LINGUISTICA URALICA LXII 2026 2 : 237—262 https://doi.org/10.3176/lu.2026.2.06

IRINA KHOMCHENKOVA, DARIA ZHORNIK (Moscow)

COMITATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN SOUTHERN MANSI

Abstract. The article describes the comitative markers of the extinct Southern Mansi language — two postpositions (*jitəl* and *jortəl*) and the suffix *-nat/-nät* — on the basis of corpus data and compares them with those of Northern Mansi in terms of Stassen 2000, Stolz & Stroh & Urdze 2006, and Arkhipov 2009. The analysis shows that all the comitative markers under consideration occur in genuine comitative constructions (ComCs), such as 'go with someone'. The postpositions are also used in ComCs with polyadic predicates (e.g., 'fight with') and in coordinating ComCs (with the structure "X Y-COM V.PL"). The postposition *jitəl* is additionally attested in inclusory ComCs (cf. Russian *мы с Петей*, lit. 'we with Peter' = 'I and Peter'). The suffix *-nat/-nät* occurs predominantly in coordinating ComCs with the structure "X-COM Y V.PL." Unlike the postpositions, *-nat/-nät* cannot be attached to personal pronoun stems. In Northern Mansi, there is no comitative case, and the main comitative marker is the postposition *jot*, whose distribution is similar to that of the Southern Mansi postpositions *jitəl* and *jortəl*. Earlier in Northern Mansi the comitative function was also expressed by the instrumental case marker *-l, -təl*. In present-day Northern Mansi, however, the latter is used mainly in coordinating and inclusory ComCs. The instrumental marker in Southern Mansi, by contrast, has neither coordinating nor comitative functions. It is used in depictive constructions ('come with a bag'), whereas in Northern Mansi such constructions employ the lexeme *tāγəl* 'full'. In the Southern Mansi corpus, the cognate lexeme *täul* 'full' was not attested in comitative constructions. In terms of Stassen (2000), modified by Arkhipov (2009), both Mansi languages can be classified as mixed AND-languages, since they have both coordinating constructions and coordinating comitative constructions. In terms of Stolz & Stroh & Urdze 2006, Southern Mansi is a language with differentiation (A-type): it has distinct comitative and instrumental markers. Contemporary Northern Mansi also belongs to this type. Earlier, however, it apparently was mixed (C-type, comitative subtype), since the instrumental marker also had comitative functions, and there was another comitative marker (the postposition *jot*).

Keywords: Southern Mansi, Northern Mansi, comitative constructions, coordination.

1. Introduction

In this article, we discuss comitative markers in Southern Mansi (< MANSI < UGRIC < URALIC), namely the postpositions *jitəl* and *jortəl*, as well as the case

Received 13 May 2026, accepted 2 October 2026, available online 19 November 2026.
© 2026 Authors. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence CC BY 4.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0).

marker *-nat/-nät*. Southern Mansi is one of the Mansi languages, which became extinct in the first half of the 20th century and exhibits several notable differences from the other Mansi languages. The data for our research include archival materials gathered by Bernát Munkácsi in 1888—1889 and Artturi Kannisto in 1901—1905 and processed within the INEL project (Grammars, Corpora and Language Technology for Indigenous Northern Eurasian Languages) at the University of Hamburg.

We view the comitative as a pluralizing construction following Arkhipov 2009. For example, in the situation expressed by the sentence ***Mary*** *went into the forest* ***with Ann***, there are two participants encoded by two NPs: the core NP (*Mary*) and the comitative NP (*Ann*). Both participants are involved in the same action ('go into the forest'). The core NP and the comitative NP are syntactically subordinate to the same predicate, but have different syntactic functions (subject and oblique object, respectively). The comitative NP can be omitted without changing the grammaticality of the sentence, and the comitative construction can be replaced with another pluralizing device, such as coordination (***Mary and Ann*** *went into the forest*) or plural number (***The girls*** *went into the forest*), without any change in the propositional meaning.

Southern Mansi was spoken until the first half of the 20th century (Honti 1988 : 148) in the southern part of Western Siberia, along the Tura and Tavda rivers (currently in Sverdlovsk Oblast, Russia; see Коряков 2022). At the beginning of the 20th century, the number of speakers was estimated at around 325, after which it rapidly declined due to assimilation under Russian influence (Bakró-Nagy 2024). Compared to other Mansi languages, the data on Southern Mansi are relatively scarce. The main work on this language is a description of Southern Mansi inflection (Honti 1975).

Today, only the Northern Mansi language is still spoken, with approximately 1,000 speakers in Western Siberia, specifically in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug and Sverdlovsk Oblast. Eastern and Western Mansi became extinct in the 20th and early 21st centuries, respectively. Southern Mansi, owing to its geographical location, was exposed to substantial Tatar influence, which resulted in extensive lexical borrowing (Keresztes 1998 : 422). Southern Mansi is also described as the most conservative Mansi language in terms of phonology (Forsberg 2024 : 281). It is the only Mansi language exhibiting front-back vowel harmony, which some researchers believe to be a retained archaic feature (Skribnik & Laakso 2022 : 527). Vowel harmony is also reflected in inflectional morphology, where many markers have both front and back variants, e.g., *-nat/-nät* for the comitative case marker.

Of more relevance to our research, however, are the differences in morphology (Honti 1975; Forsberg 2024). Firstly, Southern Mansi is the only Mansi language where dual number is absent both as a verbal and a nominal category, being attested only in the case of personal pronouns: *məŋ* '1DU', *nəŋ* '2DU', *təŋ* '3DU'.

Secondly, while object agreement remains a part of Southern Mansi verbal morphology (Szilágyi 2015), there is an occasional mismatch in the corpus between the number of the object and the form of the object agreement used, such as in (1), where a plural object occurs with singular object agreement. Sherwood (1996 : 244) analyzes such examples and shows that there

are significantly more such mismatches in data gathered by Kannisto than in data gathered by Munkácsi, suggesting a narrowing of the system over time.

