

Clause combining in spontaneous spoken Latvian, revised version for Baltic Linguistics 2018

Answers to three anonymous reviews and the comments by BW

All comments and suggestions have been very helpful for revising the paper and critically rethinking its structure and content. The revised version differs from the version for review in many respects.

I slightly changed the structure of the paper, as suggested by several reviewers. The general discussion of adverbial clause combining and the markers of adverbial clauses (forming the Theoretical background) are now in a separate section instead of a subsection and have been thoroughly revised (including some text that formerly was in the introduction). This part however kept its place after the section on Data collection and presentation (Reviewer 3 and BW had suggested to change the order), because it is tightly connected to the following discussion of the constructions found in my sample.

I also made sections instead of subsections for the main types of constructions (now: 4. Asyndetic constructions, 5. Connectives in the adverbial clause, 6. Correlative constructions) and added summaries to each. Consequently the Conclusions in Section 7 are now shorter and more focused on the main results and questions for future research (Review 2).

The introduction has been almost completely rewritten and I hope it now gives a better idea of the content and goals of the paper (Review 2 and BW). Some parts of the former version have been removed and a list of research questions is given (Review 2). An example is inserted at the very beginning (as suggested by BW) with a few remarks on transcription conventions (Review 2, BW).

In Section 2. Methods of data collection and presentation, I explained in more detail how intonation units were determined and what principles lay behind the segmentation of extracts into lines (Review 3). I also explained why measuring the corpus I compiled from the transcriptions in number of words and relating all statements about frequency to this number (BW) is problematic. As a consequence, I revised such statements throughout the paper (often by removing them) and made it more clear what I meant when talking about frequent and rare patterns in my sample.

I carefully repeated the prosodic analysis of all extracts and tried to integrate its results more systematically in the description of individual constructions (Review 1). My revision led to slightly different results, for example, I found the pattern with the “comma intonation” (the term is now avoided) much less important. However, I am aware that my prosodic analysis is still not very deep and could certainly profit from collaboration with a trained phonetician (I will consider this for future research). I also inserted a few PRAAT graphs in the section on asyndetic clause combining (Review 1).

I expanded the discussion of the participle constructions that intrigued Reviewer 1, but a more elaborate discussion of clause chaining and thematic (dis)continuity would need more data (there is only one example of the “coordinate dependent” type in my current sample and few examples of other types), and more time. This hopefully will be the subject of a future study, based on data from traditional narratives, where clause chaining is better attested.

Constructions with the connective *ka* are now treated in a separate section. The different semantic relations that turn up in these constructions are now described in a different manner (abandoning the division into WHEN1, WHEN2 etc. criticized by BW).

I made it explicit that although this paper deals with clause combining in spontaneous spoken language, it does not postulate that the patterns found here are unique to spoken varieties (a critical remark by BW). A comparison of clause combining in spoken and written registers is beyond the scope of this study.

I am also grateful for the Reviewers’ minor remarks which helped me avoid ambiguous or clumsy formulations and generally improve the quality of the text.