

Is there Switch-Reference Marking in Coordinate Clauses?

Philipp Weisser
 Universität Leipzig
 philipp.weisser@uni-leipzig.de

1 Introduction

The question in what types of clausal configurations switch-reference marking (SR) is attested and in which it is not has emerged to be a much discussed one in the typological and in the generative literature on switch-reference.

What is, however, uncontroversial is that SR marking is frequently attested in clause chaining constructions. In these cases, all medial verbs (that is usually all non-final verbs) bear an SR marker which indicates whether their subject is identical with the subject of the immediately following clause:

- (1) Jara-bute-tsu betsa-kware.
 lie-down-SS swim-REM.PAST
 'Having lain down (on my raft), I swam.'
 Cavineña, Tacanan: (Guillaume 2011, 110)
- (2) Peima fitau-fe-e-te wate tepau-a-ʔa
 carefully throw-PRF-1SG-MED.DS NEG break-3SG-IND
 'I threw it carefully and it didn't break.'
 Tauya, Trans-New-Guinea: (MacDonald 1990, 219)

SR marking also frequently occurs in subordinate clauses. In this case, the SR morpheme is always on the verb of the subordinate clause, regardless of the linear order.

- (3) [can [nuca-ta ayuda-wa-ngapaj] muna-na-ta] cri-n
 2SG 2SG-ACC help-1SG.A-SS want-FUT-ACC think-3
 'He thinks that you want to help me.'
 Imbabura Quechua (Jake (1985) as cited in Stiebels (2007))
- (4) Nu' ['i-pava 'inu-ngam kweewa-t yuku-ni-qa-t] naawakna
 1SG my-brother me-for belt-ACC make-FUT-NC-ACC.DS want
 'I want my brother to make me a belt.' Hopi, Uto-Aztecan (Hale 1992)

What has been rarely been studied at this point (though for brief discussion see McKenzie (2011); Keine (2012)) is whether SR marking is attested in coordinating configurations which involve two full-fledged clauses.

Question: Why is this of interest?

- The answer may lead us to a better understanding the phenomenon of SR in general. For example, it may help us solve the question of whether SR marking is a purely syntactic process or a discourse strategy or something in between. If SR marking is sensitive to a syntactic distinction like subordination vs. coordination, then this may suggest that SR marking has, at least, some syntactic basis.
- The answer might help us understand the nature of clause chaining constructions which have often been argued to be an instance of coordination. However, it is remarkable that hardly any clause chaining language allows for SR marking between two full-fledged coordinate clauses. If it turned out that we find no SR marking in prototypical coordination, this may help us to pinpoint the distinction between coordinate clauses and clause chains.
- The answer may be helpful to those who want to model SR within a generative framework. As the lively discussion in generative literature has shown, the question of subordination vs. coordination has become crucial for the empirical adequacy of most of the proposed analyses of SR.

Line of Action:

- Section 2 reviews all five languages which have been claimed to exhibit SR marking in full-fledged coordinate clauses in the literature.
- Section 3 summarizes the results and draws an interim conclusion.
- Section 4 makes an alternative proposal and provides further evidence in favor of the hypothesis.
- Section 5 summarizes and Section 6 discusses the consequences of the results

2 Languages in Question

Even though many articles on SR implicitly assume that there are cases of SR marking in coordinate clauses, the empirical support for this assumption is quite scarce. All in all, only five languages are explicitly claimed to make use of morphemes that encode SR relations in coordination:¹

- Lakota
- Yakunytjatjara
- Pitjantjatjara
- Kiowa
- Nêlêmwa

In the following, I will investigate the SR system of these languages in detail to show that there is a remarkable resemblance with respect to the form and function of the alleged SR morphemes.

¹In addition to these five languages, Camacho (2003) gives examples from Hopi to show that there is SR marking in coordinate clauses but these examples come without glosses and since the source on SR in Hopi are not very conclusive, I refrained from including them in this survey.

