Event Integration and the Consecutive Construction in ‘Ale

YOSHINO, Hiroshi
University of Tsukuba / JSPS Research Fellow

This paper examines how ‘Ale (East Cushitic; Ethiopia) expresses integrated complex events in terms of Talmy (2000). There are two major strategies for such expressions: the gerundial construction (i.e., a gerund with an instrumental suffix expressing a co-event) and the consecutive construction (i.e., the consecutive verb follows the main verb). The two constructions appear exchangeable at first glance, but a closer look reveals differences in their ranges of applicability. Data of ‘Ale disagree with the definition of Talmy (2000) concerning the verb-framed languages, especially in that the main verb expresses the co-event in the consecutive construction. Consequently, this paper discusses how to treat the consecutive verb that seems to indicate the cosubordination type of the clause linkage to the main verb.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Goal of the present study

This study aims to show how ‘Ale expresses the five event domains of event integration patterns (Talmy 2000). It shows the verb-framing pattern in the event domains of motion, state change, and realization, and partially in temporal contouring, but the rest of the patterns do not fit clearly within the event integration typology.

There are two constructions that express these event domains, namely, the gerundial and consecutive constructions. However, the consecutive construction is ambiguous in that it may express both integrated and non-integrated events. This study also aims to consider the differences between the gerundial and the consecutive constructions.
1.2. Basic information on the language

1.2.1. Location, number of the speakers, and genetic affiliation

‘Ale language is spoken in ‘Ale woreda (district), the Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples’ Region, the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. ‘Ale woreda gained its independence from Konso woreda and Dirashe woreda in January 2011, according to the official letter (dated 5/20/2002 E.C., reference number 22/000231/3545).

The term ‘Ale is also used here as the language name following the current local designation of the language (i.e., pako ʕal-atte [mouth ‘Ale-LOC.F]). An alternative name ‘Ale is less popularly used, for example, in Yoshino (2013a, 2013b, 2014). The language is also known as Dullay (Amborn et al. 1980), and Gawwada (Bender 1971; Black 1976; Tosco 2006, 2008, 2010).

Since the latest Ethiopian census was in 2007, there is no official information on the current number of ‘Ale speakers. The number of residents of the woreda is estimated to more than 68,000 according to the local authority.

‘Ale belongs to the Dullay group of the East Cushitic branch in the Cushitic family within the Afroasian phylum (cf. Tosco 2006: 885). Its dialects are largely divided into the highland and lowland groups. The data presented in this paper reflect the Gawwada dialect of the lowland dialect group. The dialectal differences are found mostly in phonology and partly in the lexicon. The sister language Ts’amakko is closer to the ‘Ale lowland dialects in respect to the phonology and lexicon (cf. Savà 2005).

1.2.2. Morphosyntax

The basic constituent order is SOV. There are no overt markers for subject case or object case, but the syntactic function of nominal phrases is indicated by grammatical agreement on verbs and clitics that mark the definite. Adverbials (i.e., non-argumental constituents) basically appear in any position on the left side of a predicate verb, but it is acceptable for speakers to put adverbials after the predicate verb. Subordinate clauses follow the same pattern as adverbials.

Table 1 shows four main affirmative verb paradigms, namely, imperfective, indicative future, perfective, and subjunctive future. The aspectual opposition is between the imperfective and perfective. The imperfective, and the perfective are the bases of the indicative future, and the subjunctive future, respectively. These two future tense verbs are marked by a future tense suffix -n that is attached to the verb stem and followed by either the imperfective or perfective suffix. As is common in Cushitic languages, ‘Ale shows a pattern that the first person singular and third person singular masculine, and also second person singular and third person singular feminine, share the same suffixes throughout paradigms, respectively (see Table 1).
Table 1: Main affirmative verb paradigms in ‘Ale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Indicative Future</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Subjunctive Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-n-a</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-n-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-ay</td>
<td>-n-ay</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>-n-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.M</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-n-a</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-n-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.F</td>
<td>-ay</td>
<td>-n-ay</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>-n-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>-aani</td>
<td>-n-aani</td>
<td>-ni</td>
<td>-n-(i)-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>-anku</td>
<td>-n-anku</td>
<td>-te(nku)</td>
<td>-n-te(nku)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>-anki</td>
<td>-n-anki</td>
<td>-e(nki)</td>
<td>-n-e(nki)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are less-finite verbs that fully conjugate for person, number, and gender distinctions just like the main affirmative verbs in Table 1, but they are dependent (or neutral) for other grammatical features, e.g., tense, aspect, and mood. They are further divided into two groups, namely, the dependent verb and consecutive verb (see Table 2).

Table 2: Less-finite verb paradigms in ‘Ale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Consecutive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>Class 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u ~ -o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-ay</td>
<td>-oy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.M</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u ~ -o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.F</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-oy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>-ooni</td>
<td>-aani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ooni</td>
<td>-ooni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>-onku</td>
<td>-anku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-onku</td>
<td>-onku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>-onki</td>
<td>-anki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-onki</td>
<td>-onki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a set of preverbal clitics that mark the person of the subject (Table 3). These clitics are optionally used with the affirmative paradigms, except for the consecutive verb. Their use becomes obligatory with negative verb forms; however, the third person negative ye= is used instead of the affirmative ʔi=. The consonant of the second person clitic assimilates the following consonant of the verb.

Table 3: Person-marking clitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ʔan=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First person</td>
<td>ʔaC=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second person</td>
<td>ʔi=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third person affirmative</td>
<td>ye=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘Ale has three negative verb paradigms, shown in Table 4. The negative habitual paradigm is based on the imperfective endings with a vowel alternation (i.e., /a/ to /u/ in singular, and /a/ to /o/ in plural) and an optional deletion of /y/ in the second person singular and third person singular feminine. It negates ongoing events (i.e., what is happening right now) and the quality or state of things (i.e., how something is now). The proclitic is attached to the perfective and the subjunctive to express the negative perfect and the negative future, respectively. The negative perfect negates the past events (i.e., what happened earlier), and the negative future negates the future events (i.e., what may happen later).

