

In defence of intragenetic typology: evidence from clause coordination in Daghestanian languages

In this study the technique of semantic clause coordination in *20 Daghestanian languages* (DLs) is explored. **(Semantic) clause coordination** is a (usually biclausal) construction activating cognitively conjugate events occurring simultaneously or sequentially. In accordance with that, there is typically coreference between participants of the two clauses, e.g. *The boy_i beat the girl and Ø_i went away* (where the subject of the first clause is the antecedent and the subject of the second one is a zero anaphor); *The boy beat the girl_i and she_i / the girl_i went away* (where the subject of the second clause is a pronominal / full NP anaphor).

Semantic clause coordination can be expressed by a syntactically subordinate construction. This is the case in the majority of DLs. However, this is not the main property of DLs. Typologically, DLs demonstrate a striking variation of techniques used for the expression of interclausal coreference relations. It is difficult, if not impossible, to find two languages identical in this respect. That means that clause coordination cannot be explained in terms of specific constructions in specific DLs.

Nevertheless, we assume that being extremely multiform these constructions are restricted in terms of parameterized principles and strategies rather than in terms of constructions themselves. The exhaustive description of the empirical data of DLs based on a restricted set of **principles** (such as the principle of distinguishability, principles of syntactic neutrality vs. accusativity, principles of structural or linear priority and so on) and **strategies** (such as syntactic coordination vs. subordination, dependent clause marking, anaphor marking) as well as techniques of their interplay are proposed.

It is claimed that this theoretical approach (1) restricts the set of possible constructions and (2) explains the nature of multiplicity of coordinate constructions and the cognitive and semiotic sources of restrictions. It is crucial that **none of the principles or strategies is obligatory**, each of them can be lifted in a specific construction. At the same time, principles and strategies are not fully independent: choosing a value of a principle/strategy may have implications for other choices.

In this paper the proposed approach will be illustrated by examples, demonstrating the most common values of principles and strategies. The data under investigation contradict the widely spread claim about the syntactically accusative behavior of languages with the ergative alignment. In our sample, in ten languages (ПЕРЕЧИСЛИТЬ?) coreference is marked by **zero anaphors alone**, while seven languages (ПЕРЕЧИСЛИТЬ?) use **various** types of anaphor marking, whose distribution is motivated by communicative statuses, such as topic and focus. In the latter class of languages more or less marked referring expressions can be used, as predicted by Anaphor Marking Hierarchy:

Ø < Third person pronoun / demonstrative < Emphatic / reflexive pronoun < Full NP

(This hierarchy begins with the least marked option, zero, and ends with the heaviest, most marked, option, that is, a full noun phrase.)

Finally, only in three languages coordinate constructions **resemble the accusative pattern**: Kryz, Lezgian and Agul. Still, the use of different anaphors' marking in these languages can also be explained in terms of communicative statuses. There is **the single clear example of syntactic accusativity** in our sample, found in one of the dialects of Tabassaran, namely Dyubek (opposed to the syntactically neutral Kondik dialect).

This study argues for the intragenetic approach in linguistic typology. This approach has two advantages. First, it allows to avoid errors in the analysis of constructions of specific languages studied independently, without regard for what is found in related languages. Knowledge of a construction's equivalents in related languages often helps to find the only correct interpretation of the given language. Second, the intragenetic approach shows the danger of typological generalizations based on statistically normalized samples alone. For example, if Lezgian is the sole representative of DLs in a sample, the hypothesis of the universal syntactic accusativity, even in languages with the ergative construction, will be erroneously supported.

To summarize, *the cross-genetic sample approach, being the necessary productive stage of preliminary typological overview of linguistic variation, must be enriched by the intragenetic approach. The sooner this presumption will be widely accepted by the typological community the fewer errors will be generated in typological generalizations.*