The paper treats an interesting topic and is innovative for Baltic linguistics (and especially for Latgalian). There is a very broad background. The method seems sound. Many interesting results, succinctly summarized in a conclusion section. In my view there is a need of many minor revisions (see list below, but not exhaustive).

The paper is long and long papers need to be structured rigidly for guiding the reader through them. I think the average reader needs more guiding.

The introduction is not focused enough on the major aims of the study. It does not immediately become clear what the paper really is about. An example in the introduction might be useful to catch the reader's interest.

I strongly recommend adding a section between now 1. and 2. on background. Or, if the author prefers, on definition of basic terms (or maybe two such sections). Now background is spread over all of 1-3 (most of the paper) which distracts the reader from focus on aims in 1. and focus on results in 3.

It does not become sufficiently clear in the summary of results in the conclusions which results also could be reached from the study of planned written Latgalian and which results only can be reached from studying spontaneous unplanned language. I am also a bit doubtful whether the speech in the corpus is really fully unplanned. The content is mostly "aspects of the speaker's life (childhood memories, life and traditions in the village, experiences in professional life).". It is very likely that many speakers will have talked about aspects of their life earlier, so at least the scripts of the stories are not unplanned.

I do not know whether there is any such thing as completely unplanned speech, but I can imagine speech situations which are considerably more unplanned.

p2.
I suggest to rewrite
" I use the term CLAUSE COMBINING for a subset of what is subsumed under the broader term CLAUSE LINKAGE, excluding constructions where a clause is embedded in another clause, either as a complement of the main predicate or as a modifier of one of its arguments."
so that it is easier to understand
e.g. I use CLAUSE LINKAGE as a cover term and CLAUSE COMBINING for a subset...

A more detailed discussion of the term will be given in Section 3.1.
Is it really necessary to discuss clause combining already here?

the concept is inadequate for the description of the syntax of spontaneous spoken language
see also
CHAFE, WALLACE. 1984. How people use adverbial clauses. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 10: 437–49.

This view has also been expressed (surprisingly) by Wallace Chafe, one of the pioneers of spoken language research
No reference given, "surprisingly" is confusing for the reader who does not know the topic, and the question arises whether so much detail is necessary in the introduction of the paper.

M.A.K Halliday, who maintains that spoken language has more intricate grammatical structures than written language (Vries, Lourens de, 1992).
I expect a reference to Halliday here rather than de Vries
> (de Vries 1992).

puts it, "un-self-monitored discourse",
reference?

"The units to which clauses are being combined in spontaneous speech, or, as Halliday puts it, "un-self-monitored discourse", can be very complex and their on-line construction follows elaborate rules. These regularities cannot be seen when trying to describe these units after the model of written sentences, which are the result of planning and revising."
I do not think this passage should be in the introduction

to be interpreted. (Halliday, Webster, & Halliday, 2002)
page?

p4
within the project *TriMCo Triangulation Approach for Modelling Convergence with a High Zoom-In Factor*
Who directed, carried out this project?

is present with several utterances,: consider reformulation

roughly correspond to dialect areas of Latgalian
some reference to dialectological literature might be useful

"Within the TriMCo project, a time-aligned orthographic transcription with ELAN was prepared by several students and other young adults, all speakers of Latgalian."
Something wrong with this sentence?

p5
"interviews as texts"
I wonder what "as texts" means here.

"A corpus compiled of these transcriptions[1] made it easier to find answers to quantitative research questions such as the frequency of certain linking morphemes. More important in my research however are qualitative questions which require longer contexts and information about prosody."
The way this is put first leads the reader astray. Tell us first what you do, what is useful for your study.

or co-constructing of syntactic structures, etc.
Avoid etc. in running text

"Therefore I first went through all transcripts (recordings and transcripts were known to me before this study) and extracted short samples (reaching from combinations of 2 clauses to paragraphs of up to 2 minutes) which I found good illustrations of clause combining techniques within the speech of one speaker (excluding interviewers). I focused on less interactive, more monologic parts of the interviews, which in any case prevail in the recordings:"
"less" and "more" make this passage vague. The reader expects to get an idea of what exactly you did in the method and data section. Try to put this in a more succinct way.

"Of these samples" Unclear at this point what the samples really are, can you quantify them in any way, how many? how long in total?

p6

The structure of 3. is not ideal.

It touches upon a concrete example (1) p7/8, but then moves to a list of cues which are not applied to the example directly and the list does not only give cues, but also introduces definitions of basic terms and discusses the literature (e.g. Mithun on Mohawk).

constructions (Diessel, Holger, 2013). > constructions (Diessel 2013 : Add page number).

Haiman, John & Thompson, Sarah A., 1984) > Haiman & Thompson 1984)

(Hetterle 2015: 2.3.2) Refer with page numbers

From a semantic point of view, authors commonly specify the vague notion of "modification" by listing concepts that are expressed by adverbial clauses, as in the following definition:
I do not view Hetterle's approach as traditional. It is clearly opposed to Cristofaro and it tries to approach the domain bottom up. Rather than trying to define subordination we can proceed bottom up and first start with semantic concepts, such as simultaneity.

