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1. Preliminaries

Switch-reference is a morphosyntactic mechanism that marks, (usually) on the verb, the identity or nonidentity of the subject of a clause with the subject of another clause. As the simplest example of a verbal form marking the identity of subjects we can mention English adverbial participles as in Having finished my homework, I went to sleep. Adverbial participial clauses usually have a zero subject that is coreferential with the subject of the main clause.1 The situation with Russian converbs (действительное) is similar. When the condition of coreferentiality is violated, the result are ill-formed sentences like (1), used ironically by Chekhov:

(1) Приехала я к станции и смотрела на природу из окна, arrive-conv to station and look-conv on nature in window
с шляпой слетела шляпа. from me flew off hat
‘Arriving at the station and looking at nature through the window, my hat flew away.’

Thus, the verb suffix -ji is a marker of coreference between the subjects of two clauses in Russian.2 In more elaborate systems of switch-reference not only markers of coreference (usually termed same-subject markers) but also markers of noncoreference (different-subject markers) are found. For examples, in Aymara Quechua (Quechua, South America) there are markers designating coreference and noncoreference of the subject of the dependent clause and the subject of the main clause (Coe 1983: 3):

(2) a. chákra-chaw urya-chipa, pallawmu-rqa-wayta-kuna-ta.
field-in work:as pick-past-1 flower-pl-acc
‘While I worked in the field, I picked flowers.’

b. chákra-chaw urya-piri, María pallawmu-rqa-wayta-kuna-ta.
field-in work:os-1 María pick-past-3 flower-pl-acc
‘While I worked in the field, María picked flowers.’
As we will show below, one of such systems is amply represented in Tuva, a Turkic language of southern Siberia.

1.1. The history of the issue and typological remarks

The term “switch-reference” was coined by Jacobsen (1967) with respect to some North American Indian languages. In the course of the typological studies in the 1970s and 1980s it became clear that phenomena of switch-reference are by no means exotic and are found in many languages of the world. Furthermore, it turned out that switch-reference is one of the most common means of local cohesion in discourse (see, e.g., Foley–Van Valin 1984: 322–323). Systems of switch-reference are widely attested in the languages of North America (Jacobsen 1983), South America (Cole 1983), Australia (Austin 1981), New Guinea (Longacre 1983; Lynch 1983), and Africa (Wiesemann 1987). Thus, the least documented area in this respect is Eurasia. We are aware of just a few publications on switch-reference in Eurasia that make use of this notion. They mostly concern languages of eastern and southern Asia–Manchu–Tungusic languages (Nichols 1979), Nivkh (V. Nedjal’kov in this volume), Japanese (Myhill–Hibjiya 1988, Iwasaki 1992: chapter 4), and Tibetan–Burman (Genetti 1990); see also section 1.2 below on the description of switch-reference phenomena in Asia in different terms, and the discussion of another area of Eurasia in Nichols (1983).

Typological studies in switch-reference are found in the collections of Munro (1980), Haiman–Munro (1983) and a number of more recent works (such as the collections Haiman–Thompson (1988), Austin (1988), where the theory and typology of switch-reference were developed in more detail.3

The following universal (or at least near-universal) generalizations can be made on the basis of the available cross-linguistic data on switch-reference (cf. also Haiman–Munro 1983).

1. The clause containing the switch-reference markers is dependent on the other clause (with whose subject the dependent clause is compared with respect to coreference). The degree of this dependence can vary, but some degree of dependence must be present. A higher degree of dependence is expressed as the lack of marking the dependent verb form for person and/or temporal-modal features.

2. The dependent clause containing the switch-reference marker usually precedes the main clause.


4. Same-subject (SS) and different-subject (DS) markers are frequently not structurally isomorphic. Moreover, the same-subject marker is typically indi-

visible, whereas the different-subject marker can include the subject agreement affixes (Haiman 1983).

5. There exists a hierarchy of the types of complex constructions with respect to their natural inclination to mark switch-reference. If a language has switch-reference then it should be expected primarily in constructions with the least specified type of semantic link between clauses (Jacobsen 1983: 170).

Later in this article we will consider a system of switch-reference which is clearly close to this typological standard. Functional explanations for the typological generalizations listed here will be attempted below in the conclusion of this paper.

1.2. The studies of switch-reference in Turkic linguistics

To our knowledge, the Turkic evidence has so far been mostly outside the attention zone of students of switch-reference. In the relevant literature we have noted a single mention of the data of Turkish (Haiman 1983, relying on the Turkish grammar of Lewis (1967); see also Haiman–Thompson 1984: 512). However, the facts presented in Lewis (1967) for the treatment of the convorb suffixes -yel–yel’ as unquestionable same-subject markers are quite fragmentary; for some counterexamples see Kononov (1956: 475–476).


Very significant progress in describing Turkic (and other Altaic) switch-reference systems was made by the Novosibirsk typological school led by Maja I. Ceremisina, whose work mainly focuses on the phenomenon of “polypredicative” (i.e., multicausal) constructions. The theoretical approach of this school was developed on the basis of the languages of the “Altaic type”. In particular, Ceremisina and others have independently established the distinction of “same-subject” (yemidž–ylyg) vs. “different-subject” (hayen–ylyg) forms of the dependent clause (Ceremisina 1977, 1980; Skribnik 1980). Novosibirsk scholars have provided detailed accounts of switch-reference in Altaic languages of the Tungusic (Gorelova 1980) and Mongolian (Skribnik 1980) branches, but in different terms: in the Russian tradition of Altaic studies same-subject markers are traditionally called “sub-
jective attraction” (sub`ektivno priljubščine) or “reflexiveness” (cf. Čeremisina 1979: 65). With respect to Turkic languages, Čeremisina (1980: 16, 22) noted that they also display examples of different-subject and same-subject constructions. The elaborate system of Yakut switch-reference is described in an interesting paper by Efremov (1979) (cf. also Efremov 1981) – this is probably the first systematic description of a switch-reference system in a Turkic language.

On the basis of everything said above we hope that a typologically-oriented systematic description of switch-reference in one of the Turkic languages spoken in the very geographical center of Asia can contribute to the typology of switch-reference and text cohesion, as well as to areal studies and Turkic linguistics. In section 2, multiclausal constructions that constitute the nucleus of the switch-reference system in Tuva are described; these constructions are exemplified in 2.1 and a semantic-syntactic treatment of them is suggested in 2.2 and 2.3. In section 3 we discuss the facts that can be called the periphery of the Tuva switch-reference system, i.e., constructions with adverbal clauses and with certain pronouns.

2. Switch-reference in quasi-coordinate constructions

2.1. The mechanism of switch-reference

In general, English coordinate constructions with the conjunction and, where the semantic link between clauses is least specific, are translated into Tuva by means of the following kind of constructions:

(3) a. ana-mı inkı-tı saap-taragı, Kara-kıı
    mother-1SG cow-ACC milk-SUT-IMPV-DAY Kara-ksıı
tan-ip
    kel-ıır
    gohome-CONV AUX-IMPF

    ‘My mother will milk the cow, and Kara-kıı will go home.’

b. ana-mı inkı-tı saap-kalı, O, tan-ip kal-ıır
    mother-1SG cow-ACC milk-CONV gohome-CONV AUX-IMPF

    ‘My mother will milk the cow and go home.’

In both Tuva sentences, the first clause is marked as dependent, as shown by the nonfinite verb form, and the second as independent. The major difference between the sentences is that in (3a) the subjects of the two clauses are not coreferential and are expressed by overt NPs in each clause, whereas in (3b) they are coreferential and a subject is expressed overtly only in the first clause while the second clause has a zero subject. (Non-) coreference of the dependent-clause subject with the main-clause subject is marked in the dependent clause by a verb affix. Evidently, we are dealing with a typical case of switch-reference. The affix -ırıg marks a different subject, and the affix -kalı marks the same-subject condition. The term quasi-coordination will be explained in section 2.2.

2.1.1. Earlier treatments

The affix -kalı found in (3b) has the underlying morphophonemic form -GAI and is called “the past tense converb” in a Tuva grammar (Isaakov-Pal’makov 1961: 330). Cognate forms also exist in several other Turkic languages – Bashkir, Tatar, Uzbek, Uighur and others. In these languages, this form probably does not imply the coreference of subjects. For examples of its usage see: Dmitriev (1948: 248); Kononov (1956: 243); Grunina (1961: 137); Juldašev (1977: 76, 223 ff.). However, the Yakut form in -salı, cognate to the -GAI converb, is a same-subject converb (Efremov 1979: 65). Evidently, the status of the -GAI form and the corresponding Yakut form as same-subject forms is either an innovation or a reflex of an ancient situation. In the texts collected by Nikolaj Katunov, the author of the first Tuva grammar, this converb is used almost exclusively in contexts of coreference (cf. Katunov 1903: 934–1053).

