

Adjunct islands are configurational Supplementary file

Dmitry Privoznov
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
32 Vassar Street, Cambridge
dprivoznov@gmail.com

Appendix 1. Converb clause size and epistemic adverbials

In this appendix, I will show how the distribution of epistemic adverbials supports the hypotheses about the converb clause sizes in Balkar.

First, converb clauses with an overt subject can contain an epistemic adverb (1), which shows that they do contain some clausal projections above T (Cinque 1999: 77).

- (1) [Fatima išek-siz Kerim-ge₁ boluš-up] ol₁ tüš-ge aziq et-gen-di
Fatima doubt-CAR Kerim-DAT help-CONV 3SG sleep-DAT food make-PST2-3SG
'(With) Fatima, undoubtedly, having helped Kerim, he made dinner.'

Second, converb clauses with PRO, either TP-converbs or ν P-converbs, cannot contain an epistemic adverb. Example (2) below shows a TP-converb (attached above the causative morpheme, since the controller of PRO is the Causer) modified by an epistemic adverb. The sentence is ungrammatical.

- (2) *Fatima₁ Kerim-ge₂ [PRO₁ iñir aš-ni išek-siz aša-p] kitap-ni
Fatima Kerim-DAT evening food-ACC doubt-CAR eat-CONV book-ACC
oqu-t-xan-di
read-CAUS-PST2-3SG
'Fatima₁ made Kerim read a book, after, undoubtedly, PRO₁ having eaten dinner.'

ν P-converbs cannot be modified by epistemic adverbs either, as the sentence is ungrammatical if the PRO-subject is controlled by the Causee:

- (3) *Fatima₁ Kerim-ge₂ [PRO₂ iñir aš-ni išek-siz aša-p] kitap-ni
Fatima Kerim-DAT evening food-ACC doubt-CAR eat-CONV book-ACC
oqu-t-xan-di
read-CAUS-PST2-3SG
'Fatima₁ made Kerim read a book, after, undoubtedly, PRO₁ having eaten dinner.'

Assuming that epistemic adverbs like *išeksiz* 'undoubtedly' attach above the TP-level (Cinque 1999), this is as expected. Converbs with an overt subject are CPs and thus contain enough verbal projections to host epistemic adverbs. Converbs with PRO are either TPs or ν Ps and do not have enough verbal projections to host epistemic adverbs.

Appendix 2. Possible controllers for PRO in Balkar

In this appendix, I will briefly discuss possible controllers for the PRO subject of converb clauses, since it is connected to the converb's attachment site. The PRO subject of converb clauses is usually controlled by the subject of the main clause:

- (4) *ustaz*₁ [**PRO**₁ **eşik-ni ac-ip**] *stol-nu otou-ɣa kij-ir-di*
 teacher door-ACC open-CONV table-ACC room-DAT come.in-CAUS-PST1.3SG
 'The teacher carried the table into the room, having opened the door.'

As we have seen above, however, the PRO subject of a *vP*-converb can be controlled by the Causee (5).

- (5) *Fatima Kerim-ge*₁ [**PRO**₁ **zır-ɣa tıñıla-j**] *kitap oqu-t-xan-di*
 Fatima Kerim-DAT song-DAT listen-CONV book read-CAUS-PST2-3SG
 'Fatima made Kerim₁ read a book, PRO₁ listening to a song.'

The PRO subject may not have a cross-sentential antecedent. The two sentences in (6) form a short text. In the second sentence (6b), PRO is controlled by the local subject *men* 'I', not by *meni qarındašım* 'my brother' from the previous sentence.

- (6) a. *meni qarındaš-im*₁ *maña qonaq-ɣa kel-di*
 my brother-3SG 1SG.DAT guest-DAT come-PST1.3SG
 'My brother₁ came to visit me.'
 b. [**PRO**_{*1/2} **üjge kir-ip**] *men*₂ *a-ni xal-i-n sor-du-m*
 house-DAT come.in-CONV I 3SG-GEN state-3-ACC ask-PST1-1SG
 'After PRO_{*1/2} coming into the house, I₂ asked how he was doing.'

The PRO subject can be controlled by a non-local subject, as in (7). Here the subject of *sun* 'think' *Fatima* is the understood subject of the converb clause that modifies the complement of *sun* 'think'. *Fatima* thinks that her giving Kerim the key yesterday made it possible for Kerim to enter the house.

- (7) *Fatima*₁ [**PRO**₁ **tünene aña axtış-ni ber-ip**] *Kerim üj-ge kir-al-ɣan*
 Fatima yesterday 3SG.DAT key-ACC give-CONV Kerim house-DAT come.in-POT-NZR
sun-a-di
 think-PRS-3SG
 'Fatima₁ thinks that Kerim was able to enter the house, (with) PRO₁ giving him the key.'

However, there are good reasons to believe that in (7) we are dealing with a CP-converb, not with a TP or a *vP*-converb. First, the converb has to occupy the leftmost position in the embedded clause, cf. the ungrammaticality of (8). This is expected for a CP-converb, as CP-converbs occupy a high position in the left periphery of the clause they modify. Some material could scramble to the left of them, but to a quite limited extent (see section 3.1.3). If in (8) we are indeed dealing with a CP-converb with a PRO-subject, the ungrammaticality of this example shows us that this local scrambling is limited to root clauses, which is expected, since root clauses tend to have a richer left periphery in general.

