CONJUNCTIVE AND COMITATIVE NOUN PHRASE COORDINATION IN BESERMAN UDMURT

**Abstract.** This article addresses the issue of noun phrase coordination in Beserman Udmurt. I consider monosyndetic/bisyndetic *no* and single/double comitative constructions as main competing strategies for noun phrase coordination in Beserman Udmurt. Syntactic tests show that monosyndetic/bisyndetic *no* and single/double comitative with plural verbal agreement are coordinating structures while the single comitative structure with singular verbal agreement is a case of subordination. The choice between conjunctive and comitative structures is affected by animacy, number, and syntactic function of coordinands. Elicitational data shows that bisyndetic *no* is used for emphatic coordination, since it cannot be used with collective predicates. In case of the single comitative marking, the number agreement on a verb is defined by the predicate type and the information structure of an utterance. Coordination of nouns in non-subject function is typically formed by using the asyndetic or syndetic strategy. Double comitative coordination of nouns in non-subject function is only possible under the case compounding strategy, although this strategy causes the speakers some difficulties.
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1. Introduction

Beserman Udmurt, also referred to as the language of Besermans or a distinct dialect of Udmurt (Тепляшина 1970; Кельмаков 1998; Люкина 2008), exists in spoken form and is used in several rural areas in the North-West of the Udmurt Republic. All the Beserman speakers are Beserman-Russian bilinguals. Most of them were taught the standard variety of the Udmurt language in school. The local variety of Russian has some dialectal features.

Beserman Udmurt makes use of both syndetic and comitative strategies to encode a multiple participant of a situation. Examples (1) and (2) demonstrate how the competing means are used within one text fragment.

Examples (1a, b) show two consecutive clauses taken from an experimental spoken text. In (1a), three noun conjuncts are followed by a conjunctive coordinator *no* ‘and’. In (1b), two nouns are combined with the comitative suffix *-en* on each conjunct.
(1a) [The bear uprooted a big fir-tree]  
\[ ke \, \dot{s} = n \, o \, petu \, k = n \, o \, \dot{s} \, r = n \, o \, ulvaj-ze \]
hare=and rooster=and mouse=and low.branch-P3SG.ACC
sul-i-z-\( \_ \)r (Corpus)
rough.cut-PST-3-PL
'The hare, the rooster and the mouse cut off the lower branches'

(1b) vand-\( \_ \)l-i-z-\( \_ \)r - e n  
\[ petuk - en \, s\_r-en \]
\( cut \)-ITER-PST-3-PL rooster-INS mouse-INS
'the rooster and the mouse cut up [the tree]'

Example (2) shows the competition of the double comitative marking (2a) and the monosyndetic no (2b) in consecutive sentences from another experimental text:

(2a)  
\[ i \, soos \, V\,a\,n\,a\,-\,e\,n \, \, O\,n\,d\,r\,e\,j\,-\,e\,n \, m\,\ddot{n}\,-\,o \, \ddot{s}\,r\,e\,s \, v\,\ddot{a}\,l\,-\,t\,i, \]
and they Vanya-INS Ondrey-INS go-PRS.3PL road up-PROL
\( \ddot{c}\,a\,\ddot{s}\,j\,a\,-\,t\,i, \, i \, k\,w\,a\,\ddot{z} \, \, p\,e\,j\,m\,\ddot{a}\,\ddot{k}\,-\,\ddot{m}\,\ddot{a} \, k\,u\,\ddot{e}\,k\,-\,i\,-\,\ddot{u} \, \ddot{n}, \]
forest-PROL and weather get.dark-INF start-PST-3SG=already
\[ i \, \, s\,o\,-\,o\,s... \, (\text{Corpus}) \]
and s/he-PL
'And they, Vanya and Ondrey, are going along the road, through the forest, and it has started getting dark already, and they…'

(2b) Soldat \[ V\,a\,n\,a\,=\,n\,o \, \, O\,n\,d\,r\,e\,j \, m\,\ddot{n}\,-\,o \, \ddot{c}\,a\,\ddot{s}\,j\,a\,-\,t\,i \, \ddot{s}\,r\,e\,s \, v\,\ddot{a}\,l\,-\,t\,i, \]
soldier Vanya=and Ondrey go-PRS.3PL forest-PROL road up-PROL
\( m\,\ddot{n}\,-\,o\,=\,\ddot{n}, \, \, s\,o\,-\,o\,s \, \, g\,d\,e\,t\,o \, k\,\ddot{e}\,k \, \ddot{c}\,a\,s... \, (\text{Corpus}) \]
go-PRS.3PL=already s/he-PL about two hour
'Soldier Vanya and Ondrey are going through the forest, along the road, they have been going for two hours already'

Both conjunctive and comitative structures in Beserman Udmurt can be of a monosyndetic or polysyndetic type. The single comitative construction can have either singular or plural number agreement on the predicate. Therefore I consider four types and two subtypes of constructions used to refer to a multiple participant of a situation in Beserman Udmurt:

Type I: monosyndetic conjunction: A=\textit{no} B

Type II: polysyndetic conjunction: A=\textit{no} B=\textit{no} \ldots (X=\textit{no})

Type III: single comitative marker: A-\textit{COM} B.
There are two subtypes of the type III for nouns in the subject function:

- Subtype IIIa: single comitative marker with singular number agreement on the verb
- Subtype IIIb: single comitative marker with plural number agreement on the verb