The authors of the modern grammar of Tuva (Isaakov-Pal’makov 1961) discovered the tendency for the -GAI converb to be used in the same-subject constructions (1961: 351–352), but they did not provide any interpretation of more complicated cases (see below). In a number of works on the syntax of the converb constructions in Tuva (Babulskin 1959, 1960; Delger-ool 1960; Sat 1982; Šamina 1983), this peculiarity of the -GAI converb is not mentioned. Ljudmila Šamina, in her dissertation, notes that “the converb in -GAI to a high degree guarantees the referential identity of its subject with the subject of the main action” (Šamina 1985b: 129), but she herself cites four examples with nonco-reference (1985b: 131) without any additional comments (for an account of such cases see section 2.1.3 below); cf. also Čeremisina et al. (1986: 152).

The different-subject marker, attested in example (3b), has the morphophonemic form -V-ı-GAI where -V is the affix of the so-called “future tense participle”, or, in our terminology, imperfective masdar (deverbal noun); the symbol “…” marks a position for inserting personal affixes of the first and second person that express subject agreement (the third person agreement marker is zero). -GAI is the affix of the darive case. The use of such masdar-case forms as nonfinite verbs is very typical of the structure of dependent clauses in Tuva (as well as in Turkic in general). This morphosyntactic pattern, central for Turkic languages, served as a basis for the typology of the “predicative declension of participles” developed by Maja Čeremisina and her group (Čeremisina et al. 1984a). According to Ljudmila Šamina, “participle-case constructions” are the
nucleus of the system of “polypredicative” constructions in Tuva (Šamina 1982: 61). Unlike other similar combinations, the morphological combination we are interested in (the modal in -v and the dative affix -G-4) is found in relatively few Turkic languages (Gadzheva 1973: 305–306, Ceremisinova 1981: 13). It is hard to say whether the marker has functions similar to those in Tuva in other Turkic languages. In publications on Tuva it has never been mentioned that it is the different-subject marker, although examples illustrating its usage have been cited more than once (Katnov 1903: 922–923; Issakov–Pal’maks 1961: 309; Sat 1960; Šamina 1982; Ceremisinova–Šamina–Borgojakova 1984; Šamina 1985). Curiously, while Šamina singles out a special same-subject type of participle-case constructions, she fails to observe that the -v-G-4 form cannot be used in this way and simply does not cite examples of such uses (Šamina 1985: 119–120). In the typological studies of Ceremisinova it was correctly stated that Turkic modal-case forms are functionally related to converbs. These forms, despite their structural transparency, “function in a converb-like way” (Ceremisinova 1981: 32). In Tuva this is especially true of the form in -v-G-4.

Since the switch-reference function of the -G-4 and -v-G-4 forms has not been clearly identified in previous work on Tuva syntax, it was not possible to establish that these two markers constitute a functional pair and their semantics differ precisely in one component, being otherwise identical. We will discuss the shared semantic components of these two markers in section 2.2 below (for this kind of functional pair see Eftimov 1979 on Yakut, and Shkirim 1980: 109–110 on Buryat). Multicausal constructions including these markers are, according to our data, highly frequent and correlate with each other in a regular way, forming the nucleus of the morphosyntactic system of switch-reference in Tuva.

2.1.2. Principal examples
Let us examine the functioning of the switch-reference mechanism in multicausal constructions, taking into account all possible types of coreference between the arguments of the main clause and the dependent clause. First, let us look at constructions with verbs that have core case frames: nominative with one-place verbs, and nominative-accusative with two-place verbs. The same-subject marker appears only in the case of coreference of two subjects, whereas the different-subject marker appears in all other cases, no matter whether there is some coreference or not.

A. One-place verb plus one-place verb; no coreference:

(4) alan-zi bera-j bura-sa, Kara-oil nad-p. tad-ar.
father-3 go-conv aux:ds Kara-oil sleep-conv aux:impp
"The father will leave and Kara-oil will go to sleep."
I. Two-place verb plus two-place verb; no coreference:

(10)  
asa-qi inek-ti waq p khaq, Kara-kis is-lis-ni  
mother-3 cow-acc milk conv aux-ds, Kara-kys floor-acc  
is-p kuar.  
wash conv aux-impp  
‘After the mother milks the cow, Kara-kys will wash the floor.’

J. Two-place verb plus two-place verb; coreference of subjects:

(11)  
Kara-kis, deng-ma-qi-n, imger-t p kaaq, 0, inek-ti  
Kara-kys brother-3-acc feed conv auxks cow-acc  
isaar.  
milk impp  
‘After Kara-kys has fed her brother, she will milk the cow.’

K. Two-place verb plus two-place verb; other types of single coreference:

(12)  
sung, inek-ti buqbaa, asa-qi 0, maakum.  
girl cow conv feed conv mother-3 praise conv  
‘The girl washed the cow and her mother praised her.’

(13)  
asa-qi Kara-oool-du, imger-t p kaaq, 0, inek-ti  
mother-3 Kara-oool-acc feed conv auxks he cow acc  
wasp kuar.  
milk conv aux impp  
‘When the mother has fed Kara-oool, he will milk the cow.’

(14)  
asa-qi inek-ti, is-p kaaq, Kara-kis onu,  
mother-3 cow acc wash conv auxks Kara-kys it acc  
wasp kuar.  
milk conv aux impp  
‘The mother will wash the cow; and then Kara-oool will milk it.’

L. Two-place verb plus two-place verb; coreference of subjects; coreference of objects:

(15)  
0, inek-ti, 0, al-ga, alo-m, 0, saar.  
cow 3-acc wash conv aux conv father-1sg milk impp  
‘Having washed the cow, the father will milk it.’

M. Two-place verb plus two-place verb; the subject of the first verb is coreferential with the object of the second verb, and vice versa:

(16)  
iwa, Kara-oool-du, iztp-t-arqaa, 0, onu, xaq-t-ar  
dog Kara-oool-acc bite conv auxks he it acc conv bite conv aux conv  
‘If the dog bites Kara-oool he will hit it.’

The set of sentences just cited clearly demonstrates that the mechanism of switch-reference operates in a quite regular way in bicausal constructions where each clause has a typical agentive subject in the nominative case. Let us now see how this purely syntactic, subject-oriented mechanism works if we have clauses with less typical subjects.

In the first place, we have to look at dative quasi-subjects and derived passive subjects. In Tuva there is a small class of one-place stative verbs governing the dative case, e.g., *sokh bol ‘be cold’, *aridol bol ‘ache’. Let us consider both possible locations of a dative quasi-subject that is coreferential with a nominative subject, in the main clause and in the dependent clause, respectively.

(17)  
Kara-oool, ad-aq /-berq/, baq, sokh bol-ar.  
Kara-oool sleep conv auxks aux ss hepat cold be-impp  
‘If Kara-oool falls asleep, he will be cold.’

(18)  
Kara-oool-ar, sokh bolq /-bol-gol/, o1, iglaq here  
Kara-oool dat cold be conv he conv conv aux impp  
‘If Kara-oool gets cold, he will cry.’

Clearly, the Tuva switch-reference system does not equate the dative quasi-subject with the genuine subject. And of course, the same-subject marker cannot be controlled by the dative of those verbs that have a nominative argument. It is precisely this nominative NR, the syntactic subject, that controls switch-reference, even if it is not the most central argument semantically.

(19)  
a.  
Kara-oool-ar, Kara-kis, taart-arqa /-tart-kal/, o1, onu  
Kara-oool dat Kara-kys fit conv fit conv he she conv  
sil kuam.  
kiss impp  
‘Kara-oool liked Kara-kys, and he kissed her.’ (lit. ‘Kara-kys suited Kara-oool ...’)

b.  
Kara-kis, Kara-oool-ar, taart-kal /-tart-arqa/, o1, onu,  
Kara-kys Kara-oool dat fit conv fit conv she he conv  
sil kuam.  
kiss impp  
‘Kara-oool liked Kara-kys and she kissed him.’ (lit. ‘Kara-kys suited Kara-oool ...’)

Next we look at passive constructions. In a passive clause the original direct object turns up as the nominative subject, whereas the original subject is marked by the dative case. The verb displays a passive marker. Here are examples with passive (20) and main (21) clauses:
Evidently, the passive subject controls switch-reference to the same degree as the initial subject. The agent phrase, marked by the dative case, is of course not equated with the subject:

(22) ara-qi, korga (/*/kegel), Kara-oool ana, ette-ird
mother-3 come-conv come-ss Kara-oool she-dat break-pass-impf
"When the mother comes, Kara-oool will get beaten by her."9

Thus, in the case of nonprototypical subjects the mechanism of switch-reference retains its strict orientation to the syntactic subject in the nominative.

