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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] ọl₁ tūš-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 vP-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 iŋir 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.’

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

(3) *Fatima₁ Kerim-ge₂ [PRO₂ iŋir 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 vPs 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, [PRO₁ ešik-ni ac-ip] stol-nu otou-怏a 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-ge₁ [PRO₁ zir-weekday tıŋila-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 qarindašɨm ‘my brother’ from the previous sentence.

(6) 
a. meni qarindaš-im₁ maŋa qonaq-ɨn kel-di
my brother-3SG guest-DAT come-PST1.3SG
‘My brother₁ came to visit me.’
b. [PRO₁/2 üjge kir-ip] men₂ a-ni xal-i-n sor-du-m
house-DAT come.in-CONV I 3SG-GEN state-3-ACC ask-PST1-1SG
‘After PRO₁/2 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) 
Fatima₁ [PRO₁ tünene aŋa axtiš-ɨn ber-ip] Kerim üj-ge kir-al-ɨn
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.
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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:
'(With) his hands shaking, Kerim 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:

'(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 e₁ didn’t happen, e₂ wouldn’t have happened’, where e₁ is the event associated with the converb and e₂ is the event associated with the main clause, as in (13).

'(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 converses with an overt subject may restrict a modal operator in the matrix clause (similar to conditional sentences):

'(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 cause 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 -ali ‘be able to’), as conditional clauses often do.