Type IV: multiple comitative marker: A-\textit{COM} B-\textit{COM} \ldots (X-\textit{COM})

Although the parameter of the number of coordinands (two vs more than two) is briefly discussed in section 5, the main focus of this article is on constructions with two coordinated nouns. In this case, constructions of type II and type IV are referred to as \textit{bisyndetic conjunction} and \textit{double comitative} respectively.
Conjunctive and comitative noun phrase coordination has not received a linguistic description for Beserman Udmurt so far. The corresponding structures in Standard Udmurt have been mentioned in several grammar descriptions. The grammar of the modern Udmurt language (ГСУЯ) gives some information on the means of phrase coordination in two chapters (ГСУЯ 1962: 324—327; 1970: 217—232). The chapters provide a classification and lists of coordinative conjunctions and give examples of mono- and polysyndetic uses of conjunctive =no. Winkler (2012) gives examples of sentences with two participants in the subject function, each noun bearing the comitative marking, and plural verbal agreement. Kondratjeva (Кондратьева 2011: 122—123), as well as Grammar of the modern Udmurt language (ГСУЯ 1962: 102), give examples of the single comitative marking with singular or plural verbal agreement and double comitative marking in the subject function with plural verbal agreement. According to Kondratjeva, all the examples refer to equal participants of an event. She also points out that R. Bartens distinguishes between the single and double comitative as the sociative and coordinative functions of the comitative suffix.

In this paper, I will show that the choice of one of the four types of NP coordination strategies in the spoken language of Besermans is affected by the number and animacy of participants, predicate type, information structure of an utterance, and syntactic function of coordinating nouns.

Data for this research was collected during field trips to the village Шамардан, Юкаменский district, Udmurt Republic in 2012—2018 (in total, I worked with eight native speakers of the language), as well as from the Beserman corpus (Архангельский, Бирюк, Идрисов 2015) and the Beserman multimedia corpus (Архангельский 2017).

2. Overview of coordinating strategies in Beserman Udmurt

Asyndetic coordination in Udmurt, like in other Finno-Ugric languages, is usually considered a diachronically older structure ("It is [---] usually assumed that Proto-Finno-Ugric had no grammaticalized overt coordinators" (Wälchli 2005: 206)).

Example (3) from the Beserman corpus shows asyndetic coordination of two noun phrases (proper names) in the direct object function; both coordinands are marked with the accusative case suffix.

(3) So naľTa pínat-los-se
s/he look.for.PRS.3SG child-FL-P3SG.ACC
M a š a-j e z P a š a-j e z naľTa
Masha-ACC Pasha-ACC look.for.PRS.3SG
‘She is looking for her children, looking for Masha and Pasha’

Most of the coordinating conjunctions in Standard Udmurt are borrowed either from Russian (adversative a, no, disjunctive to...to) or Tatar (disjunctive ja...ja, jake...jake, olo) (Серебренников 1963: 375; Майтинская 2010: 104). The analysis of spoken data of modern Udmurt by Kaysina (2013) showed that there are more borrowed conjunctions in informal Udmurt speech: conjunctive i, disjunctive iľi, iľbo, disjunctive correlative ne to...ne to, to iľi...to iľi. The conjunction da is defined in the Udmurt-Russian
dictionary (YPG 2008) as a spoken particle which is also used as a conjunc-
tive connector.

The system of Beserman conjunctions looks quite similar to the one in
Standard Udmurt except for the fact that conjunctive correlative ne... ne,
adversative noš, and disjunctive correlative to lī... to lī are missing in the
Šamardan idiom of Beserman Udmurt. However, Ljukina (Ljukina 2008)
mentions the last two for other Beserman idioms (Junda and Balezino).

Table 1 presents the system of Beserman coordinating conjunctions. In
brackets, elements that are rare or missing in the Šamardan idiom are shown.
The sign =, typically used for glossing clitics, shows here the model of prosodic
leaning of the conjunctions which are unstressed words. There are three
elements that are used postpositionally, namely two conjunctives, =no and
=da, and a disjunctive correlative construction comprised of a doubled ques-
tion particle =a. Both postpositive conjunctive coordinators can be used
monosyntetically or polysyntetically. This fact agrees with the idea of Stassen
about languages that have postpositional conjunctions: "...languages which
present this option typically also allow a construction of the polysyndetic
type, so that these monosyntetic constructions are best regarded as variants
in which one of the markers in the polysyndetic construction is optionally
deleted" (Stassen 2013). Also, according to Stassen, there is a correlation
between the existence of postposed coordinators and word order in a language:
"If a language has a (monosyntetically or polysyntetically) postposed coor-
dination marker, then that language is verb-final" (Stassen 2000 : 15).

The prosodic status of conjunctive i needs further investigation. Among
the uses of i as a coordinating conjunction in the Beserman corpus, there are
about 40 instances of the clause coordinator i followed by a pause indicated
with ... where i sounds rather like a separate prosodic unit (example 4).