2.1.3. Deviations from strict coreference

Above we considered examples with a dative quasi-subject. Tuva has one further type of verbal case frame lacking the regular nominative subject. This type consists of several predicates with a lexically fixed subject and a possessor argument (in the genitive case in -aln), for instance: X-aln xñiyn bułyn ‘feel nauseous’ (lit. ‘X’s mood breaks away’), X-aln xñiyn bukair ‘start feeling nauseous’ (lit. ‘X’s mood gets spoiled’). It turns out that the possessor argument of such a predicate is optionally treated like a subject, i.e., in constructions with such predicates either the same subject or the different-subject marker can be used.

(23) Kara-oool, ləmme-n-ïp
Kara-oool get-conv
[aga, aukids algal, aukids]
[algal, aukids]
bergen.

"When Kara-oool had eaten, he felt sick."

(24) ol-dan, xñiyn-ï
bojan-3 mood-3
[ksam-ry, bukair
get-spoiled-conv auxids
get-spoiled
get-spoiled
køl-eld.

"The boy got sick, and he returned home."10

Furthermore, this variation in the morphological marking is not an individual peculiarity of these predicates. In general, a possessor that is a part of a subject NP is treated like the subject itself with respect to switch-reference control. Thus, the possibility to use the same-subject construction in examples (23)–(24) is only a special manifestation of this rule. For example:

(25) O, koñ
sometimes
[ksam-ry, karan
køl-gen eye-3
make-move-ss
make-move-ss
make-move]

"The man made several moves, and his eyes flashed."11

(26) a-da-ši
horse-1sg
aari-ry, bukair
get-sick-conv auxids
get-sick
get-sick
American
thence further ride-conv
ride

"My horse got sick, and I could not ride further."12

But marking the dependent clause as same-subject becomes impossible when not only the possessor of the dependent-clause subject is coreferential with the main-clause subject, as in (26), but also the dependent-clause subject itself is coreferential with a nonsubject argument of the main clause. Thus, in the following example we also have coreference of the dependent-subject subject "mother" with the main-clause object "her", in addition to the coreference between "my" and "I".

(27) ara-m, kej-çeg (/*/kegel); men oum, ləmme-n er men.
mother-1sg come-conv come-ss I she:ACC feed-impf 1sg

"When my mother comes, I will feed her."

The difference between (26) and (27) can be accounted for as follows: In sentence (26), the right-hand part is a one-place clause, and by using the same-
subject form the speaker establishes a referential link between clauses without tisking an incorrect reading of the sentence. In (27), by contrast, the advantage of highlighting the coreferential link through the possessor by means of the same-subject marker is canceled out by the possible contradiction between, on the one hand, the same-subject marker, and the coreference of the subject with the object, on the other. In this respect the following example is interesting, where the same-subject marker is triggered by the coreference of the possessors of the subjects of both clauses (here again there is variation: the form *sins-argy with a different-subject marker can also be used).

(26) tere-niŋ öge sin-gal, dugaj-lar-i jji tala-ke orullok cart-gen axle:3 break-ss wheel-pl.3 two side-dir far halaŋi bar-ghalan. jump.away AUX-ITERPF

'The axle of the cart broke, and its wheels flew far away to the side.'\(^{13}\)

Having observed that the subject property of same-subject control is extended to the subject’s possessor, we should point out that this kind of equal treatment of these syntactic units is apparently characteristic of the Turkic languages in general (this was noted for the process of relativization in Turkish, cf. Underhill 1972; cf. also Wilkins (1988: 166–168) for similar evidence from Australia.

The facts connected with the use of switch-reference markers in constructions with dative verbs and the passive favor the interpretation that the Tuva switch-reference mechanism is oriented exclusively toward the syntactic subject (the NP in the nominative case). However, the above examples of constructions with coreference through the possessor show that the same-subject marker is possible not only in cases of strict coreference between the subjects, but also when the referential link between them is weaker. These observations lead us to think that the use of the same-subject marker is not really governed by one, but by two factors: (a) the existence of two NPs in the nominative case;\(^{14}\) (b) the existence of coreference between these NPs. Condition (a) is more important – it is necessary. If there are no two NPs in the nominative case, as in (17)–(18), the use of the same-subject marker is impossible. If there are two nominative NPs, then the same-subject marker can be used even if condition (b) is not strictly fulfilled; this is what happens in examples (23)–(26) and (28). The deviations from strict coreference may not be too strong and are always connected either with incomplete coreference or with difficulty in establishing coreference or noncoreference.

The extension of the range of use of the same-subject marker to cases of coreference through the possessor are not the only deviation from strict coreference in Tuva. Investigators of different languages that have switch-reference systems have noticed "gray zones", where the orientation of the switch-reference mechanism toward coreference can become blurred (cf. Haiman–Munro 1983: 12). Cross-linguistically the most important sources of such blurring are:

1. incomplete coincidence of the referential extension of the subjects, e.g., one subject "I", the other one "we" (cf. Franklin 1983: 43–47);
2. referential nonprototypicality of the subject (the prototypical case is the referentially specific subject);
3. semantic nonprototypicality of the subject (the prototypical case is the internally active subject, the agent).

The individuality of the switch-reference system of a given language is found precisely in the nature and the degree of the blurring of the syntactic character of the switch-reference mechanism. We now consider in turn all three sources of such blurring in Tuva. It should be stressed at the outset that only the same-subject marker extends its scope by encroaching upon the domain of the different-subject marker and thereby creates variation; the reverse process is not found. The explanation for this is apparently that the switch-reference mechanism has the pragmatic function of establishing text cohesion and linking clauses, which is highlighted to a greater extent by the same-subject marker.

The clearest examples of incomplete coincidence of the referential extension of two NPs are the pronouns 'I' and 'we'. With such quasi-coreference between the two subjects the use of the same-subject marker is ruled out. As to the different-subject marker, the informants recognize the correctness of such structures with differing degrees of certainty. It is immaterial in which of the two clauses the subject pronoun with greater extension is found.

(29) men bužinya
I house-DAT *kalgj
come-ss
bis di̇l̇ėk̇i ɨṁ-ni ɨp
we noon meal-ACC eat-COND
al-di-vi̇c.
AUX-PAST-1PL

*I came home, and we had lunch.'\(^{15}\)

In such a situation speakers prefer to use a construction that does not mark switch-reference at all. The acceptability of the different-subject marker is beyond doubt in cases where both subjects whose extensions coincide partially are third person NPs.
When the singers stopped singing, some of them left.

In a sense, examples (23) to (25) and (28) with inalienable possession also belong to this class of cases. They differ in that the relation between the referents is not one of set-inclusion, but a part-whole relation. For the Tuvan switch-reference mechanism the latter relation is closer to identity (i.e., coreference) than the former, so the same-subject marker is possible in the examples with coreference through the possessor.

The referentially prototypical subject is the referentially specific NP (on this and other referential characteristics see Padučeva 1985). NPs with another referential status are nonprototypical, referentially marginal subjects. NPs with generic referential status are treated on a par with prototypical subjects in Tuvan, i.e., in the absence of coreference the different-subject marker is used.

The same behavior is shown by universal NPs with the quantifier ba 'all'. Note, however, that the same-subject marker obligatorily appears when one of the clauses contains a variable with the universal nominal ba'm 'everyone', which refers to the whole set of referents given in the other predicate:

All guests came and every one of them brought a present.

In cases of strict coreference of subjects that are expressed by generic, universal and indefinite NPs, only the same-subject marker may be chosen. The same is true for syntactic zeroes with indefinite personal meaning:

One sings songs when one finishes work.
The rock hurt the child). The less a referent is internally active and concrete, the more it is nonprototypical as a subject. Subjects that are expressed by inanimate, but concrete NPs do not trigger any changes in the use of switch-reference markers. The minimal semantic nonprototypicality to which the switch-reference mechanism is sensitive is nonconcreteness. Typical examples are natural factors and elements (wind, rain, season, illness, hunger). When one of the subjects is of this type, either the different-subject marker or the same-subject marker may be used, but only if the second subject, too, is inanimate:

(37) a. \[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{las} \quad \text{diff-vergence} \\
\text{spring} \quad \text{come.down-	ext{DS}} \\
\text{čekter} \quad \text{čas-\text{IP}} \\
\text{flower-pl.} \quad \text{blossom.out-	ext{CONV AUX-\text{PF}}} \\
\text{či-\text{kel}} \\
\text{come.down-	ext{SS}} \\
\end{array} \]

'Spring came, and the flowers blossomed out.'

b. \[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{las} \quad \text{diff-vergence} \\
\text{ česik)el} \\
\text{dunaj-\text{IP}} \\
\text{či\text{-\text{m}}} \\
\text{in town-dir.} \quad \text{ride-PAST-\text{SSG}} \\
\end{array} \]

'Spring came, and I rode into town.'