- (8) *Fatima₁ [Kerim [PRO₁ **tünene aña axtiš-ni ber-ip**] üj-ge kir-al-ɸan]
 Fatima Kerim yesterday 3SG.DAT key-ACC give-CONV house-DAT come.in-POT-NZR
 sun-a-di
 think-PRS-3SG
 ‘Fatima₁ thinks that Kerim was able to enter the house, (with) PRO₁ giving him the key.’

Second, a pronoun inside the converb may not be bound by a quantifier in the embedded subject position:

- (9) *Fatima₁ [[PRO₁ **tünene aña₂ axtiš-ni ber-ip**] **xar zašciq₂** üj-ge
 Fatima yesterday 3SG.DAT key-ACC give-CONV every boy house-DAT
 kir-al-ɸan] sun-a-di
 come.in-POT-NZR think-PRS-3SG
 ‘Fatima₁ thinks that every boy₂ was able to enter the house, (with) PRO₁ giving him₂ the key.’

Third, there has to be a special semantic relation between the converb clause and the main clause, represented by *with* in the English translations of (7)-(9). In this case, it is causation: if Fatima didn’t give Kerim the key, he wouldn’t have been able to enter the house. If this counterfactual inference is not supported by the context, the sentence is judged as odd:

- (10) #Fatima₁ [[PRO₁ **tünene aña axtiš-ni ber-ip**] Kerim tüken-ge bar-ɸan]
 Fatima yesterday 3SG.DAT key-ACC give-CONV Kerim store-DAT go-NZR
 sun-a-di
 think-PRS-3SG
 ‘Fatima₁ thinks that Kerim went to the store, (with) PRO₁ giving him the key.’

The sentence in (10) implies that Fatima giving Kerim the key caused him to go to the store, which is an odd inference, hence the sentence is judged as strange. The speakers comment that the two events are not connected to each other.

These data are easily explained, if we make two assumptions. First, PRO has to be controlled by the closest c-commanding noun phrase (see the Minimal Distance Principle in Rosenbaum 1967, Larson 1991, among many others). Second, CP-converbs may have an overt subject or PRO, meanwhile, TP and vP-converbs can only have PRO in their subject position.

Crucially, as I have shown above, CP-converbs are base-generated above the main subject. This means that, if they have PRO for the subject, this PRO has to be controlled by a c-commanding noun phrase in a higher clause, as in (7).

Meanwhile, TP and vP-converbs may be base-generated lower. Correspondingly, their PRO subject is controlled either by the local subject or by some lower argument, depending on the attachment site of the converb. If the converb clause is attached below the Causee, the Causee controls PRO, as in (5).

Appendix 3. CP-converbs: Semantic relation to the main clause

There are four cases when a converb may have its own overt subject. The first case is when the subject of the converb clause and the subject of the main clause stand in the part-whole relation:

- (11) **[qol-lar-i₁ qaltira-j]** Kerim₁ stol-nu otou-*ka* kir-giz-t-di
 hand-PL-3 shake-CONV Kerim table-ACC room-DAT come.in-CAUS-CAUS-PST1.3SG
 ‘(With) his₁ hands shaking, Kerim₁ carried the table into the room.’

The second case is when the converb and the main clause “describe the same event”. More precisely, when the event associated with the converb clause and the event associated with the main clause mereologically overlap:

- (12) **[Fatima bir-inci alkış ajt-ip]** quancni başla-di
 Fatima one-ORD toast say-CONV celebration begin-PST1.3SG
 ‘(With) Fatima saying the first toast, the celebrations began.’

The third case is when the converb clause and the main clause stand in the relation of causation. A Balkar converb may have its own overt subject, if the sentence has a counterfactual inference of the form ‘if e_1 didn’t happen, e_2 wouldn’t have happened’, where e_1 is the event associated with the converb and e_2 is the event associated with the main clause, as in (13).

- (13) **[Fatima eşik-ni bezgi-ler-in-den teş-ip]** Kerim tešek-ni üj-ge
 Fatima door-ACC hinge-PL-3-ABL take.off-CONV Kerim bed-ACC house-DAT
 (alaj) kij-ir-di
 thus come.in-CAUS-PST1.3SG
 ‘(With) Fatima having taken the door off its hinges, Kerim carried the bed into the house.’

The sentence in (13) implies that if Fatima didn’t take the door off its hinges, Kerim wouldn’t have carried the table into the house.

Finally, to a limited extent, Balkar converbs with an overt subject may restrict a modal operator in the matrix clause (similar to conditional sentences):

- (14) **[Kerim Fatima-*ka*₁ mašina sat-ip al-ip]** ol₁ šaxar-*ka* bar-al-liq-di
 Kerim Fatima-DAT car buy-CONV take-CONV 3SG city-DAT go-POT-FUT-3SG
 ‘(With) Kerim buying Fatima a car, she will be able to go to the city.’

The difference between the counterfactual causation use in (13) and the conditional use in (14) is that in the latter case the sentence does not entail the truth of the converb clause. Namely, (14) does not entail that Kerim will buy Fatima a car. It can be followed up by ‘but he will not’ without a contradiction.¹

To sum up, there are four circumstances in which a converb clause may have an overt subject in Balkar. First, if the subject of the converb clause and the subject of the main clause stand in the part-whole relation. Second, if the event described by the converb clause and the event described by the main clause overlap. Third, if the converb clause and the main clause are related by ‘counterfactual causation’. Fourth, if the converb clause restricts a modal operator in the main clause.

¹ It should be noted that in (14) the converb clause is interpreted as a restrictor of the modal operator in the main clause (the suffix *-al* ‘be able to’), as conditional clauses often do.