***$_i$ *c'a   ve'acha,   **shaa***$_i$ *irs   dolush   xir   vara.*

      Ahmed   house V:come:CVtemp 3s:REFL happiness D:be:CVsim be:FUT V:be:WP

      'When Ahmed$_i$ came home, he$_i$ was happy.'

    b. ***Shaa***$_i$ *c'a   ve'acha,   **Ahwmad***$_i$ *irs   dolush   xir   vara.*

      3s:REFL house V:come:CVtemp Ahmed   happiness D:be:CVsim be:FUT V:be:WP

      'When he$_i$ came home, Ahmed$_i$ was happy.'

Three other areas of Chechen syntax were studied to determine if there were further ways in which chaining constructions and subordinate constructions would show systematically different behavior: word order, negation, and *wh*-questions. Some of the results of the tests performed will be presented below. However, they did not produce any further diagnostics for distinguishing chaining structures from subordinate ones.

A final area in which chaining constructions and subordinate constructions differ is in their basic semantics. As will be seen in the discussion in sections 5 and 6, subordinate clauses modify their matrix clause in some way, most typically having some sort of temporal force. Chained constructions, however, do not modify their matrix clause. Rather, they are used to string together a sequence of related events into one sentence. That being said, there is certainly the potential overlap between the semantics of subordinate and chaining structures, especially between the semantics of the temporal converb and a chained clause as illustrated in the pair of sentences in (17). The chained and subordinate clauses being compared are bolded.

(17) a. ***Malika tykana   'a jaghna***, *(cuo)   kinchka uecush,   cunna Aadam gira.*
   Malika store:DAT & J:go:CVant 3s:ERG book   buy:CVsim 3s:DAT Adam see:WP
   'Malika went to the store, and buying the book, she saw Adam.'

   b. ***Malika tykana   jaghcha***, *cuo   kinchka uecush,   cunna Aadam gira.*
   Malika store:DAT J:go:CVtemp 3s:ERG book   buy:CVsim 3s:DAT Adam see:WP
   'When Malika went to the store, buying a book, she saw Adam.'

A potentially interesting observation to be made here is that the subordinate verb form which has the most semantic overlap with chained clauses, the temporal converb, is also the one which behaves like chained clauses with respect to long-distance reflexivization, as seen above.

Having gone over the criteria which were used to distinguish between coordination, chaining, and subordination, in the next sections the properties of the various constructions will be covered in more detail. Section 4 will describe the major coordinate structures of the language, section 5 will describe chaining structures, and section 6 will describe subordinate structures.

4   Coordination

4.0   *Introduction*

In this section, the strategies Chechen employs for "coordination" of clauses will be discussed. Coordination, here, is used in its traditional sense. However, section 4.3 will show that

this label might not be the most accurate way to characterize all the constructions which will be seen according to Foley and Van Valin's (1984) typology of clause combining types.

Two major types of clausal coordination will be covered: sentential coordination and verb phrase coordination. These two types of coordination have distinct properties. Sentential coordination involves the juxtaposition of two clauses with or without a conjunction between them, while verb phrase coordination uses the special clause-internal preverbal conjunctive enclitic *'a* within each conjunct when finite verbs are coordinated but uses a different strategy for certain periphrastic tenses.

In section 4.3, the types of coordination will be examined with respect to Foley and Van Valin's (1984) typology of clause linkage. It will be argued that the sentential coordination discussed here is an example of coordinate nexus, by their terminology, while finite verb phrase coordination is an example of cosubordinate nexus.

4.1   *Sentential coordination*

Chechen allows both asyndetic coordination and coordination with overt conjunctions. In (18) examples of asyndetic coordination are given. Asyndetically coordinated sentences can be distinguished from juxtaposed, independent sentences by the lack of a strong prosodic break between the two conjuncts.

(18) a. *Dwadaellarg   t'iehwa du,   xinderrig hwalxa du.*

     DX:go:CVant:NZ behind D:be:PRS future   front   D:be:PRS

     'The past is behind me, the future is ahead of me.'

  b. *Suuna Ahwmad ca   gira,   Aadam gira.*

     1s:DAT Ahmed   NEG see:WP Adam   see:WP

     'I didn't see Ahmed, I saw Adam.'

Chechen can also form basic coordinate structures combining two finite clauses by making use of a conjunction as in the sentence in (19) where the conjunction *t'q'a* appears.

(19) *Ahwmada   ch'aara iicara,   t'q'a Marjamas cicig iicara.*

   Ahmed:ERG fish   buy:WP and   Mary:ERG cat   buy:WP

   'Ahmed bought a fish, and Mary bought a cat.'

In addition, Chechen allows arguments to be dropped in the second conjunct when they are the same as arguments in the first conjunct. An example of this in asyndetic coordination was seen in (18b) where the subject appears in only the first conjunct. An example of such conjunction reduction for syndetic coordination is seen in (20).

(20) *Ahwmada   ch'aara iicara,   t'q'a Marjamas 'a   iicara   izza.*

   Ahmed:ERG fish   buy:WP and   Mary:ERG FOC buy:WP 3s:FOC:ABS

   'Ahmed bought a fish, and Mary bought one, too.'

In (20) the second clause lacks an overt object and the object of its verb *iicara* 'buy:WP' is interpreted as being the same as the object of *iicara* in the first sentence. In addition, the enclitic *'a* appears after the subject of the second clause *Marjaama*, and the word *izza*, here translated as 'too', but phonologically the same as the emphatic third singular nominative pronoun, appears at the end of the sentence. The appearance of the particle *'a* in sentences like (20) is an example of focal *'a*. There, it indicates contrastive focus of the subject of the second clause with with the subject of the first clause.

Various other types of reduced coordinate structures similar to the one seen in (20) can also be found as the sentences in (21) indicate.

(21) a. *Ahwmada   ch'aara iicara,   t'q'a Marjamas 'a dira   izza.*

   Ahmed:ERG fish   buy:WP and   Mary:ERG & D:do:WP 3s:FOC:ABS

   'Ahmed bought a fish, and Mary did, too.'

   b. *Ahwmada   ch'aara, t'q'a Marjamas cicig uecur   du.*

   Ahmed:ERG fish   and   Mary:ERG cat   buy:FUT D:be:PRS

   'Ahmed will buy a fish and Mary a cat.'

c. *Ahwmadna   ch'aara kariira, t'q'a Marjamas iicara.*

  Ahmed:DAT fish   find:WP and   Mary:ERG buy:WP

  'Ahmed found, and Mary bought, a fish.'

In (21a) an example of *do*-support can be seen in the highly reduced second conjunct. In (21b) the verb is deleted from the first conjunct. In this particular sentence, the verb agrees with the absolutive argument of the second conjunct *cicig* 'cat', which is in the D gender class. The word *ch'aara* 'fish' is in the B gender class. In (21c) two clauses with contrasting verbs, but the same object, are conjoined.

Following a general grammatical pattern in the language, word order in conjoined sentences is very free. No parallelism restrictions, for example, hold between two conjoined sentences as the examples in (22) illustrate.

(22) a. *Ahwmada   iicara   ch'aara, t'q'a Marjamas doexkira cicig.*

  Ahmed:ERG buy:WP fish   and   Mary:ERG sell:WP   cat

  'Ahmed bought a fish, and Mary sold a cat.'

  b. *Ahwmad   ch'aara iicara, t'q'a cicig doexkira Marjamas.*

  Ahmed:ERG fish   buy:WP and   cat   D:sell:WP Mary:ERG

  'Ahmed bought a fish, and Mary sold a cat.'

Questions formed from conjoined sentences have some fairly interesting properties. Unsurprisingly, it is possible to form *wh*-questions where one *wh*-word fills the same structural position in two conjuncts as in the example in (23a). However, it is also possible to have a *wh*-word in only one of two conjuncts but only if the second conjunct is interpreted as a yes/no question. In other words, the presence of a *wh*-word in a coordinate structure implies that the whole sentence is given interrogative force even if the *wh*-word only has force in one conjunct. An example of this is given in (23b).

(23) a. *Hu~ Ahwmada   iicara, t'q'a Marjamas joexkira.*

   what Ahmed:ERG buy:WP and   Mary:ERG J:sell:WP

   'What did Ahmed buy and Mary sell?'

   b. *Hwa~   ch'aara iicara, t'q'a Marjamas cicig doexkira?*

   who:ERG fish   buy:WP and   Mary:ERG cat   sell:WP

   'Who bought a fish, and did Mary buy a cat?'

In a sentence like the one in (23b) the interrogative force on the second conjunct is conveyed via intonation. A very similar sentence is given in (24) where the yes/no question status on the second conjunct is explicitly marked by the use of an *-ii* interrogative suffix on the second verb. (One of the uses of anterior form of the verb is as a finite verb with a non-witnessed past tense reading. In this way, it is very similar to English verbs ending in *-ed* which have main clause and subordinate clause uses.)

(24) *Hwa~   ch'aara iecna,   t'q'a Marjamas cicig iecnii?*

   who:ERG fish   buy:CVant and   Mary:ERG cat   buy:CVant:INT

   'Who bought a fish, and did Mary buy a cat?'

4.2   *Verb phrase coordination*

In addition to sentential coordination, two main types of verb phrase coordination can be found in Chechen. The first is where a finite auxiliary used in periphrastic tense constructions can have scope over verb phrases headed by non-finite verb forms. The progressive offers a straightforward example. It is formed using the simultaneous form of the verb plus a form of the verb *Du* 'be' in a construction very similar to the English *be. . . -ing* progressive. Examples are given in (25). In (25a) two full sentences are conjoined with *t'q'a* and both contain a finite form of *Du* as part of the progressive. In contrast, in (25b) the auxiliary only appears once and has scope over both conjuncts.[2]

(25) a. *Ahwmad ch'aara uecush* **vu,** *t'q'a Marjam cicig uecush* **ju.**

      Ahmed fish   buy:CVsim V:be:PRS and Mary:ERG cat   buy:CVsim J:be:PRS

      'Ahmed is buying a fish, and Mary is buying a cat.'

   b. *Ahwmad ch'aara uecush* *t'q'a Marjam cicig uecush* **ju.**

      Ahmed fish   buy:CVsim and Mary:ERG cat   buy:CVsim J:be:PRS

      'Ahmed is buying a fish, and Mary is buying a cat.'

The construction exemplified in (25b) is different from all others seen in this section insofar as there is only one finite verb in the sentence, the form of 'be', and the other verbs are in a non-finite form. This means, in terms of Foley and Van Valin's typology, that this is an instance of core coordination (1984: 245) and is not central to the general discussion of this paper.