(1) *kwaark-**ət** šɛkweľäk-**ət** äm jil-pɔš-ɔnt-**ɛl**-ɔm*
crow-**PL** magpie-**PL** 1SG PRF-drive-PRS-**SG.O**-1SG.S
'I chased away the crows and magpies'
(MAX_19031224_Hunter_flk.033)

Finally, the case systems of all Mansi languages differ slightly, and Southern Mansi is unique in this respect as well, since it is the only Mansi language that has a dedicated comitative case marker *-nat/-nät*. It is absent from all other Mansi languages but is present in some Khanty languages, such as Southern Khanty.

Comitative constructions in Northern Mansi were described in Хомченкова & Жорник 2021; 2025. However, the Southern Mansi system is considerably different from the Northern Mansi system. The most obvious difference is that Southern Mansi possesses a separate comitative case marker. More subtle differences should be examined as well. Thus, in this article, we describe comitative constructions in Southern Mansi, compare the Southern and Northern Mansi systems, and determine the typological profile of Southern Mansi according to Stassen 2000; Stolz & Stroh & Urdze 2006; Arkhipov 2009.

The article is structured as follows. In Section 2, we describe our dataset. In Section 3, we present the Southern Mansi comitative markers, and in Section 4, we discuss the types of comitative constructions we investigate. In Section 5, Southern Mansi data are presented, and in Section 6, Southern Mansi comitative constructions are compared with Northern Mansi constructions. In Section 7, we discuss the typological contexts, and in Section 8, we present our conclusions.

2. Southern Mansi data

Southern Mansi data are scarce and are preserved in two archival collections: Bernát Munkácsi's *Vogul Népköltési Gyűjtemény* (Munkácsi 1896 : 322—323, 344—371, 401—408, 432—433) and Artturi Kannisto's *Wogulische Volksdichtung* (Kannisto 1951 : 127—130, 157—158, 260—263, 322—323; 1955 : 3; 1956 : 154—201; 1958 : 395—397; 1963 : 89—90, 129—130, 186, 202). These researchers conducted fieldwork in Western Siberia at the end of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th centuries, when Southern Mansi was still spoken, and recorded Southern Mansi texts in the settlements of Gorodok, Chandyri, Yanychkovo, Kuzyayeva, and Shaytanskaya. No Southern Mansi data are found in the archive of Valery Chernetsov (VChA), whose materials were recorded between 1925 and 1938 in all settlements where Mansi languages were spoken at the time. This suggests that by then Southern Mansi was either completely or almost extinct.

The Southern Mansi texts from Munkácsi's and Kannisto's archives have been processed within the INEL (Grammars, Corpora and Language Technology for Indigenous Northern Eurasian Languages) project at the University of Hamburg and can be found in the Tavda (Southern) Mansi corpus[1]

[1] https://inel.corpora.uni-hamburg.de/TavdaMansiCorpus/search.

(see Sipőcz & Wagner-Nagy 2025). They are also available on the Tavda (Southern) Mansi website created by Norbert Szilágyi.[2] The corpus comprises 29 texts recorded from ten speakers, containing a total of 11,879 tokens (see Table 1). Of the ten known speakers, four are women and six are men. The texts are glossed and have Russian, English, German, and Hungarian translations.

Table 1

Speakers in the Southern Mansi corpus

Speaker	Gender	Village	Texts	Tokens	Consultant
SPI	Male	Kuzyayeva	7	3446	Munkácsi
MAX	Male	Yanychkovo	7	3344	Kannisto
EAF	Male	Shaytanskaya	5	2221	Kannisto
KAT	Male	Chandyri	2	1282	Munkácsi
KAI	Female	Shaytanskaya/Chandyri	2	829	Kannisto
MMA	Male	Yanychkovo	2	539	Kannisto
MFX	Male	Yanychkovo	1	89	Munkácsi
KZE	Female	Chandyri	1	68	Kannisto
MAF	Female	Yanychkovo	1	31	Kannisto
KTE	female	Chandyri	1	30	Kannisto

3. Comitative markers in Southern Mansi

Southern Mansi has three comitative markers: the postpositions *jitəl* and *jortəl* and the comitative case marker *-nat/-nät*.

As we have mentioned in the Introduction, the presence of a dedicated comitative case marker is unique to Southern Mansi, since it is absent from all other Mansi languages. In the Southern Mansi corpus, the following variants of the case marker are present: *-nät*, *-nət*, *-näät*, *-nɛt*, *-net*, and *-nɔt*. Honti (1975 : 85—86) provides several examples of words with the comitative case marker (2).

(2) *äämp-**näät*** 'with the dog' *äämp* 'dog'
*lotee-**naat*** 'with his horse' *lotee* 'his horse'
*tamər-**ənäät*** 'with the root' *tamər* 'root'
*khɔrp-**enet*** 'with the little forest' *kaarp* 'little forest'

The choice of the variant appears to depend on vowel harmony; see *äämp-**näät*** 'with the dog' vs. *lotee-**naat*** 'with his horse.' However, vowel harmony is not consistently observed, as shown by *tamər-ənäät* 'with the root' (front vowel in the comitative case marker despite back vowels in the stem) and *khɔrp-enet* 'with the little forest' (front vowel in the comitative case marker despite a back vowel in the stem). The factors underlying this variation are beyond the scope of the present study.

The comitative case marker does not appear to combine with personal pronouns: such combinations are not mentioned by Honti (1975), and no examples are found in the Southern Mansi corpus. This is not unusual in Mansi, since the set of cases that combine with personal pronouns in Mansi

[2] https://norbertszilagyi91.wixsite.com/tawdamansi/corpora.

languages is mostly limited to the accusative, lative, and ablative cases, and examples of other cases are rare. To express other case relations, such as the locative, postpositions are commonly used. The available Southern Mansi data suggest that this is also the case in this language, with comitative postpositions occurring with personal pronouns.

The first proposed etymology for the marker *-nat/-nät* is found in Munkácsi 1894 : 264. Munkácsi analyzes it as consisting of an initial *-n*, which he compares to the Irtysh Khanty instrumental *-nat*, and a final *-t*, which he analyzes as a reduction of the comitative/instrumental *-tél*. He, in turn, connects *-tél* to the word *tail* 'full,' which can have a comitative meaning. Fokos (1907 : 22) rejects this analysis and proposes that it is a combination of the locative suffixes *-n* and *-t*, further connecting the *-n* element with the Hungarian locative marker *-nál*. Forsberg (2018 : 17) presents the marker in Khanty as the Proto-Khanty comitative-instrumental **-nat/*-nät* and, citing Honti (1984 : 40), links it to the Proto-Ugric locative II marker **-n*V*t*.