(4) kôška-t-e ta-iz leša i... ug păr-s
be.afraid-caus-prs.3sg this-P3sg apparently and NEG enter-sg
'[another rooster] apparently scares him [the first rooster], and [the first
rooster] doesn’t come in'

Although noun phrase coordination with monosyntetic i is always possi-
ble under elicitation, there are relatively few such instances in the Beser-
man corpus. In most corpus examples, i appears as a means of clause coor-
dination, as a part of conjunctional adverbs or discourse markers (i tiik, i
tare, i sšre 'and then'; i fšo 'that’s all’), or as the topic switch marker. As
opposed to no and da, the connector i in Beserman cannot be used as a postposed polysyndetic NP coordinator, and there are rare examples of the bisyndetic i (where the coordinator precedes verbal coordinands (i A i B)).

Corpus occurrences of ja are much less frequent. Apart from the discourse marker with the meaning close to ‘okay’, ‘well’, ‘yes’, ja is used for clause coordination and as a part of conjunctual adverbs ja tare, ja vot, ja sre and then’. Monosyndetic or polysyndetic ja cannot be used for noun phrase coordination (5b). Polysyndetic ja is used by some speakers as a sentential disjunctive connector ‘sometimes P, sometimes Q’. while other speakers admitted they could understand the expression (5a) but they would phrase it using to... to... instead of ja:

(5a) Ja=Maša lôkt-e, ja=Pêta
   Ja Masha come-PRS.3SG ja Petya

(5b) *Ja=Maša ja=Pêta lôkt-e
   Ja Masha ja Petya come-3(SG)
   ‘Sometimes Masha comes, sometimes Petya’ (Elicitation)

Most of the occurrences of da are found within a bisyndetic construction X=da mar=da (lit. ‘X and what and’) which is used as a general extender (in the sense of Overstreet, Yule 1997):

(6) Kud.dûrja potkormî=no kar-iško-m k a ŋ ê n=d a
    sometimes feed(RUS.INF)=and do-PRS-1PL pea-INS=and
    m a r=d a (Corpus)
    what=and
    ‘Sometimes we also feed [the fish] with peas and whatever else’

The conjunction da can also be used for monosyndetic and bisyndetic constituent coordination (7):

(7) Solašen lôkt-o-z a n a j - e z=d a b r a t - e z=d a (Corpus)
    from.that.side come-FUT-3-SG mother-P3SG=and brother-P3sg=and
    ‘Mother and brother will come from that side’

The conjunction no is exploited, to a different extent, in all the functions listed in the semantic map for additives by D. Forker (2016): as an additive (‘too’), a scalar additive (‘even’), a constituent coordinator (‘and’), as an optional element following indefinite pronouns of different types (kińke (no) ‘somebody’, nokiń (no) ‘nobody’); as a part of a concessive conjunction ke no ‘although’ (lit. ‘if and’); as a contrastive topic marker; as a part of conjunctional adverbs (no tare, no sobere ‘and then’).

No can coordinate different word categories. For coordination of verbs, a converb construction can be used, like in (8a). Example (8b) is a paraphrase of (8a) with the conjunctive coordinator no ‘and’.

(8a) So  l ô k t - ë s a  j u a
    s/he come-CVB ask.PRS.3SG

(8b) So  l ô k t - ë =n o  j u a
    s/he come-PRS.3SG=and ask.3SG
    ‘He comes and asks’ (Elicitation)

The conjunctive coordinator no is by far the main means of conjunctive coordination. It can be used monosyndetically and polysyndetically with
different word categories. If coordinands are used in the subject function and precede the predicate, the predicate can only have plural number agreement. According to ГСУЯ 1970: 222—223, the predicate preceding coordinated non-human singular nouns can optionally have singular number agreement in Standard Udmurt. The example (7) shows that this rule also applies to human nouns in Beserman Udmurt. In this article, the issue of NP coordinands in the subject function preceded by a predicate was not investigated.

3. The comitative case in Beserman Udmurt

The Udmurt language, as opposed to the closely related Komi language, doesn’t have separate case markers for the instrumental and comitative cases (for instrumental-comitative competition in Komi see Некрасова 2015). In Beserman Udmurt, the instrumental-comitative suffix has the form -en for most singular nouns (9), -in for some singular nouns and pronominal stems (9), -en for inalienable and plural nouns (10). The suffix -en has the allomorph -jen which can optionally occur after vowel stems except stems ending in u. Orthography of the examples in the article retains the original -en/-jen variability as it was recorded.

(9) ṇoroga-ško-m obyčno kiń bğat-e mar-i n,  
fish-prs-1pl usually who can-prs.3sg what-ins  
kiń bğat-e viznan-e n čoroga-lo  
who-can-prs.3sg fishing.rod-ins fish-prs.3pl  
'Ve usually go fishing with whatever one can, some can fish with a fishing-rod'

(10) Män-i m klub-e brat-jos -en n -m  
go-pst-1pl club-ill brother-pl-INS-F1sg  
'[I (lit. we)] came to the club with my brothers'  
Comitative marking in coordinating structures can be single (type III), i.e. one conjunct is marked (11), or double (type IV), i.e. both conjuncts are marked, like in examples (1), (2).

(11) ǯől̃gőr šər -en mak tős-s-e łówk-ń̃ ̃  
sparrow mouse-ins poppy seed-p3-acc.sg share-inf  
ev-z bğat-e  
NEG.pst-3 can-pl  
The sparrow and the mouse couldn’t share a poppy seed'

Conjuncts with the single comitative marking in the subject function can have singular (type IIIa) or plural (type IIIb) number agreement on the verb (12).