2.1 Lakhota

According to Chafe (1976), Lakhota has an elaborate SR system applying between coordinate clauses. The morpheme *na* encodes a same subject relation, while *yŭk^hā* encodes a different subject relation:

- (5) a. Joe wīyā wāhāska č^ha wāyākī *na* heye...
 Joe woman tall 'a' see and.SS say
 'Joe saw a woman who was tall and he said...'
 b. Joe wīyā wāhāska č^ha wāyākī *yŭk^hā* heye...
 Joe woman tall 'a' see and.DS say
 'Joe saw a woman who was tall and she said...'
- Dahlstrom (1982)

In a reply to Chafe (1976), Dahlstrom (1982) argues that the Lakhota system cannot be a SR system, at least not a prototypical one which follows the original definition by Jacobson (1967). She gives all four logically possible exceptions to Chafes generalization:

- SS and *yŭk^hā*. (6-a)
 - DS and *na*. (6-c)
 - DS and *yŭk^hā* is prohibited. (6-b)
 - SS and *na* is prohibited. (6-d)
- (6) a. k^hoškalka nŭp k^holakič^hiyā-pi *na* lila t^hekič^hixila-pi. *Yŭk^hā* heniyos
 young.man two friend.RECP-PL and.SS very loveRECP-PL and.DS those
 nŭp ila zuya iyāya-pi
 two only to.war set.off-PL
 'Two young men were friends with each other and loved each other very much.
 One day, those two set off to war.'
 b. *č^huwe leye leč^hi taktokanŭhā he. *Yŭk^hā* asāpi op^het^hŭ wahi ep^he
 sister say here what.2.do Q and.DS milk buy 1.come 1.say
 'My sister said: What are you doing here? And I said: I came to buy milk'
 c. č^ha ota ileya-pi *na* el ixpeya-pi *na* heč^hel xuɣnaɣe
 wood much make.burn-PL and.SS on place-PL and.SS thus burn.up
 'They set fire to a lot of wood and placed him up on it and he burned'
 d. *mazop^hiyeta wa'i *na* č^huwe wāblake
 store.to 1-go and.SS sister 1-saw
 'I went to the store and I saw my sister'
- Dahlstrom (1982)

According to Dahlstrom (1982), the decisive criterion to distinguish between these two morphemes is not the identical reference of the subject but "*the continuity of the action*". *yŭk^hā* encodes a change of scenery, time or location. Dahlstrom concludes with the remark that the difference between the Lakhota system and a canonical SR system is so big that she would not subsume Lakhota under a the label SR system.

2.2 Yakunytjatjara

In subordinate purpose clauses, Yakunytjatjara exhibits a relatively simple canonical system of SR marking. Here, only the (non-)identity of subjects is relevant for the choice of markers.

- (7) Subordinate clauses in Yakunytjatjara Goddard (1985)
- a. kunga-ngku tii kutja-nu tjiki-ntji-kitja-ngku
 woman-ERG tea.ACC heat-PST drink-NMLZ-INTENT-ERG
 'The woman heated the tea (because she wanted) to drink'

- b. kunga-ngku tii kutja-nu (tjitji-ngku) tjiki-ntja-ku
 woman-ERG tea.ACC heat-PST (child-ERG) drink-NMLZ-PURP.DS
 'The woman made some tea for someone/the child to drink'

In addition, Yakunyjtjara exhibits a phenomenon which looks like SR marking in coordinate clauses. However, in these cases, they do not use the same morphemes as in subordinate clauses but the two conjunctions *munu* (SS) und *kaa* (DS).

- (8) Coordinate clauses in Yakunyjtjara Goddard (1985)
- a. nyina-ra paluru paka-nu munu yanku-la maa-ngari-ngu munu
 sit-CVB DEF(NOM) get.up-PST and.SS go-CVB away-lie-PST and.SS
 piyuku yanku-la maa.ngari-ngu
 again go-CVB away-lie-PST
 'Having stayed some time, she set off, and having travelled for some time
 camped and again travelled and camped away.'
- b. mamu-ngku patja-ni kaa nganana watarku nyina-nyi
 evil.being-ERG bite-PRS and.DS 1PL.NOM heedless.NOM sit-PRS
 'Evil spirit beings are biting them. And/But we are not paying attention.'

Goddard (1985) gives a number of examples which illustrate that, in coordinate clauses, the choice of conjunctions is not made on the basis of the (non-)identity of reference but rather on whether there is a continuity of actions or not.