The other type of verb phrase coordination involves coordination of two finite verbs and is, thus, an example of peripheral coordination. In this construction, the enclitic particle *'a* is placed in immediate preverbal position before the finite verb in each conjunct as seen in the examples in (26). This structure deviates from the other forms of coordination in requiring *'a* to be placed within each conjunct and not allowing the use of a coordinating conjunction like *t'q'a*. This is the only case where preverbal *'a* has been observed outside of a chaining construction. So, although examples like those seen in (26) are examples of coordination insofar as they are semantically coordinate, their structure is very different from that of the other forms of coordination seen above. It is worth noting that this type of coordination shares another structural similarity to chaining constructions in addition to its use of preverbal *'a*—it involves clause linkage where two clauses must share a subject.[3]

(26) a. *Maliika loomax hwal 'a jeelara oahwa 'a joessara.*

      Malika mountain:LAT up   & J:ascend:WP down & J:descend:WP

      'Malika climbed up and down the mountain.'

b. *Maalik viela   ’a viilara   vialxa ’a vilxara.*

Malik   V:laugh & V:laugh:WP V:cry & V:cry:WP

‘Malik laughed and cried.’

Two facts show that this use of *’a* is a case of preverbal *’a* and not an instance of focal *’a*. The first is quite simply that the consultants do not report any particular focus semantics for the elements preceded by *’a* (or the whole verb phrase, for that matter). The second is that when focal *’a* has been observed in coordinate structures, as in (20) for example, it only appears on the contrasting member of the second conjunct, not in both conjuncts as is the case in the examples in (26).

As with sentential coordination (and all other types of clause combining examined), the structure seen in (26) permits a wide range of word orders and allows arguments to be unexpressed in one conjunct when they are the same in another conjunct. In (27a) a variant word order for (26a) is given, and in (27b) the argument *ch’eeri* ‘fish.PL’, while expressed only once, is understood as the subject of both verbs.

(27) a. *Hwal ’a jeelira   oahwa ’a joessira   Maliika loomax.*

DX   & J:go:WP down & J:descend:WP Malika mountain:LAT

‘Malika climbed up and down the mountain.’

b. *Ieca ’a iecara   doexka ’a doexkira ch’eeri Maliikas.*

buy & buy:WP sell   & D:sell:WP fish:PL Malika:ERG

‘Malika bought and sold some fish.’

With respect to negation, for semantic reasons, the consultant rejected sentences showing this sort of verb phrase coordination when only one of the conjuncts was negated. Specifically, such a structure required the insertion of an overt conjunction *amma* ‘but’ which requires sentential conjuncts. Thus, in (28a) is the correct variant of (26a) with the second conjunct negated. When both conjuncts are negated, there is no such semantic problem and true verb phrase coordination is possible, as seen in (28b).

(28) a. *Maliika loomax　　 hwal jeelira, amma (iza)　 oahwa ca joessara.*

　　　 Malika　mountain:LAT DX　 J:go:WP but　 3s:ABS down　not J:descend:WP

　　　 'Malika climbed up the mountain but (she) didn't climb down.'

　　b. *Maliika loomax　　 hwal 'a ca jeelara oahwa 'a ca joessara.*

　　　 Malika　mountain:LAT DX　 & not J:go:WP down　& not J:descend:WP

　　　 'Malika didn't climb up and down the mountain.'

For reasons that are unclear to me, but presumably are pragmatic in nature, this sort of verb phrase coordination was resistant to question formation. Again using the sentence in (26a) as a base, the sentence in (29a) was given as the proper yes/no question form, and the sentence in (29b) was given as the proper form of a *wh*-question on the subject of the sentence.[4] Sentence (29a) is an example of a chaining construction, and sentence (29b) makes use of sentential coordination.

(29) a. *Ahwmad, loomax　　 cheaxka hwal 'a vialla,　 mialligsh oahwa voessarii?*

　　　 Ahmed　 mountain:LAT quickly DX　& V:go:CVant slowly　 down V:descend:WP:INT

　　　 'Did Ahmed climb up the mountain quickly and down slowly?'

　　b. *Mila loomax　　 cheaxka hwal veelira,　 t'q'a mialligsh oahwa voessira?*

　　　 Who mountain:LAT quickly　DX　 V:go:WP and　 slowly　 down　V:descend:WP

　　　 'Who climbed up the mountain quickly and down slowly?'

In the next section, I will take up the issue of how sentential and verb phrase coordination fit into Foley and Van Valin's (1984) typology of clause linkage. It will be argued that, despite the cover term "coordination" used here to describe both, they both exemplify different sorts of clause combining which helps to explain their different formal behavior.

4.3　*The typological status of coordinate structures in Chechen*

Many of the examples of clause combining at the peripheral level seen above are clearly cases of coordination insofar as two constituents are conjoined which could function as independent sentences on their own.

However, some of the examples are a bit more problematic since they contain reduced structures that cannot serve as independent clauses. In section 4.1 we saw one class of sentences, exemplified below by the sentence in (30), which involved apparent sentential coordination where the second conjunct was reduced.

(30) *Ahwmada   ch'aara iicara,   t'q'a Marjamas 'a iicara   izza.*

    Ahmed:ERG fish   buy:WP and   Mary:ERG & buy:WP 3s:FOC:ABS

    'Ahmed bought a fish, and Mary bought one, too.'

A second class of problematic examples was seen in section 4.2 where verb phrases were conjoined by use of preverbal *'a*. These are exemplified here by the sentence in (31).

(31) *Maliika loomax   hwal 'a jeelara   oahwa 'a joessara.*

    Malika mountain:LAT up   & J:ascend:WP down & J:descend:WP

    'Malika climbed up and down the mountain.'

Since neither clause is an argument of the other clause in examples like (30) and (31) we know that there is no embedding of one clause into another and, therefore, none of these sentences are cases of subordinate nexus. Less clear, however, is whether or not the nexus types of these sentences are coordinate or cosubordinate—in order to determine this, it is necessary to determine whether or not the reduced structures exemplified by (30) and (31) are dependent in the sense of Foley and Van Valin (1984).

According to Foley and Van Valin's operator hierarchy (1984: 224), the conclusive test to determine the lack of a dependency relation between two clauses is if each can have different illocutionary force from the other. For example, if a sentence, paralleling (21c), like, *Ahmed found, but did Mary buy, a fish?*, were grammatical in Chechen, then there would be no dependency relationship between the two clauses.

Though data involving structures like that seen in (30) and (31) where the conjuncts have different illocutionary force is difficult to elicit, some examples have been found. What these

26

examples indicate is that the structures exemplified in (30) are examples of coordinate nexus while those in (31) are examples of cosubordinate nexus.

(32) *Ahwmad ch'aara uecush vu, amma ahw ma ieca!*

 Ahmed fish buy:CVsim V:be:PRS but 2s:ERG not buy:IMP

 'Ahmed is buying a fish, but don't you buy (one), too!'

(33) a. *Ahwmad loomax cheakhka hwal 'a veelara*

  Ahmed mountain:LAT quickly up & V:ascend:WP

  mialligsh oahwa 'a voessara.

  slowly down & V:descend:WP

  'Ahmed ascended the mountain quickly and descended it slowly.'

 b.**Ahwmad loomax cheakhka hwal 'a veelara*

  Ahmed mountain:LAT quickly up & V:ascend:WP

  mialligsh oahwa 'a voessara?

  slowly down & V:descend:WP

  Intended reading: 'Ahmed ascended the mountain quickly, and descended it slowly?'

  (Interrogative force only on second conjunct.)

 c. *Ahwmad loomax cheakhka hwal veelara*

  Ahmed mountain:LAT quickly up V:ascend:WP

  amma mialligsh oahwa voessara?

  but slowly down V:descend:WP

  'Ahmed ascended the mountain quickly, but descended it slowly?'

  (Interrogative force only on second conjunct.)

The sentence in (32) shows that the conjuncts in a sentential linking construction can have different illocutionary even when one of the conjuncts is reduced. Both occurrences of the verb

ieca 'take' are taken to have *ch'aara* 'fish' as their object, but that word only appears in the first conjunct. Since each conjunct in such a sentence can have different illocutionary force, there can be no dependence between them. Thus, they must be examples of peripheral coordination, in the sense of Foley and Van Valin (1984).

The two conjuncts in verb phrase linking which make use of preverbal *'a*, on the other hand, cannot be specified for different illocutionary force as the data in (33) illustrates. The verb phrase linking in (33a) is grammatical. However, when an attempt was made to elicit a sentence like that in (33b), where the second conjunct had interrogative force, the consultant rejected it and offered the sentence in (33c) as a grammatical alternative. The ungrammaticality of (33b), implies that there is dependency between the clauses for illocutionary force and, therefore, that their relationship is one of cosubordination.

The contrast between the ungrammatical (33b) and the grammatical (33c) is striking since the sentences are essentially the same except for the type of linking construction they employ. In order to make a grammatical variant of (33b), the consultant made use of precisely the same type of construction that the data in (32) showed to be coordinate. That is, a construction which makes use of an overt conjunction (here, *amma* 'but'), doesn't use preverbal *'a*, and in which one of the conjuncts is reduced. (In the discussion of forming questions from coordinated verb phrases above, we saw in sentence (29b), that it is not simply *amma* which is incompatible with the absence of preverbal *'a*. The more neutral coordinating *t'q'a* 'and' had the same effect.)

The conclusions drawn from the data in (32) and (33) fit nicely within the larger descriptive picture of Chechen clause combining. The structures exemplified by (30) are formally very similar to structures which are clearly coordinate, like the one (19) which contains two conjuncts each of which can be an independent sentence. Thus, it is not surprising that they appear to be coordinate structures based on Foley and Van Valin's (1984) criteria.

The sentences exemplified by (31), on the other hand, closely resemble chained expressions, which will be discussed below in section 5 and will be clearly shown, in section 5.9, to be examples of cosubordinate nexus. (Cross-linguistically, clause chaining constructions, in fact, are

28

considered by Foley and Van Valin to be one of the best examples of cosubordinate nexus at the peripheral level (1984: 257).) Verb phrase coordination, like chaining, involves a shared subject across two predicates and makes use of preverbal *'a*.

While examples of enclitics with the form *'a* are found throughout Chechen grammar, encliticized to a wide range of grammatical categories, preverbal *'a* has only been observed in verb phrase coordination and chaining constructions. Describing preverbal *'a* as a marker of peripheral cosubordination in Chechen allows a simple characterization of these two syntactic environments and is, thus, taken as strong support of Foley and Van Valin's (1984) characterization of cosubordination. Without their notion of cosubordination, it is not clear how else chaining structures and verb phrase linking constructions could be classified together while, at the same time, excluding all of the true coordination constructions seen in this section—especially ones like (33c) where preverbal *'a* does not appear but there is a shared subject between the two conjuncts.

4.4   *Conclusion*

In this section, the two basic types of clausal coordination were discussed. The first was sentential coordination. It can be either syndetic or asyndetic, and it is possible to conjoin a reduced conjunct with a full conjunct when they share arguments. The second type of coordination was verb phrase coordination. Peripheral verb phrase coordination required preverbal *'a* to appear in each conjunct.