Table 4: Main negative verb paradigms in ‘Ale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Negative Habitual</th>
<th>Negative Perfect</th>
<th>Negative Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>ʔan=......-u</td>
<td>ʔan=......-i</td>
<td>ʔan=......-n-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>ʔaC=......-u</td>
<td>ʔaC=......-ti</td>
<td>ʔaC=......-n-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.M</td>
<td>ye=......-u</td>
<td>ye=......-i</td>
<td>ye=......-n-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.F</td>
<td>ye=......-u</td>
<td>ye=......-ti</td>
<td>ye=......-n-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>ʔan=......-ooni</td>
<td>ʔan=......-ne ~ -ni</td>
<td>ʔan=......-n-(i)-ne ~ -ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>ʔaC=......-onku</td>
<td>ʔaC=......-te</td>
<td>ʔaC=......-n-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>ye=......-onki</td>
<td>ye=......-e</td>
<td>ye=......-n-e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the consecutive verb can be used in combinations with any other verb in Table 1, the combination with the imperfective verb is less frequent and the use of multiple imperfective verbs is frequent in descriptions of ongoing events.

There is also a non-finite verb form that is called here a gerund. The gerund forms through suffixing a singular noun suffix to a verb stem. The singular noun suffix has masculine (i.e., -o, -ko) and feminine (i.e., -e, -te) forms, and both sets of forms mark the gerund. It is lexically determined which gender form is applicable to the given verb. The gerund is not entirely nominal, since it can take a direct object. However, it requires a possessive pronoun or a nominal with a locative suffix to express its (sense) subject, and this is a very feature that nominals have in ‘Ale. The gerund itself can be subject or object in a sentence, or it can appear as an adverbial by means of case suffixes. It also takes the proximal locational proclitic na= that is attached to finite verbs elsewhere.

1.3. Literature review

The most comprehensive work on this language is Amborn et al. (1980). However, they described the language exclusively using data from the highland dialects (i.e., Harso and Dobase). Tosco (2006, 2008, 2010) presented studies on the verbal morphosyntax of
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Gawwada, which corresponds to the Gawwada dialect of the lowland dialect group of ‘Ale, in the term used in this paper.

There have been no event integration studies on ‘Ale, except for Yoshino (2014). Yoshino (2014) is a preliminary work on this topic with a discussion of the status of consecutive verbs as converbs. Its conclusion is as follows: ‘Ale belongs to the verb-framed languages but deviates from the typology of Talmy (2000) at the same time, and the deviation pattern is similar to the case of Sidaama, which is reported by Kawachi (2012: 185). Problems concerning the consecutive construction were pointed out; however, its analyses were provisional and required detailed study. Yoshino (2014: 119–120) argued that the consecutive construction does not express integrated complex events, by comparing it with converbs. This study reconsiders the analyses of Yoshino (2014) with new data collected in fieldwork and revises the theoretical explanation of the consecutive construction.

2. Patterns of expressing events in the five event domains in ‘Ale

The patterns of expressing integrated events are realized by the gerundial construction and the consecutive construction. The gerundial construction consists of a gerund with the instrumental case-marking suffix -ttay and a main verb that follows it. A focus marking clitic =kki follows the instrumental suffix in most cases, and in such cases, the suffix-final y is lost, which results in the form -tta=kki instead of *-ttay=kki. This focus marker is used no more than once in a given sentence; therefore, when some other element is focused with =kki, the gerund with the instrumental suffix does not take the focus marker. The gerund with the instrumental suffix in this construction is embedded in a sentence and functions as an adverbial phrase (e.g., ‘by (means of) doing; with doing’).

There are two other constructions that use gerunds to express events in several particular event domains. One of them uses the gerund as a direct object of the main verb. In this construction, the main verb denotes ability (e.g., be able to) (20), completion (e.g., finish, stop) (33–34), and initiation (e.g., begin) (35–36). The other construction uses the gerund with a locative suffix -ito (m.) or -ette (f.), according to the gerund suffixes that show a gender distinction. The main verbs in this construction are either verbs of duration (e.g., stay, sleep) (37–38), or a verb gull- ‘to surpass, be better than’ (58–59).

The consecutive construction is made up of three components: a main verb, the non-final marking particle pa or enclitic =(pa), and a consecutive verb. The consecutive verb shares the subject with the main verb, as well as the grammatical features of tense, aspect, mood, and polarity (i.e., affirmative versus negative). The consecutive verb fully inflects for person, number, and gender, which generally corresponds with the main verb. The consecutive construction expresses a temporal sequence of events as well as the
integrated complex events. Therefore, a sentence with the consecutive construction has two possible readings, and its interpretation is dependent on the context.

In short, the gerund is converbial and invariable for the (sense) subject, whereas the consecutive verb fully inflects for the subject but depends on the immediate fully finite verb for other grammatical features.

2.1. Motion

The patterns expressing events in the motion domain are the most straightforward among the five domains. Both the gerundial and consecutive constructions are widely used, while some expressions are realized as a simple sentence with a lexicalized verb.

2.1.1. Manner

Although the two constructions can substitute for each other, preference is given to the consecutive construction, for example, (1), in casual speech, according to the language consultants who provided the data for this study. The gerundial construction, for example, (2), is alternatively used as its semantic equivalent.

(1) Koʔase gangal-at-ti pa manne gala xull-i.
ball roll-MID-PFV.3SG.F NF house under enter-CNS.3SG.F
‘A ball rolled into a house.’ (lit. ‘A ball rolled and entered a house.’)

(2) Koʔase gangal-ad-e-tta=kki manne gala xull-i-ti.
ball roll-MID-GER-INS=FOC house under enter-EP-PFV.3SG.F
‘A ball rolled into a house.’ (lit. ‘A ball entered a house by rolling.’)

In many cases, the two constructions are semantically equivalent, freely substituting for each other, for example, (1) and (2). However, in some cases, a certain difference appears between the two constructions when they have a self-agentive subject. Consider the pair of examples (3) and (4) below.