The tendency to use the same-subject marker is strongest when one of the subjects is an NP with the meaning of a period of time. In this case the second subject can also be animate.

(38) \[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{šil} \quad \text{šil} \quad \text{ord-\text{SS}} \\
\text{three year} \quad \text{pass-\text{SS}} \\
\text{xoxaj-\text{IP}} \quad \text{long-tu-m} \\
\text{town-dir.} \quad \text{ride-PAST-\text{SSG}} \\
\text{ord-\text{SS}} \\
\text{pass-\text{DS}} \\
\end{array} \]

'When three years had passed, I rode into town.'

A similar phenomenon occurs in sentences where one of the subjects is a mass noun that is noncoreferential with the other subject. A comparison of the following two sentences shows how the feature count/mass of the second subject influences the possibility of the same-subject marker (when used with the lexical item "money", the qualifier "three" leads to a count meaning):

(39) a. \[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{šaga} \quad \text{keerje} \\
\text{letter} \quad \text{come.ss} \\
\text{alka} \quad \text{xokugen} \\
\text{kelegel} \quad \text{money come-pf} \\
\text{come ss} \\
\end{array} \]

'A letter came, and money came.' (e.g., enclosed in the letter)

b. \[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{šaga} \quad \text{keerje} \\
\text{letter come}$\text{ss}$ (come-\text{SS}) \\
\text{alaka} \quad \text{xokugen} \\
\text{three} \quad \text{money come-pf} \\
\end{array} \]

'A letter came, and the three roubles came.'

Deverbal nominal forms like 'the work', 'the fight') do not favor the use of the same-subject marker according to our data. Let us now summarize the general rules for the use of switch-reference markers. If in a bi-clausal construction there are no two nominative NPs, then the choice is clear: the different-subject marker. If there are two subject NPs and their referents are clearly coreferential or clearly referentially disjoint, then the same-subject marker or the different-subject marker, respectively, is chosen. If the subjects (or at least one of them) are sufficiently nonprototypical (indefinite personal zero, nonconcrete meaning, etc.), the switch-reference mechanism "loses its orientation" and is unable to establish the identity or distinctness of insufficiently identified entities. Strictly speaking, these entities are distinct, so the different-subject marker is possible, but their distinctness is not sufficiently clear, so the same-subject marker is possible as well. It should be emphasized that we are everywhere dealing with an expansion of the same-subject marker into the area of incomplete coreference.

2.1.4. Negation

A clause whose verb comprises a switch-reference marker can, of course, not only be affirmative, but also negative. Negation is expressed cumulatively together with the markers of converses and masersats (at least in the cases that interest us here). The negative same-subject marker is -B4n (a universal negative conversal marker). The negative different-subject marker is -B4S.GA.17 If difference of subject is marked on a negative analytic verb form, the convert of the nonfinite (lexical) verb takes the negative form in -B4n, and the final (auxiliary) verb stays in the affirmative different-subject form in -V.R.GA, according to our data. The negative same- and different-subject markers do not show any differences in their syntactic behavior vis-\text{-vis} the affirmative markers.

Examples include:

(40) \[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{arag, xijen-i-n} \quad \text{lap-hyn} \\
\text{girl shirt-3-ACC wash-SUNE AF.} \\
\text{go-conv aux-pf} \\
\end{array} \]

'The girl went away without washing the shirt.'

(41) \[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{asu-qi} \quad \text{ords-ord} \quad \text{baurga} \\
\text{mother-3 \quad feed-CONV auxs \quad child-3} \\
\text{xokugen} \\
\text{cry-conv} \\
\end{array} \]

'This mother did not feed the child, and he cried.'
2.2. Semantics of connection in switch-reference constructions

What is the grammatical meaning common to the converb form in -GAH (same-subject marker) and the masdar-case form in -VR.GA (different-subject marker)? The semantic relations between the main and the dependent parts of the biclausal constructions in the examples cited in section 2.1 were quite varied. The idea of the existence of a link between two situations, common to all of them, was realized in different cases as a temporal relation (the event of the dependent clause precedes the event of the main clause), a logical relation (the event of the dependent clause is a condition for the event of the main clause, or a consequence event, expressed by the main clause, follows from a cause event, expressed by the dependent clause), a logical-temporal relation (one event naturally follows the other). The event of the dependent clause precedes the event of the main clause in some sense, temporally or logically. This meaning is iconically reflected in the linear order of the clauses, and the markers -GAH and -VR.GA themselves carry only the idea of a link between the clauses, without conveying any temporal meaning. As can be seen in the examples, in biclausal constructions of the type considered here the grammatical meaning of tense is conveyed only by the finite forms of the main clause. Nor do the same- and different-subject markers have an aspectual meaning of their own; the aspectual meaning in the dependent clause with these forms is conveyed only by auxiliary verbs.

Of special interest is the tense-neutrality of the different-subject form, which is morphologically built on the basis of the imperfective masdar in -VR. In finite forms the masdar in -VR conveys the temporal meaning “non-past tense” and the aspectual meaning “imperfective”. The meanings “perfect” and “past” are mostly expressed by masdar forms in -GAH. The aspectual-temporal contrast of the affixes -VR and -GAH is also preserved in the masdar-case forms -VR.DA and -GAH.DA, which mark dependent clauses and are structurally similar to the different-subject marker (see section 3.1 for more details). In these two forms the locative case suffix -DA is added to the masdar marker and the person agreement suffixes. The dependent-clause forms in -VR.DA and -GAH.DA express the meaning of simultaneity or cooccurrence of two events. This meaning component is clearly conveyed in these forms by the locative case forms, which contain the idea of collocating two objects together. Similarly, in the different-subject marker -VR.GA, the notion of non-simultaneity and link is expressed by the dative case which contains the idea of a displacement from one location to another, while the masdar component of the different-subject marker has been desemantitized and has lost all aspectual-temporal meaning, in contrast to the masdar affixes in the -DA forms. Furthermore, there is no form expressing a dependent clause that combines the -GAH masdar with the dative case. This fact provides evidence from the system for the fact that, despite its transparent internal structure, the different-subject marker -VR.GA has left the paradigm of masdar-case forms, has merged into a unitary whole and is now in functional opposition to the marker -GAH, expressing the same relative time and differing only in its switch-reference properties. To use Ceremisinova’s expression, the -VR.GA form has been “converbalized” (деприлатизирован), because it has been isolated from the other formally parallel forms (Ceremisinova et al. 1984: 39). The regular interaction of two dependent-clause forms, for the same and different-subject conditions, forms the switch-reference system in Tuva. Although the two forms have the same grammatical meaning, except for their switch-reference function, the same-subject dependent clauses naturally imply a greater connectedness of the events than the different-subject clauses. In connected discourse, the form that expresses the greater connectedness has communicative priority. This also explains the fact that in cases of deviation from the prototypical referential relations between clauses (i.e., from coreference) it is always the same-subject forms that expand into the domain of the different-subject forms, but never the other way round. In several recent papers it has been proposed that in some languages, the morphology that might be thought of as expressing the switch-reference distinction in fact expresses the event linkage (Carlson 1987, Mitnath 1993).