The comitative postpositions *jitəl* (variants found in the corpus: *jit*(*ə*)*l, jitəlʲ*) and *jortəl* (variants found in the corpus: *jort*(*ə*)*l, joortəl*) correspond in their function to the Northern Mansi comitative postposition *jot*. The postposition *jortəl* and the Northern Mansi *jot* are described as etymologically linked to the word *jurt* 'friend, companion' (Сайнахова 1966 : 121), which, in turn, is described as a borrowing from Komi. The etymology of *jitəl* is less certain.[3] Unlike the Northern Mansi *jot*, both Southern Mansi postpositions have the instrumental case marker *-əl* as part of their stem,[4] and this marker is not separable at the stage of development of Southern Mansi reflected in the existing data. The instrumental case is occasionally found as part of postposition stems in Mansi languages; see, e.g., Northern Mansi *urəl* 'about'.

In Southern Mansi, as in the other Mansi languages, the order of nominal inflection suffixes is number — possession — case. Thus, if the case marker were a productive affix, possessive markers in constructions with a personal pronoun and a postposition would be inserted between the stem and the case marker, such as *pölt-u-t* (at-POSS.1PL-LOC) in (3). However, in the case of Southern Mansi comitative postpositions, the possessive marker follows the instrumental marker: *äm jit-əl-əm* (1SG with-INS-POSS.1SG) 'with me'.

(3) *tämnəŋ toolmǫx* ***mäŋ pölt-u-t*** *ää suw-ənt*
such thief 1PL at-POSS.1PL-LOC NEG become-PRS-[3SG]
'We don't have such thieves'
(KAT_18880823_Copperman_flk.018)

There are situations where we find *jit* and *jort* without the instrumental marker; however, in this case, they do not function as comitative postpositions. The marker *jit* without the instrumental case is a preverb (4). In this function, it is associated with the verb rather than with the pronoun *äm* 'I', since postpositions in Mansi take possessive suffixes when used with pronouns.

[3] One of the reviewers proposed a possible link between this postposition and the Komi verb *jit-* 'put together, connect,' which is attested as a borrowing in Northern Mansi; see *jat-* 'tie together' (Rédei 1970 : 172). However, in Munkácsi and Kálmán (1986 : 179), *jot* and *jit* are shown as dialectal variants of the same lexeme.
[4] In Northern Mansi, the form *jotəl* also exists; however, it does not possess a comitative meaning and is instead a temporal connector meaning 'then'.

(4) *säät məl-ɔs, jü-min′-äs-t, äm **jit**-kait-s-əm*
week pass-PST[3SG] home-go-PST-3PL 1SG COM-run-PST-1SG
'A week has passed, they went home, I ran with them'
(MAX_19031224_Hunter_flk.039)

The form *jort* also occurs independently of the instrumental marker, with the meaning 'companion,' and is used in the corpus with the translative case (5). Note that in this example the preverb *jit* (in the form of *it'*) is also used.

(5) *tɔɔrəŋ-puu, it′-wu-l-ən ämän-mi **jǫrt**-əu?*
bear-boy with-take-SG.O-2SG.S 1SG.OBL-ACC companion-TRL
'Bearboy, do you want to take me with you as your companion?'
(SPI_18890419_Bearboy_flk.035)

In Table 2, we present the frequencies of the three comitative markers in texts recorded from different speakers. The comitative case is the most widespread comitative marker, with 44 instances occurring in texts from all speakers. The postpositions occur in the corpus less frequently, with *jortəl* occurring 10 times and *jitəl* 20 times. It is possible that the choice of a postposition is influenced by a speaker's dialect. Indeed, some speakers used *jitəl* but not *jortəl* (SPI, KAI), while some speakers preferred *jortəl* over *jitəl* (KAT, MFX). However, in texts recorded from some of the speakers (MAX, EAF), both postpositions were attested (see Table 2). The available data therefore do not allow us to determine reliably whether the choice between the two postpositions is dialectally conditioned.

Table 2

The distribution of comitative markers by speakers

Speaker	Tokens in the corpus	Village	*-nat/-nät*	*jitəl*	*jortəl*	Total
SPI	3446	Kuzyayeva	16	11		27
MAX	3344	Yanychkovo	6	6	5	17
KAI	829	Shaytanskaya/ Bol'shiye Chandyri	8	2		10
KAT	1282	Bol'shiye Chandyri	6		3	9
EAF	2221	Shaytanskaya	4	1	1	6
KZE	68	Bol'shiye Chandyri	3			3
MFX	89	Yanychkovo	1		1	2

4. Comitative constructions: theoretical background

As mentioned in the Introduction, the comitative is a pluralizing construction. According to Arkhipov (2009 : 224), "a (genuine) comitative construction (= ComC) is a morphosyntactic construction used to express a non-obligatory participant set in a given situation S, such that: (a) the predicate denoting S is not repeated more than once; (b) the individual participants making up the participant set are expressed separately; (c) the expressions denoting these participants differ in structural rank." The NP with the higher structural rank is the core NP, while the NP with the lower structural rank is the peripheral (or comitative) NP. A prototypical genuine ComC is illustrated in (6). The two NPs in (6) refer to separate

participants in the same event: Mary and Ann both participate in the event of going into the forest. At the same time, the two NPs are syntactically asymmetric, and the peripheral NP can be omitted without making the sentence ungrammatical.

(6) ***Mary***$_{\text{CORE NP}}$ *went into the forest* (***with Ann***)$_{\text{PERIPHERAL NP}}$

Comitative markers are also used in constructions that do not meet all the criteria for genuine ComCs. Following Arkhipov (2009 : 225), we refer to these as quasi-comitative constructions. In the present study, four types are most relevant: ComCs with polyadic predicates, coordinating ComCs, inclusory ComCs, and depictive ComCs. They differ in the semantic and syntactic relationship between the core and peripheral NPs.