(3) ʔaagitte manne hiisi na haʔ-e-ti=pa.
bird house 3SG.F.GEN PROX fly-EP-PFV.3SG.F=NF
lig-i.
exit-CNS.3SG.F
‘A bird flew out of its nest.’ (lit. ‘A bird flew at her house and exited.’)

(4) ʔaagitte manne hiisi na haʔ-e-tta=kki
bird house 3SG.F.GEN PROX fly-GER-INS=FOC
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lig-i-ti.
exit-EP-PFV.3SG.F
‘A bird flew out of its nest.’ (lit. ‘A bird exited by flying at her house.’)

It is obvious that the bird in (3) flaps its wings in its nest, but the sentence does not specify how the bird went out of the nest; in other words, the bird might have fallen from the nest after flapping its wings or flying inside the nest. The sentence describes a sequence of events as they happened. Meanwhile, (4) clarifies that the bird went out of the nest by means of flying.

2.1.2. Cause

In the cause sub-domain, where the subject is agentive, the use of a lexicalized verb is the most preferred, as in (5) (e.g., gangalades- ‘to pass something by rolling’). The gerundial construction can express (almost) the same meaning with another transitive verb, e.g., teex- ‘to give’ in (6).

(5) ʔiso ʔiskripto=si=ki t’arapesakko ʔita
3SG.M pen=PROX.DEM=FOC table across
nu=gangalad-es-i.
DIST=roll-CAUS-PFV.3SG.M
‘He rolled this pen across a table to him/her.’ (lit. ‘He passed this pen by rolling it across a table.’)

(6) ʔiso ʔise=nu=ki ʔiskripto=si t’arapesakko
3SG.M 3SG.F=DIST=FOC pen=PROX.DEM table
ʔita gangalad-es-ettay nu=teex-i.
across roll-CAUS-GER-INS DIST=give-PFV.3SG.M
‘He rolled the pen across a table to her.’ (lit. ‘He gave this pen to her by rolling it across a table.’)

However, the consecutive construction does not express the same meaning as (5), unlike (6) with the gerundial construction. What (5) and (6) have in common is the simultaneity of the framing-event and the co-event. In other words, the two events start and end (almost) at the same time, not merely overlapping. This seems not to fit with the consecutive construction.

The verb hatab- ‘to throw’ in (7) has a lexicalized meaning of ‘to pass something by throwing,’ and it expresses ‘throw something into somewhere’ with the help of the location noun gitte ‘inside’ and the clitic =ma ‘at, to.’ The same meaning can be
expressed by the gerundial construction, as in (8), while the consecutive construction is not used due to the abovementioned reason.

(7) \( \text{ʔise } \text{ʔawurukko}=\text{si}=\text{ki } \text{manne } \text{xusu } \text{gitte}=\text{ma} \)
\( 3\text{SG.F } \text{stone}=\text{PROX.DEM}=\text{FOC } \text{house } 3\text{SG.M.GEN } \text{inside}=\text{to} \)
\( \text{hatab-ti.} \)
‘She threw this stone into his house.’ (lit. ‘She threw this stone to the inside of his house.’)

(8) \( \text{ʔise } \text{ʔawurukko } \text{manne } \text{xusu } \text{gitte}=\text{ma } \text{null-ts-ti.} \)
\( 3\text{SG.F } \text{stone } \text{house } 3\text{SG.M.GEN } \text{inside}=\text{to } \text{enter-CAUS-PFV.3SG.F} \)
‘She threw a stone into his house.’ (lit. ‘She put a stone to the inside of his house by throwing it.’)

2.1.3. Concomitance
Expressions of the concomitance sub-domain use both of the two constructions. To express the simultaneity of events, the gerundial construction (9) is preferred. However, the consecutive construction in (10) can express almost the same meaning as (9).

(9) \( \text{ʔise } \text{tul-o-ta}=\text{kti } \text{garo } \text{mann-ette} \)
\( 3\text{SG.F } \text{cough-GER-INS}=\text{FOC } \text{direction } \text{house-LOC.F} \)
\( \text{null-ti.} \)
\( \text{enter-EP-PFV.3SG.F} \)
‘She entered a house, coughing.’ (lit. ‘She went in the direction of a house with coughing.’)

(10) \( \text{ʔise } \text{i}=\text{tul-ti } \text{pa } \text{garo } \text{mann-ette} \)
\( 3\text{SG.F } 3=\text{cough-PFV.3SG.F } \text{NF } \text{direction } \text{house-LOC.F} \)
\( \text{xull-ti.} \)
\( \text{enter-CNS.3SG.F} \)
‘She entered a house, coughing.’ (lit. ‘She coughed and went in the direction of a house.’)
In some cases, it has to be expressed by the consecutive construction due to the semantic mismatch. Consider the pair of the consecutive construction in (11) and the inadequate (but grammatical) gerundial construction in (12) below.

(11) ṭise [baare k’artahay]=si ṭattat-ti=pa
    3SG.F [dress green]=PROX.DEM wear-PFV.3SG.F=NF
go.to.party-CNS.3SG.F
‘She wore this green dress to a party.’ (*lit. ‘She wore this green dress and went to a party.’)

(12) ṭise [baare k’artahay]=si ṭattad-e-ttay rug-ti.
    3SG.F [dress green]=PROX.DEM wear-GER-INS go.to.party-PFV.3SG.F
‘She went to a party, while wearing this green dress.’ (i.e., She was still in the process of wearing the dress when she went to a party.)

Although (12) has a grammatically adequate structure of the gerundial construction, the verb attad- ‘to wear’ does not comply with its notion of concomitance. The instrumental gerund phrase in (12) can also take the focus marker =kki.

2.1.4. Precursion

Precursion is usually expressed with a lexicalized verb, though the two constructions can surely express it. Consider the following examples of an expression with a lexicalized verb (13), the gerundial construction (14), and the consecutive construction (15).

(13) ḫemato biyye=ma furr-i.
    mirror ground=to splinter-PFV.3SG.M
‘A mirror splintered on the ground.’