(12) Maša Vaša-jen Moskva-jńän pu m i şk-i-z / pu m i şk-i-z-ñ  
Masha Vasya-ins Moscow-loc meet-pst-3sg/meet-pst-3-pl  
'Masha and Vasya met in Moscow' (Elicitation)  
Double comitative is also found in the argument structure of the post-position series visk- ‘between’:  
(13) es-en telčeka-jen visk-ń  
door-ins handcart-ins between-loc  
'between the door and the handcart'
4. Syntactic tests for coordination in Beserman Udmurt

According to Arkhipov (2009a: 224—225), comitative constructions differ from coordinate constructions in the different structural rank of the expressions denoting the participants of a situation. As it was formulated by Ross (1967: 161), "in a coordinate structure, no conjunct may be moved, nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct". In order to see if construction types (I—IV) reveal features of coordination or subordination, I applied a wh-extraction test and a relativization test as in Stassen 2000: 7 for English and Архипов 2009b: 40 for Russian. The results show that the single comitative structure with singular verbal agreement (subtype IIIa) in (14a) is a clear instance of subordination, as it is possible to replace one of the NPs with a wh-word (14b, c):

(14a) Peťa Vaša-en ləkt-ı-z
     Petya Vasya-INS come-PST-3SG
     'Petya came with Vasya' (Elicitation)

Wh-extraction:
(14b) Kińen Peťa ləkt-ı-z?
     who-INS Petya come-PST-3SG
     'Who did Petya come with?' (Elicitation)

Relativization:
(14c) Mon tod-iško so pi-jez, k iń-en Peťa ləkt-ı-z
     I know-PRS(1SG) that boy-ACC who-INS Petya come-PST-3(SG)
     'I know the boy who Petya came with' (Elicitation)

The single comitative structure with plural verbal agreement (15a) makes sentences (15b, c) ungrammatical:

(15a) Peťa Vaša-en ləkt-ı-z-ı
     Petya Vasya-INS come-PST-3-PL
     'Petya came with Vasya' (Elicitation)

(15b) *Kińen Peťa ləkt-ı-z-ı?
     who-INS Petya come-PST-3-PL
     Intended meaning: 'Who did Petya come with?' (Elicitation)

(15c) *Mon tod-iško so pi-jez, k iń-en Peťa ləkt-ı-z-ı
     I know-PRS.1SG that boy-ACC who-INS Petya come-PST-3-PL
     Intended meaning: 'I know the boy who Petya came with' (Elicitation)

The sentences (16b, c) and (17b, c) are ungrammatical, therefore the constructions with monosyndetic (16a) and bisyndetic (17a) no are typical coordinate structures:

(16a) Vaša=en o Peťa ləkt-ı-z-ı
     Vaša=and Petya come-PST-3-PL
     'Vaša and Petya came' (Elicitation)

(16b) *Kińen Peťa ləkt-ı-z-ı?
     who=and Petya come-PST-3-PL
     Intended meaning: 'Who did Petya come with?' (Elicitation)
Julia Zubova

(16c) *Mon tod-iško so pi-jez, k i ň=n o Peťa=l̃kt-i-z- stratégie
I know-PRES.1SG that boy-ACC who=and Petya come-PST-3-PL
Intended meaning: ‘I know the boy who Petya came with’ (Elicitation)

(17a) Vaša=n o Peťa=n o l̃kt-i-z-stratégie
Vaša=and Petya=and come-PST-3-PL
‘Vaša and Petya came’ (Elicitation)

(17b) *K i ň=n o Peťa=n o l̃kt-i-z-stratégie?
who=and Petya=and come-PST-3-PL
Intended meaning: ‘Who did Petya come with?’ (Elicitation)

(17c) *Mon tod-iško so pi-jez, k i ň=n o Peťa=l̃kti-z-stratégie
I know-PRES.1SG that boy-ACC who=and Petya=and come-PST-3-PL
Intended meaning: ‘I know the boy who Petya came with / I know
the boy who came with Petya’ (Elicitation)

It is also impossible to replace one of the elements of the double comitative construction with a wh-word (18a, b, c):

(18a) Vaša-INS Peťa-INS l̃kt-i-z-stratégie
‘Vaša and Petya came’ (Elicitation)

(18b) *K i ň-INS Peťa-INS l̃kt-i-z-stratégie?
who-INS Petya-INS come-PST-3-PL
Intended meaning: ‘Who did Petya come with? / Who came with Pet
í
(18c) *Mon tod-iško so pi-jez, k i ň-INS Peťa-INS l̃kti-z-stratégie
I know-PRES.1SG that boy-ACC who-INS Petya-INS come-PST-3-PL
Intended meaning: ‘I know the boy who Pet
í
(18c) *Mon tod-iško so pi-jez, k i ň-INS Peťa-INS l̃kti-z-stratégie
I know-PRES.1SG that boy-ACC who-INS Petya-INS come-PST-3-PL
Intended meaning: ‘I know the boy who Pet
í

The tests show that monosyndetic and bisyndetic conjunctive structures (types I, II) show features of coordination. Single comitative with plural verbal agreement (type IIIb) as well as double comitative (type IV) show the same features as the coordinate structures. Single comitative with singular verbal agreement (type IIIa) demonstrates typical subordinate behavior.