A ComC with a polyadic predicate differs from a genuine ComC in that the peripheral NP is an obligatory argument of the predicate (Arkhipov 2009 : 230). Compare the genuine ComC in (6) with the example in (7): the sentence is ungrammatical when the peripheral NP is omitted. Thus, unlike *go*, the predicate *meet* requires the presence of another participant. The semantic relation between the two NPs is therefore determined by the argument structure of the predicate rather than by the optional addition of an accompanying participant.

(7) *Mary met* ****(with** Ann)*

Coordinating ComCs exhibit "some (or all) features of coordination proper" (Arkhipov 2009 : 234). One important diagnostic is plural verbal agreement. In (8), the two NPs together determine the number of the verb, and the peripheral NP cannot be omitted. The construction differs formally from ordinary coordination (*Маша и Петя*), however, in that the NPs have different morphosyntactic marking (the core NP is nominative, while the peripheral NP is instrumental). Coordinating ComCs are closer to coordination in their syntactic and semantic properties, although they retain the formal marking of a comitative construction.

(8) Russian
Маша *(***с** *Пет-ей*) *ходи-л-и в лес*
Masha.NOM.SG with Petya-INS.SG go-PST-PL in forest.ACC.SG
'Mary and Peter (lit. 'Mary with Peter') went to the forest'

An inclusory ComC is formed by two NPs, the first of which (the core NP) is a non-singular personal pronoun, while the referent of the second (peripheral) NP is included in the set of referents denoted by the first one (Arkhipov 2009 : 235). Thus, the peripheral NP does not introduce a participant outside the reference of the core NP; rather, it specifies one of its members. Two types of inclusory constructions can be distinguished. In a phrasal inclusory construction, the two NPs form a single constituent and trigger plural verbal agreement, as in (9). Here *мы* 'we' denotes a plural set that includes the speaker and at least one other individual, while *с Машей* 'with Masha' identifies one particular member of this set. In a split inclusory construction, the first NP is absent, but the verbal agreement is still non-singular, as in (10).

(9) Russian
Мы ***с*** *Маш-ей* *ходи-л-и* *вчера* *в* *лес*
we.NOM with Masha-INS.SG go-PST-PL yesterday in forest.ACC.SG
'Mary and I (lit. 'we with Mary') went to the forest yesterday'

(10) Spanish
Con *Juan va-mos al* *cine*
with Juan go-1PL to.DEF.M.SG cinema
'Juan and I are going to the movies'
(Camacho 2000 : 366)

In a depictive ComC the peripheral NP is a participant-oriented adjunct, typically referring to an inanimate entity (Arkhipov 2009 : 238); see, e.g., (11). The crucial difference between this construction and a genuine ComC concerns the semantic status of the peripheral NP. In a genuine ComC such as *John had lunch with Mary*, Mary is understood as participating in the lunch event: both John and Mary had lunch. In (11), by contrast, the bag does not participate in the event of coming. The sentence can instead be paraphrased as 'He came and he had a bag with him'. Such a paraphrase is regarded as a diagnostic for depictive constructions (Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt 2005 : 11).

(11) *He came* ***with*** *a bag*

The most important distinctions between the comitative constructions described above are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

A genuine ComC and quasi-comitative ComCs

Construction	**Relation between NPs**	**Omission of the peripheral NP**	**Verbal agreement**	**Example**
Genuine ComC	Additional participant accompanying the core NP	Possible	With the core NP	(6)
Polyadic ComC	Participant required by the predicate	Not possible	With the core NP	(7)
Coordinating ComC	Two coordinated NPs	Not possible	Non-singular	(8)
Phrasal inclusory ComC	Referent of the peripheral NP included in the core NP's reference	Possible	Non-singular	(9)
Split inclusory ComC	Peripheral NP identifies a member of a plural participant set expressed only by verbal agreement	Not possible	Non-singular	(10)
Depictive ComC	Peripheral NP is a participant-oriented adjunct	Possible	With the core NP	(11)

This classification provides the framework for the analysis of Mansi comitative constructions.

Section 5 examines the distribution of Southern Mansi comitative markers across these construction types. The results are then compared with the distribution of comitative markers in Northern Mansi in Section 6.

5. Comitative constructions in Southern Mansi

5.1. Genuine ComCs

The postpositions *jitəl* (12) and *jortəl* (13), as well as the suffix *-nat/-nät* (14), are all attested in genuine ComCs and can therefore be considered comitative markers. The basic word order is "X Y COM V.SG," with the comitative NP following the core NP and preceding the verb. This order is expected in an SOV language such as Mansi.

(12) *jükä tüx ääwi-t'-i* ***jitl*** *l'iem ɛrün tɔt-ɔnt*,
woman 3SG girl-DIM-POSS.3SG with bird_cherry very carry-PRS[3SG]
ɛńčüx ääw üüš-kɔr tɔt-ɔnt
old_man girl little-something carry-PRS[3SG]
'The woman and her daughter bring a lot of berries, the old man's daughter brings few'
(KAI_19040202_TwoGirls_flk.007)

(13) *nii-m kom* ***jortəl*** *koj-i*
woman-POSS.1SG man with lie-3SG
'(I went into the house,) my wife is sleeping with a man'
(MAX_19031224_Hunter_flk.077)

(14) *l'iem waat-əŋ jükä kit ääwi-t'i-****nɛt*** *il-änt-äl*
bird_cherry gather-INF woman two girl-DIM-COM go-FRQ-PRS[3SG]
'The woman goes berry picking with her two daughters'
(KAI_19040202_TwoGirls_flk.006)

In some examples with the comitative suffix, however, the word order is inverted, as in (15): "V.SG X-COM Y." Here, the verb precedes the core NP, while the comitative NP occurs between the verb and the core NP.

(15) *müüś kül küür jü-too-s-ta miśkärx-****nät*** *oxšɔr*
little house in in-come_in-PST-3PL young_man-COM fox
'The fox entered the small house with the boy'
(KAI_19040202_BoyAndFox_flk.027)

The core NP may be non-overt, as in (16), which contains the comitative suffix, and in (17)—(18), which contain postpositions in imperative clauses.