It was also argued that, in Chechen, sentential linking is an example of coordinate nexus, in the sense of Foley and Van Valin (1984), and verb phrase linking is an example of cosubordinate nexus.

5   **Chaining**

5.0   *Introduction*

This section covers one of the typologically more interesting features of Chechen clause combining, clause chaining. Clause chaining is a phenomenon in which a series of clauses

29

bearing a narrative relationship to each other are joined together into a structure in which the verb in only one of those clauses is fully inflected. The tenses of all other verbs in the chain are interpreted with respect to the fully inflected verb. (For a more detailed discussion of chaining see Longacre (1985: 263-83).) Many languages which make use of chaining also formally have a well-developed system of switch-reference marking (Longacre 1985: 264). While Chechen does have one intriguing device, discussed in section 5.8 of indicating change in subject between chained clauses, this is fairly marginal in comparison to other clause chaining languages. (The discussion in section 5.8 will address the issue of how the restriction that the clauses in chaining constructions must share a subject can be rectified with the fact that Chechen exhibits different subject marking in chained expressions.)

In the sections below, the formal properties of chained expressions will be delineated. Sections 5.1–5.5 discuss a range of properties of chained expressions, section 5.8 describes what is known about different subject marking in chaining constructions, and section 5.9 places chaining in Chechen within Foley and Van Valin's (1984) typology of clause linkage arguing that chaining is an example of peripheral cosubordination.

Throughout the discussion below, the term *chained clause* will refer to a non-finite clause in a sentence exhibiting clause chaining. The term *chained expression* will refer to a sentence which contains one or more chained clauses.

5.1 *The basic structure of chained expressions*

The most common chaining structures involve the use of the anterior form of the verb *-na* with preverbal *'a* to express a sequential relationship between the events described by a series of clauses. Several examples are given below—the chained clauses are separated from each other and the matrix clause by commas.

(34) a. *Ahwmada,   kiexat jaaz 'a dina*,   *zhejna dueshu.*

      Ahmad:ERG letter   write & D:do:CVant book   D:read:PRS

      'Ahmad, having written a letter, reads a book.'

b. *Ahwmad, wa 'a wiina,   dwa-vaghara.*

Ahmad   stay & stay:CVant DX-V:go:WP

'Ahmad stayed (for a while) and left.'

c. *Cicko,   ch'aara 'a gina,   'i   bu'u.*

cat:ERG fish   & see:CVant 3s:ABS B:eat:PRS

'The cat, having seen a fish, eats it.'

d. *Doogha toexna   aara 'a jialla,   tykana   'a jaghna,   c'a je'ara Maliika.*

lock   hit:CVant DX   & J:go:CVant store:DAT & J:come:CVant home J:go:WP Malika

'Having locked the door and gone out, Malika went to the store, and came home.'

e. @*Shiena$_i$*   *lastiina   hwoqa dwa 'a liacna,   uozosh   t'e 'a jaaliina,*

  3s:REFL:DAT swing:CVant stick   DX   & catch:CVant pull:CVsim DX & J:bring:CVant

gai-tte   miira toexna oahwa 'a jillina   hwoqa biatta   buoliira

stomach-on leg   hit:CVant DX   & J:put:CVant stick   B:beat:INF B:begin:WP

nuskaluo$_i$ maarnaanna.

bride:ERG mother-in-law

'The bride, having caught the stick which was being swung at her, pulling, brought it to her, kicked the mother-in-law, brought her down, and started to beat her with the stick.'

Sentence (34c) unambiguously illustrates the important fact that speakers prefer finite verb of in the chained expression, and not chained verbs, to assign case to the subject, since the verb in the chained clause *gina* 'see:CVant' assigns the dative case to its subject, not ergative (as seen in sentence (3)). In elicitation forms when the subject in initial position, speakers sometimes assign case to the subject based on the valence of the first (i.e. nearest) verb. However, upon reflection, they typically correct this. No corpus of natural Chechen speech exists to determine whether or not these elicitation effects reflect any true grammatical pattern in the language.

The sentences in (34a), (34b), and (34c) show a perfectly natural variant where the subject of each of the clauses in the chaining construction is at the beginning of the sentence.

31

The sentences in (34d) and (34e) show a more striking, but very common, pattern where the subject of each of the clauses in the chaining construction is at the end of the entire sentence. In the example in (34e), despite the very long chained construction, the two participants in the action expressed in the construction are the very last words in the sentence. The first word in the sentence *shiena*, the third singular dative reflexive pronoun, gets it case assigned locally by the verb *lastiina* 'swing:CVant'. It refers to the subject of the sentence *nuskaluo* 'bride:ERG', which gets it case assigned by the infinitive *biatta* 'beat' in the last clause. (The fact that *shiena* is reflexive makes it an instance of long-distance reflexivization discussed in section 3.2.)

5.2   *The verb forms used in chaining*

All the examples of chaining to this point have involved the anterior form of the verb. However, chains involving two other verb forms, the simultaneous and the progressive anterior (so called because it most naturally combines with matrix clauses with "progressive" semantics) also occur.

In (35) chaining constructions using the simultaneous form of the verb *-ush*, which has progressive semantics, are given. The English translations in (35) do not precisely render an important fact about their semantics, namely that the events in the chain are taken to happen in succession not simultaneously.

(35) a. *Dwa 'a q'oulush,   aara-veelira iza*
          DX   & close:CVsim DX-V:go:WP 3s:ABS
          'Closing (it), he went out.'

      b. *Ahwmad, niaw 'a joellush,   chuehwa veelara.*
          Ahmed   door & J:open:CVsim inside   V:go:WP
          'Opening the door, Ahmed went inside.'

c. *Doogha 'a tuoxush,   niaw dwa 'a q'oulush,   aara-veelira Ahwmad.*

    lock   & hit:CVsim door DX   & close:CVsim DX-V:go:WP Ahmed

    'Locking it, closing the door, Ahmed went out.'

There is both a chaining and a subordinate use of the simultaneous form of the verb. The primary formal marker of the different uses is that the chaining use employs preverbal *'a* while the subordinate use does not. This correlates with the important semantic difference that, when used in a chaining construction, the action of the simultaneous form of the verb precedes that of the finite verb while, when used in a subordinate construction, the two actions overlap. The near-minimal pair in (36) was offered by one consultant to illustrate the different senses.

(36) a. *Kinchka uecush,   cunna aghcha dai'ira.*

    book   buy:CVsim 3s:DAT money D:lost:WP

    'Buying the book, (s)he lost the money.'

   b. *Gazet   'a uecush,   c'a   je'ara.*

    newspaper & buy:CVsim house J:come:WP

    'Buying a paper, she went home.'

In (36a) the subject of the sentence is taken to have lost the money during the act of buying the book. In (36b), on the other hand, the subject is taken to have bought a newspaper and then gone home. There is a comparable dual use of the anterior form of the verb both as a chaining and subordinate form. This is discussed in section 6.4.

Chaining constructions making use of the progressive anterior form of the verb *-ii* are given in (37).

(37) a. *Maliikas,   tykana   'a juedii,   zhejna 'a uecii,   c'a   'a jooghii,*

    Maliika:ERG store:DAT & J:go:CVpan book   & buy:CVpan home & J:come:CVpan

    zhejna dueshu.

    book   D:read:PRS

    'Malika goes to the store, buys a book, comes home, and reads the book.'

33

b. *Cicko,   ch'aara 'a goj,   'i   bu'u.*

cat:ERG fish   & see:CVpan 3s:ABS B:eat:PRS

'The cat sees a fish and eats it.'

c. @*Shaa   micha=m juedash   chu   borsham 'a hwoqii   k'iegarniehwaa,*

  3s:REFL where=PTC J:go:CVsim inside whitewash & wipe:CVpan back-to-front

aara 'a joolii,   c'ianna   doogha 'a tuoxii,

DX   & J:go:CVpan house:DAT key   & hit:CVpan

dwa-juedash   xilla   'i.

DX-J:go:CVsim be:NW 3s:ABS

'When she went anywhere she whitewashed the inside (i.e. floor) from back to front, went out, locked the house, and left.'

The semantics of *-ii* are very similar to those of the anterior *-na*. In a chain, the action expressed by a clause headed by a progressive anterior is taken to be punctual and happens before the action expressed by the finite verb. The main difference between the progressive anterior and the anterior is what tense each allows in the head verb of the matrix clause it combines with. The progressive anterior cannot, for example, combine with matrix clauses where the head verb is in the witnessed past tense. However, they can both be used with some tenses without any detectable difference in meaning.

What makes understanding the exact use of each verb form difficult is the existence of pairs of sentences like (34c) and (37b) which have essentially the same meaning even though the chained clause in (34c) contains the anterior and the one in (37b) contains the progressive anterior. (However, the sentence in (37b) was the first one produced during elicitation and seems to be the more natural choice to combine the two clauses seen in those sentences.) The exact semantic difference between the anterior and the present anterior remains an open question.

5.3   *Shared subject arguments in chaining constructions*

As mentioned above chained clauses are subject to the restriction that each clause have the

34

same subject. (Though this restriction is not absolute for one of the consultants, it is certainly a very strong one.) The subject of each chained clause can either be overt or non-overt. If it is overt, it typically is reflexive, as in the first clause in sentence (37c), for example. However, an overt pronominal argument can also be non-reflexive as in (41c) below, for example. Examples of argument sharing where the shared argument is non-overt (i.e. null) in one of the clauses can be seen in every example given to this point, and, indeed, this is the most common pattern in chained clauses.

Chaining constructions provide important tests for subjecthood in Chechen. This is of particular interest for the language since it is a morphologically ergative. Despite this, it turns out not to be syntactically ergative with respect to clause chaining.

For example, in (11), repeated below in (38), the finite verb of the clause *iicara* 'take:WP' assigns ergative case to its subject—the pronoun *cuo* '3s:ERG' at the beginning of the sentence. This subject is taken to be the agent of each of the chained clauses including the next to last one *chu 'a jaghana* 'having gone in' which is intransitive and would assign the absolutive case to its agent. So, shared non-overt arguments in the sentence correspond to the agents of each clause—regardless of the case which would be assigned to them.

(38) @*Jaghana, cuo, cwa hwoqa 'a be'ana, doogha 'a duoxiina,*

    J:go:CVant 3s:ERG one stick   & B:come:CVant lock   & D:break:TR:CVant

    chu 'a jaghana, ju'urg swa-iicara.

    in   & J:go:CVant food   DX-take:WP

    '(Having Gone) she took the stake and broke the lock and went in and took the food.'

Similarly, in (2), repeated below in (39), the finite verb of the clause *je'ara* 'come:WP' assigns absolutive case to the subject of the chained expression *Maliika*. The next to last clause of this sentence, however, *zhejna 'a iecna* 'having bought a book', would assign ergative case to its agent. Again, despite this, the agent of the intransitive finite verb is also interpreted as the agent of the transitive verb *iecna* 'buy:CVant'.