5. The number of coordinands

In Beserman Udmurt, the conjunction no can be used for any number of coordinands. Although there are no corpus examples of more than two coordinands in comitative structures, it is possible to elicit such examples (19):

(19) Peťa-INS Vaša-INS Jura-INS pukt-il’j’a-m-stratégie korka
Petya-INS Vasya-INS Yura-INS build-PST3PL-PST2-3-PL house
‘Petya, Vasya, and Yura built a house’ (Elicitation)

However, some speakers noted that conjunctive coordination with no or juxtaposition of coordinands would sound more natural.

6. Animacy of coordinands

No is insensitive to coordinand animacy, while the comitative structure in the subject function is mostly used with nouns denoting people or animal characters in fairy tales.
Elicitation shows a decrease in acceptability of comitative coordination structures from human to inanimate nouns.

Double comitative is a preferred strategy for human subjects (20):

(20)  
\[ N \, l-e \, n-\tilde{m} \, p \, i-e \, n-\tilde{m} \, gorod-e \, ko\check{s}k-i-z-\tilde{m} \]  
\[ \text{daughter-INS-1SG son-INS-1SG city-ILL leave-PST-3-PL} \]  
"My daughter and my son went to the city" (Elicitation)

In case of the subject denoting animals, some speakers reject sentence (21) as ungrammatical, while others say it is less appropriate than the no-strategy.

(21)  
\[ \tilde{z} \, e \, n-\tilde{m} \, s \, ka \, l-e \, n-\tilde{m} \, muket \, gurt-e \, pegj-\tilde{m}-i\tilde{l}Ia-\tilde{m} \]  
\[ \text{sheep-INS-1SG cow-INS-1SG another village-ILL run.away-3PL-PST2} \]  
"Intended meaning: 'My sheep and my cow ran away to the neighboring village' (Elicitation)

Example (22a) with two inanimate subjects is ungrammatical. The only way to make double comitative possible is to add the adverb \( \check{c}o\check{s} \) 'together', thus giving the sentence a slightly different reading:

(22a)  
\[ *M\check{n}am \, bak\check{c}a-ja-m \, \tilde{s} \, e \, d \, s \, u \, t \, e \, r \, -\tilde{e}n \, g \, o \, r \, d \, s \, u \, t \, e \, r \, -\tilde{e}n \]  
\[ \text{my garden-LOC-P1(SG) black currant-INS red currant-INS} \]  
\[ \text{grow-PRS.3PL} \]  
"There are black currants and red currants growing in my garden' (Elicitation)

(22b)  
\[ M\check{n}am \, bak\check{c}a-ja-m \, \tilde{s} \, e \, d \, s \, u \, t \, e \, r \, -\tilde{e}n \, g \, o \, r \, d \, s \, u \, t \, e \, r \, -\tilde{e}n \]  
\[ \text{my garden-LOC-1(SG) black currant-INS red currant-INS} \]  
\[ \check{c}o\check{s} \, \check{c} \, o \, \check{c} \, \text{grow-PRS.3PL} \]  
"There are black currants and red currants growing next to each other in my garden’ (Elicitation)

7. Type of the predicate

7.1 Predicates denoting non-simultaneous events

Haspelmath (2004) after Abdoulaye (2004) define the semantic differences between comitative and conjunctive constructions in English based on the necessity of a simultaneous reading of an action for comitative structures. The simultaneous interpretation implies that the participants perform an action at the same place or at the same time.

In Beserman Udmurt, the structure with single comitative and singular verbal agreement is ungrammatical in the context of non-simultaneous action:

(23)  
\[ *P\, e\, t\, a \, V\, a\, s\, a\,-\tilde{e}n \, p\, g\, t\, e\, t\, e \, gorod-\text{-jos-}\tilde{m} \, d\, \tilde{s} \, e \, \check{c} \, k-i-z \]  
\[ \text{Petya Vasya-INS different city-PL-LOC study-PST-3(SG)} \]  
"Petya and Vasya studied in different cities' (Elicitation)

Single comitative with plural number agreement on the verb in (24) does not look acceptable for three out of four native speakers:
7.2 Predicates with collective and distributive interpretations

In this section I will consider the conjunctive and comitative constructions in the context of predicates of collective and mixed types. For situations denoted by collective predicates (e.g., reciprocal predicates like English meet, see each other), a multiple participant is obligatory. Predicates of mixed type (in terms of Vaillette 1998) can be applicable for both an individual and a multiple participant. When applied to a multiple participant, a predicate of mixed type can be interpreted as collective or distributive. N. Vaillette (1998: 257) puts the predicates of mixed type like lift the piano between purely collective like meet, see each other and purely distributive like die, be asleep).

Collective vs distributive predicate distinction is particularly interesting in the context of bisyndetic coordinating constructions (type II). In many languages, a construction with a conjunction/additive particle on both conjuncts can only be emphatic, i.e. give the predicate a distributive reading (Forker 2012: 15).

According to data elicited from native Beserman speakers, constructions of type I (example 26a), type III (examples 26b), type IV (example 26c) can be used with the reciprocal predicates.