(16) *ti šɔw-t kɔɔnt-****änɔt*** *ji-skä-t*, …
this many-NMLZ army-COM come-COND-3SG
'If he comes with such a large army, (it will mean the death of my father)'
(MAX_19031208_Copperman_flk.215)

(17) *jäj-in äm* ***jit-l-əm***
come-IMP.2SG 1SG with-INS-POSS.1SG
'Come with me!'
(SPI_18890419_PoorBoy_flk.035)

(18) *miń-in ńewestɔ-n* ***joortəl*** *moorä pɔɔx-ən*
go-IMP.2SG bride-POSS.2SG with sea side-LAT
'Go with your bride to the shore of the sea!'
(MAX_19031208_Copperman_flk.299)

5.2. ComCs with polyadic predicates

The comitative postpositions (but not the comitative suffix) are attested in ComCs with polyadic predicates, as in (19)—(20).

(19) *ńǫxor nöu äm* ***jit-əl-əm*** *woo-k^{h}ot-en, …*
what 2SG 1SG with-INS-POSS.1SG beat-MD-2SG.S
'Why are you fighting with me, (you're still young)'
(SPI_18890418_Kitten_flk.036)

(20) *wäps-əm min täut-iŋ ńɔlu* ***jortəl*** *wɔx-xɔt-ən …*
son_in_law-POSS.1SG go[IMP.2SG] fire-ATTR snake with beat-MD-IMP.2SG
'Son-in-law, go and fight with the fiery serpent (and protect your wife)'
(KAT_18880823_Copperman_flk.101)

Example (21) is ambiguous. On the one hand, it can be analyzed as a ComC with a polyadic predicate, with *möŋ piiš äńčukänu* 'our ancestors' as the core NP; the verb is plural because it agrees with this plural NP. On the other hand, (21) can be analyzed as a coordinating ComC, in which the core and peripheral NPs form a single constituent controlling plural verbal agreement, lit. 'our ancestors and Russians did not mix'.

(21) *elpəl möŋ piiš äńčuk-än-u sɔpər* ***jortəl*** *ää k^{h}ɔsəltəl-s-t*
earlier 1PL old old_man-PL-POSS.1PL Russian with NEG mix-PST-3PL
'In the past, our ancestors did not mix with the Russians'
(MFX_18890417_SacredLake_nar.003)

5.3. Coordinating ComCs

The basic strategy for NP coordination in Southern Mansi is juxtaposition, as in (22)—(23).

(22) ***tɛťä***, ***mämä*** *lää-nt-et*: …
father mommy say-PRS-3PL
'Father and mother say, ("Go!")'
(EAF_19031221_TaleOfPokatikorokh_flk.039)

(23) *tiil-əəm puw-i* ***pöŋ-i***, ***käät-i*** *äitäm-k^{h}ar*,
born-PTCP.PST boy-POSS.3SG head-POSS.3SG hand-POSS.3SG person-ADJZ
puxńi k^{h}oor-i-nɔl tɔɔrəŋ k^{h}aitəl pǫn-ǫŋ-k^{h}ɔr
navel edge-POSS.3SG-ABL bear like wool-ATTR-ADJZ
'Her newborn son has a head and hands like a man and hair like a bear from his navel down'
(SPI_18890419_Bearboy_flk.016)

In his typological study of NP conjunction, Stassen (2000 : 7—8) notes that juxtaposition is a minor strategy (even though it is not rare) and usually competes with some other coordinating strategies involving overt linking markers. According to Stassen, juxtaposition "often performs a specific,

restricted, function: it is used either in 'list-like' enumerations, or in the encoding of NP-pairs which habitually go together and can be said to form some conventionalized whole or 'conceptual unit'" (Stassen 2000 : 8, with reference to Mithun 1988 : 332). Mithun (1988 : 332) further distinguishes between juxtaposed NPs without an intonation break, which tend to denote conceptual units, and NPs separated by comma intonation, which denote conceptually distinct members of a set. Since no audio recordings are available for the Southern Mansi corpus, however, these two types of juxtaposition cannot be distinguished here.

Southern Mansi has no native NP coordinating conjunctions.[5] The only conjunction attested with NP coordination is *i*, borrowed from Russian (24), which occurs only once in the corpus in this function. It is otherwise used primarily for non-NP coordination. The conjunction *ja* 'and' is likewise restricted to non-NP coordination, as in (25), and is used mainly to connect VPs or clauses. No examples of *ja* coordinating NPs were found in the corpus.

(24) *tüt'i jünipält lo-t* ***i*** *sɔwr-ət šɔx kääl-im ɔl-at*,
that after horse-PL and cow-PL all get_up-CVB be-3PL
kaar-tɔwx ***i*** *tɔwx šɔx kääl-im ɔl-at*
male-chicken and chicken all get_up-CVB be-3PL
'After that the horses and cows all appeared, the roosters and chickens all appeared'
(KAI_19040202_TwoGirls_flk.024)

(25) *koorəm maa-n*: *kit' kooro ɛnäm,* ***jɔ*** *ox kor nüün*
three place-LAT two bag 1SG.LAT and one bag 2SG.LAT
'[We will divide the grain] into three parts: two sacks for me and one for you.'
(EAF_19031221_TaleOfPokatikorokh_flk.022)

Juxtaposition is not, however, the only strategy available for NP coordination in Southern Mansi. Both comitative postpositions and the comitative suffix can connect two NPs that form a single constituent and control plural verbal agreement.

In coordinating ComCs, the comitative suffix occurs most frequently in the construction "X-COM Y," in which the peripheral NP precedes the core NP, as in (26).