(14) ḫemato biyye=ma puʃ-e-tta=kki far-i.
    mirror ground=to fall-GER-INS=FOC break-PFV.3SG.M
‘A mirror broke, falling to the ground.’

(15) ḫemato biyye=ma ʔi=puʃ-i=pa far-u.
    mirror ground=to 3=fall-PFV.3SG.M=NF break-CNS.3SG.M
‘A mirror fell to the ground and broke.’
The trio (16), (17), and (18) are another occurrence of the above pattern. In these examples, the subject is agentive and the verb has an object. The gerund is treated as a nominal form of a verb, but it can be observed in (16) that it retains some verbal features, i.e., the presence of the direct object and the proximal locational clitic na=.

(16) ʔano manne gittaʔan=ʔiso=ɡub-i.
1SG house inside 1=3SG.M.ACC=lock-PFV.1SG
‘I locked him inside a house.’

(17) ʔano manne na=ɡub-e-tta=kkiʔan=bad-i.
1SG house PROX=lock-GER-INS=FOC 1=hide-PFV.1SG
‘I locked him/her in a house.’ (lit. ‘I hid, locking a house for him/her.’)

(18) ʔano manneʔan=na=ɡub-i=pa bad-a.
1SG house 1=PROX=lock-PFV.1SG=NF hide-CNS.1SG
‘I locked him/her in a house.’ (lit. ‘I locked a house for him/her and hid.’)

2.1.5. Enablement
The gerundial construction does not fit in the enablement sub-domain, and the consecutive construction is used instead, as in (19). This is due to the incompatibility with the simultaneity expressed by the gerundial construction. To the speakers, the two actions of opening and entering cannot overlap, and they must be done one by one.

(19) ʔise mangaxe ɡaf-i-ti=pa xull-i.
3SG.F door open-EP-PFV.3SG.F=NF enter-CNS.3SG.F
‘She opened a door and entered.’

Another way of expressing enablement is through the use of the gerund as a direct object of the verb ʔalgas- ‘to be able,’ as in (20).

(20) ʔarmusu=ssa=si tukk-ito ʔod-as-e
bottle=DIST.DEM=ACC shelf-LOC.M descend-CAUS-GER ʔalgas-nay?
be.able-FUT.2SG
‘Can you put down that bottle from a shelf?’ (lit. ‘Will you be able to make that bottle descend from a shelf?’)
2.2. State change

Both the gerundial construction (21) and the consecutive construction (22) are used in the domain of state change.

(21) \(Hammakko=si\) \(sibin-e-tta=kki\) \(xum-i\).
     candle=PROX.DEM burn-GER-INS=FOC end-PFV.3SG.M
‘This candle burnt out.’ (lit. ‘This candle ended by burning.’)

(22) \(Hammakko=si\) \(sibin-i\) \(pa\) \(xum-u\).
     candle=PROX.DEM burn-PFV.3SG.M NF end-CNS.3SG.M
‘This candle burnt out.’ (lit. ‘This candle burnt and ended.’)

Another pair of expressions, (23) and (24) below, certainly shows the difference between the gerundial and consecutive constructions. When the gerund is employed as in (23), the person drained clothes by squeezing; he is supposed to have checked how much the clothes were drained while squeezing them. However, in the consecutive construction in (24), the person squeezed and then drained clothes. The actual action of squeezing could have occurred multiple times, but it is perceived as a single event of squeezing, as indicated by the optional adverb \(to?onna\) ‘once’ in (24).

(23) \(?ano\) \(lallaade=si\) \(t’ib-e-tta=kki\) \(?an=hax-os-i\).
     1SG clothes=PROX.DEM squeeze-GER-INS=FOC 1=dry-CAUS-PFV.1SG
‘I squeezed these clothes dry.’ (lit. ‘I dried by squeezing these clothes.’)

(24) \(?ano\) \(lallaade=si\) \(to?onna=kka\) \(t’ib-i\)
     1SG clothes=PROX.DEM once=FOC squeeze-PFV.1SG
     \(pa\) \(hax-os-a\).
     NF dry-CAUS-CNS.1SG
‘I squeezed these clothes dry.’ (lit. ‘I squeezed these clothes once and dried.’)

The expressions for state change, for example, (25), can be paraphrased by a sentence with a purpose clause, like (26), as the semantic equivalent.

(25) \(?iso\) \(mangaxe=si\) \(dug-e-tta=kki\) \(gaf-i\).
     3SG.M door=PROX.DEM push-GER-INS=FOC open-PFV.3SG.M
‘He pushed this door open.’ (lit. ‘He opened by pushing this door.’)
2.3. Realization

The two constructions are used to express the patterns of the realization domain like the motion and state change domains, as in (27) and (28). These examples do not differ in meaning, but (27) is more natural or neutral than (28) to the language consultants.

(27) ʔiso ɠanɔ=si ɠaʃ-e=nu ʔi=dug-i.
3SG.M door=PROX.DEM open-GER=DIST 3=push-PFV.3SG.M
‘He pushed this door open.’ (lit. ‘He pushed in order to open this door.’)

(28) ʔano ɠattummo=si ʔan=diit-i pa getey-is-a.
1SG hubcap=PROX.DEM 1=kick-PFV.1SG NF be.flat-CAUS-CNS.1SG
‘I kicked this hubcap flat.’ (lit. ‘I kicked this hubcap and flattened.’)

In (27), the person kicked the hubcap and flattened it as a result; the sentence expresses the sequence of events in a cause-effect relationship. (28) expresses that the person flattened the hubcap ‘by means of kicking.’

In some cases, the use of adverbials is the most popular and the gerundial construction is alternatively used. Consider the following examples, (29) and (30).

(29) ʔise [hob-i hiisi]=si baree=ma fabat-ti.
3SG.F [shoe-PL 3SG.F.GEN]=ACC tightness=at tie-PFV.3SG.F
‘She tied her shoes tightly.’

(30) ʔise [hob-i hiisi]=si fabad-e-tta=kki
3SG.F [shoe-PL 3SG.F.GEN]=ACC tie-GER-INS=FOC
(baree=ma) kokk-is-ti.
(tightness=at) be.strong-CAUS-PFV.3SG.F
‘She tied her shoes tightly.’ (lit. ‘She strengthened her shoes (tightly) by tying (them).’)