2.3. Quasi-coordination as a type of syntactic dependence in switch-reference constructions

The interpretation of multicausal constructions with a dependent clause marked by a converb or masdar-case form of the verb has traditionally been controversial in Soviet Turkic linguistics. The content of this controversy is widely known (for overviews cf., e.g., Gadzieva 1957, Narvev 1975, Ubrinova 1976: 14-24, Hanser 1982, with reference to Tuva: Sat 1960). and briefly amounts to the following dilemma: should sentences of the type (42) be regarded as “complex” (i.e., biclausal) or “simple” (expanded); in other words, should their dependent clauses be regarded as subordinated clauses (Russian придаточные) or as “phrases” (Russian обстоятельства); in yet other words, should such dependent clauses be considered as being of the same type as subordinate clauses with European-type conjunctions (such clauses are also attested in Turkic languages but usually constitute a very marginal kind of dependent clause; cf. Ceremisinova 1981) or of a different type? Example (3) is here re-presented as (42).
Our view on this matter is the following. The whole problem is a result of carrying over terms and categories from Russian to Turkic languages which were coined in Russian grammatical research and make sense elsewhere only with serious reservations. In carrying over these categories to Turkic languages, Turkologists take as their defining features either structure or meaning. In the first case it turns out that Turkic languages do not have subordinate clauses at all, because subordinate clauses must of necessity have a subordinating conjunction (as in Russian) and all converbal and modal-case clauses fall into the category of phrases. In the second case it is practically the Russian translational equivalent that is taken as a basis for the classification. In this case most of the converbal and modal-case clauses turn out to be subordinate clauses. In order to arrive at a typologically adequate solution of the problem, the "Russocentric" approach and the Russian-oriented distinction between "phrase" and "subordinate clause" should be given up completely. A clause can have quite different degrees of dependence or reduction from minimal dependence (in a coordinate construction) to maximal dependence (as a "copredicate" in the sentence He went toward the house with a quick pace). "Phrase" and "subordinate clause" are labels that refer to two points on the scale of reduction in Russian that are not universally applicable. What is universal is the functional types of multi-clausal constructions that are identified on the basis of semantic relations between clauses, in particular, complement clauses, adverbial clauses, coordination. But the degree of reduction is expressed in every language differently, by means of the syntactic (internal structure of the dependent clause) and morphological (marking of the verb) resources of the language.

What type of multi-clausal construction do sentences of the type (42), which are of interest to us here, belong to Cerenmizina (1981) considers all such sentences as belonging to the "adverbial subsytem" of "polypredicative constructions", i.e., as constructions with adverbial clauses. However, let us turn again to the examples in section 2.1.2. As we observed, the specific semantic link between the clauses can vary, and the only constant feature is the notion of the existence of a link between the situations and of a precedence relation between the two clauses. This leads us to think that these constructions are semantically closest to coordinate constructions. Such an interpretation finds an indirect confirmation in their Russian equivalents: the majority of the examples are translations of Russian coordinate sentences with the conjunction i 'and'. In addition, the range of meanings expressed by these biclausal constructions is very close to the range of meanings of the Russian conjunction i. As is well known, the meaning of the coordinating conjunction in Russian is never completely free of adverbial meaning (cf. Švédova 1980: 617). But in Russian conjunctive coordination allows the use of finite verb forms in both coordinate clauses. If we give up the a priori assumption that this feature of predicate coordination is universal, the Tuva constructions with a switch-reference marker must be regarded as coordinate. The typological difference between Turkic and Indo-European languages is that Turkic languages have no (or very little) conjunctive coordination. This is why they express coordination by making one of the clauses dependent on the other by means of a nonfinite verb. (This type of coordination is typologically very widespread, cf. Bengtson 1980). Since Tuva does have marginal (conjunctionless) constructions with two or more finite verbs, we will call switch-reference constructions quasi-coordinate.

Adverbial clauses, on the other hand, are expressed by means of modals, postpositional constructions in Tuva. In contrast to converbal and modal-case constructions, they express a semantically specific type of link -- temporal sequence, cause-result relation, etc., and not the existence of a link per se, as the quasi-coordinate constructions (on modals, postposition constructions see Šamina 1981, 1985a).

That the link in quasi-coordinate constructions is of a coordinative kind is confirmed by the freedom with which chains of dependent clauses can be built up in which only the last clause has a finite verb. Tuva narrative texts abound in such chaining constructions with dependent clauses containing switch-reference markers (e.g., Bubunkin 1959: 100, Isakov-Pal'min 1961: 331). These really multi-clausal constructions are characterized by a principle that can be called the principle of linear control of switch-reference: the use of a switch-reference marker in every clause is controlled by the (lack of) coreference with the subject of the clause that follows, for example:

(43) na-o a-say, jike-e-n ber-keše, jike-e-naj en eki hoy thirty herd-3-ACC give-SS herd-3-GEN most good e-d-e-n mud-up e-man-up e-alger, aal home-3-ACC catch-CONV saddle-CONV AUX-SS camp koy-ep loo-up taw-argy, (...) Karati-Khan Dep glounder-CONV AUX-CONV AUX-DS Karaty-Khan AUX
Tuva is not unique in showing this tendency for chaining constructions. First, the existence of such chains in other Turkic languages has often been noted (cf., e.g., Daskakov 1975: 237, Gadžieva–Birjaković 1983: 7). Second, it is well known that many languages with switch-reference have a tendency for chaining text structures (cf. Longacre 1983).

3. Other types of switch-reference marking constructions

It is not always easy to draw semantic distinctions between quasi-coordinate constructions and those with adverbial clauses. The prototypical discourse function of the quasi-coordinate constructions is signaling maintenance and preserving or, in contrast to this, change of the main active participant of the situation described, i.e., marking of switch-reference. The information concerning the semantic type of relation between the conjoined situations is secondary. The opposition is the case as far as constructions with adverbial clauses are concerned. Their prototypical discourse function is signaling the specific type of semantic relation between events, one of which is described as a temporal, causal or purposive elaboration of the other. Information on common participants can be provided, however, as secondary in importance. It is of interest to know whether a language like Tuva employs its switch-reference resources in various constructions not specifically focused on participant tracking (For surveys of Tuva constructions with adverbial clauses, see Babajan 1960, Delger-ool 1960, Sat 1982). In this section, several types of constructions with adverbial clauses are analyzed. We are primarily interested in what means are used for coding sameness/difference of subjects, to what extent these means are regular, and whether they should be viewed as components of the switch-reference system.

3.1. Constructions with temporal clauses

There are a variety of temporal clauses in the Tuva language. Thus, 85 formal types of such clauses are described in Samina (1985b). (Among them are our quasi-coordinate constructions with the markers -G4 and -Vr.-G4.) Temporal constructions considered in that paper to be the basic ones are those with the dependent verb marked as a masdar-case form in -G4 or -D4 (dative or locative cases, respectively). From our point of view, these forms, which look similar at first glance, have very different functions, which is reflected in different morphological and syntactic restrictions on their distribution. The conditions for using -G4 forms and their functions within the system of switch-reference have been analyzed in full detail in section 1. Above. As for -D4 forms, they appear to be the most frequent masdar-case forms in Turkic languages (see, for instance, Gadžieva 1973; Ceremisinova 1981). In the works on the Tuva language, they have been treated similarly to -Vr.-G4 forms (Samina 1982; Sat 1968; Ceremisinova et al. 1984). The following examples show some occurrences of -D4 forms.

(45)

   girl/3 sick-IMPF-TEMP mother-3 CTY-CONV AUX.
   'When the girl is sick, her mother cries.'

b. sun rise-PP-TEMP earth get.illuminated-PP
   'When the sun rose, the earth became illuminated.'

c. men sind-iz siid-ir-im-da sunu-m (men) atsunh-kan.
   I sleep-CONV AUX-IMPF-1SG-TEMP mother-1 EACC awaken-PP
   'When I was asleep, my mother awakened me.'

d. avu-zi aliq-zi-bile ingadad-iz obd-da, ofl-u uru-bile
   mother-3 father-3CT-CONV-ALG TEMP boy-3 girl-3 with
   toll-CONV AUX-PP
   'While the mother and father talked, their children fooled around.'

e. enjez luk-la, kepp xewek
   grass wet-TEMP cut must
   'While the grass is wet, one has to mow it.'

The following morphological features are characteristic of -D4 constructions: co-occurrence with both imperfective (45a) and perfective (45b) masdars, that is, -Vr- and -G4-case forms, respectively; with simple or analytic (45c) verbal predicates; directly with the auxiliary stem — the most frequent case (45d); with an adjective predicate (45e). Form a syntactic point of view, -D4 constructions tend to be used in combination with the noncoreference of subjects, though this correlation is not as strict as for -Vr.-G4 constructions (see below).
Semantically, -Da constructions represent the idea of a loose temporal coo- 
currence of two events, i.e., partial or absolute identity of their temporal bound-
aries (see Katanov 1963: 924; Delger-ool 1960; Šamia 1985 b: 60). It is this 
meaning that is responsible for the frequent non-coreference of subjects en-
countered in -Da constructions: Naturally, in the real world temporally coo-
current events more frequently involve distinct actors (cf., however, a more 
peculiar situation represented by -Blaan constructions, see below). Deviations 
from this correlation occur in nonstandard situations where either it is difficult 
to judge whether the coreference of subjects is really observed — see (46) (and 
cf. 2.1.3 above), or the temporal clause is expressed in a reduced way; in the last 
case the temporal clause usually breaks up the main clause — see (47)–(48).

(46) 

day-a 

berg-en-de, su̱lde-ar-i 

dam haat.
freeze-conv aux-pf-temp work-impp-3 still go-imppp

‘When one is freezing, one works even better.’ (lit. ‘... his working goes ...’)