- (9) kaa nganana iriti kap palya-ngka nyina-ngi... palu nganana-mantu
 and..DS 1PL.NOM long.ago water good-LOC ait-PST-IPFV but 1PL.NOM-CERT
 kapi palya-ngka nyina-ngi kaa nganana kuwri kapi puwa-nguru
 water good-LOC sit.PST-IPFV and.DS 1PL.NOM now water bore-ABL
 pika ura-ni
 sicknessACC get-PRS
 'And in the old days we had good water... only of course in the old days we had
 good water, but these days we get sicknesses from bore water.'

This non-canonical use is, however, restricted to coordinate clauses. SR marking in subordinate clauses is completely canonical.

2.3 Pitjantjara

The identical pattern can be found in the sister language Pitjantjara. Again, we find completely canonical use of SR marking in subordinate purpose clauses and conditional clauses. We also find alleged SR marking between coordinate clauses and what we find again, is that, in contrast to subordinate clauses, SR marking with coordinate clauses can be non-canonical. DS-marking can be used to signal a change of time, place or scenery. Also, it is remarkable that coordinate SR and subordinate SR make use of two different sets of morphemes.

- (10) Trevor-lu watja-nu Mary-lu tjitji nya-kunyangka.
 Trevor-ERG say-PAST Mary-ERG child see-ANT.DS
 'Trevor said that Mary had seen the child.' (Bowe 1990:70)

- (11) Pula ngalkula wiya-ti-ngkula ngari-ngu ka kunyu palu-mpa
 3DU.NOM eat-ANT.SS NEG-INCH-ANT.SS lie-PST and.DS REP 3SG.GEN
 mama ngunytju-ku ngura ila-ri-ngu-lta
 father mother-GEN place near-INCH-PST-EMPH
 'After they had eaten it all, they lay down. They were really getting near their
 mother's and father's place now.' (Bowe 1990:97)

2.4 Kiowa

In a number of papers (McKenzie (2007, 2010, 2011)), it was argued that Kiowa exhibits instances of SR marking in clear cases of coordination of two full-fledged clauses. According to McKenzie, *gàu* functions as SS-marker while *nàu* is the respective DS-marker.

- (12) a. Yísàum \emptyset =hébà gàu èm=sáu.
 Yisaum 3SG=enter.PRF and.SS 3SG=REFL=sit.down.PRF
 'Yisaum_i came in and he_i sat down.'
 b. Yísàum \emptyset =hébà nàu èm=sáu.
 Yisaum 3SG=enter.PRF and.DS 3SG=REFL=sit.down.PRF
 'Yisaum_i came in and he_{*i/j} sat down.' (McKenzie, 2011, 82)

Furthermore, Kiowa also has SR-marking in subordinate clauses. In these cases, just as in Yakunytjatjara and Pitjantjatjara, a different set of markers is used, namely verbal affixes.

- (13) Háun hájél [èm-gún-mǎu=ché] èm-dǎu-jáu-gú
 NEG person.INDF 3-dance-IPFV=when.SS 3-sing-act-NEG
 'Nobody sang while they danced' (McKenzie, 2011, 239)

In Kiowa, we also find non-canonical use of SR-markers, but again only in coordinate clauses. The markers *gàu* and *nàu* can be used also to indicate continuity and discontinuity of the action. In (14), we find "unexpected" SR marking in both examples for reasons of information structure.

- (14) a. Óp á=álé. nè=gáu óp jáuchò á=álé.
 There 3>3=chase-PRF then=and.DS there instead 3>3=chase-PRF
 'They chased it here and then they chased it this way' Palmer Jr. (2003)
 b. Kathryn gà=gút gàu Esther=àl gà=gút
 Kathryn 3>3=write.PRF andSS Esther=too 3>3=write.PRF
 'Kathryn wrote a letter and Esther wrote one too.' McKenzie (2007)

2.5 Nêlêmwa

McKenzie (2011) cites Nêlêmwa (Bril (2004)) as another language which exhibits SR-marking in coordinate clauses. In fact, Nêlêmwa has two conjunctions which may be interpreted as SR-marker. In (15), one can see the function of *na*, glossed as DS, and *me*, glossed as SS.