(39) *Maliika, tykana   'a jaghna,   zhejna 'a iecna,   c'a   je'ara.*

Malika   store:DAT & J:go:CVant book   & buy:CVant home J:come:WP

'Malika went to the store, bought a book, and came back home.'

Interestingly, by this test, dative experiencers of perception verbs also behave like agents. This can be seen in sentence (40) where the finite verb *gira* 'see' assigns dative case to its subject *Maliikina* which is taken to be the agent of the two intransitive chained clauses and the transitive subordinate clause in the sentence.

(40) *Maliikina,   tykana   'a jaghna,   c'a   'a je'ana,*

Malika:DAT store:DAT & J:go:CVtemp home & J:come:CVant

njaw jillicha,   Ahwmad gira.

door J:open:CVant Ahmad   see:WP

'Malika went to the store, came home, when she opened the door, she saw Ahmed.'

5.4 *The order of clauses in chaining constructions*

All the examples seen so far are in canonical chaining order—a series of chained clauses in a sentence where the last clause contains the finite verb. The role order plays in the interpretation of the sentence is that the events in the chained clauses are interpreted as happening one after the other with the event of the main verb being taken as the last event of the sequence.

Some variability in the order of the chained clauses is possible—in particular chained clauses can be moved to the end of the sentence as in the examples in (41). (The postposed chained clauses are bolded.)

(41) a. *Maliika, tykana   'a jaghna,   c'a   je'ara,   **zhejna 'a iecna**.*

Malika   store:DAT & J:go:CVant home J:come:WP book   & buy:CVant

'Malika, having gone to the store, came back home, having bought a book.'

b. *Maliika c'a   je'ara,   **tykana   'a jaghna**,   zhejna 'a iecna.*

Malika home J:come:WP store:DAT & J:go:CVant book   & buy:CVant

'Malika came home, having gone to the store and bought a book.'

36

c. *Cicko   ch'aara bu'u,   **iza   cunna 'a goj**.*

cat:ERG fish   B:eat:PRS 3s:ABS 3s:DAT & see:CVpan

'The cat eats a fish, having seen it.'

As above, the chained clauses can be identified by the presence of preverbal *'a* in them and by the fact that they are headed by verbs in one of the three chaining forms. Importantly, shifting the order of the clauses does not alter the fact that the finite verb is understood to be the last event described by the sentence.

While the freedom of the order of chained clauses may seem surprising at first, we will see below for subordinate clauses in section 6 also can appear in variable positions with respect to the clause headed by the finite verb in the sentence. So, the examples in (41) can be understood to instantiate a general possibility for non-finite clauses.

5.5   *The order of words within a chained clause*

Chechen deviates from a pattern found in related languages where non-finite clauses tend to be restricted verb-final order. (See Testelec (1998: 271–2) for general discussion of this restriction in Nakh languages.)

The sentences in (42) illustrate that chained clauses do not need to be verb final. Because of a complicated restriction on the placement of preverbal enclitic *'a* that it's host be part of its verb phrase, these sentences contain copy verbs immediately preceding *'a* which serve as its phonological host. This copy verb imparts no special semantics to the construction.

(42) a. *Maliika, ieca 'a iecna   **kinchka**, Ahwmadna jelira.*

Malika   buy & buy:CVant book   Ahmed:DAT J:give:WP

'Malika, having bought a book, gave it to Ahmed.'

b. *Ga 'a goj   **ch'aara**, iza   bu'u   cicko.*

see & see:CVpan fish   3s:ABS B:eat:PRS cat:ERG

'Having seen the fish, the cat eats it.'

37

In the sentence in (42a), *kinchka* 'book' the object of *iecna* 'take.CVant' appears after the verb. Since that argument is not overtly referred to at all in the final clause, it may seem as though it is associated with that clause. However, this sentence was elicited with intonation which grouped *kinchka* with the clause headed by *iecna*. (Despite the fact that no overt argument corresponding to *kinchka* appears in the final clause, the J gender class agreement on the verb makes it clear that it is the object of *jelira* 'J.give.WP'.) In (42b) the object of chained clause, *ch'aara* 'fish' also appears after its verb, *goj* 'see.CVpan'. In that sentence, the presence of the pronoun *iza* '3s.ABS' referring to *ch'aara* in the second clause makes it completely clear that *ch'aara* is the object of *goj*.

A similar case of an argument following the verb of a chained clause was seen in (37c) where the oblique argument *k'iegarniehwaa* 'back-to-front' appeared after its verb *hwoqii* 'wipe:CVpan'. This example was found in a text.

5.6   *Negation in chained expressions*

When not semantically deviant, it is possible to negate a clause in a chained expression. Negation of the finite verb of the sentence has narrow scope and does not negate the whole sentence as the sentence in (43) illustrates.

(43) *Cicko,   ch'aara 'a goj,   'i   ca bu'u.*
       cat:ERG fish   & see:CVpan 3s:ABS not B:eat:PRS
       'The cat, having seen the fish, doesn't eat it.'

The sentence in (44) shows that a chained clause can be marked separately for negation.

(44) *Cicko,   ch'aara 'a ca goj,   'i   ca bu'u.*
       cat:ERG fish   & not see:CVpan 3s:ABS not B:eat:PRS
       'The cat, having not seen the fish, didn't eat it.'

I have been unable to construct a sentence where it is appropriate to negate a chained clause but not the finite clause. However, I do not believe this is a syntactic restriction. Rather, the semantics of such sentences simply make them unlikely candidates for chaining constructions.

5.7 Questions and chained expressions

Forming *wh*-questions within chained expressions is perfectly reasonable and the *wh*-word can either refer to the shared subject of the chained expression, an argument of a chained clause, or an argument of the finite clause. The examples in (45) illustrate this.

(45) a. *Mila, tykana   'a jaghna,   c'a   je'ara?*

    Who store:DAT & J:go:CVant house:ABS J:come:WP

    'Who went to the store and came home?'

  b. *Maliika, hu˜ 'a iecna,   c'a   je'ara?*

    Malika   what & buy:CVant house J:come:WP

    'Maliika bought what and came home?'

  c. *Kinchka 'a iecna,   micha jaghara Maliika?*

    book   & buy:CVant where J:go:WP Malika

    'Having bought a book, where did Malika go?'

In (45a) the *wh*-word refers to shared subject, in (45b) the *wh*-word is an argument of a chained clause, and in (45c) it is an argument of the finite clause.

It is also possible to form yes/no question on chained expressions as illustrated in (46).

(46) *Maliika, tykana   'a jaghna,   c'a   je'arii?*

  Malika   store:DAT & J:go:CVant house J:come:WP:Q

  'Did Malika go to the store and come home?'

As in the English translation, the scope of the yes/no question is over the whole sentence in (46).

5.8 The switch-reference causative

There is not an extensive system of switch-reference marking in Chechen. However, when clauses are chained and an oblique argument of one clause is coreferential with the shared subject

of the chain, a verb can appear in causative form, without any causative semantics—a type of different subject marking. This is illustrated in (47).

(47) *Maliikina$_i$ Ahwmad$_j$ 'a gina,   cunna$_j$ tuoxa 'a toexna,*

   Malika:DAT$_i$ Ahmed$_j$ & see:CVant 3s:DAT$_j$ hit   & hit:CVant

   cynga$_j$ shiena$_i$ 'a tuoxiitira.

   3s:LOC$_j$ 3s:RFL:DAT$_i$ & hit:CAUS:WP

   'Malika saw Ahmed, she hit him, and then he hit her.'

The second clause in (47) has a non-overt subject which is understood as being coreferential with *Maliika*, the subject of the first clause. In the last clause, the dative reflexive pronoun *shiena* is coreferential with *Maliika*. The agent of the last clause is also understood to be *cynga* a non-reflexive locative pronoun coreferential with *Ahwmad* in the first clause. Typically, however, the agent of the verb *tuoxa* 'hit' would be ergative, not locative. (The patient of *tuoxa* is always in the dative and an optional instrument is in the absolutive.) Furthermore, the form of the final verb *tuoxiitira* is causative, but has no obvious causative semantics. The causativization does seem to explain why *cynga* appears in the locative case since that is the case of the causee of a causative verb. So, although the causativization of the final verb is not reflected in the semantics, it is reflected in the syntax. The net effect of this whole construction is that it marks that the subject of the preceding clause is an oblique argument of the following clause—that is, it is a type of different subject marking.

The sentence in (47) could, in some sense, be viewed as a counterexample to the generalization that the subject is shared in each clause of a chained expression. Semantically, at least, *cynga*, appears to be the subject of the final clause, and this pronoun refers to Ahmed not Malika. However, this pronoun is in an oblique case never otherwise associated with the role of subject in Chechen. Furthermore, Malika retains the subject-like property of controlling reflexivization in the final clause. Therefore, it would seem, that whatever the semantics, Malika remains the syntactic subject of each clause of the sentence, and the example in (47), therefore,

follows the general restriction that clauses in chained expressions have the same subject.

5.9   *The typological status of chaining structures in Chechen*

Foley and Van Valin (1984: 257) claim that one of the best examples of cosubordinate nexus is the type of phenomenon seen in clause chaining. The particular examples of clause chaining they examined were from Papuan and American Indian languages. The claim here is that Chechen clause chaining is also an example of cosubordinate nexus. To justify that claim it is necessary to establish that the clauses headed by non-finite converbs in chained expressions are dependent, but not embedded.

It is clear that there is a dependency relationship in the linking of a non-finite chained clause with a finite clause since the tense of the non-finite clause can only be interpreted with respect to the tense of the finite clause. It is slightly more difficult to establish that non-finite chained clauses are non-embedded. This is because of examples like (48) in which the non-finite chained clauses superficially look as if they are embedded within the clause headed by the finite verb.

(48) *Maliikina,* **tykana**   **’a jaghna,**   **c’a**   **’a je’ana,**

   Malika:DAT store:DAT & J:go:CVant home & J:come:CVant

   njaw jillicha,   *Ahwmad gira.*

   door J:open:CVtemp Ahmad   see:WP

   ‘Malika went to the store, came home, when she opened the door, she saw Ahmed.’

The subject and first word of (48), *Maliikina* is in the dative case. Neither of the two bolded, chained clauses in (48) assigns dative case to their subjects. Neither does the non-bolded subordinate clause (clauses of this type are discussed in section 6.3). The only verb in (48) which assigns dative case to a subject is *gira* ‘see’. So, on the surface, the two chained clauses appear to be embedded in a finite clause headed by *gira*.

However, examples like (34e), show that there is considerable freedom with the placement of subjects of finite verbs in chained expressions. Also, there is evidence from the placement of preverbal *’a* that subjects in chained clauses are not syntactically closely connected to the rest of

41

the clause. Specifically, preverbal *'a*, which is an enclitic, must be preceded by an argument of the verb it is placed with respect to. This can include direct objects, preverbs, and directional markers—however, subjects cannot serve as hosts for *'a*, even absolutive subjects of intransitive verbs. Subjects, thus, syntactically, do not seem to form a tight constituent with their verb. (See Peterson (2001), for a discussion of the cognate particle in Ingush, and Conathan and Good (2000) for a discussion of Chechen which covers this aspect of the behavior of *'a* in more detail.) Thus, the ability to occur after an initial subject cannot really be taken as evidence that a non-finite chained clause is embedded within a finite clause.