(47) 

dan mey-taulip-im-ni [sin-er-ip-de] ap al-ič

that IGEN bag-1SG-ACC EXIST-IMPP-2SG-TEMP takeconv aux-impp

2SG

lit. ‘That bag of mine, when you go out, you’ll pick up.’

(48) 

ala-m [Toora-xem-da 

ber-gan-da] mey-gi̱xungi sala-ip

father-1SG Toora-khem-LOC be-pf-temp 1DAT shirt buy-conv

ber-gaen.

aux-pf

‘My father, staying at Toora-khem, bought a shirt for me.’

The temporal -Da clause in (48) obviously has the primary locative meaning, 
whereas the auxiliary bal ‘be located’ simply serves as the carrier of the -Da 
marker.

Thus, -Da constructions should be analyzed as temporal, and hence, adverbial 
clauses, in contrast to -Vr.GA constructions, which were analyzed as quasi-
coordinate. This claim is also supported by the fact that -Da clauses fail to 
participate in clause chaining (cf. examples with -Vr.GA clauses in 2.3). This is 
motivated by a closer and more unidirectional dependence of the -Da modifier 
on the main clause as compared to the quasi-coordinate constructions.

From the point of view of the switch-reference system, a “quasi-minimal pair” for 
-Da constructions appears to be the construction with the -Blaan 
converb which requires strictly coreferential subjects. (On this converb and its 
properties see Babulkin 1959: 101; Issakov-Pal’mbash 1961: 388; Šamia 1985 b:

125–126). The discourse function of -Blaan constructions is to emphasize strict 
temporal cooccurrence, and even fusion of two events. This is a peculiar situ-
at of -Blaan constructions again bring in the difficult problem of delimitation 
between adverbial clause constructions and coordination: the idea of conjunc-
tion is expressed to a maximal degree by a structure where events are unified 
both by a common main participant — especially when it is the only participant 
of a one-place-verb — and by temporal cooccurrence.

(49) 
a. anu-zi 

unu-n 

lenger-bilaan, inqa̱daq-em-ep olah.

mother-3 girl3-acc feed-temp-ss talk-conv aux

‘The mother feeds her daughter and speaks to her.’

b. kem xiqi̱ndir-bilaan, ana-zi 

unu-n 

lenger-ip 

ber-gan.

food cook-tempss mother-3 girl3-acc feed-temp conv aux-pf

‘While cooking, the mother (simultaneously) feels her daughter.’

An important fact about the Tuva switch-reference system is that in same-
subject constructions the deletion of a subject NP can occur either in the main 
or in the dependent clause — see the positions of the NP aneq in (49 a–b). But 
this fact can receive another interpretation: it is always the subject of the depen-
dent clause that is deleted; but since the dependent clause in all cases precedes 
the main clause, sometimes the remaining subject NP can be dislocated to 
the leftmost position in the sentence. Thus, the full NP aneq in (49 a) either 
belong to the dependent clause, to which it is actually adjacent, or it is dislocated 
from its original position in the main clause, in which case the dependent clause in 
around by main clause material. Each of the interpretations has its pros and 
cons, but in any case the variant with the subject in the left clause — see (49 a) — 
be justifiably considered a quasi-coordinate construction, because it is 
characterized by anaphoric, not cataphoric deletion.

When there is a pragmatic need of communicating the idea of temporal cooc-
currence or fusion of two events with distinct actors, a passive variant of the 
-Blaan construction can be used, permitting to preserve the subject coreference.

(50) 
a. qeq-em 

alai-zi-n-go 

eeto-dir-bilaan, injag-e 

ber-gan.

boy-3 father-3-suf-dat beat-pass-temp-ss cry-conv aux-pf

lit. ‘The boy gets beaten by his father and cries.’

Of course, this is possible only if some coreference between the clauses is present, 
as in (50 a), where the patient of the dependent clause is coreferential with the 
agent of the main clause. Compare this with the case where there is no corefe-
rence, subjects cannot be made coreferential and the -Da clause is used:
A peculiar feature of -BİİAN conversivs is the possibility of their autonomous use as finite forms with person markers. When used in this manner they have an emphatic meaning "X is still doing P (and) still doing Q", as in (51 b–c).

The -BİİAN and -DA forms are close to being part of the switch-reference system. But still there are some features which differentiate them from the constructions analyzed in section 2: (a) they are not full synonyms, as -BİİAN has an emphatic sense of paralleling events; (b) -VAR. DA and -GEN. DA are not as consistent with respect to their different-subject-function as -VAR. GA is. Other patterns of temporal constructions – with conjunctions or masdars plus postpositions (see Šamin 1985 b) – are not sensitive to switch-reference and thus are not examined here. It should also be added that in some cases a temporal relation may implicate a causal or conditional relation (depending on the context and aspectual characteristics of the event), the expression of temporal cooccurrence remains the prototypical function of -DA and -BİİAN constructions. The prototypical means for expressing condition are constructions with a special conditional mood marker in the dependent clause. They are not sensitive to switch-reference (see Kibrik 1988) and thus are not considered in this paper.

3.2. Constructions with causal clauses

Among the great variety of Tuva constructions that express causal relations (see Šamin 1980, 1985 a), one can single out a nuclear subset where the switch-reference distinction is observed. (As noted above, in adverbial clause constructions, switch-reference marking tends to be associated with the least specific semantics). The following are some basic examples:

(52 a)  men korag-a ber-gem beł-gel, ber-kü ni džar-ıp dide-saan men.  I be afraid aux-pf be-ss wolf-acl kill-aux conv can-neg pf 1sg 'I could not kill the wolf because I had been frightened.'

b.  ber-kü amikak ber-gem, džar-be-di-m.  wolf young bečs kill-neg past 1sg 'Since the wolf was young, I did not kill it.'

c.  mën džar-kü ber-gem, sëj ay ügen. 1sg that year cold bečs much animal die-pf 'Since the year was cold, a lot of animals died.'

Example (52 a) shows a same-subject construction, and (52 b) a different-subject construction with a coreferential direct object in the main clause. In (52 c) there are no coreferential NPs. It is obvious that the switch-reference markers are the same as in quasi-coordinate constructions: -GA and -VAR. GA. However, in causal constructions there is a special carrier for those markers, namely the existential copula bečs that can accompany not only nominal but also verbal predicates of dependent clauses without any restrictions on their form – see (52) and also cf. (53):

(53 a) al-cam dika targa-kam beł-gem, sana j ber-gen. 1sg father-1sg very be:tried-pf be-ss sleep-aux conv aux-pf 'My father fell asleep because he grew very tired.'

b.  al-cam dika turq-kam, sana j ber-gen. 1sg father-1sg very be:tried-pf sleep-aux conv aux-pf 'My father grew very tired and fell asleep.'

Some peculiarities of switch-reference in causal constructions can be seen in sentences like (54 a):

(54 a)  sëj eksi beurep-da keb-dii-m.  you good be:temp-2sg-temp aux-past 1sg 'I came because you are good.'

Here the different-subject marker is -DA – the same as in temporal clauses. But its carrier is still a finite form of the same copula bečs. One can compare it to an analogous temporal clause construction demonstrating the nominal predicate:

(54 b) sëj eksi turq-da, sana j ber-pf 1sg you little aux-temp youdat song-pf sing-aux conv la-m bi:sa conv aux-pf 1sg 'When you were young, I sang songs to you.'
The question arises as to what the grammatical status of the copula bol- is which appears as bolqual, bolvur.GA or bolvur.DH and can accompany all types of predicates in causal clauses. From our point of view it would be misleading to describe these forms as conjunctives or postpositions (see Isakov-Pal Inbax 1961: 450; Šamina 1980, Šamina 1985 a, 1985 b). At the same time, they cannot be equated with the auxiliaries and be thus considered a part of the complex verbal predicate since they are attached to an already formed analytic complex. We would prefer to view these markers not in terms of paradigmatically defined word classes (conjunctives vs. auxiliaries etc.), but functionally, according to their role as switch-reference markers in causal constructions. This is even more reasonable in view of the special character of the same/different-subject opposition in causal constructions: not -GAI vs. -Vr.GA, but bolqual vs. bolur.Ga, bolur.DH. (The existence of the two latter forms is due to different aspactual features of the events in question). In general, constructions with causal clauses belong to the switch-reference system, their morphological base being the quasi-coordination switch-reference markers -GAI/-Vr.GA.