(26) *čerkət-****nət*** *pɔtɔləx uk-iń k^{h}ɔrɔt-ɔxt-l-eet*
floor-COM ceiling one-LAT look-MD-PRS-3pl
'The floor and the ceiling look at each other.'
(KAT_188908_Riddles_flk.027)

Example (27) is controversial. It resembles a coordinating ComC for two reasons. First, it has the word order "X-COM Y," which is typical of coordinating ComCs. Second, the context suggests that the question concerns the location of two people of equal status, rather than the location of one person (Pilke) accompanied by another (Inichke). However, the verb has singular agreement. It is possible that the 3SG existential verb can be used

[5] In Northern Mansi, NPs can be coordinated by means of the additive particle *os* (Хомченкова & Жорник 2021). The cognate particle *ɔs* exists in Southern Mansi but, according to corpus data, it does not have coordinating functions.

with plural NPs, but no other examples of this type are attested in the Southern Mansi corpus.[6, 7]

(27) *jiiničkä-**näät** pil'kää-n kɔɔt ɔɔl*
Inichke-COM Pilke-POSS.2SG where be.3SG
("Where are the two bulls?" "Inichke and Pilke have slaughtered them and eaten them) 'Where are Inichke and Pilke?'
(KZE_19040108_Dialog_conv.018)

The comitative suffix also occurs in coordinating ComCs with the reverse structure "X Y-COM" (28), and double marking is attested as well (29). Such examples, however, are considerably rarer.

(28) [*jɔɔrlǫ kiit-əm äńčux jukä-ti-**nət***]
poor send-PTCP.PST old_man woman-POSS.3SG-COM
ɔl-ɔnt-eet, $k^hǫj$-ɔnt-eet
be-PRS-3PL lie-PRS-3PL
'The poor old man in exile lives with his wife, they are fine'
(SPI_18890420_Exil_flk.002)

(29) *staršina-**nət** k^hatči-ɔn-ə-**nət***
foreman-COM writer-PL-POSS.3SG-COM
'(Three kites are sitting at a table.) The foreman and his secretaries'
(KAT_188908_Riddles_flk.031)

Coordinating ComCs with the postpositions are likewise rare. They have the structure "X Y-COM" (30)—(31), which is identical to the structure found in genuine ComCs.

(30) *tɔɔrəŋ jukä **jit-əl** nii-nət $k^hǫm$ k^haitəl ɔl-ɔnt-eet*
bear woman with-INS woman-COM man like be-PRS-**3PL**
'The bear and the woman live like man and wife.'
(SPI_18890419_Bearboy_flk.014)

(31) *wɔx-xɔt-əm junipääl-t näjär-pöu Väńkä uxsal'-k um **jortəl***
beat-MD-PTCP.PST after-LOC emperor-son Vanka copper-man with
il-täul-əm-əs-t
PRF-fly-MOM-PST-**3PL**
'After the fight, Prince Vanka and the Copper Man flew away'
(KAT_18880823_Copperman_flk.138)

5.4. Inclusory ComC

The postposition *jitəl* is attested in split-type inclusory constructions of the form "[Ø Y-COM] V.PL," as in (32)—(34). In all three examples, there is the comitative NP (*mämäm jitəl* 'with my mother,' *juwiääwit jitəl* 'with his sister,' *mičäx jitəl'* with the girl'), and the verb bears plural agreement (*jiwä* '[we] will come,' *nauk^{h}otst* '[they] begin,' *jäng^{h}əu* '[we] play'), but the core NP is unexpressed.

[6] In Northern Mansi, the existential verb agrees in number with the subject (Bakró-Nagy & Sipőcz & Skribnik 2022 : 555).
[7] As one of the reviewers points out, another relevant fact is that only *Pilke* bears the topic marker used in this text, namely the 2SG possessive suffix, although possessive marking of the comitative NP is also possible (see, e.g., (29)).

(32) *kʰuläit′-ɔt-ən, woor-in, äm iń nänän-nel il-miń-əm,*
next_day-POSS.3SG-LAT wait-IMP.2PL 1SG now 2PL-ABL PRF-go-1SG
mämä-m ***jit-əl*** *ji-wä, nänän-mi ju-tii-länu*
mommy-POSS.1SG with-INS come-**1PL** 2PL-ACC in-eat-1PL.S.PL.O
'Tomorrow, wait a minute, I'll go away from you, my mother and I will come back and eat you'
(SPI_18890420_GirlAndBoy_flk.036)

(33) *l′oońčt-ɔxt-əm il-pajt-əs,*
cry-MD-PTCP.PST PRF-cease-PST[3SG]
juwi-ääw-it′ ***jit-əl′*** *läkänə-xt-əŋ nau-kʰot-s-t*
elder-girl-POSS.3SG with-INS doll-MD-INF begin-MD-PST-**3PL**
'She stopped crying and started to play with his [the boy's] sister'
(SPI_18890420_GirlAndBoy_flk.024)

(34) *mičäx* ***jit-əl*** *təə jängʰ-əu, təə jängʰ-əu, tol töu puru-miń-änt*
girl with-INS well play-**1PL** well play-**1PL** then 3SG back-go-PRS[3SG]
'The girl and I play and play, and then she goes back'
(SPI_18890420_GirlAndBoy_flk.020—021)

5.5. Depictive ComC

There is one example resembling a depictive ComC (35), in which the comitative suffix is used. This sentence can be analyzed as a depictive construction because it describes people appearing together with their belongings ('people appeared, and they were with their weapons and swords'). Similar examples with the predicate 'appear' are found in Архипов 2009 : 209, where they are analyzed as depictive ComCs.

(35) *jɔlt-kət-s-t kɔlx, mɔltək-ɔn šüer-än-**nät**,*
collect-MD-PST-3PL folk rifle-POSS.3PL sword-POSS.3PL-COM
tomrɔ, šärjet, kɔn jɔnk-ɔnt, kɔn pork-ɔ-nt
domra violin who play-PRS[3SG] who dance-PRS[3SG]
'(He tied his horse and turned the egg:) people appeared with their rifles and swords, balalaikas and violins, one playing, the other dancing'
(MAX_19031208_Copperman_flk.309)

The Southern Mansi corpus contains two similar contexts (36)—(37). In these examples, the words *mɔltək* 'rifle' and *šüer* 'sword' bear the attributive suffix *-əŋ* with the proprietive meaning 'having X, being with X' and occur in predicative position, as indicated by the marker *kɔr* 'PRED.'[8]

(36) *kɔlx jɔlt-kət-s-t mɔltək-əŋ šüer-əŋ-**kɔr**-t*
folk collect-MD-PST-3PL rifle-**ATTR** sword-**ATTR**-PRED-PL
'People showed up, with guns and swords'
(MAX_19031208_Copperman_flk.210)

(37) *kɔlx kään mɔltək-əŋ šüer-əŋ-kɔr-t, …*
folk many rifle-**ATTR** sword-**ATTR**-PRED-PL
'There were many people there, people with rifles, with swords'
(MAX_19031208_Copperman_flk.212)

[8] The use of *kɔr* in this function can be seen in the following examples: *sɛjim kül* 'bad house' in the sentence 'The man built a bad house again for the daughter' (KAI_19040202_TwoGirls_flk.040) and *mäšni säim-kɔr* 'clothes bad-PRED' in the sentence 'Look, his suit is bad, that's why he doesn't like it' (KAI_19040202_BoyAndFox_flk.050).