The consecutive construction is, however, considered inappropriate for expressions of (29) and (30) according to the speakers. This seems due to the fact that tying and
tightening are simultaneous in nature (i.e., A concurrently with B), which is incompatible with the sequential nuance (i.e., A and then B) of the consecutive construction.

2.4. Temporal contouring

This section describes instances in the seven sub-domains of temporal contouring: completion/termination, initiation, continuation, frequency, habitualness, gradualness, and repetition. Overall, the consecutive construction is not used in this event domain, except to express repetition.

2.4.1. Completion/termination

The gerundial construction (31) is used only in a few cases, and the same meaning can be expressed by idiomatic expressions, as in (32).

(31) Yeeto=si yiʔ-o-tta=kki ʔi=xum-i.
food=PROX.DEM eat-GER-INS=FOC 3=end-PFV.3SG.M
‘This food was eaten up.’ (lit. ‘This food ended by eating.’)

(32) Yeeto=si xum-ad-i ʔag-i.
food=PROX.DEM end-MID-PFV.3SG.F exist-PFV.3SG.M
‘This food was eaten up.’ (lit. ‘This food which ended existed.’)

The other way to express the completion or termination of events is with the construction where the gerund is an object of the main verb; see (33) and (34).

(33) ?ANO ʔawfo ʔug-e=si ʔan= dikk-is-ad-i.
1SG coffee drink-GER=PROX.DEM 1=finish-CAUS-MID-PFV.1SG
‘I drank up (a cup of) coffee.’ (lit. ‘I finished the activity of drinking coffee.’)

(34) ?ise tul-o ʔi=fikkar-af-i-ti.
3SG.F cough-GER 3=stand-CAUS-EP-PFV.3SG.F
‘She stopped coughing.’

However, the usage of gerunds in the latter type shows that the co-event is embedded as a part of the main clause. Therefore, it is not a case of the expression of integrated complex events.

2.4.2. Initiation

The usage of gerunds as direct objects is predominant to express events of this sub-domain (see (35) and (36)), and neither the gerundial nor the consecutive construction
is used. This is reasonable because (i) the co-event occurs only after the framing event happens, but the framing event is punctual; therefore, nothing overlaps; and (ii) the framing and co-events are not analyzed as a sequence of events. For reason (i), the meaning cannot be expressed by the gerundial construction; and the consecutive construction does not comply with (ii).

(35) $\textit{Miʔ\textit{aa}ʔ\textit{e}=si}$ $\textit{ʔooʔ-e}$ $\textit{ʔi=bay-i}$.  
$\text{baby=}\text{PROX.DEM}$ $\text{cry-GER}$ $3=\text{begin-PFV.3SG.M}$  
‘This baby began crying.’

(36) $\textit{ʔiso}$ $\textit{manne}$ $\textit{gfu\text{-ad-e}}$ $\textit{ʔi=bay-i}$.  
$\text{3SG.M}$ $\text{house}$ $\text{build-MID-GER}$ $3=\text{begin-PFV.3SG.M}$  
‘He began building a house.’

2.4.3. Continuation

In this sub-domain, another construction is frequently used, in which the gerund with the locative suffix expresses the co-event. The locative suffix has two allomorphs corresponding to the gender of the gerund: -ette for masculine and -ito for feminine. Consider the following examples, (37) and (38).

(37) $\textit{ʔise}$ $\textit{ʔall\text{-ad-a-tte}}$ $\textit{gayy-e-ti}$.  
$\text{3SG.F}$ $\text{talk-GER-LOC.F}$ $\text{stay-EP-PFV.3SG.F}$  
‘She talked on.’ (lit. ‘She stayed at talking.’)

(38) $\textit{ʔise}$ $\textit{gallabgo}$ $\textit{gaasa}$ $\textit{diit-i-to}$ $\textit{raf-ti}$.  
$\text{3SG.F}$ $\text{night}$ $\text{whole}$ $\text{kick-GER-LOC.M}$ $\text{spend.night-PFV.3SG.F}$  
‘She danced all night.’ (lit. ‘She spent the whole night at playing a kind of local kicking-dance.’)

There is a construction that uses the gerund with the contrastive clitic $=ma$. This clitic has polysemy with the clitic meaning ‘at, to.’ However, it is only found in one example (39), as far as the present author knows. (39) can be rephrased with the gerundial construction (40).

(39) $\textit{ʔiso}$ $\textit{perre}$ $\textit{xuusu}$ $\textit{gaasa}$ $\textit{ʔise}$ $\textit{tiʔad-e}=ma$  
$\text{3SG.M}$ $\text{life}$ $\text{3SG.M.GEN}$ $\text{whole}$ $\text{3SG.F}$ $\text{wait-GER}=\text{CONTR}$
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boɡɡ-i.
empty-PFV.3SG.M
‘He spent all his life waiting for her.’ (lit. ‘He emptied his whole life (in vain) in spite of waiting for her.’)

(40) ʔis o  per re  xuus u  ga a s a  ʔi s e  t iʔ ad-e-tta=kki
3SG.M life 3SG.M.GEN whole 3SG.F wait-GER-INS=FOC
boɡɡ-i.
empty-PFV.3SG.M
‘He spent all his life waiting for her.’ (lit. ‘He emptied his whole life by waiting.’)

2.4.4. Frequency, habitualness, and gradualness
None of the events of frequency and habitualness form a complex event. A typical expression is composed of the adverbial phrase(s) and the main verb; see (41) and (42) for frequency, (43) for habitualness, and (44) for gradualness.

(41) ʔi n e  g uy ya a go  t okko  t okko  ? an=moor ani.
1PL day one one 1=go.market-IPFV.1PL
‘We go to a market sometimes.’

(42) ʔi s e  t o r b a=ma  t oʔ o n n a=kki  m oo r-i ti.
3SG.F week=at once=FOC go.market-EP-PFV.3SG.F
‘She went to a market once a week.’