3.3. Constructions with purposive clauses

A large group of biclausal constructions in Tuva show in their dependent clause a marker based on a form of the verb dr- ‘say, tell’. Among these, constructions with purposive clauses form a special and easily definable class (another class that is not of interest to us here is complements with verbs of intellectual activity). The purposive clause is introduced by the marker del which is in fact the -GAI-converb of dr-. (For further information on purposive clauses see Šamina 1980; Sat 1981). Thus an expression translatable as “X does P in order to do Q”, means literally “saying Q, X does P”. The following are some basic examples:

(55) a. ava-m ga xqes-k-ir del, men zo o-ri-tur=ta-m.
   mother-1SG DAT meet-IMPF PURP 1 TOWN GO-PAST-1SG
   ‘I went to the town in order to see my mother.’

b. ava-qi dilan-zi=ni del, ura min-nu-xu qazir-xip-kaan.
   mother-3 REST-IMPF PURP girl-3 COOK-CONV AUX-IMPF 3SG
   ‘For the mother to have a rest, her daughter cooked the soup.’

c. a-m kenx-ten-nu-zi=ni del, men qal-á=ti tur-ip
   father-1SG scold-SUP-NEG-IMP-3SG PURP we FIREWOOD CHOP-CONV
   kal diá-m.
   AUX-PAST-1SG
   ‘I chopped firewood so that my father would not scold me.’

These examples suggest that the different/same-subject contrast is relevant for purposive constructions as well, though the means of expressing it are different. The different-subject relation (55 b, 55 c) is signaled by the “imperative-optative mood” (Sat 1955: 695) on the dependent verb; for the third person its marker is -Zia. The literal meaning of (55 b), for example, is “Saying: ‘Let the mother have a rest’, the daughter cooked the soup’.

As for the same-subject relation, (55 a), it is signaled by the plain indicative mood. That this form is a finite one, and not a modal or participle, is better seen in examples with zero agreement:

(56) aso-m dilan-ir men del, san-zp kei-gen.  
   fatheree-1SG REST-IMPF 1SG PURP GOSOME-CONV AUX-PP
   ‘My father came home to have a rest’.

The optional first person marker men is present in this sentence. It is used to describe the purpose of some event most explicitly, by verbalizing it through direct speech – “Father came, saying: ‘I’ll have a rest’”. The absence of the person marker men in (56) would describe that purpose by verbalizing it as indirect speech: “Father came, saying that he’ll have a rest”.

These two possibilities create occasional ambiguities which are resolved by the context, depending on whether the purposive is construed as representing direct or indirect speech:

(57) a. ava-m meni lenger-ip qaj-zi=ni del, men atší=dam
   mother-1SG ACC FEED-CONV WATER-IMP-3SG PURP you WORK-ABL
   kel diá-p.
   come-PAST-3SG
   a. Direct speech: ‘You came from work so your mother would feed you.’ (lit. ‘Saying: “Let my mother feed you”’ you came from work.’)
   b. Indirect speech: ‘You came from work so my mother would feed me.’ (lit. ‘Saying [that] my mother should feed me you came from work’.)

From the pragmatic point of view, interpretation (a) is no doubt preferable here.

The system of switch-reference in purposive clauses operates according to the same main principle that holds for the other types of constructions reviewed above: the same-subject marker appears only in case two referential nominal NPs are present; semantic features are not taken into account. See (58):

(58) Ø, ild bol-zi del, ool, polku-ni odep-kaan.
   warm BE-IMP-3SG PURP BOY STOVE-ACC HEAT-PP
   ‘The boy started the stove in order to get warm’.
The verb ḏaş bel-‘be warm’ requires the dative, not the nominative case, and the respective NP cannot be considered the subject NP in Tuva. For the switch-reference mechanism it means different-subject marking, in this case – the imperative-operative mood of the main verb.

Thus, there are good reasons for considering purpurpuse constructions in Tuva as belonging to the switch-reference system. Though same- and different-subject markers in purpurpuse constructions are different from those analyzed in previous sections, the main same-subject marker -GAI also finds its place here: the verbal form deč shares its subject with the main clause introducing direct/indirect speech and is used as an intermediate link for maintaining the referential bond between the subjects of the main and dependent clauses.

3.4. Constructions with conjoining verbs

The examination of purpurpuse adverbial clauses concludes the overview of multiclausal constructions that mark switch-reference along with their adverbal meanings. However, we have still not considered the constructions with the verbs in -dlp and -V/-j that allow only same-subject usages. Forms cognate with these verbs are found in nearly all Turkic languages, and in Turkological works many pages are usually devoted to them (see, e.g., Dmitriev 1948: 187; Konoev 1956: 475–476; Gadjieva 1961; Lewis 1967: 175–178; Gadjieva 1973: 318–321; Peochuevskij 1975: 237–238; Julaževe 1977: 158–179, 185). Tuva constructions with the -V/-j and -dlp verbs are described in much detail in Katanov (1903: 846, 850), Babuśkin (1939; Issakov-Pal’mbax 1961: 316–330). In Samina (1985b) they are described along with the other conjoining constructions conveying temporal relations. In our opinion, such a categorization is not quite justifiable and is rather motivated by the semantics of Russian translations of these constructions with the help of Russian converb phrases.

Converbs in -V/-j and -dlp have traditionally been thought to have at least two separate types of uses (Issakov and Pal’mbax 1961: 316). These are, first, marking the dependent clause in a multi-clausal construction, and, second, marking all nonfinal verb forms in an analytical verbal construction. In both types of uses these verbs barely have any independent meaning – they basically serve to conjoin adjacent verbs (see below); hence the term ‘conjoining converbs’. The two types of uses are illustrated by the following examples.

(59) a. ool abar-a, daqma-q-bile čan-jp alar-gan.
   boy zit-conv sister-3-with play-conv aux-pf
   'The boy is sitting and playing with his sister.'

b. daqma-q-bile čan-jp alar-a. ool igolj ber-gen.
   sister-3-with play-conv aux-conv boy cry-conv aux-pf
   'The boy was playing with his sister and burst into tears.'
class of auxiliary verbs, the intermediate cases are not unique and cover the whole continuum of transition from multicausal constructions with conjoining counterparts to the analytic verb forms.

A possible framework for describing these two types of conjoiner uses is the idea of Foley–Van Valin 1984 and Foley–Olson 1985 that serial constructions and coordinate clauses are nothing but two stages of the process of clause juncture that can reach different degrees of completion: (1) sharing all arguments by both predicates, as in analytic forms; (2) sharing only part of the arguments, necessarily including the main protagonist, as in the multi-causal constructions in (59a, 59b); (3) sharing only the adverbial arguments (not necessarily present). Conjoiners in -V/j and -/lp do not have parallel forms that mark different-subject. Thus, like English adverbial participle and Russian conjoiners, they do not constitute a subsystem of switch-reference.

4. Conclusion

Let us briefly summarize the results of this study. The basis of the switch-reference system in Tuva is constituted by a pair of morphological markers -G/A and -/G.A (same-subject and different-subject respectively) used in quasi-coordinate constructions (section 2). This morphological opposition also underlies a subsystem of switch-reference in causal adverbial clause constructions (section 3.2). There is also a pair of markers that express temporal adverbial clauses with the meaning of simultaneity (section 3.1) and that are partially paralleled with the pair of basic markers, but are grammaticalized to a lesser degree. Another subsystem of switch-reference – purposive adverbial clause constructions (section 3.3) – is based on different morphological resources: the same and different-subject status is shown on the dependent verb by means of the indicative and imperative-optative moods respectively. The last type of switch-reference marking constructions we are aware of is the construction with conjoining conjoiners in -/lp and -V/j which embraces a broad range of multicausal structures: from an analytical verb form to a clause chain. The markers of these conjoiners are same-subject markers and do not have different-subject marking counterparts.

In section 1, we listed cross-linguistically frequent properties of switch-reference systems. Now we will try to compare the Tuva variant of such a system with the typological “standard” and to provide functional explanations for the properties in question.

1. In Tuva switch-reference constructions, the switch-reference markers also mark the clause as dependent. The very fact that (non)coreference of the clause’s subject with another subject is marked makes the clause dependent, requires comparing it to some other clause. Moreover, markers of switch-reference not only signal (non)coreference of the subject of the dependent clause with the subject of the main clause, but in addition express certain adverbial meanings with different degrees of specificity: from a minimally specific meaning in quasi-coordinate constructions to a highly specific meaning in purposive adverbial clauses.

2. Tuva has verb-final word order, and in a simple clause all arguments are located to the left of the verb. In accordance with this principle, the main finite verb tends to take the rightmost position in multicausal constructions, whereas the nonfinite (frequently nominalized) clauses marking switch-reference take the argument slots to the left of the main verb.

3. The Tuva switch-reference mechanism marks (non)coreference of syntactic subjects. In cases where the referential properties of the subject are blurred, variation of switch-reference markers is possible.