(26a)  
Maša=no Vaša Moskva-jŏn todma-ĉ-k-i-z-ŭ
Masha=and Vasya Moscow-LOC know-CAUS-DETR-PST-3-PL
'Masha and Vasya met in Moscow’ (Elicitation)

(26b)  
Maša Vaša=en Moskva-jŏn todma-ĉ-k-i-z/
Masha Vasya-COM Moscow-LOC know-CAUS-DETR-PST-3SG/
todma-ĉ -k-i-z-ŭ
know-CAUS-DETR-PST-3-PL
'Masha and Vasya met in Moscow’ (Elicitation)

(26c)  
Maša-en Vaša=en Moskva-jŏn todma-ĉ-k-i-z-ŭ
Masha-COM Vasya-COM Moscow-LOC know-CAUS-DETR-PST-3-PL
'Masha and Vasya met in Moscow’ (Elicitation)

The bisyndetic no (type II) is unacceptable for most of the speakers (although several speakers hesitated giving the grammaticality judgements about example (26d)):

(26d)  
*Maša=no Vaša=no Moskva-jŏn todma-ĉ-k-i-z-ŭ
Masha=and Vasha=and Moscow-LOC know-DETR-PST-3-PL
'Masha and Vasya met in Moscow’ (Elicitation)
In the context of a predicate of mixed type, all the subjects agreed that the situation in (27) can only have a distributive, but not a collective reading, which implies that the speaker got two TVs, one from each sibling:

(27) Brat-e=no sestra-je=no vordišk-em nunal-a-m
    brother-P1SG=and sister-P1SG=and be.born-PTCP day-Ill-P1SG
    televizor šot-i-z-3
    television give-PST-3-PL

'Both my brother and my sister gave me a TV for my birthday' (Elicitation)

When monosyndetic (type I), double comitative (type IV) and single comitative with plural agreement (type IIIb) constructions are used in the situation like in (27), native speakers perceive the situation as collective, as this interpretation sounds pragmatically more natural in the given context. Speakers tend to reinforce the collective meaning by using the adverb čoš ‘together’.

For the single comitative construction, there is a restriction for singular agreement. In the example 28, only plural agreement is judged as grammatical.

(28) Brat-e sestra-en-3m vordišk-em nunal-a-m
    brother-P1SG sister-INS-P1SG be.born-PTCP day-Ill-P1SG
    televizor šot-i-z-3 / *šot-i-z
    television give-PST-3-PL

'My brother and my sister gave me a TV for my birthday' (Elicitation)

Ungrammaticality of singular number agreement in (28) can be explained in terms of information structure of the utterance. Arkhipov (Архипов 2009: 107, 109) argues that central and comitative NPs have different communicative status, the former usually being a topic of the sentence, the latter being a part of focus (rheme).

In the context of mixed predicates with both NPs in sentence-initial position, singular agreement sounds odd for three native speakers; two native speakers allow both singular and plural agreement; one speaker strongly prefers singular agreement:

(29) Vaša Pet-a-en pis ³pɔlɔ-l-e / ³polɔ-l-o.
    Vasya Petya-INS wood chop-ITER-PRS.3SG / chop-ITER-PRS.3PL

'Vasya and Petya are chopping wood' (Elicitation)

Singular agreement becomes acceptable for all native speakers if the position of a comitative NP changes to post-verbal:

    Vasya wood chop-ITER-PRS.3SG Petya-INS

'Vasya is chopping wood with Petya' (Elicitation)

Also, when a comitative NP is focused, singular agreement is allowed by all speakers:

(31) Kiń-en Vaša pis pɔlɔ-l-e?
    who-INS Vasya wood chop-ITER-PRS.3SG

'Who is Vasya chopping wood with?'

Vaša Pet-a-en pɔlɔ-l-e
    Vasya Petya-INS chop-ITER-PRS.3SG

'Vasya is chopping [wood] with Petya' (Elicitation)
In the example 28, singular number agreement would mean that the comitative NP ʹśestraēmʹ ‘with my sister’ is focused, which is not the case in the given context (the focus is on the direct object ʹtelēvizorʹ ‘television’). As coordinated nouns constitute the topic of the sentence, only plural agreement is allowed in (28).

To summarize, the analysis of predicate types shows that 1) in the context of non-simultaneous action, the use of single comitative constructions (type III a,b) is restricted; 2) the bisyndetic no is used for emphatic coordination in Beserman Udmurt; 3) in single comitative constructions, both singular and plural number agreement is allowed in the context of collective (reciprocal) predicates; 4) in contexts with predicates of mixed type, the comitative NP must be in the focused position for singular number agreement to be used. The plural number agreement is used when both coordinated nouns are in the topic of the sentence.

8. Coordination of nouns with overt case marking

Most examples of NP coordination found in the Beserman corpus are either in the subject or direct object function with zero case marking. There are corpus examples of a multiple participant in dative and genitive coordinated asyndetically (32) or polysyntetically (33):

(32) k u r e g - j o s - l 3 ﬂ 3 a 3 3 e g - j o s - l 3 3 i j o n 3 o t - e (Corpus)
    hen-PL-DAT          goose-PL-DAT          food give-PRS.3SG

ʹ[She] is giving food to hens and geeseʹ

(33) ńi m - j o s - s e  t o d - = ńi  k a 3 d 3 j - e z - l 3 3 s :
    name-PL-P3(SG).ACC know-PRS.3SG=already each-P3SG-GEN2
    ś 3 j o s - l 3 3 3 = n o ,  s k a l - l - e 3 = n o ,  k u n a 3 l - e 3 = n o (Corpus)
    sheep-PL-GEN2=and cow-GEN2=and calf-GEN2=and

ʹ[He] knows the names of all of them: sheep, and cows, and calvesʹ

If we try to find an instance of the comitative coordination strategy in oblique cases in the corpus, we can see the following comparable sentences from three speakers retelling a Russian fairy-tale. In the first round, the subjects were asked to translate the fairy-tale sentence by sentence, then to retell the story from memory. All three speakers use different constructions for coordination of nouns in the genitive case (encoding the experiencer). In the source text in Russian, a comitative construction in nominative (the subject function) was used:

(34) Russian
    Пока она ходила, медведь с волком есть  захотели
    while she walk:PST:F bear            with wolf:INS      eat:INF want:PST:PL

ʹWhile she [the fox] was wondering, the bear and the wolf got hungryʹ

In the first round, speaker 1 uses a mixed monosyndetic/single comitative structure "A-GEN=no B-COM".