(43) ʔa n o  ʔo r h e  g uy y a a go=ma  ? an=ʃug i.
1SG milk day=at 1=drink-PFV.1SG
‘I used to drink milk daily.’ (lit. ‘He drank milk daily.’)

(44) ʔiso  pi r r-a d e=s i  pasanad i  lok ko  pa  lok ko
3SG.M money-PL=ACC borrow-PFV.3SG.M little NF little
ʔi=xol-as-i.
3=return-CAUS-PFV.3SG.M
‘He returned the money, which he borrowed, little by little.’

A single exceptional case is (45), where the frequentative verb stem expresses the notion of gradual. However, the stem derivation is analyzed as occurring at a lexical level, since the same strategy is found to mark plurality and repetitive action in various
languages (cf. Key 1965). Therefore, it is not counted as a pattern of event integration as defined here.

(45) Loʔ-ide=si ̄ille gala ʔi=far-far-e.
cow-PL=PROX.DEM together under 3=FREQ-die-PFV.3PL
‘These cows died one after another.’

2.4.5. Repetition
Repetition is expressed by either a frequentative stem of verbs (46) or the consecutive construction with xol- ‘to return; to repeat’ as the first verb (47).

(46) ?iso pago ̄inglez-atte ʔi=ko-gollis-i.
3SG.M mouth English-LOC.F 3=FREQ-teach-PFV.3SG.M
‘He taught English (many times).’

(47) ?ise ʔi=xol-ti=ppa tul-i.
3SG.F 3=repeat-PFV.3SG.F=NF cough-CNS.3SG.F
‘She coughed again.’ (lit. ‘She repeated and coughed.’)

It is only in this event domain that the first verb expresses the framing event and the second expresses the co-event. The consecutive construction usually requires the non-final particle/clitic pa/(p)pa between the main verb and the consecutive verb, but it can be omitted in a few cases, for example, (48).

(48) ?ise ʔi=xol-ti ʔogay-i.
3SG.F 3=repeat-PFV.3SG.F come-CNS.3SG.F
‘She came back.’ (lit. ‘She repeated (and) came.’)

To intensify the notion of repetition, the verb xol- is used as the second verb (i.e., the first consecutive verb), and the third verb (i.e., the second consecutive verb) expresses the co-event, as in (49). This strategy is systematically applicable to any consecutive construction with xol- as the main verb.

(49) ?ise ʔi=xol-ti=ppa xol-i=ppa ʔogay-i.
3SG.F 3=repeat-PFV.3SG.F=NF repeat-CNS.3SG.F=NF come-CNS.3SG.F
‘She came back again.’ or ‘She came again and again.’ (lit. ‘She repeated, repeated and came.’)
2.5. Action correlating

This event domain includes five sub-categories: concert, accompaniment, imitation, surpassment, and demonstration. There are no instances of the consecutive construction, and the gerund with the locative suffix is used only in surpassment. The accusative use of the gerund is observed in the demonstration. Otherwise, the adverbial phrases are conditional clauses employed as expressions of the functional equivalents.

2.5.1. Concert

All the collected examples show that concert is expressed by the adverbial phrases with 'alle ‘with,’ as shown in (50) and (51).

(50) ʔano ʔiso ʕalle ʔan=songo=hekk-ad-i.
1SG 3SG.M with l=melody=play-MID-PFV.1SG
‘I played a melody with him.’

(51) ʔisunde ʕille ʕalle moore=ma ʔaff-e.
3PL together with market=at go-PFV.3PL
‘They went to a market together.’

2.5.2. Accompaniment

Four expressions are used for accompaniment, but none of them are considered to express a complex event. These expressions use the adverbial phrases with (i) 'alle ‘with’ (52), (ii) ɠamo... gula ‘in the manner of...’ (53), (iii) the gerund with the distal locational clitic =nu (54), or (iv) the subordinate clause consisting of the imperfective verb followed by the proximal locational clitic =na (55).

(52) ʔano ʔiso ʕalle ʔukkule ʔan=sango=yoc-i.
1SG 3SG.M with likeness l=melody=strum-PFV.1SG
‘I played a melody along with him.’ (lit. ‘I played a melody alike with him.’)

(53) ʔano ɠamo xuusu gula ʔan=sillay=gall-ani.
1SG manner 3SG.M.GEN toward l=together=sing-PFV.1PL
‘I sang along with him.’ (lit. ‘I, we sang together in his manner.’)

(54) ʔano=ppa ʔisunde hekk-o=nu ʔan=silla=liggayy-ani.
1SG=NF 3PL play-GER=DIST l=together=meet-PFV.1PL
‘They and I acted in concert to play.’ (lit. ‘They and I, we met in order to play.’)
2.5.3. Imitation

Imitation is expressed by either (i) the adverbial phrase consisting of \textit{gamo... gula} ‘in the manner of...’ (56) or (ii) the subordinate clause consisting of the imperfective verb followed by the proximal locational clitic =\textit{na} (57). As with accompaniment, none of them express a complex event.

\begin{align}
\text{(56)} & \quad ?\text{ano} \quad ?\text{gamo} \quad ?\text{xuusu} \quad ?\text{gula}=\text{kki} \quad ?\text{an}=\text{hekk-}\text{ad-i}. \\
& \quad 1SG \quad \text{manner} \quad 3SG.M.GEN \quad \text{toward} = \text{FOC} \quad 1=\text{play-MID-PFV.1SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘I played just like him.’ (lit. ‘I played in his manner.’)}
\end{align}

\begin{align}
\text{(57)} & \quad ?\text{ine} \quad ?\text{songo} \quad ?\text{hekk-}\text{ad-an}=\text{na} \quad ?\text{ano} \\
& \quad 1PL \quad \text{melody} \quad \text{play-MID-IPFV.1PL=PROX} \quad 1SG \\
& \quad ?\text{iso}=\text{na} \quad ?\text{gala} \quad ?\text{an}=\text{eem-i}. \\
& \quad 3SG.M=\text{PROX} \quad \text{under} \quad 1=\text{look-PFV.1SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘When we play a melody, I followed him.’ (lit. ‘... I looked under him.’)}
\end{align}