Generally, in Southern Mansi, the instrumental marker is used in depictive contexts with comitative meaning; see examples (38)—(39). The instrumental suffix itself does not have a comitative function, as it is not attested in genuine ComCs.

(38) *mičäx il-änt-äl äm-än läkänäw-**əl**, …*
girl go-FRQ-PRS[3SG] 1SG-LAT doll-INS
'A little girl comes to me **with** a doll (crying on the porch)'
(SPI_18890420_GirlAndBoy_flk.019)

(39) *šärkəś-ən muś ɔltən sɔntɔk^{h}-əl möw-u-s, ti sɔntɔk^{h}-**əl***
eagle-LAT little gold box-INS give-PASS-PST[3SG] this box-INS
l'ɔx sei ju-miń-änt
road along home-go-PRS[3SG]
'The eagle has given him a small golden box; **with** this box, he goes home along the road'
(SPI_18890420_Exil_flk.021)

The same meaning can also be expressed by means of a paraphrase. Thus, 'the man went into the forest with his weapon' can be paraphrased as 'the man took his weapon and went to the forest' (40).

(40) *kiit-əm ääńčux mɔltɔx wu-s soj-nɔ miń-äs*
send-PTCP.PST old_man weapon take-PST[3SG] sparse_forest-LAT go-PST[3SG]
'The exiled old man took his weapon and went into the forest'
(SPI_18890420_Exil_flk.006)

5.6. ComCs with a core NP in non-subject functions

The examples in which the core NP is not a subject require separate consideration.

Examples (41)—(42), containing the comitative suffix, are instances of coordinating ComCs. In (41), the core NP, which is the agent of a passive construction, is marked by the lative, whereas in (42), the core NP is marked by the ablative and functions as an adjunct.

(41) [*jiinička-**näät** pil'kää-n*] *jäkt-iim jüü-täj-üü-s*
Inichke-COM Pilke-LAT cut-CVB PRF-eat-PASS-PST[3SG]
'Inichke and Pilke have slaughtered them and eaten them' (lit. 'They [two bulls] were eaten by Inichke and Pilke')
(KZE_19040108_Dialog_conv.017)

(42) *mäləm-t-s-til, äsräil kol't-s iń jil,*
pull_out-CAUS-PST-3SG.S.SG.O devil leave_behind-PST[3SG] now PRF
*košot kol't-s [oxšɔr-**nät** miškärx-näl]*
far leave_behind-PST[3SG] fox-COM young_man-ABL
'He pulled it out, the devil now is left behind, staying far away from the fox and the boy.'
(KAI_19040202_BoyAndFox_flk.040)

The situation with direct objects is less straightforward.

In (43), the core NP functions as a direct object and bears accusative marking. On the one hand, this construction resembles a coordinating ComC because it has the characteristic structure "X-COM Y." On the other hand, the verb shows singular object agreement, suggesting that it agrees

with the core NP alone rather than with the core and peripheral NPs as a plural constituent. However, as we indicated in the Introduction, object agreement is not fully productive in Southern Mansi. The corpus contains examples in which the object marker is singular despite the object being plural, as in (44) = (1): this sentence contains a coordination via juxtaposition of two NPs, both of which are plural.

(43) *šańix-**näät*** *näjär-ääü-mi* *jünpäl joxt-s-täl*
bridegroom-COM emperor-girl-ACC after come-PST-3SG.S.**SG.O**
'He caught up with the emperor's daughter and her bridegroom'
(MAX_19031208_Copperman_flk.237)

(44) *kwaark-ət šɛkwelʹäk-ət äm jil-pɔš-ɔnt-ɛl-əm*
crow-**PL** magpie-**PL** 1SG PRF-drive-PRS-**SG.O**-1SG.S
'I chased away the crows and magpies'
(MAX_19031224_Hunter_flk.033)

There are also three unambiguous examples in which the core NP functions as a direct object (45)—(47).[9]

(45) *ɛńčüx* *tat-ɔs-tel* *jükä* *ääü-mi* *soi-nɔ*,
old_man take-PST-3SG.S.SG.O woman girl-ACC sparse_forest-LAT
kɛmlʹä itʹmäx kään tat-ɔs *ääw-i* ***jit-l***
soft bread many take-PST[3SG] girl-POSS.3SG with-INS
'The old man led the woman's daughter to the forest, [and] he brought a lot of soft bread [there] with her daughter'
(KAI_19040202_TwoGirls_flk.039)

(46) *kʰoorəm lu* *ikääl-ən,* *ääši* *Šinpɔl* ***jortəl***
three horse saddle-IMP.2SG grandfather Shinpal with
möt *solʹ-ne* *il-kiit-in*!
other earth-LAT PRF-send-IMP.2SG
'Saddle three horses and send them with his grandfather Shinpal to a foreign land'
(KAT_18880823_Copperman_flk.056)

(47) *tɔɔrəŋ-puu* *ɔšo̯ŋ* *kʰaalʹ tärčik-i-**nət*** *no̯ŋ-mənəmt-əs*, …
bear-son thick birch root-POSS.3SG-COM up-rip-PST[3SG]
'The bear cub uproots a thick birch tree (and hits the bear with it)'
(SPI_18890419_Bearboy_flk.024)

In (48), the core NP *ńor* 'belt' likewise functions as a direct object. The translation of this sentence may suggest an interpretation in which the belt and the loop form a single NP (i.e., *he cut* [*a belt with a hole*]). There are, however, two reasons to reject this analysis. First, the peripheral NP is dislocated from the core NP, which is not typical of NP dependents in Mansi. Second, NP dependents with proprietive meaning ('having X') are normally marked by attributivizers; cf. *kʰoorəm pöŋ-əp äsräil* 'the three-headed dragon' (three head-ATTR dragon) or *wo̯u-ŋ ätäm-ət* 'strong men' (power-ATTR man-PL).