Modification is not necessarily a vague concept. The problem is rather that it is rarely defined.
See http://su.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1186506&dswid=1948
(which does not treat complex clauses)

so that causal and conditional relations could be distinguished by intonation alone (without lexical or grammatical means)?
See on a related issue:
Elvira-García, Randy & Roseano, Paolo & Fernández-Planas, Ana Ma. 2017. Prosody as a cue for syntactic dependency. Evidence from dependent and independent clauses with subordination marks in Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 109: 29-46.

p7
In the following example, clause (d)
> In (1), clause (d)

"In contrast, clauses (e) and (f) are prosodically integrated",
unclear what this means. The note "The clause in lines (d)-(f) form a clause complex in my understanding." does not explain this either.

"They are also grammatically marked in a way conventionally associated with a specific semantic relation, namely, counterfactuality."
elaborate!

p8
The meaning of signs as — and = is explained in the end of the paper, but readers might profit from more guiding to this list earlier in the paper.

"When deciding whether a pair of clauses qualify as an instance of clause-combining in the way that interests me in this study,"
should be formulated in a less subjective way in the final version of the paper.

I do not find the adjacency criterion particularly useful. It would be useful only if subordination was the rule and juxtaposition of sentences the exception.

p9
"During this journey I will also consider"

The researcher's and the reader's journey shouldn't be the same. The paper has to be structured such that it is maximally easy to understand what has been done. You cannot expect the reader to follow your journey.

"Analyzing the use of temporal, causal, and conditional clauses with explicit lexical markers in Japanese conversations, they find that these clauses also appear in patterns where they do not modify a clause."
see:
Evans, Nicholas, 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In: Nikolaeva, Irina (ed*.), Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
https://libris.kb.se/bib/12248467
Evans, Nicholas & Watanabe, Honoré (eds.). 2018. *Insubordination.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

"two different understandings of ADVERBIAL CLAUSE: first, we define the category functionally ('a clause modifying a clause'), then we expand the use of the term to instances where a form typically fulfilling the defining function is used elsewhere."
Does this mean: first onomasiological approach (or functional domain), then semasiological approach?

al. (Elvira-García, Roseano, & Fernández-Planas, 2017) show prosodic differences in English conditional clauses
Spanish?

"Macrolatvian" I do not like this term. If you really want to use it, you have to define it.

p10 My small corpus reflects > My sub-corpus?

In sum, clause combining with converbs is not frequent in these interviews.
Difficult to assess if we do not know how large your suborpus is.
Frequency is often given in terms of ratio. Occurrence per number of words, clauses, sentences, or per number of complex clauses.

p14 They may be more coordinative or more subordinative,
reformulate
e.g. they differ in their degree of subordination

(see Hetterle 2015 for the broadest typological investigation).
> for the most comprehensive typological investigation

p15
by one speakers; more > by one speaker; more

"The possible lack of a simple connective for concessive clauses is partly due to the size of my corpus." If there is one elsewhere, just name it!

What is the special value of having an inventory for just your sample? Why not giving all markers in Table 2 and mark those which are not attested in the sample?

(*k-* and *j-*), and > (*k-* or *j-*), and

inherited material not found in Latvian is *cikom* 'until, as long as, while'.
>not found in Modern Standard Latvian

Gliks has *ciekams*

Complex connectives
I think there are many more complex connectives (maybe not in your sample), such as until the day when etc. see
EDGREN, EVA. 1971. *Temporal Clauses in English*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
put differently, your complex ones are rather simple

The complex connectives are less frequent than the simple connectives in my data.
Anything else would be strange following basic Zipfian principles of quantitative linguistics.

None is used by all speakers and some are used by only one or two speakers.
How do you know the speakers do not use them when they are not recorded?

"The most active user of connectives is one second generation speaker from Eastern Latgalia (a teacher of English),"
Do you suggest by this that complexity of connectives might be a sociolinguistic variable?

Complexity across speakers could be easily measured by (Shannon) entropy
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Entropy_(information_theory)
(least complexity if all connectives are the same, highest if all connectives are different)

The connective *par cik* 'for + how much' shows a pattern not found with other connectives.
In what respect?

and is assumed to be a calque from Russian *поскольку*,
assumed by whom? Transcribe Russian forms.

for use in standard varieties: in standard Latvian and standard Latgalian?

Temporal and conditional connectives: items and meanings
Section number missing

If frequency is so important for the discussion, why not giving it in Tables 2 and 3 for each connective?

I ended up with 142 > This resulted in...

I divided these clauses into two temporal and two conditional subgroups:
Why? Has anybody else done it the same way or in a similar way earlier?
    Are there any intermediate cases (Table 4 suggests that no)

when1, when2 etc. How do these relate to Kortmann's labels or any other system of labels that have been used earlier?
How do we know that it is important to distinguish between these labels?