2.5.4. Surpassment

A verb-framing pattern is found in surpassment, composed of the gerund with the locative suffix and the verb \textit{gull-} ‘to surpass’ as the matrix verb, as shown in (58) and (59).

\begin{align}
\text{(58)} & \quad ?\text{ano} \quad ?\text{iso}=\text{si} \quad \text{hekk-}\text{i-to} \quad ?\text{an}=\text{nu}=\text{gull-i}. \\
& \quad 1SG \quad 3SG.M=\text{OBL} \quad \text{play-GER-LOC.M} \quad 1=\text{DIST=surpass-PFV.1SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘I outplayed him.’ (lit. ‘I surpassed him at playing.’)}
\end{align}

\begin{align}
\text{(59)} & \quad ?\text{ise} \quad \text{gaf-} \text{e-tte} \quad ?\text{isunde}=\text{si} \quad ?\text{i}=\text{gull-ay}. \\
& \quad 3SG.F \quad \text{cook-GER-LOC.F} \quad 3PL=\text{OBL} \quad 3=\text{surpass-IPFV.3SG.F} \\
& \quad \text{‘She cooks better than them.’ (lit. ‘She surpasses them at cooking.’)}
\end{align}
2.5.5. Demonstration

The phrase meaning ‘how to (do something)’ is used in demonstration, consisting of ɠamungoʔamala and the gerund followed by the accusative-marking clitic =si. The person-marking clitic and the distal locational clitic =nu are attached to the main verb as a rule. Consider the following examples, (60) and (61).

(60) ʔise [ɠamungoʔa-mala dit-i]=si ʔi=nu=hiʔ-as-ti.
3SG.F [manner-EP-how kick-GER]=ACC 3=DIST=see-CAUS-PFV.3SG.F
‘She demonstrated to him/her how to kick.’ (lit. ‘She showed the how-to of kicking to somebody.’)

(61) ʔano [ɠamungoʔa-mala [songo hekk-aɗ-e]]=si=kki
1SG [manner-EP-how [melody play-MID-GER]]=ACC=FOC
ʔan=nu=hiʔ-as-i.
1=DIST=see-CAUS-PFV.1SG
‘I demonstrated to him/her how to play a melody.’ (lit. ‘I showed the how-to of playing a melody to somebody.’)

The verbal nature of the gerund is retained to some extent, as shown in (61), where the gerund hekkad- has the object songo. The whole phrase ‘how to (do something)’ seems to be the object of the matrix verb hiʔas- ‘to show’ (cf. Yoshino 2014: 117–118).

3. Discussion

While the gerundial construction of ‘Ale is comparable to the expressions of complex events in other verb-framed languages, its consecutive construction seems to lack analogous expressions. As a verb-framed language, ‘Ale might be expected to use the main verb to express the framing event and the consecutive verb to express the co-event, just like the gerundial construction. However, in reality, the consecutive verb expresses the framing event, which is realized by the main verb in the gerundial construction; consequently, the main verb in the consecutive construction expresses the co-event. There are exceptional cases in which the verb xol- ‘to repeat’ is the main verb of the consecutive construction and it expresses the framing event (see §2.4.5). This distortion is illustrated in Table 5.
Table 5: Functions of the verb forms in the two constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Framing event</th>
<th>Co-event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gerundial construction</td>
<td>Main verb</td>
<td>Gerund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive construction</td>
<td>Consecutive verb</td>
<td>Main verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in the repetition sub-domain)</td>
<td>Main verb (xo\text{-})</td>
<td>Consecutive verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consecutive verb is a dependent verb form that never appears alone in any independent clause and shares the subject and some grammatical features of the preceding finite verb. Tosco (2008: 225) further concludes that the consecutive verb itself is dependent on the other verbs.

The non-final particle/clitic \textit{pa}=\textit{(p)}\textit{pa} is used to mark the linkage of (pro)nouns. It also marks the coordination of clauses. This is exemplified in (62).

\begin{align*}
\text{(62) } & \text{\textit{fam}bo}=\text{i}si & \text{\textit{ba}} & \text{\textit{har}o}=\text{i}si & \text{\textit{?i}se}=\text{si} \\
& \text{boy}=\text{PROX.DEM} & \text{NF} & \text{dog}=\text{PROX.DEM} & \text{3SG.F}=\text{ACC} \\
& \text{\textit{\text{?e}=?eem-angi} } & \text{\textit{ba} } & \text{\textit{ye}=\text{\text{\textit{fag-ti}}}} \text{.} \\
& \text{FREQ-see-IPFV.3PL} & \text{NF} & \text{3.NEG}=\text{exist-PFV.3SG.F} \\
& \text{‘This boy and this dog are looking for her, but she is missing.’ (lit. ‘...and she has not existed.’)}
\end{align*}

The consecutive verb usually appears with the preceding particle/clitic \textit{pa}=\textit{(p)}\textit{pa}. However, this non-final marker is probably not an obligatory part of the consecutive construction, based on the fact that the consecutive verb can appear without it, for example, (48) (cf. Tosco 2008: 216–217).

The difference between the coordination construction and the consecutive construction is ambiguous in their translations; see (63) and (64).

\begin{align*}
\text{(63) } & \text{\textit{?i}se } & \text{\textit{k}o?\text{a}a\text{s}e} & \text{leb-\textit{uw}-ad-\text{ay} } & \text{\textit{ba} } & \text{manne} & \text{gala} \\
& \text{3SG.F} & \text{ball} & \text{kick-INC-MID-IPFV.3SG.F} & \text{NF} & \text{house} & \text{under} \\
& \text{xull-is-ti} & \text{.} \\
& \text{enter-CAUS-PFV.3SG.F} \\
& \text{‘She kicked a ball into a house.’ (lit. ‘She was kicking a ball and made it enter a house.’)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(64) } & \text{\textit{?i}se } & \text{\textit{k}o\text{-}\text{a}a\text{s}e} & \text{leb-\textit{uw}-an-nay } & \text{\textit{ba} } & \text{\textit{man}na} & \text{gala} \\
& \text{3SG.F} & \text{ball} & \text{kick-INC-MID-FUT.3SG.F} & \text{NF} & \text{house} & \text{under}
\end{align*}
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xull-es-i.
enter-CAUS-CNS.3SG.F

‘She will kick a ball into a house.’ (lit. ‘She will kick a ball and make it enter.’)