4. The main same-subject marker in Tuva (-G/A) is morphologically unanalyzable while the different-subject marker (-/G.A) has an internal structure and agrees with the subject of its clause. This is quite natural since noncoreference, unlike the same-subject case, does not convey by itself any information about the subject.

5. In Tuva, the basic type of multicausal constructions displaying switch-reference marking is what we called quasi-coordinate constructions with same- and different-subject markers in the dependent clause. These constructions show the semantically least specific link between clauses. Presumably, this is explained by the fact that switch-reference first emerges in constructions where the type of coreference is least predictable from the semantic nature of the interclausal link itself.

All that we have said above permits us to outline some perspectives for further studies on switch-reference. As for Tuva, at least the following aspects deserve to be mentioned: (1) discovering the remaining types of constructions marking switch-reference, if any; (2) an in-depth study of conjoiner constructions (see section 3.4) and the continuous scale between analytical verb forms and multicausal constructions with dependent conjoiner clauses; the relevance of the notion of conjoiner construction to the Tuva evidence; (3) the interplay of such devices of discourse cohesion as switch-reference and anaphora (cf. Kökik 1988 for some work in this direction).

As for Turkic studies in general, all Turkic languages should be closely examined to see whether they have switch-reference phenomena or not. Relying both on general speculations and preliminary analyses, there are reasons to suspect that switch-reference is quite typical of the Turkic language type. The contempo-
rare state of syntactic typology calls for filling this gap in our knowledge about this language family, which is in fact one of the best documented in the world.

**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1, 2, 3</th>
<th>persons of</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>locative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>subject/possessor</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>perfective masdar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONV</td>
<td>converb</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>PTCL</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>PURP</td>
<td>purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative-optative</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>imperfective masdar</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>same subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR</td>
<td>interruptive aspect</td>
<td>SUF</td>
<td>meaningless suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITER</td>
<td>iterative aspect</td>
<td>(morphophonemically) induced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>directional case</td>
<td>TEMP</td>
<td>temporal clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Tuva examples, we ignore zero morphemes and omit the corresponding glosses, like nominative case marker, third person agreement.

**Notes**


1. This paper was translated by three people: Martin Haspelmath and the authors. We are deeply grateful to Martin for his help, collaboration, and encouragement. However, we alone assume all the responsibility for the contents of the paper.

Tuvan is a Turkic language spoken in southern Siberia (mostly in the Tuva republic, a part of the Russian Federation) by approximately 200,000 speakers (1989 census). In English the Tuva language has been variously called Tuvian, Tuvin, Tuvinian, as well as a number of older names (see Comrie 1992: 190). The Tuva people call their language tuv al. Tuvan is a member of the Northern (Eastern-Hunnic) branch of the Turkic family. The grammatical structure of Tuva is mostly within the limits of the Turkic “standard”, but includes some features shared by other Turkic, Ugro-Mongolic and Mongolic languages of the area. The lexicon displays a strong influence from Mongolian. The standard Tuva orthography is based on the Cyrillic alphabet. Here we use a transliteration system fairly common in Turkic studies (see, e.g., Comrie 1981). The character ı represents a high back unrounded vowel; /ı/ is a palatal voiced fricative.

This paper is based on data collected by the authors in the 1986 linguistic expedition of Moscow State University in Tuva (Toda distric, the village of Il). Except for the cases specifically indicated, all Tuva examples were elicited from our consultants in the village of Il, who speak the Toda dialect of Tuva (see Madanina 1974). Checking our materials with the speakers of the Tuva literary dialect of Tuva showed that the Toda dialect does not differ significantly from the Tuva literary dialect in the relevant aspects. The cases of divergence between dialects are indicated in the paper. We have occasionally used data from written Tuvan texts, as well as from the works of other authors. Such cases are indicated.

We are happy to express our gratitude to our consultants—the schoolteachers from the village of Il, and also our colleagues Ul’jaan P. Operyool and Marina V. Mongol, who helped us correct and supplement our data. We thank the members of the Tuva linguistic expedition who discussed with us certain aspects of the present work, and we are very thankful to Aleksandr E. Kibrik, Antonina I. Korol, Isaak S. Kotinsky, Maria S. Poliansky, Evgeny R. Tsurikov, Yakov G. Testale, and Viktoria N. Yartseva, who read an early version of the article and made valuable comments. We also highly appreciate the help of Thomas Payne who provided us with some important information. Keith Maye suggested a number of stylistic improvements, for which we are very much indebted to him. Naturally, all mistakes and omissions are our own responsibility.

1. True, there are marginal examples of nonconferentiality of subjects of the participle and main clauses in English, e.g. *John having calmly sat by the tree, Bill waited patiently behind the tree for the bear* (we owe this example to Robert D. Van Valin). To ensure such nonconferentiality, however, there should be an overt NP in the participle clause: the absence of a noun phrase is equivalent, by default, to conferentiality.

2. There are well-known examples of correct Russian sentences with converbs where the subjects are not, strictly speaking, conferential (see, e.g., Bengtson 1979). In fact, Russian converbs are no less complicated than the Tuva converbs discussed below. The Russian data are cited here simply for illustrative purposes.

3. Staring 1993 appeared after the revised version of this paper was finished, so we could not take it into account.

4. Two notes are due here:

(a) *Kara-* (‘Black girl’) is one of the most common Tuva female names (below we will also meet the common male name *Kara-* ‘Black boy’).

(b) in the second classes of (3b), one can see that the verb forms are the analytic ones, i.e., they consist of a lexically full verb in the converb form in -پ plus an auxiliary verbs in a finite form. This kind of analytic structure is highly typical of Tuva texts. We will deal with the analytic structures in more detail in section 3.4.

5. Following Turbological tradition, we use a morphophonemic transcription for affixes where capitals indicate morphophonemes that can be realized differently on the surface, depending on the context. For example, the morphophoneme A can show up as a or /a/ because of vowel harmony, depending on the stem vowel; the morphophoneme S surfaces as /g, k/ and sometimes zero.

6. Although the term ‘converb’ (depresumably) was originally brought into Turkic linguistics from the Russian grammatical tradition, the requirement of conferentiality of the main clause and dependent clause subjects is not usually implied by its usage in Turkic studies; see Ceretnitsina (1977).

7. On the difference between agreement affixes on masolars and regular nouns see Ceretnitsina (1981: 34).
8. It should be noted that a more natural translation of such sentences as English would be something like "Kara-ool’s father will leave and Kara-ool will go to sleep" but we stick here and below to a translation more isomorphic to the Tuva construction; in contrast to English, the preferred interpretation of such Tuvan sentences is that it is Kara-ool who is the father’s son.

9. This example was elicited from a speaker of the literary dialect of Tuvan. For the speakers of the Todña dialect such sentences are unacceptable. In Todña bidirectional constructions of the type in question, one of the clauses can be made passive only if there is a strong motivation to topicalize the patient — to make it a passive subject; such a motivation can appear only if the second clause includes an argument concomitant with this patient subject, which is not the case in (22).

10. Our informants do not agree on the stylistic value of the same-subject variants of such sentences. Different forms are preferred on different occasions. The unsystematic nature of these preferences perhaps indicates that they are not motivated in every single case, but only reflect the informants’ intuitions about the somewhat marginal status of these constructions.

11. This example with the same-subject form was taken from the written text of a Tuva fairy tale. The different-subject variant was checked with an informant.

12. Examples (25)–(26) are from a speaker of the standard dialect.

13. This example is from Babulkin (1959: 101).

14. Although it is, of course, not necessary (and actually does not occur often in practice) that both NPs are overt.

15. This example, as well as the other examples in the remainder of section 2.1.3 are from a speaker of the standard dialect.

16. As has been observed by Mati S. Polinьsky (personal communication), the possibility of the same-subject marker in example (37a) (and its impossibility in (37b)) can also be explained differently, namely by the existence of an associative link between the concepts of “spring” and “flowers”; such links are similar to referential relations like part/whole, which were considered above. In general, for some uses of same-subject markers in the context of incomplete co-reference one can imagine a somewhat different treatment, based not on the noncontrastuality of subjects, but on the discovery of various relations of similarity and link between subjects; simple co-reference is a special case of such relations.

17. -bi is the negative variant of the imperfective matural marker -fi.

18. Indeed, such a combination exists, but in a completely different function: to mark a sentential complement of a verb that requires a dative object.

19. The word group with a quick pause, formally an instrumental/manner NP, can be viewed as a reduction of the predication "he passed quickly".

20. This example was taken from the written text of a Tuva fairy tale and was checked with an informant.
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