Furthermore, embeddedness, in the sense of Foley and Van Valin (1984) is not determined by the surface word order of constituents. Rather it is determined by whether or not one clause must be considered an element of another clause. Chaining clearly occurs at the periphery of a clause, since chained clauses do not fill any argument roles of the finite verb in the sentence. Thus, if chained clauses were embedded, they would have to be peripheral elements of the clause headed by the finite verb. The periphery, according to Foley and Van Valin (1984: 77) "contains arguments expressing the spatio-temporal setting of [an] event as well as secondary participants in [an] event, e.g. beneficiaries."

Clearly, then, non-finite chained clauses are not part of the periphery of a clause. Their role is not to provide a "setting" for the predication of the finite verb. Rather, the semantic relationship between non-finite and finite clauses in a chained expression is purely one of temporal sequencing. Chechen employs subordination strategies, to be outlined in section 6, to explicitly mark the spatio-temporal setting of a clause with another clause.

To get a sense for how the criterion of being a peripheral argument distinguishes clause chaining from subordination, consider, for example, the pair of sentences in (49). The first uses the subordinate immediate anterior converb, and in the second the clause headed by this converb has been replaced a single temporal word, *dialq'ialc* 'until_noon'. The fact that the clause headed by the immediate anterior converb can be replaced by such a temporal expression indicates that the clause fills a peripheral argument slot.

(49) a. *Shaa   c'a   vallalc,   Ahwmad samuq'anie vara.*

3s:REFL house V:go:CVuntil Ahmed   amused:ALL V:be:WP

'Until he came home, Ahmed was happy.'

b. *Dialq'ialc Ahwmad samuq'anie vara.*

until_noon Ahmed   amused:ALL V:be:WP

'Until noon, Ahmad was happy.'

Just as in English, a clear relationship can be made between subordinated clauses and non-clausal temporal expressions. No such replacement can be done for chained clauses on the other hand. This is because they refer to events themselves and not peripheral arguments of events. Because of these facts, it is clear that by Foley and Van Valin's (1984) criteria, chained clauses are not peripheral arguments of the clause they are dependent on. Thus, they are dependent, but not embedded, meaning that the relationship between a chained clause and the clause headed by the finite verb in the chained expression is one of cosubordinate nexus.

It would be worthwhile, of course, to see if there are any other characteristics of Chechen grammar which indicate that subordinate clauses are in some sense embedded but chained clauses are not. Of the five criteria discussed in section 3.2 which distinguish chaining constructions from subordinate ones, one of them is potentially relevant to this question. This is the way the two types of clauses behave with respect to long-distance reflexivization. As mentioned in section 3.2, subordinate clauses (except for clauses headed by the temporal converb) showed an asymmetry where subjects of subordinate clauses could not be coreferential with reflexive pronouns in the main clause but subjects of main clauses could be coreferential with reflexive pronouns in subordinate clauses. Chained clauses showed no such asymmetry.

Assuming, perhaps not uncontroversially, that the relationship between reflexive pronouns and their antecedents in Chechen is somehow indicative of syntactic structure, the obvious inference to be made from these coreferentiality facts is that subordinate clauses are, in some sense, contained (i.e. embedded) within the structure of their finite clause while chained clauses

are simply linked to their finite clauses without being properly contained by them. Developing a formal analysis to match this descriptive intuition would lead us far astray from the main goal of this paper. However, long-distance reflexivization seems to me the most promising area of Chechen grammar to look for further criteria of syntactic embeddedness.

Having established that chaining in Chechen is an instance of cosubordinate nexus, it would be worthwhile to briefly compare it with verb phrase coordination which was also argued to be an instance of cosubordinate nexus. There is an interesting formal difference between the two with with respect to their use of the preverbal particle *'a*. In chaining constructions only the clauses headed by non-finite converbs contain preverbal *'a*. Thus, there is a distinction made between the dependent clauses and the clause headed by the finite verb with respect to the use of *'a*. In the verb phrase linking discussed in section 4.3, on the other hand, each clause is marked with preverbal *'a*. This seemingly corresponds with the fact that, while the clauses in such constructions are in a cosubordinate relation with each other, there is no clear asymmetry where one clause is dependent and the other independent. So, while peripheral cosubordinate nexus consistently makes use of preverbal *'a*, the exact details of its use are dependent on the particular clause linking construction being employed.

5.10   *Conclusion*

In this section clause chaining structures in Chechen were described across a range of parameters including their basic syntax, possible interclausal order and intraclausal word order, negation, and question formation. Additionally, the language's use of a different-subject marking device was briefly discussed. Finally, it was argued that clause chaining in Chechen is an example of peripheral cosubordination in the sense of Foley and Van Valin (1984).

6   Subordination

6.0   *Introduction*

In this section, various strategies Chechen employs for modifying finite matrix clauses with subordinate clauses will be covered. The core cases of this involve converbs, but there are also

strategies which make use of participles and nominalizations. Also, there is one lexical item which appears to be a subordinating conjunction. The basic semantics and syntax of each of subordination type will be discussed as well as various other aspects which are of potential typological interest like word order, question formation, and negation.

Most of the subordinate structures described in this section fit a pattern exemplified in the sentence in (50), repeated from (3). The basic structure is one in which a subordinate clause headed by a converb, which is final in its clause, precedes the clause it modifies—though neither of these two ordering restrictions is obligatory. This modified clause need not be finite. In fact, it is not uncommon for a subordinate clause to modify a chained clause (see, for example, the sentences in (67)).

(50) **Maliikina   Ahwmad gaalie**,   *iza   dwa-vuedu.*

    Malika:DAT Ahmed   see:CVpost 3s:ABS DX-V:come:PRS

    'Before Malika sees Ahmed, he leaves.'

In a sentence like (50), the absolute tense of the subordinate clause can only be interpreted with respect to the tense of the clause it attaches to. Subordinate clauses behave like normal clauses in terms of argument structure and case assignment. However, it is possible for arguments in subordinate clauses to be dropped when coreferential with arguments in the clause they modify (see, for example, (67a)). Also arguments in subordinate clauses are subject to long-distance reflexivization (as described above in section 3.2) if they are coreferential with the subject of the clause they modify.

With respect to coreference where the pronoun is not reflexive, all of the structures discussed in this section followed a basic pattern exemplified in (51) for the posterior converb.

(51) a. **Ahwmad$_i$** *c'a   vallalie,   'i$_j$ irs   dolush   vara.* $i{=}j$ or $i{\neq}j$

    Ahmed   house V:come:CVpost 3s:ABS happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

    'Before Ahmed$_i$ got home, he$_j$ was happy.'

b. **'I**$_i$ *c'a*   *vallalie,*   **Ahwmad**$_j$ *irs*   *dolush*   *vara.* $i{\neq}j$

3s:ABS house V:come:CVpost Ahmed   happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

'Before he$_i$ went home, Ahmed$_j$ was happy.'

The example in (51a) shows that a noun in a subordinate clause can be coreferential with a non-reflexive pronoun in the clause it modifies—thus, the restriction illustrated by sentence (15b) only applies to reflexive pronouns. The sentence in (51b) illustrates an effect where a non-reflexive pronoun in the subordinate clause cannot be coreferential with a noun in the main clause. The structure in (51b) represents the exact configuration where a reflexive pronoun would be used to indicate such coreference.

Another way in which all of the structures to be described in this section behaved consistently, to the extent that semantically appropriate sentences could be constructed, was with respect to negation. Negation in the modified clause never propagated up to the subordinate clause, which could be negated independently. The sentences in (52) illustrate this using the temporal converb.

(52) a. *Maliika c'a   je'acha,*   *Ahwmad irs*   *dolush*   *vaacara.*

Malika   house J:come:CVtemp Ahmed   happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP:NEG

'When Malika came home, Ahmed wasn't happy.'

b. *Maliika c'a   ca je'acha,*   *Ahwmad irs*   *dolush*   *vara.*

Malika   house not J:come:CVtemp Ahmed   happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

'When Malika didn't come home, Ahmed was happy.'

On the semantic level, the subordinate clauses which will be looked at here modify the action of the clause they are attached to or provide the topic for that clause. That is, they are either adverbial or adsentential modifiers in the sense of Bickel (1998).

The presentation of this section will try to both go through the use of each subordinating converb and discuss how Chechen expresses certain important adverbial relations involving clause combining. The focus will be on those constructions which use true converbs. For

46

completeness, certain structures which have similar semantics to converbal clauses will be discussed as well. There are two reasons for this. The first is to simply give the reader a sense for the range of strategies Chechen uses to convey the basic semantics of subordinate clause combining. The second is so that the syntactic properties non-core subordinating strategies can be compared with the core strategies.

In section 6.8, the subordinate constructions discussed in this section will be categorized according to Foley and Van Valin's (1984) typology of nexus types. Most of them will argued to be examples of peripheral subordinate nexus.

6.1 *Immediate anterior*

Clauses headed by converbs ending in *-(l)alc* in Chechen translate into English as subordinate clauses beginning with *until*, thus the name immediate anterior. Some examples are given in (53).

(53) a. *Maliika c'a   jallalc,   Ahwmad irs   dolush   vara.*
Malika home J:come:CVuntil Ahmed   happy D:be:CVsim V:be:WP
'Until Malika came home, Ahmed was happy.'

b. *Chyra humnash dwa-jiallalc, tyka swa-jillinira.*
inside thing:PL DX-go:CVuntil store DX-J:open:WP
'Until it ran out of things, the store was open.'

c. *Ahwmada,   (s)takanchu duzzalc,   xi   doettira.*
Ahmed:ERG glass:in   D:fill:CVuntil water D:pour:WP
'Ahmed, until the glass was full, poured water.'

The sentence in (54) shows that it is possible to position an immediate anterior clause after the clause it modifies. The position of subordinate clauses with respect to the clause they modify is generally flexible.

(54) *As   kinchka jiishira,   so   dwa-vizhalc.*

  1s:ERG book   J:read:WP 1s:ABS DX-V:sleep:CVuntil

  'I read the book until I fell asleep.'

Following a general pattern, the word order within immediate anterior clauses is also flexible as the sentence in (55) shows. The subject of the converb *jallalc* appears after the verb. The J gender marking on the verb, for a human female absolutive argument, makes the syntactic relationship unambiguous.

(55) *C'a   jallalc   Maliika, Ahwmad irs   dolush   vara.*

  home J:come:CVuntil Maliika Ahmed   happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

  'Until Malika came home, Ahmed was happy.'