In contrast, their literal translations indicate that the two clauses have different aspects in the coordination construction in (63), whereas the second clause shares the tense-aspect-mood notion with the first clause in the consecutive construction in (64). The coordination construction in ‘Ale is certainly a case of coordination because it has two independent clauses in (63).

The consecutive construction in (64) is not a case of coordination since the consecutive verb shows dependence on the other verb. However, at the same time, it is not a case of subordination, because there is no structural dependence, which is the required condition of subordination according to Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 454). The gerundial construction meets the condition, and it shows subordination with the gerund as an adverbial phrase, which modifies the matrix clause.

The author considers the consecutive construction to be cosubordination because of the dependence of operators (see Yoshino (2014: 119–120) for the earlier analysis). The operators are abstract schemes that are encoded in different ways in different languages, such as tense, aspect, and negation. The consecutive construction includes tense (i.e., present, past, and future) and status (i.e., epistemic modality) (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997: 40–41). The epistemic modality includes necessity and possibility, which is internally derived (Palmer 2001: 9–10).

Which operators are shared depends on the particular consecutive construction. In all the examples presented in §2, past tense and realis status are shared. There is no past tense marker, but it is deduced when the matrix verb has the perfective aspect. By contrast, the consecutive verb in (64) shares future tense, possibility and willingness status, and realis status with the main verb. When the main verb is the subjunctive future, as in (65), the consecutive verb shares future tense, possibility status, and irrealis status.

(65) Guyyango xaf-ne=ppa fette=sa=si hantungo-ttay
day arrive-SBJV.3PL=NF girl=DIST.DEM=ACC wedding-INS
Sakkad-ongi.
sit-CNS.3PL

‘They may arrive on the day and attend the wedding for that girl.’

The distribution of the gerundial and consecutive constructions seems to reflect these syntactic differences (Table 6). Both constructions mostly cover the three event domains of motion, state change, and realization, while their uses in temporal contouring and
action correlating are very limited. The two events (i.e., the framing and co-events) in motion (manner, cause, concomitance, and precursion), state change, and realization are easily expressed by means of verbs in ‘Ale; therefore, both constructions are applicable.

Table 6: Distribution of the two constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event domain</th>
<th>Gerundial construction</th>
<th>Consecutive construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>X (2, 4)</td>
<td>X (1, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>X (6, 8)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concomitance</td>
<td>X (9, 12)</td>
<td>X (10, 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precursion</td>
<td>X (14, 17)</td>
<td>X (15, 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enablement</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State change</td>
<td>X (21, 23, 25)</td>
<td>X (22, 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization</td>
<td>X (28, 30)</td>
<td>X (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal contouring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion/termination</td>
<td>? (31)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>? (40)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitualness</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradualness</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X (47, 48, 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action correlating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompaniment</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surpassment</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(X = applicable; n/a = not attested; ? = ambiguous; numbers correspond to the examples)

Cause in the motion event domain is not expressed by the consecutive construction because the events are integrated well and they are not taken as a sequence of events in ‘Ale. Enablement concerns the cause-effect relation of the events, and it is perceived as a sequence of two separate events in ‘Ale. The adverbially used gerund basically modifies some aspect of the event in the main clause, or the gerund is a periphery (i.e., a non-argument) attached to the clause; therefore, it is difficult to express a sequence in this way. The consecutive construction basically expresses a sequence of events that may partly overlap, and so it is applicable to enablement.

The example of completion/termination with the gerundial construction (31) is ambiguous in that its literal meaning is comparable with those of the gerundial construction examples of motion, for example, (2). Similarly, the example of continuation (40) is ambiguous because it resembles the examples of motion. Given that the use of the
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The consecutive construction in repetition is the only case where complex events are unambiguously expressed in the temporal contouring domain. However, as seen in (47), for example, it is also the only case in which the main verb expresses the framing event and the consecutive verb expresses the co-event. The author concludes that this particular construction is fossilized or fixed as a grammatical device of the iterative aspect, while it retains certain verbal features (i.e., the first verb \textit{xol-} fully conjugates for subject and tense-aspect).

These results are contrary to the general assumption found in Talmy’s (2000) definition that verb-framed languages express the framing event by means of main verbs. It even seems different from the patterns of satellite-framed languages because the non-main verb surely conjugates for the grammatical subject (person, number, and gender), unlike gerunds, although other grammatical features are dependent on the main verb. This fact supports Kawachi’s (2012: 185) assumption based on his analysis of Sidaama (along with Japanese and Korean) that some verb-framed languages do not take the framing event as “an informative description of what has happened when used out of context” in some event domains and, thus, “a V-language may have to express the framing event with an adverbial or a non-main verb.” It is also remarkable that ‘Ale and Sidaama share similar patterns of deviation from the prototypical verb-framed language, even though they use different strategies of expressions.

4. Conclusion

‘Ale has several ways to express complex events, but among them, only the gerundial and consecutive constructions can be considered expressions of integrated events. However, these constructions are syntactically and semantically different from each other. The consecutive construction is similar to compound sentences (i.e., coordination) in form, and it can mostly be paraphrased by the gerundial construction (i.e., subordination). When the juncture-nexus test is applied following Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: Chapter 8), the consecutive construction is judged to be a case of cosubordination. This seems to explain its two possible readings (i.e., sequential and simultaneous).

What is notable about the consecutive construction is that the non-main verb expresses the framing event while the main verb expresses the co-event. A further study of consecutive verbs in Dullay languages and converbs in other Ethiopian languages might
shed new light on the particular issue of how cosubordinate constructions should be treated in event integration typology.
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