- (15) a. **Na** na pek **me** na tu tharaxila-na mwaidu, **na**
 And.DS 1SG avoid and.SS 1SG go.down jump-1SG down.there and.DS
 hla thu tho-nuat **me** hla khabwe: [...]
 3PL make call-mouth and.SS say
 'But then, I avoid them and jump away and then they call and say: [...]'
 Bril (2004)

However, we also find examples, which show that SR marking in Nêlêmwa is non-canonical. Hence, Bril (2004) argues that these markers encode topic-(dis)continuity

- (16) a. I_i oda Teâ Pwayili_i shi Teâ Ovaac_j me i_j khabwe [...]
 3SG go.up Teâ Pwayili side Teâ Ovaac and.SS 3SG say
 ushi-n a Teâ Ovaac_i...
 BEN-POSS.3SG A Teâ Ovaac
 'Teâ Pwayili goes up to Teâ Ovaac and Teâ Ovaac tells him...'

3 Interim Summary

All five languages show a very homogeneous picture. The alleged SR systems behaves identical with respect to three independent parameters:

- These five languages are the only ones in which we find SR marking in coordination of full-fledged clauses.
- These five languages are the only ones in which the SR morpheme itself is a conjunction and not a verbal affix.
- These five languages all exhibit a great amount non-canonical use of the alleged SR-marking.²

Furthermore it is remarkable that these three parameters not only pattern cross-linguistically but also within a language. Three of the languages in question exhibit SR marking in subordinate and coordinate clauses and even in these language the parameters always go hand in hand. SR in subordinate clauses is always canonical and it is always expressed by a bound morpheme. SR in coordinate clauses is always non-canonical and is always expressed by a free morpheme.

⇒ Although these three parameters are in principle completely independent of each other, they always go hand in hand. This suggests that the alleged cases of SR marking in coordinate clauses are in fact a completely different phenomenon.

⇒ A classification as a distinct phenomenon would yield several advantages:

- These five languages would no longer be exotic exceptions to a otherwise quite homogeneous phenomenon.
- Treating the observed phenomena as a category different from SR marking, would capture the intuitions of the authors of the respective grammars (Dahlstrom 1982; Goddard 1985; Bril 2004)
- The definition of switch-reference can be confined in several dimensions at once:
 - SR marking could uniformly treated as a verbal category.
 - The application of SR systems would be restricted to contexts of subordinate clauses and clause chains.
- One would have an elegant explanation for the different behaviour of the same phenomenon in different syntactic contexts in a certain language.

²As has been amply noted in the literature, these languages are not the only ones, which exhibit non-canonical use, but nevertheless it is remarkable that all of them do.

4 Tight and Loose Coordination

One of the languages claimed to have SR marking in coordinate clauses is Nêlêmwa, a Oceanic language from New Caledonia. Oceanic languages do not have SR marking generally. However, they do have a great number of conjunctions to conjoin different categories and express a number of different relations. One of these relational differences is *Tight* and *loose coordination*.

The difference can be nicely illustrated with NP coordination: The tight coordinator is used when there is a tight connection between the two conjuncts, that is when they form a natural pair. The loose coordinator is used when the two conjuncts do not have a tight connection or when the conjunction is more accidental.

- (17) *pā nājá mā páruí* (18) *i nā-wē bau i nā-wájí*
 ART months and years the taro.fields and the sugercane.fields
 'months and years' 'the taro fields and the sugercane fields'
 Paicî (Moyses-Faurie and Lynch 2004)
- (19) *gu mää ge* (20) *gu mê ge*
 you and I (as a couple) you and I (no strong relationship)
 Xârâcùù (Moyses-Faurie and Lynch 2004)

These coordinators are also used in predicate and clause coordination. Some languages however have begun to use only the tight coordinator in cases of predicate coordination:

- (21) *È mwââ paá mê mā pūrö*
 3SG then take DIR and cook
 'She brings and cooks them' Paicî (Rivierre 1983)

Some languages maintained the distinction between tight and loose coordination across the board with the of nouns, predicates and clauses. One of these languages is Tawala:

- (22) *ama-ta po hina-ta* (23) *a kenduluma ma hina-na*
 father-1.PL and mother-1.PL 3.SG wife and mother-3.SG
 'Our father and our mother' 'His wife and his mother'
 Tawala (Ezard (1984))
- (24) Tawala clausal coordination
- a. *Apo a-ne-nae po a-ne-nae po u meyagai...*
 FUT 1.SG-DUR-go and 1.SG-DUR-go and LOC village
 'I went and went and (came) to the village'
- b. *I-na-togo a-mae ma i-na-dumol-i naka a-nae*
 3.SG-POT-blow 1.SG-stay and 3.SG-POT-calm-3.SG that 1.SG-go
 'If it's windy I'll stay, but if it's calm I'll go'
- c. *To-nae po hi-gohili-yai*
 1.EXCL.PL-go and 3.PL-surprise-1.EXCL.PL
 'We went and they surprised us'
- d. *Pona a-nonol-i ma gamo-u i-witai*
 language 1.SG-hear-3.SG and mouth-1.SG 3.SG-heavy
 'I can hear the language but can't speak it' Ezard (1997)

According to Ezard, the difference between *po* and *ma* in clausal coordination is the following:

Po "indicates a close connection between two clauses - sometimes a repetition of the predicate, sometimes the identity of the subject, always agreement in polarity" whereas *ma* "marks a clause as being in contrast to the previous clause - a change of subject, mood or spatio-temporal setting, polarity" (Ezard (1997:247ff))

This is same situation we found in Lakhota, Yakunytjatjara, Pitjantjatjara, Kiowa and Nêlêmwa, the only difference being that in Tawala, we can draw a connection and show that these two conjunctions are also used in tight and loose NP-coordination, which is something that can hardly be reanalysed as SR marking.

Another language where we find the the whole range of uses of both coordinators is Mangap-Mbula, also an Austronesian language spoken in Papua New Guinea.

- (25) a. mbeŋ ma aigule
 night and day
 'Night and day.' or 'All the time'
- b. serembat mi tuumbu mi zeere...
 Sweet.potato and pitpit and edible.green.plant
 'Sweet potatoes, pitpit and edible green leaves...'
- Mangap-Mbula (Bugenhagen 1995)

The coordinator *ma* conjoins natural pairs as in (25-a) while *mi* conjoins accidental combinations. Similarly with predicate and clause coordination:

- (26) a. Am-kan ma am-win mi am-keene.
 1PL.EXCL-eat and 1PL.EXCL-drink and 1PL.EXCL-sleep
 'We ate and drank and slept.'
- b. Aŋ-kam Aibike ma am-la mokleene.
 1SG-get Aibike and 1PL.EXCL-go garden
 'I took Aibike with me to the garden.'
- c. Ni i-miili mi guraaba kini i-la Koobo.
 He 3SG-return and friend LOC.3SG 3SG-go Aramot
 'He returned and his friend went to Aramot Island'
- Mangap-Mbula (Bugenhagen 1995)

As (26-a), an instance of predicate coordination, shows, eating and drinking is a natural combination while eating, drinking and sleeping is not. With clause coordination, the difference between *ma* and *mi* encodes whether the two clauses express "successive aspects of a single event" or "distinct events" (Bugenhagen (1995:159)).

Again, the distinction is the same with the languages we saw in Section 2. And again, we find that since the conjunctions are the same as in tight and loose NP coordination, this suggests that we are not dealing with SR marking but rather with something different.

5 Summary

I intended to show that...

- ... all languages claimed to have SR marking in coordinate clauses behave remarkably similar with respect to the form and function of their alleged SR markers.
- ... this suggests that, in these cases, we are dealing with a different phenomenon with different properties.
- ... what we are dealing with is the phenomenon of Tight and Loose Coordination, which is already known from Oceanic Languages.

Assuming two distinct phenomena enables us to

- ... confine the definition of switch-reference in several dimensions at once.
- ... explain why the seemingly exotic cases of SR marking in coordinate clauses are - taken by themselves - surprisingly homogeneous.
- ... account for the fact that even within one language the parameters pattern according to the dichotomy I proposed.

6 Consequences

- The results of this talk suggest that SR marking is sensitive to the syntactic configuration it applies to
 - ⇒ This may, depending on one's assumptions about pragmatics, be interpreted as an argument for the view that there is a syntactic or semantic basis underlying the phenomenon of SR marking.
- The results of the preceding sections suggest that there is a substantial difference between clausal coordination and clause chaining constructions.
 - ⇒ Otherwise, the clearcut distinction between configurations which allow for SR marking and those which do not would be unexpected.
- Generative approaches which analyze SR marking as a syntactic phenomenon based on the concept of c-command (i.e. binding, agreement, movement) can still claim to be cross-linguistically valid inasmuch as they are not invalidated by obvious cases of SR marking in clausal coordination.
 - ⇒ Nevertheless these theories still face the problem that clause chains are at least to a certain degree (see previous bullet) coordinate in nature.