Also following a general pattern, *wh*-questions are permitted for arguments of immediate anterior clauses, as seen in (56). (In the translations below, the echo-question reading is often the most salient one in English. However, examples like (56) do not necessarily correspond to echo questions in Chechen.)

(56) *Mila c'a   jallalc,   Ahwmad irs   dolush   vara?*

  Who house J:come:CVuntil Ahmed   happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

  'Ahmed was happy until who came home?'

Clauses headed by the immediate anterior converb, along with clauses headed by the posterior converb, to be discussed in the next section, represent the most prototypical subordinate clause types in Chechen. This is because they are headed by true converbs and show the regular pattern for long-distance reflexivization (unlike the temporal converb).

6.2 *Posterior*

There are two primary ways to express the idea encoded by English clauses beginning with *before*. Examples of the first, which makes use of a clause headed by a converb ending in *-lie* are given in (57). These are the more common of the two types. The second way to express

48

before-clauses involves the use of a nominalized form of the verb and a postposition. Examples of this latter type of clause combining will be presented in section 6.5.

(57) a. *Maliikina   Ahwmad gaalie,   iza   dwa-vuedu.*

       Malika:DAT Ahmed   see:CVpost 3s:ABS DX-V:come:PRS

       'Before Malika sees Ahmed, he leaves.'

   b. *Ahwmad c'a   vallalie,   irs   dolush   vara.*

       Ahmed   house V:come:CVpost happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

       'Before Ahmed came home, he was happy.'

The sentence in (58) shows that the position of a clause headed by the posterior converb with respect to the modified clause is flexible. In (58) the subordinate clause appears after the subject of the modified clause.

(58) *Ahwmad, Maliika c'a   jallalie,   irs   dolush   vara.*

    Ahmed   Malika house J:come:CVpost happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

    'Ahmed, before Malika came home, was happy.'

The example in (59) shows that word order within a clause headed by the posterior converb is also flexible. In (59) the subject of the converb appears at the end of the subordinate clause.

(59) *C'a   jallalie   Maliika, Ahwmad irs   dolush   vara.*

    house J:come:CVpost Malika   Ahmed   happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

    'Before Malika came home, Ahmed was happy.'

The sentence in (60) shows a *wh*-question on an argument of a clause headed by the posterior converb.

(60) *Mila suuna galie,   as   ch'aara iicara?*

    who 1s:DAT see:CVpost 1s:ERG fish   buy:WP

    'I bought a fish before I saw who?'

As mentioned above in section 6.1, clauses headed by the posterior converb are among the most prototypical examples of subordinating constructions in Chechen.

6.3 Temporal

A clause headed by the temporal converb form ending in *-cha* has a similar meaning to an English clause headed by *when*. Some examples of the temporal converb are given in (61). The semantic function of clauses headed by the temporal converb and chained clauses overlap to a considerable extent.

(61) a. @*Baga xi   qerzicha,   yzzu chaam xylu: miarza moz sanna miarza.*
   mouth water rinse:CVtemp same taste   be:INGR:PRS sweet   like honey sweet
   'When he rinses his mouth with water, the taste is the same, sweet like honey.'

   b. *Cuo   sei˜   vashiina   toexcha,   so   aara-veelara.*
   3s:ERG 1s:RFL:GEN brother:DAT hit:CVtemp 1s:ABS DX-V:go:WP
   'When he hit my brother, I went out.'

   c. *Dogha de'acha,   txo   loama   ghur daac.*
   rain   D:go:CVtemp 1pe:ABS mountain:ADV D:be:NEG
   'If it's raining, we won't go to the mountains.'

Sentence (61c) shows that the temporal converb can have a range of interpretations depending on context—in that sentence, it is best interpreted as a realis conditional.

The sentence in (62), where the clause headed by the temporal converb appears at the end of the sentence, shows that such clauses are not strictly ordered with respect to the clause they modify.

(62) *Ahwmad irs   dolush   vara, Maliika c'a   je'acha.*
   Ahmed   happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP Malika house J:come:CVtemp
   'Ahwmad was happy when Malika came home.'

The sentence in (63) shows that the order of elements within clauses headed by the temporal converb are also not strictly ordered.

(63) *C'a je'acha   Maliika, Ahwmad irs   dolush   vara.*

     house J:come:CVtemp Malika   Ahmed   happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

     'When Malika came home, Ahmed was happy.'

Sentence (64) shows that a *wh*-question can be formed based on an argument of a temporal converb.

(64) *Sunna mila gicha,   as   ch'aara iicara?*

     1s:DAT who see:CVtemp 1s:ERG fish   buy:WP

     'I bought a fish when I saw who?'

In sentence (16b) in section 3.2, a somewhat anomalous property of clauses headed by the temporal converb was described—specifically, the subject of such a clause can be coreferential with a reflexive pronoun in the modified clause. This pattern is typical of chaining structures, not subordinate ones. Clauses headed by the temporal converb have been seen to pattern with chained clauses in another way. The interrogative suffix *-ii*, used to form yes/no questions in Chechen, typically marks the finite verb of its clause. However, it has also been observed marking the head verb of a chained clause and the head verb of a temporal clause. Examples are given in (65).

(65) a. *Malika tykana   'a jaghn**ii**,   c'a   je'arii?*

       Malika store:DAT & J:go:CVant:INT house J:come:WP:INT

       'Did Malika go to the store and come home?'

    b. *Maliika c'a   je'ach**ii**,   Ahwmad irs   dolush   varii?*

       Malika house J:come:CVtemp:INT Ahwmad happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP:INT

       'When Malika came home was Ahmed happy?'

In the sentences in (65) both the finite verb and non-finite verbs are marked with *-ii* in the question formation. This is an optional strategy. No converb other than the temporal converb allowed this marking. Thus, this is another way, in addition to their behavior with respect to long-distance reflexivization, that such clauses pattern with chained clauses.

The temporal converb, thus, forms atypical subordinate clauses. In fact, the available evidence indicates that the clauses they form are ambiguous between chained clauses and subordinate ones. This ambiguity is not simply syntactic, but also, as mentioned above, semantic, since there is overlap between the semantics of the temporal converb and chained expressions.

Because clauses headed by the temporal converb can be replaced by temporal expressions, as indicated by the pair of sentences in (66), they are peripheral arguments by Foley and Van Valin's (1984) criteria. For this reason primarily, I have labeled them as subordinate clauses. However, it is clear that, in a more fine-grained classificatory system, we would need to place such clauses in a category between subordination and chaining.

(66) a. *Maliika c'a   je'acha,   Ahwmad irs   dolush   vara.*

       Malika house J:come:CVtemp Ahmed   happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

       'When Malika came home, Ahmed was happy.'

   b. *Dialq'ianna Ahwmad irs   dolush   vara.*

       noon:DAT   Ahmed   happiness D:be:CVsim V:be:WP

       'At noon, Ahmed was happy.'

6.4   *Participial phrases*

While there is a class of verb forms which here are called participles, these only play a role in clause combining when used to form relative clauses and will be discussed in section 6.6. Phrases having a participial translation in English are formed using the anterior and simultaneous forms of the verb. These forms were seen in section 5 since they also serve to form chained expressions. The participial and chaining use of these converbs can be clearly formally distinguished by the fact that preverbal *'a* only appears when they are used within chained expressions.

It is difficult to convey in English the different semantics of the participial and chaining uses of these verb forms. However, there is a difference—namely, that in the chaining use the action denoted by the verb is understood to occur before the action of the next verb while in the participial use the two actions are taken to be simultaneous. The verb pair in (36), discussed in

section 5.2, exemplified this basic difference.

When used participially, the simultaneous converb ending in *-ush* and the anterior converb ending in *-na*, have uses roughly corresponding to those of the English participles forms ending in *-ing* and *-ed* respectively. Examples are given in (67).

(67) a. *Doogha toexna   aara 'a jialla,   tykana   'a jaghna,   c'a   je'ara   Maliika.*
       lock   hit:CVant DX   & J:go:CVant store:DAT & J:come:CVant home J:go:WP Malika
       'Having locked the door and gone out, Malika went to the store, and came home.'

   b. *Doogha tuoxush   aara 'a jialla,   tykana   'a jaghna,   c'a   je'ara   Maliika.*
       lock   hit:CVsim DX   & J:go:CVant store:DAT & J:come:CVant home J:go:WP Malika
       'Locking the door as she went out, Malika went to the store, and came back home.'

   c. @***T'aaqqa jaghana*** *cxa vir*   *'a daalina,*   *'i*   *chukhula*   *hwiizira*
      Then   J:go:CVant one donkey & D:lead:CVant 3s:ABS inside:PERL turn-around:WP

      cuo,   ***chohw q'ehwia de   diash***.
      3s:ERG in:LOC bitter   day D:do:CVsim
      'Then, she went and lead a donkey, took it around inside, making a terrible mess (literally: making a bitter day inside).'

The first converb in (67a), *toexna* 'hit:CVant' is an example of an anterior converb subordinate to the first chained clause in its sentence. And the first converb in (67b), *tuoxush* 'hit:CVsim' is an example of a simultaneous converb subordinate to the the first chained clause in its sentence. As mentioned above, these subordinate clauses can be formally differentiated from chained clauses by their lack of preverbal *'a*.

The sentence in (67c) makes use of both the anterior and the simultaneous converbs used participially. The first converb in the sentence, *jaghana* 'J:go:CVant', is subordinate to the first chained clause, and the last clause in the sentence, headed by the converb *diash* 'D:do:CVsim', is subordinate to the finite clause of the sentence.

These participial phrases show some atypical behavior for subordinate clauses. They are described in this section as subordinate because they have similar semantics to the clearly subordinate structures insofar as they seem to be specifying a time at which the action of the modified clause takes place. In section 6.8, I will briefly discuss why they would not be considered subordinate clauses in Foley and Van Valin's typology and argue instead that they are best classified as examples of cosubordinate clauses at the core level.

The primary way in which these structures are atypical is that, like chained expressions, these clauses must be understood as having the same subject as the clause they modify. However, there is evidence that it is not simply the case that they must have a subject argument which is coreferential with the subject of the clause they modify but rather they cannot be overtly specified as having a subject at all. The sentence in (68) illustrates this idea.

(68) *Shaa doogha tuoxush Maliika aara 'a jialla, tykana jaghara.*
  3s:REFL key hit:CVsim Malika out & J:go:CVant store:DAT J:go:WP
  'Locking the door by herself, Malika went out and to the store.'

In (68) a reflexive pronoun *shaa* is in stereotypical subject position for the simultaneous verb form *tuoxush*. If participials of the sort exemplified by (68) were exactly like chained clauses, this reflexive pronoun should be interpreted simply as a repetition of the subject which is shared by the other clauses in the sentence. This is how the reflexive pronoun behaves in the chained clause in (15b), for example. However, in (68) there is only one available interpretation for the reflexive pronoun where it is used to mean 'by oneself'. This interpretation is actually generally available for the pronoun but has not been the primary interpretation of it in any example to this point.