(35a) Speaker 1 I:

(Poka 3 o s 3 v e 3 l l - i - z,  g o n d 3 r - l e n = n o k i j o n - e n
while s/he walk-PST-3SG bear-GEN=and         wolf-INS
    ści - šk - e m - z - Modificar pot - i - z (Corpus)
    eat-DETR-NMLZ-3-PL come,out-PST-3SG

ʹWhile s/he [the fox] was wandering, the bear and the wolf got hungryʹ
The strategy in (35a) is seen as ungrammatical under elicitation. In the second round, speaker 1 uses a monosyndetic no strategy "A-GEN=no B-GEN":

(35b) Speaker 1 II:

Foka so veļt-e, gondr-len=n o kijon-len
while s/he walk-PRS.3SG bear-GEN=and wolf-GEN
kōt-sā ūma-nā kučki-z (Corpus)
belly-P3PL feel.hungry-INF begin-PST-3SG

'While s/he [the fox] was wandering, the bear and the wolf got hungry'

Speaker 2 produces a self-correction in the first round. The comitative marker on the second element in "A-NOM B-COM" is replaced by (or added to) the genitive marker:

(35c) Speaker 2 I:

Ku poka so veļt-i-z gondr kijonen ... len
when while s/he walk-PST.3SG bear-GEN=and wolf-INS GEN
šišk-em-z-ā pot-i-z (Corpus)
eat-DETR-NMLZ-3-PL come.out-PST-3SG

'While s/he [the fox] was wandering, the bear and the wolf got hungry'

In the second round, Speaker 2 skips the text fragment thus avoiding the awkward construction.

Finally, Speaker 3 replaces the whole double comitative structure "A-COM B-COM" with "A-GEN B-COM".

(35d) Speaker 3 I:

šišk velt-icož gondr ren kijonen ... gondr-len
fox walk-CVB bear-INS wolf-INS bear-GEN
kijonen kōt-sā ūma-z
wolf-GEN belly-P3PL feel.hungry-PST.3SG

'While the fox was wandering, the bear and the wolf got hungry'

In the second round, speaker 3 makes a self-repair changing "A-COM B-COM" to "B-PL-GEN".

(35e) Speaker 3 II

So šerk-šūn=uk gondr-ren kijonen [---]
s/he back-loc=PTCL bear-INS wolf-INS
kijon-joso-len kōt-sā ūma-m
wolf-PL-GEN belly-P3PL feel.hungry-PST2.3SG

'Behind [the fox’s] back, the bear and the wolf got hungry'

As can be seen in the examples (35a—e), using the comitative coordination strategy for the genitive subject causes difficulties for speakers. Under later elicitation, comitative constructions in (35a, c, e) were considered ungrammatical. The subjects replaced them with the asyndetic or monosyndetic coordination:

(35f) Gondr-len (= no) kijon-len šišk-em-z-ā
bear-GEN(=and) wolf-GEN eat-DETR-NMLZ-3-PL
pot-i-z
come.out-PST-3SG

'The bear and the wolf got hungry'
However, a competing strategy also came up:

\[(35g) \text{Gondr} - \text{en kionenjolen} \text{sišk-em-z-}δ \text{pot-i-z} \]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{bear-INS} & \text{wolf-INS-PL-GEN} \\
\text{eat-DETR-NMLZ-3-PL} & \text{come.out-PST-3SG}
\end{array}
\]

'The bear and the wolf got hungry.'

Example in (35g) has the structure "A-COM B-COM-PL-GEN". This type of case compounding is described by T. Arkhangelskiy and M. Usacheva among "peripheral case compounding kinds", where the suspended case suffix attaches to the whole coordinated phrase:

\[(36) \left[\text{abi-jen babam-en-jos-len ta korka-jez}\right] \]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{grandmother-INS} & \text{grandfather-INS-PL-GEN this house-P.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

'This house belongs to my grandmother and grandfather' (Arkhangelskiy, Usacheva 2018)

Using the case compounding strategy, it is possible to elicit the double comitative coordination structures for overtly marked cases:

\[(37) \text{Accusative:}\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Fedya} & \text{žug-i-z} \\
\text{Vas-en Jura-enjos-tδ}
\end{array}
\]

Fedya beat-PST-3SG Vasya-INS Yura-INS-PL-ACC

'Fedya beat Vasya and yura [Vasya and Yura are crying]' (Elicitation)

\[(38) \text{Genitive:}\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Vasya-INS} & \text{Petya-INS-PL-GEN anaj-ataj-jos-sδ} \\
\text{mother-father-PL-P3PL} & \text{gurt-δn ul-o}
\end{array}
\]