From a mnemonic perspective indices are very bad. Rather replace when1 , if2 etc by some catchy names that people can remember at that helps them grasp the differences.

holydays)' > holidays)'

The function IF2 was found only 5 times in my sample and the tokens differ from each other considerably.
does this mean that it is not really a homogeneous function? Is it then a rest class (anything not IF1)?

As *ja* is the common word for 'if' in Standard Latvian, this may be a case of interference or even code-switching;
It may also be a relic, since j- forms tend to be older than k- forms.
Of course, written language tends to be more conservative, so there is not necessary a contradiction between the alternative explanations
HERRMANN, EDUARD. 1912. Über die Entwicklung der Konjunktionalsätze im Litauischen. Jena: Frommannsche Buchdrukerei.

even code-switching;
any other evidence in the material that there might be code-switching to Latvian?

in these functions more or less synonymous with ka.
This is almost tautological, since two forms within one function are necessarily synonymous (if it is really only one function).

Are kai and kā really the same connective? the same form? I guess that they do not have the same etymology at least.

p22
In the following example the speaker > In (21)

This technique is found quite often in my corpus,
"my corpus" should be replaced by "the corpus" at least in some instances.

p23
<allegro
Mark in some way more different from the text, there is also misalignment in the example

Such a construction is however rare in my data.
"such" is vague here. > This construction...?

p23
"The self-correction is another evidence for the differences between initial and final temporal clauses: speakers do not simply continue the main clause and add the adverbial clause (to produce a grammatically correct clause complex such as *es tagad arī brauč256u uz Aglynu / ka maņ beja dzimšonys dīna*)."
Difficult to understand what is meant here. Should perhaps be elaborated. Give an English translation of the expression in parentheses.
It seems to me that you might think of the two clauses as competing for earlier production. If there is an interruption in the main clause, the subordinate clause is produced in that gap.
Could this be some form of parenthetical?
Dehé, Nicole. 2014. *Parentheticals in Spoken English.* The syntax-prosody relation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kluck, Marlies & Ott, Denis & de Vries, Mark (eds.). 2015. *Parenthesis and Ellipsis: cross-linguistic and theoretical perspectives.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Asher, Nicholas. 2000. Truth conditional discourse semantics for parentheticals. *Journal of Semantics* 17.1: 31-50.

Thompson, Sandra A. & Mulac, Anthony. 1991. A quantitative perspective on the grammaticization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Heine, Bernd (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization* 2: 313-330.

[24]

p32
However, this is the only example I ever found where inversion is used in clause combining and
So maybe it is simply no subordination here.
Of course, you could argue that it might be a first step towards grammaticalization of German-like constructions, but I really see no need to invoke subordination here.

Note that Latgalian, other than what we find in English or German, does not use inversion in questions.
Consider a reformulation and saying explicitly what you mean about English and German.

The above is a good example > (35) is a good example

The combination *kai – tai* often indicates a relation of immediate anteriority.
Does not surprise me, since correlative constructions are a construction for expressing identity, i.e. simultaneity in temporal clauses.
(36) is not necessarily anteriority. it can also be interpreted as simultaneity with an emphasis on the initial border of the simultaneous phase

which sets in after the word tai, questions > which sets in after the word *tai*, questions

but the speaker's laughter,
maybe this is a story that has been told time and again by her relatives and it has become conventional in the family to laugh at this point.

34
through implication and
implication or implicature?
About implicature and temporal clauses see
Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & König. Ekkehard. 1991. The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In Traugott, Elizabeth Closs & Heine, Bernd (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization* 1: *Focus on theoretical and methodological issues*, 189-218. (30p)

37 d/e seem to illustrate neatly how correlative elements serve for connecting two clauses
Note also the traditional Indo-Europeanist view that correlative clauses are not embedding, reflected in Lehmann's work
Lehmann, Christian. 1984. *Der Relativsatz. Typologie seiner Strukturen, Theorie seiner Funktionen, Kompendium seiner Grammatik.* (Language Universals Series 3.) Narr: Tübingen. https://www.christianlehmann.eu/publ/Lehmann1984_Der_Relativsatz_OCRed.pdf
Interestingly, correlatives have recently become a hot topic for generativists.
Lipták, Anikó Klára. 2009. *Correlatives Cross-Linguistically.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

37 f *yyy* italics or not? This is very important! I think yyy is too clause to a possible transcription with the sound expressed as y in Latgalian orthography.

The correlative particle *ta* (*to*) strengthens the link between the two clauses,
exactly!

Example (38) contains also an incident > Example (38) also contains an occurrence
an incident is something different

p35 before 4. Consider adding a summarizing para.

p37/38
This research is one of the very first studies on the grammar of spontaneous speech in a Baltic language. It has convinced myself, and hopefully will convince the reader, that this grammar is indeed intricate
Me as reader, yes, partly. However, the way you put it here suggests that grammar of spontaneous speech is completely different from written planned language, and this does not seem to be the case. Many of the findings in your conclusions hold as well for written and planned Latgalian. I miss a clear summary of what is really different.