The fact that the reflexive pronoun only has this special interpretation when used in a participial phrases shows that they differ from chained clauses and indicates that an overt subject cannot be expressed in them at all, unlike chained clauses.

With respect to the relative position of participial phrases and the clause they modify, the sentence in (67c) shows that they can both precede and follow it.

Participial phrases headed by the simultaneous form of the verb differ from those headed by the anterior form insofar as the former, but not the latter, allow an object to follow the verb. Thus, the sentence in (69) is grammatical but simply replacing *tuoxush* 'hit.CVsim' with *toexna* 'hit.CVant' would make it ungrammatical. Since (67a) is grammatical, it is not simply the case that *toexna* can't be used to modify the first clause in (69).

(69) *Tuoxush   doogha aara 'a jialla,   tykana   jaghara Maliika.*
     hit:CVsim lock   out   & J:go:CVant store:DAT J:go:WP Malika
     'Locking the door, Malika went out and to the store.'

Like with other types of subordinated clauses, participial phrases allow *wh*-questions on their arguments, as seen in (70).

(70) *Hu˜ tuoxush   aara 'a jialla,   tykana   jaghara Maliika?*
     what hit:CVsim out   & J:go:CVant store:DAT J:go:WP Malika
     'Malika went to the store having gone out and hit(/locked) what?'

6.5   *Subordination with postpositions*

Although differing formally, certain clauses headed by nominalized verbs which are objects of temporal postpositions share many properties of prototypical subordinate clauses. These nominalized verbs decline like normal nouns and use the nominalizer suffix (instead of the masdar). Some examples are given in (71) using the postpositions *t'iahwa* 'after' and *hwalxa* 'before'. These postpositions assign comparative case to their objects.

(71) a. *So   c'a   ve'anchul   t'iahwa, suuna naab qiitara.*
        1s:ABS home V:come:CVant:NZ:CSN after   1s:DAT sleep hit:WP
        'After I came home, I fell asleep.'

    b. *Sunna ginchul   hwalxa, iza   Ahwmadna gira.*
        1s:DAT see:CVant:NZ:CSN before   3s:ABS Ahmed:DAT see:WP
        'Before I saw him, Ahmed saw him.'

Subordinate clauses like the one in (71b) do not have precisely the same meaning as sentences which make use of the posterior converb discussed in section 6.2. It is possible to interpret (71b) such that the speaker did not see Ahmed—i.e., along the lines of *Ahmed saw him before I got a chance to*. Such an interpretation is not possible, however, for the minimal pair sentence using the *-lie* converb in (72).

(72) *Sunna galie,   iza   Ahwmadna gira.*

    1s:DAT see:CVpost 3s:ABS Ahmed:DAT see:WP

    'Before I saw him, Ahmed saw him.'

The sentence in (73) shows that these postpositional phrases have the typical property of subordinate phrases that they do not need to be strictly ordered with respect to the clause they modify.

(73) *Ahwmadna Maliika gira,   'i   c'a   je'anchul   t'iahwa.*

    Ahmed:DAT Malika see:WP 3s:ABS house J:come:CVant:NZ:CSN after

    'Ahmed saw Malika, after she came home.'

Somewhat surprisingly, given their formal status as postpositional phrases, these constructions allow arguments of the nominalized verb to appear after the postposition as illustrated in (74).

(74) *C'a   je'anchul   t'iahwa Maliika, Ahwmadna 'i   gira.*

    house J:come:CVant:NZ:CSN after   Malika   Ahmed:DAT 3s:ABS see:WP

    'After Malika came home, she saw Ahmed.'

These postpositional constructions, like all other subordinating constructions described here, also allow *wh*-questions on their arguments as illustrated in (75).

(75) *Mila c'a   je'anchul   t'iahwa, Ahwmadna gira?*

    who house J:come:CVant:NZ:CSN after   Ahmed:DAT see:WP

    'After who came home did Ahmed see her?'

Despite their formal status as postpositional phrases, these these temporal constructions show all the other syntactic properties of subordinated phrases, which is why they are described here.

6.6   *Subordinate-like relative clauses*

The way to form *while*-clauses in Chechen makes use of a relative clause whose head noun is the word *juq'* 'interval, period' in the dative case heading a noun phrase modified by a relative clause describing some event. An example is given in (76). (Relative clauses are formed in Chechen by modifying a noun with a clause headed by a participle form of the verb.)

(76) *Ahwmada   zhejna dueshuchu   juq'ana,   Maliikas   gazet   diishira.*
    Ahmed:ERG book   read:PRS:PART:OBL middle:DAT Malika:ERG newspaper D:read:WP
    'While Ahmed was reading a book, Malika was reading a newspaper.'
    Literally: 'In the interval in which Ahmed read a book, Malika read a newspaper.'

This subordinate-like relative clause constructions show many of the properties found in true subordinate clauses. In (77) it is shown that these clauses do not need to be strictly ordered with respect to the clause they modify. Example (78) shows that *wh*-questions can be formed on arguments of these constructions.

(77) *Ahwmada   gazet   diishira, Maliika tykana   jueduchu   juq'ana.*
    Ahmed:ERG newspaper read:WP Malika store:DAT J:go:PRS:PPL:OBL interval:DAT
    'Ahmed read the paper while Malika went to the store.'

(78) *Mila tykana   jueduchu   juq'ana,   Ahwmada   gazet   diishira?*
    who store:DAT J:go:PRS:PPL:OBL interval:DAT Ahmed:ERG newspaper read:WP
    'Ahmed read the paper while who was going to the store?'

However, there is one crucial way in which this relative-clause construction does not behave like a true subordinate clause—arguments of the verb cannot appear after the head noun of the relative clause or the participle form of the verb. Thus, a sentence like the one in (79a) is

unacceptable. Argument order before the participle is free, as the word order in (79b) indicates, where the subject and directional noun phrase are in the reverse of their canonical order.

(79) a.*_Tykana   jueduchu   juq'ana   Maliika, Ahwmada   gazet   diishira._
         store:DAT J:go:PRS:PPL:OBL interval:DAT Malika   Ahmed:ERG newspaper read:WP

   b. _Tykana   Maliika jueduchu   juq'ana,   Ahwmada   gazet   diishira._
       store:DAT Malika J:go:PRS:PPL:OBL interval:DAT Ahmed:ERG newspaper read:WP
       'While Malika was going to the store, Ahmed read the newspaper.'

While this _while_-construction shares some features with true subordinate clauses, its formal status as a relative clause prevents it from sharing all the features associated with them. I have included it in the description here to show how it differs from the postpositional constructions described in section 6.5 which do show the full-range subordinate-clause behavior. Properly speaking, however, this construction should probably be considered simply a relative clause with similar semantics to subordinate clauses.

6.7   _Causal clauses with_ deela

Although they diverge from the core temporal semantics of the other subordinating constructions described in this section, causal clauses making use of the word _deela_ 'because' merit some discussion because _deela_ appears to be the best potential example of a subordinating conjunction in Chechen—a lexical category otherwise conspicuously absent from the language.

Use of the word _deela_ is not required to make causal clauses—other strategies are available. For example, in (80) a causal clause is formed via a construction where the verb is in the masdar form marked by the dative case.

(80) _Ahwmada   Maliikina   t'aara tuoxarna,   'i   juelxash   jara._
    Ahmed:ERG Malika:DAT palm   hit:MAS:DAT 3s:ABS J:cry:CVsim J:be:WP
    'Becuase Ahmed slapped Malika, she was crying.'

However, *deela*-clauses appear to be the most common way to form causal clauses. Following the default head-final syntax of Chechen, the word *deela* is typically last in its clause. Examples of *deela*-clauses are given in (81)

(81) a. *Maliika$_i$ juelxash   jara,   Ahwmada   shiena$_i$ t'aara toexna   deela.*
       Maliika J:cry:CVsim J:be:WP Ahmed:ERG 3s:RFL:DAT palm   hit:CVant because
       'Malika$_i$ was crying, because Ahmed slapped her$_i$.'

   b. *Ahwmad c'a   ca   vooghush   volu   deela,   Maliika juelxash   jara.*
      Ahmed   home NEG V:come:CVsim V:be:PRS:PART because Maliika J:cry:CVsim J:be:WP
      'Because Ahmed isn't coming home, Malika was crying.'

   c. *@Mott   shaa   xaza   liebina   deela,   mott   shaa   xaza   biicana*
       tongue 3s:RFL beautiful speak:CVant because tongue 3s:REFL beautiful B:narrate:CVant

      deela,   shie˜   mattax   hwa-joolush jolu   waenarx   miarza
      because 3s:RFL:GEN tongue:LAT DX-J:go:CVsim J:be:PRS:PART steam:LAT sweet

      taatol   'a xylush,   oahwa dooghush   du   hara shouda
      stream & be:INGR:CVsim down   D:go:CVsim D:be:PRS this   spring-water

      oolii   ishta zhop   lo   cuo.
      QUOT thus   answer give:PRES 3s:ERG
      '"Because I used flattering language, because I spoke flattery, the steam on my tongue flows as a sweet stream and forms this spring" he answered.'

On a formal level this construction superficially resembles a relative clause headed by some noun *deela*. The verbs in all the clauses which precede *deela* are in participle form (the form of the verb is ambiguous in many examples, but it is unambiguously the participle in (81b)). This is the standard relative construction: clause headed by participle plus noun.

However, there are two ways in which *deela* clauses diverge from standard relative clauses in Chechen. First, *deela* does not exist independently as a noun. Second, even if *deela* were a noun,

59

it is always preceded by an absolutive form of the participle. Participles are based either on the past or present stem of the verb and are marked for absolutive or oblique case. Table 4 gives the participle forms of the verb *ieca* 'take'.

[Table 4 goes here.]

The form of the participle, thus, indicates that, if *deela* is a noun, it is in the absolutive case. This case agreement pattern can be straightforwardly contrasted with that seen in *while*-clauses in section 6.6. In that construction, the nominal head of the relative clause, *juq'ana* 'interval:DAT' was in the dative case and the participle was in the expected oblique form.

It is clear in the examples in (81) that *deela* is not serving as an absolutive argument of a verb. This odd case-marking pattern on the participle means that *deela*-clauses do not appear to be, properly speaking, relative clauses.

Furthermore, clauses headed by *deela* diverge from relative clauses, and pattern with prototypical subordinate clauses, in an important way—arguments of the participle form of the verb can follow *deela*. An example of this is given in (82). Recall from example (79a) that this was not allowed for clauses headed by the noun *juq'ana*.

(82) *Comgush jolu   deela   Maliika, Ahwmad shkolie   ca vaxara.*
    ill   J:be:PPL:PRS because Malika   Ahmed   school:DAT not V:go:WP
    'Because Malika was sick, Ahmed didn't go to school.'