'Vasya and Petya’s parents live in a village' (Elicitation)

\[(39) \text{Genitive 2:}\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Mi kšška-ško-m} & \text{Vasya-en Petya-enjos-lδś} \\
\text{We be.afraid-PRS-1PL Vasya-INS Petya-INS-PL-GEN2}
\end{array}
\]

'Ve are afraid of Vasya and Petya' (Elicitation)

\[(40) \text{Dative:}\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Vasya-INS} & \text{Petya-enjos-lδś šot-i-m jol} \\
\text{Vasya-INS-PL-DAT give-PST-1PL milk}
\end{array}
\]

'We gave milk to Vasya and Petya' (Elicitation)

\[(41) \text{Comitative:}\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Mon uža-ško} & \text{Jura-en Petya-jenjos-śn} \\
\text{I work-PRS.1SG Yura-INS Petya-INS-PL-INS}
\end{array}
\]

'I work with Yura and Petya' (Elicitation)

\[(42) \text{Caritive:}\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Masha škt-i-z} & \text{Jura-en Vasya-enjos-tek} \\
\text{Masha come-PST-3SG Yura-INS Vasya-INS-PL-CAR}
\end{array}
\]

'Masha came without Yura and Vasya' (Elicitation)

For some speakers, it takes some time to produce the case compounding forms, and they say they don’t use those very often. The easiest case
to produce and process is dative. Nevertheless, all the forms are grammatical and intelligible.

Comitative coordination of nouns within a postpositional phrase is not possible.

9. Conclusions

In the article, two competing means of coordination were analyzed — the conjunction no and the instrumental-comitative case. The main findings are summarized in the table 1.

Table 2

| Features of conjunctive and comitative coordinating constructions in Beserman Udmurt |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                  | I A=no B A=\text{no} B A=\text{com} B \text{V(PL)} A=\text{com} B \text{V(PL)} | II A=\text{no} B A=\text{no} B A=\text{com} B \text{V(PL)} A=\text{com} B \text{V(PL)} | IIIa A-\text{com} B \text{V(SG)} A=\text{com} B \text{V(SG)} | IIIb A-\text{com} B \text{V(PL)} A=\text{com} B \text{V(PL)} | IV A-\text{com} B \text{com} B \text{com} B |
| Syntactic tests for coordination | + | + | + | + | + |
| Non-human coordinands | + | + | +/- | +/− | +/− |
| Non-simultaneous predicate | + | + | − | −/+ | + |
| Reciprocal predicate | + | − | + | + | + |
| Collective non-reciprocal predicate | + | − | (changes the interpretation of a predicate to distributive) | (only when the comitative coordinand is in focus) | + | + |
| Coordinands with overt case marking | + | + | + | + (case compounding strategy) | + | + |

According to Stassen’s typology for noun phrase coordination (Stassen 2013), such features as the ability of the comitative phrase to be moved “from its canonical position to a position adjacent to the other conjunct”, differential number agreement, and doubling of the comitative marker can be possible paths from the comitative to the coordinating strategy. While the parameter of the word order is not significant for an SOV language (where ”comitative phrases [----] are typically positioned at the same side of the predicate as subjects are” (Stassen 2000 : 30)), both the differential number agreement and comitative marker doubling are found in Beserman Udmurt.

Constructions of type I (monosyndetic no) and IV (double comitative), being coordinating structures, exhibit most functions that are similar. The construction of type IIIb has more in common with the subordinating comitative construction (type IIIa). The bisyndetic no construction should be classified as the emphatic coordination (“both A and B”).

There were cases of native speakers disagreeing on the number agreement and, in some cases, the grammaticality was hard to judge. Also, less frequently found types of coordination (as syndetic, syndetic with coordi-
nators \( i \) and \( da \), constructions with a repeated predicate) remained out of the scope of this research. Therefore there is a need for an experimental test for parameters of coordination.
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СОЮЗНОЕ И КОМИТАТИВНОЕ СОЧИНЕНИЕ ИМЕННЫХ ГРУПП
В БЕСЕРМЯНСКОМ ДИАЛЕКТЕ УДМУРТСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

В статье рассматривается вопрос о сочинении именных групп в языке бесермян. Одиночный/повторяющийся союз no и одиночный/двойной маркер комитатива рассматриваются как основные конкурирующие стратегии именного сочинения. Синтаксические тесты демонстрируют, что структуры с одиночным и двойным комитативным показателем при глагольном согласовании по множественному числу, как и конструкции с одиночным и повторяющимся союзом представляют собой сочинительные структуры. Конструкция с одиночным комитативным показателем при глагольном согласовании по единственному числу является подчинительной. На выбор между союзной и комитативной конструкциями оказывают влияние количество сочиняемых элементов, их одушевленность, синтаксическая функция и информационная структура предложения. Данные элицитации показывают, что двойной союз no используется для эмфатического сочинения, так как не сочетается с коллективными предикатами. В случае одиночного комитативного маркирования согласование по числу у глагола определяется типом предиката и информационной структурой высказывания. Сочинение имен в позициях, отличных от субъектной или объектной (с нулевым падежным маркированием), осуществляется преимущественно при помощи бессоюзной или союзной стратегии. Сочинение имен с помощью двойного комитатива в данных синтаксических позициях возможно при использовании двухпадежной конструкции, которая, однако, вызывает трудности у говорящих при порождении и интерпретации.