Review: **Adverbial clause combining in Latgalian: temporal, conditional, causal and concessive relations in spontaneous speech**

1. Originality/Contribution to the field: Does the paper make an original and novel contribution in relation to previous research?

The paper is an interesting investigation of adverbial clause combining in Latgalian in speech elicited via interviews from 10 persons. The introduction displays the theoretical background of the analysis presenting definitions of adverbial clauses and related constructions, of clause linkage in spontaneous speech and outlines the structure of the paper. The second section is dedicated to data and methodology explaining the origins of the data and how it was prepared for the analyses. The biggest section presents the techniques of adverbial clause combining in Latgalian with subsections on the definition of adverbial clause, on asyndetic clause combining, on lexical markers in the adverbial clause and on correlative constructions and lexical markers in the main clause. The paper closes with a concluding section – before the author adds some details on transcription symbols, abbreviations and glosses and lists the references mentioned in the paper.

In the present form, the paper seems to give new and valuable insights into clause combining in spoken Latgalian.

2. Theoretical background: The content relates well to existing literature in the field, i.e. the relevant literature is adequately referred to.

The paper is established on existing research on adverbial clauses and their typologies. As the paper is based on spontaneous speech, the difficulties that arise with respect to sentence segmentation and also the decisions that finally affected the categorisations could be made clearer. The transcript is made according to GAT, and therefore based on prosodic units. These, however, are not necessarily syntactically relevant. It is probably a naïve question from a non-informed person about Latgalian: How is a Latgalian main clause – in general – different from a subordinate clause? Does it make any difference with respect to word order etc. so that one can tell that it is a subordinated clause or a main clause linked with an adverb (as explained in section 3.4).

With respect to the segmentation of the data and also the definition of phrase complex, the author could add some details that make clearer how she/he dealt with the specificities of syntactically relevant segments in spoken data (Probably the article from Fraser et al. 2000 could be interesting as it discusses various ways of segmenting spoken data: Foster, Pauline, Alan Tonkyn, und Gillian Wigglesworth (2000): Measuring spoken language: a unit for all reasons. Applied Linguistics 21(3): 354–375.)

3. Research questions/objectives/hypotheses: Relevance of the research question(s)? Are the research questions/objectives/ hypotheses clearly stated?

Yes, the author gives a clear introduction into the aims of the paper.

4. Relevance of the methodology: Does the chapter make clear that research methods used are appropriate and well-motivated?

The author makes clear where the data comes from and how it is analyzed, but please consider the above mentioned issues with respect to the segmentation of spoken data.

Since the author underlines that she/he is mainly interested in the narratives, it would probably make sense not to repeatedly name the data interviews which accentuates the dialogic format, but eventually refer to the material as data or speech.

5. Presentation and discussion of results: Are the findings clearly presented, and aligned with the stated research questions/objectives.

Yes, the author generally presents the results and insights on Latgalian clause combining very clear and comprehensible way – some minor questions are listed below.

6. Quality of style.

If needed – depending on the journal's guidelines – the editors will have to ask for an abstract, key words or a short title.

7. Quality of language.

Overall, the text is very readable, but occasionally there seem to be some minor language issues that could be improved, e.g. p. 22 "This a patter I found …" . I am not a native speaker myself, so I only suggest thorough proof-reading and editing.

8. Appropriateness of title.

The title seems to be appropriate. I was just hesitating a little bit after reading the paper, because the paper also covers clause combining in a more general way (asyndetic clause combining with converbs, etc.). However, whether this is subsumed under adverbials, might be due to different definitions of adverbial clause (see section 3).

9. Other comments and suggestions to the author.

Some details and questions:

− p. 3 particles such as *a, vot,* at the beginning …. > English translation of the particles is missing

− p. 3 beginning and end of a complex – what exactly is meant by "complex"?

− p. 3 why is Section 2 decribed after section 3 – and not the other way round which would probably better lead the reader through the paper.

− p. 4 what does "well educated" mean in "All speakers are well educated"; this has a judgemental undertone which is surely not eh aim of the author; I suggest just describing the educational background (higher degree or compulsory schooling or…)

− p. 5 "segmenting the transcription syntactically into clauses – according to which criterion?

− p. 5 "clear border signals" – what is meant with the term "border signal"?

− Footnote 2 judgment > judgement

− p. 7 "clause (a) is the coda of a paragraph where the speaker told … - As paragraph is a concept from written language, I would rather use turn or statement or….

− Footnote 4 – probably I have read over it, but what is defined as a clause complex?

– p. 8 – the list of the criterions – at this point the quality of the different criteria could be made clearer (prosody and semantics and lexical elements are used to syntactically segment the data…) – see also my comment above with respect to the segmentation of the data.

– p. 9. "during this journey" - is this a common metaphor in academic English?

– p. 10 "in these interviews" – as the focus in not on the fact that interviews are analysed I would rather name it "analyzed speech" or "presented data"

– p. 10 Comma intonation – has this be defined before, just very shortly

– p. 11 ex. (5) This was a point where I asked myself where the borders between subordinate adverbial clauses and types of main clauses are in Latgalian, as the author describes it as a clause complex and mentiones that the "adverbial" clause is pronounced as a more or less separate unit…

– p. 12 "a reliable transcriber" – is this statement necessary to give him/her the authority to make decisions on what is heard

– p. 13 possiblity > possibility

– p. 13 recomendations for beekeeping > recommendations

– Last paragraph on p. 13: Just a question: Wouldn't a construction grammar approach help for such examples?

– p 14. "they may be more coordinative or more subordinative"… is it a continuum? How does it then look like? And is it really possible to analyse every clause that is in a temporal, causal etc. relation to the rest of the text as an adverbial clause?

– p. 14 lexical markers – is a differenciation between conjunctions, adverbs etc. that is made in many languages not important? Are connectives and lexical markers the same, therefore used synonymously?

– p. 15 of an indefinite pronouns > of an indefinite pronoun

– p. 16 about half of the tokens of *ka* I identified > are identified

– Footnote 13 – eliminate one "and" after PARTICLE – or do I segment the footnote in the wrong way? There are some translations missing, I think.

– Table 4: the *because* is missing in the description

– p. 19: "are not clear to me"… I would make a more general statement about the data and that the differences are not obvious etc., and avoid a personal statement.

– p. 21 – examples 18 70 20 – this was a passage where it was not totally clear whether the examples are segmented according to prosodic or syntactic criteria.

– p. 27 your description reminds me of the different usage of German *weil* 'because' either as a conjunction or as a discourse marker (Gohl, Christine, and Susanne Günthner. "Grammatikalisierung von *weil* als Diskursmarker in der gesprochenen Sprache." *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 18.1 (1999): 39-75. For discourse markers more generally; I think Fraser, e.g.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of pragmatics*, *31*(7), 931-952. could be an interesting starting point.)

– p. 35 last paragraph before section 4 – I think there is a problem with the line numbering of line a and b… please check.

Overall appreciation of the paper:

Overall, I think the paper is an interesting and valuable contribution to the study of clause combining in Latgalian – especially as there seem to be no other study to which research on actual spoken Latgalian can have recourse to. The paper could surely benefit from rethinking and reworking some of the issues mentioned above:

    -> Accept with minor modifications