Thus, *deela*-clauses, though they resemble relative clauses to some extent, are certainly not canonical ones. Instead, these clauses appear to be a peculiar sort of relative-like construction which can only be used in clause combining, which implies that *deela* is a subordinating conjunction. It is the only word showing such behavior known to exist in Chechen.

Clauses headed by *deela* further pattern with subordinate clauses across the two other features being discussed here. Namely, they do not need to be strictly ordered with respect the

clause they modify, and they permit *wh*-questions on their arguments, as illustrated in (83) and (84) respectively.

(83) *Ahwmad shkolie   ca vaxara, Maliika comgush jolu   deela.*
     Ahmed   school:DAT not V:go:WP Malika ill   J:be:PPL:PRS because
     'Ahmed didn't go to school because Malika was sick.'

(84) *Mila comgush jolu   deela,   Ahwmad shkolie   ca vaxara?*
     who ill   J:be:PPL:PRS because Ahmed   school:DAT not V:go:WP
     'Ahmed didn't go to school because who was sick?'

6.8   *The typological status of subordinate clauses in Chechen*

    Most of the structures examined in this section clearly fill the role of peripheral arguments in the sense of Foley and Van Valin (1984). This includes both the postpositional phrases discussed in section 6.5 and the relative clauses discussed in section 6.6. Even if those structures are not treated as syntactic subordinate clauses, this does not change the fact that semantically they fill the role of peripheral arguments.

    The two clearest-cut cases of proper subordination, clauses headed by the immediate anterior and posterior converbs, are, thus embedded in the structure of the clause they modify. Since they are also dependent on that clause for tense interpretation, this means that they are subordinate at the peripheral level in the sense of Foley and Van Valin (1984). Clauses headed by the temporal converb also meet Foley and Van Valin's criteria for being subordinate, but, as discussed in section 6.3, tests internal to Chechen indicate that they bear some resemblance to chained expressions which were argued to be examples of cosubordinate nexus in section 5.9.

    Of the other structures examined in this section, *deela*-clauses offer the next best example of peripheral subordination. It is clear from Foley and Van Valin (1984:24) that they considered causal clauses to be peripheral arguments and *deela*-clauses are clearly dependent on the clause they modify.

61

The participial phrases described in section 6.4 would, at first, appear to also be examples of peripheral subordination since their semantics are similar to the core cases of that type of clause linking. However, it was pointed out in section 6.4 that, as indicated by sentence (68), participial phrases do not seem to be allowed to have on overt subject separate from the subject of the clause they are combined with. This indicates that they must share a core argument, namely the subject, with the clause they combine with, making participial phrases an example of nexus at the core level.

If participial phrases are examples of core-level nexus, the next question is whether they are instances of subordination, cosubordination, or coordination. Participial phrases are clearly dependent on they clause they link to for interpretation of parameters like their tense, meaning the nexus type is either subordination or cosubordination. At the same time, participial phrases are not embedded at the core level since they fill no core-level argument role (this would be, basically, either subject or object). Thus, participial phrases are instances of cosubordination at the core level.

I will leave open the question as to how to classify the postpositional constructions discussed in section 6.5 and the relative construction discussed in section 6.6 with respect to Foley and Van Valin's typology. Clearly, the postpositional phrases are more subordinate than the relative clauses since, like prototypical subordinate clauses they allow arguments to come after the head of the phrase. However, both the postpositional and the relative structures examined above are syntactically associated with non-verbal structures. Thus, determining whether or not they are truly examples of subordinate clauses would require a detailed comparison between their subordinate-like uses and their more typical uses—a topic for a different paper.

6.9   *Conclusion*

In this section, a range of structures were examined which all had in common that they had the basic semantics of subordinate clauses. Some of these structures, like clauses headed by the immediate anterior and posterior converbs, were clearly cases of subordinate clauses while others

were less so, ranging from the temporal clause which shared most features of the clear-cut cases of subordination to certain relative-clause structures which diverged more strongly from prototypical subordination.

7 Conclusion

There were two major goals of this paper. The first, and more important, was to describe, as systematically as possible from the available data, the strategies Chechen uses to combine clauses across the traditional categories of coordination, chaining, and subordination. Various aspects of the language's clause-combining strategies were examined including their basic syntax and semantics as well as some more particular syntactic details like constituent order, negation, and *wh*-question formation.

A second goal of this paper was to place the clause-combining structures of Chechen within Foley and Van Valin's (1984) typology of clause linkage. This was done not simply to focus the overall discussion. Rather, their three-way classification of nexus types, which includes the traditional categories of coordination and subordination along with the category of cosubordination, lent valuable insight into some of the formal differences in the structures examined. In particular, it allowed a straightforward explanation of the syntactic environment where preverbal *'a* appears in Chechen. Specifically, it was argued that preverbal *'a* is a marker of peripheral cosubordination in the language.

ABBREVIATIONS

The following are the gloss abbreviations used in the article not listed in table 1.

VERBAL		OTHER	
DX	Deictic proclitic	ABS	Absolutive
IMP	Imperative	ERG	Ergative
PRS	Present	DAT	Dative
INF	Infinitive	CSN	Comparative
RP	Recent Past	ALL	Allative
WP	Witnessed Past	LAT	Lative
NW	Non-witnessed Past	1,2,3	1st, 2nd, 3rd person
IMPF	Imperfect	s,p	singular, plural
FUT	Future	e,i	exclusive, inclusive
GEM	Focus gemination	&	Preverbal conjunctive *'a*
CS	Causative	FOC	Focus marker
INGR	Ingressive	PTC	Particle
INT	Interrogative	QUOT	Quotative marker
B,D,J,V	Gender prefixes		

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NOTES

1. The orthography in this paper was developed for Ingush and Chechen by Johanna Nichols as part of the UCB Ingush project. In the chart below, I give the IPA equivalent for those consonants whose value may be unclear and for all the vowels.

Consonants

TRANSCRIPTION	IPA EQUIVALENTS
p', t', k', q', ch'	ejective consonants
ch	[tʃ]
gh	[ɣ]
sh	[ʃ]
w	[ʕ]
hw	[ħ]
cch, ggh, ssh, ''	geminates for ch, gh, sh and '

Vowels

ii	[iː]	yy	[yː]	uu	[uː]
i	[ɪ]	y	[y]	u	[ʊ]
ie	[iːɛ]	ue	[yːʌ]	uo	[uːʌ]
ia	[iɛ]	oe	[yʌ]		
e	[ɛ]	a	[ʌ]	o	[wʌ]
ea	[ɛæː]	aa	[aː]	oa	[ɔaː]
ei	[ej]				
ai	[ʌj]	oi	[oj]	ou	[ʌw]
~	nasalization on the preceding vowel				

2. This sort of periphrastic tense has a bi-absolutive case-marking pattern where the inflected auxiliary assigns absolutive case to the subject of the sentence and the converb assigns absolutive case to its object. The future tense, an example of which was given in (21c), despite using an auxiliary in its formation, does not show this pattern. Rather, it follows the typical absolutive-ergative case-marking pattern.

3. The copy verbs seen in (26b) and various other examples are present due to restrictions on the placement of preverbal 'a described in Peterson (2001) and Conathan and Good (2001). They fill no argument slot, nor do they affect the semantics of the sentence.

4. Question formation for verb phrase coordination has not been examined in extreme depth, and it is possible that different combinations of conjoined predicates would yield different results. Atelic predicates would be natural candidates except, when conjoined, speakers prefer using periphrastic progressive forms which results in conjoined structures of the form exemplified (25b).

REFERENCES

Bickel, Balthasar. 1998. "Review of *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective* ed. by Ekkehard König and Martin Haspelmath, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter 1995". *Linguistic Typology* 2: 381–97.

Conathan, Lisa and Good, Jeff. 2000. "Morphosyntactic reduplication in Chechen and Ingush". In: Okrent, Arika and Boyle, John (eds.), *The proceedings from the panels of the Chicago Linguistic Society's thirty-sixth meeting* 36-2: 49–61. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Foley, William, and Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1995. "The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category". In: Haspelmath, Martin and König, Ekkehard (eds.), *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective: Structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms—adverbial participles, gerunds* 1–56. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Longacre, Robert E. 1985. "Sentences as combinations of clauses". In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description, volume II* 235–286. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nichols, Johanna. 2001. "Long-distance reflexivization in Chechen and Ingush". In: Cole, Peter; Hermon, Gabriella; and Huang, C.-T. James (eds.), *Long distance reflexives* 255–278. New York: Academic Press.

Peterson, David. 2001. "Ingush *'a*: The elusive type 5 clitic?". *Language* 77: 144–55.

Testelec, Yakov G. 1998. "Word order in Daghestanian languages". In Sierwiska, Anna (ed.), *Constituent order in the languages of Europe* 257–80. Berlin: Mouton.

Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. 1993. "A synopsis of Role and Reference Grammar". In: Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. (ed.), *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar* 1–166. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Table 1: *Chechen Non-finite Verbal Suffixes*

Suffix	Gloss	Form	Stem	Translation
Immediate Anterior	CVuntil	*-(l)alc*	Inf.	'Until …'
Posterior	CVpost	*-lie*	Inf.	'Before …'
Temporal	CVtemp	*-cha*	Inf.	'When/If …'
Participle	PART	*-˜/-chu*	Pres./Past	Participle
Nominalizer	NZ	*-rg/-chu*+CASE	Pres./Past	Nominalizer
Masdar (Verbal Noun)	MAS	*-r*	Inf.	Nominalizer
Irrealis	CVirr	*-ahw*	Pres/Inf./Past	'If … be …
Anterior	CVant	*-na*	Inf.	'Having V-ed'
Progressive Anterior	CVpan	*-i*	Pres.	'Having V-ed'
Simultaneous	CVsim	*-ush*	Pres.	'V-ing'

Table 2: *Chechen Verbal Suffix Uses*

Converb	Gloss	Chaining	Subordinate
Immediate Anterior	CVuntil	No	Yes
Posterior	CVpost	No	Yes
Temporal	CVtemp	No	Yes
Participle	PART	No	Limited
Nominalizer	NZ	No	Limited
Masdar	MAS	No	Limited
Anterior	CVant	Yes	Yes
Progressive Anterior	CVpan	Yes	No
Simultaneous	CVsim	Yes	Yes

Table 3: *Declension of* ch'aara *'fish'*

Case	Singular	Plural
Nominative	*ch'aara*	*ch'eerii*
Genitive	*ch'eera˜*	*ch'eerii˜*
Dative	*ch'eerana*	*ch'eerashna*
Ergative	*ch'eeruo*	*ch'eerash*
Allative	*ch'eerie*	*ch'eerashka*
Instrumental	*ch'eeraca*	*ch'eerashca*
Lative	*ch'eerax*	*ch'eeriax*
Comparative	*ch'eeral*	*ch'eerial*

Table 4: *Participle forms of* ieca *'take'*

Case	Present Stem	Past Stem
Absolutive	*uecu˜*	*iecna*
Oblique	*uecuchu*	*iecnachu*