Literatur

- Bowe, Heather J. (1990), *Categories, Constituents and Constituent Order in Pitjantjatjara*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Bril, Isabell (2004), Coordination and inclusory constructions in New Caledonian and Oceanic languages, in M.Haspelmath, ed., 'Coordinating Constructions', Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 499–534.
- Bugenhagen, Robert (1995), *A Grammar of Mangap-Mbula: An Austronesian Language of Papua New Guinea*, Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, ANU. Pacific Linguistics.
- Camacho, José (2003), *The Structure of Soordination*, Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Dordrecht.
- Chafe, W. (1976), Givenness, definiteness, contrastiveness, subject, topic and point of view, in C.Li, ed., 'Subject and Topic', Academic Press.
- Dahlstrom, Amy (1982), A Functional Analysis of Switch-Reference in Lakhota discourse, in K.Tuite, R.Schneider and R.Chametzky, eds, 'Papers from the Eighteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society', Chicago, CLS, pp. 72–81.
- Ezard, Bryan (1984), *The Tawala language: An introduction with helps for language learning*, Available Online: http://www.sil.org/pacific/png/pubs/51910/Tawala_Introduction.pdf.
- Ezard, Bryan (1997), *A grammar of Tawala: An Austronesian language of the Milne Bay Area. Papua New Guinea*, Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies ANU. Pacific Linguistics.
- Goddard, Cliff (1985), *A Grammar of Yankunytjatjara*, Institute for Aboriginal Development Press.
- Guillaume, Antoine (2011), Subordinate clauses, switch-reference, and tail-head linkage in Cavineña narratives, in R.van Gijn, K.Haude and P.Musyken, eds, 'Subordination in native South American Languages', Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Hale, Ken (1992), Subject Obviation, Switch Reference and Control, in R.Larson, S.Iatridou, L.Utpal and H.James, eds, 'Control and Grammar', Dordrecht Kluwer.
- Jacobson, William (1967), Switch-reference in Hokan-Coalhuiltecan, in D.Hymes and W.Bittle, eds, 'Studies in South-Western Ethnolinguistics', Mouton, The Hague, pp. 238–263.
- Jake, Janice Lynn (1985), *Grammatical Relations in Imbabura Quechua*, New York: Garland.
- Keine, Stefan (2012), Switch-Reference as Coordination, in P.Weisser, ed., 'Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 89. Perspectives on Switch-Reference: Local Modelling and Empirical Distribution', pp. 107–164.
- MacDonald, Lorna (1990), *A Grammar of Tauya*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- McKenzie, Andrew (2007), Non-canonical switch-reference and situation semantics, *in* A. R. Deal, ed., 'Proceedings of the 4th Conference on the Semantics of Under-represented Languages of the Americas (SULA 4)', Amherst: GLSA, University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics.
- McKenzie, Andrew (2010), Subject Domain Restriction and Reference Tracking, *in* N. Li and D. Lutz, eds, 'Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT 20)', Ithaca: CLC.
- McKenzie, Andrew (2011), *The Role of Contextual Restriction in Reference Tracking (Draft)*, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Moyse-Faurie, Claire and John Lynch (2004), Coordination in Oceanic languages and Proto Oceanic, *in* M. Haspelmath, ed., 'Coordinating Constructions', Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 444–499.
- Palmer Jr., Gus (2003), *Telling Stories the Kiowa Way*, Tucson, Arizona, Arizona University Press.
- Rivierre, Jean-Claude (1983), *Dictionnaire paicî-français (Nouvelle-Calédonie)*, Paris, Peeters.
- Stiebels, Barbara (2007), Towards a typology of complement control, *in* B. Stiebels, ed., 'Studies in Complement Control', ZAS Papers in Linguistics.

Abbreviations in addition to the Leipzig Glossing Rules:

ANT	anterior
CERT	certainly (from Goddard (1985))
DIR	directional
DS	different subject
EMPH	emphatic
INCH	inchoative
INTENT	intentional (from Goddard (1985))
MED	medial
NC	not given by Hale (1992)
REM.PAST	remnant past
SR	switch-reference
SS	same subject