[9] In (47), the peripheral NP may be analyzed as having an adverbial function, specifying the manner in which the birch was extracted: as a whole, 'with its roots.' This may be an instance of a holistic comitative construction in terms of Хомченкова (2026), in which the core and peripheral NPs form a single entity, and the peripheral NP contributes a meaning of entirety or "wholeness".

(48) *ńor jixt-s šiš-näl peeťľä-ti-**nät***
belt cut-PST[3SG] back-ABL loop-POSS.3SG-COM
'He cut a belt with a hole from his back.'
(EAF_19031221_TaleOfPokatikorokh_flk.069)

(49) *jowt-**əŋ**-ńeel-**əŋ** pɛü-m kün-tiil-üp-s pəl tiil-üp-s*
bow-ATTR-arrow-ATTR son-POSS.1SG out-born-MOM-PST[3SG] EMPH born-MOM-PST[3SG]
'My son was born with a bow and an arrow (lit. 'my son, which had a bow and an arrow'), he was born'
(KTE_19040202_Song_sng.001)

5.7. Other: argument ComC

There is one example in the corpus, presented in (50), that falls outside the classification of comitative constructions introduced in Section 4. Following Архипов (2003), this construction can be classified as an "argument ComC" since the predicate in question can govern a comitative complement. In (50), the referent of the peripheral NP has the semantic role of Patient.

(50) *ńoxǧr wäär-eem iń äm töu **jit-əl-i***
what make-1SG now 1SG 3SG with-INS-POSS.3SG
'What should I do with it now?'
(SPI_18890420_Exil_flk.027)

5.8. Summary

To sum up, all three markers under consideration — *jit-əl* 'with-INS,' *jortəl* 'with,' and *-nat/nät* 'COM' — can be regarded as comitative markers since all three occur in genuine ComCs. Their frequencies are broadly comparable (see Table 4). In ComCs with polyadic predicates, only the two postpositions are attested. All three markers also occur in coordinating ComCs, although their distribution differs: the postpositions are used in constructions of the form "X Y-COM," whereas the comitative suffix predominantly occurs in the construction "X-COM Y." Overall, the most frequent comitative marker is *-nat/-nät*; *jitəl* occurs approximately half as often, and the rarest is *jortəl*.

Table 4

Comitative constructions in Southern Mansi

ComC	***-nat/-nät* 'COM'**	***jit-əl* 'with-ins'**	***jortəl* 'with'**
Genuine	4	3	5
With core NP as DO	1		1
With polyadic predicates		11	2
Inclusory		3	
Coordinating (X Y-COM)	4	1	1
Coordinating (X-COM Y)	30		
Coordinating (X-COM Y-COM)	1		
Controversial	4	1	1
Argument		1	
Total	**44**	**20**	**10**

6. Comparison with Northern Mansi

The system of comitative constructions in Northern Mansi[10] is described by Хомченкова and Жорник (2021; 2025).

The basic comitative marker is the postposition *jot*. It occurs in genuine ComCs (51), ComCs with polyadic predicates (52), coordinating ComCs (53), and inclusory ComCs (54).

(51) *Тав юрт-э ёт ёхт-ыс*
taw jurt-e ***jot*** *joxt-əs*
3SG friend-POSS.3SG COM come-PST
'He came with his friend'
(Бахтиярова & Динисламова 2016 : 136)

(52) *Эква-пыгрись хон аги ёт анигл-ахт-и, сипыг-хат-и*
ēkwa-pīγri xōn āγi ***jot*** *ańiγl-axt-i sipiγ-xat-i*
Ekwa-Pygris tsar girl COM kiss-REFL-NPST suck-REFL-NPST
'Ekwa-Pygris and the tsar's daughter are hugging and kissing'
(Сайнахова 1966 : 123)

(53) *Татьяна Филипповна ты āги-тэ ёт тэ̄лы маснут ос*
taťjāna fil'īpovna ti āγi-te ***jot*** *tēli masnut os*
Tatyana Filippovna this girl-POSS.3SG COM winter clothes ADD
пурка юнт-э̄-г, тувыл тынал-ы-ян-э̄н
purka jūnt-ē-γ tuwəl tinal-i-jan-ēn
fur_boots sew-NPST-3DU then sell-NPST-PL.O-3DU.S
'Tatyana Filippovna and her daughter sew winter clothes and fur boots, then sell them'
(Lūimā Sēripos, 2013, No. 9: 10)

(54) *tuwəl mēn jurt-xum-im* ***jot*** *tuw ta worat-as-mēn*
then 1DU friend-man-POSS.1SG COM to_there PTCL strive-PST-1DU
ta massin-na
that car-LAT
'Then my friend and I asked to get into that car'
(ULMC: AEJ_SP_030218_lovestory)

This postposition is also attested, although only to a limited extent, in depictive ComCs (55).

(55) *ʔjeńa saγrap* ***jot*** *joxt-əs*
Eugene axe COM come-PST
'Eugene came with an axe'
(Хомченкова & Жорник 2021 : 138)

The instrumental case suffix *-(ə)l, -təl* is also attested in genuine ComCs (56)—(57). However, this use of the instrumental is considered ungrammatical by contemporary speakers (Хомченкова & Жорник 2021), suggesting that this function of the instrumental may have been lost. Similarly, Скрибник and Афанасьева (2007 : 58), Riese (2001 : 26), and Bakró-Nagy Sipőcz and Skribnik (2022 : 543) argue that comitative meaning in Northern Mansi is primarily expressed by the postposition *jot*.

[10] Many of the Northern Mansi examples we use are taken from published sources or archival collections, where the language is represented in different variants of the Cyrillic or Latin-based orthography. In these cases, we preserve the writing system of the original.

(56) *as-e-**tьl*** *min-i*
father-POSS.3SG-INS go-NPST
'[s/he] goes with her/his father'
(Чернецов 1937 : 176)

(57) *Akw ekw̯ ɔ̄l-i, pɿγ-ē-**təl** ɔ̄l-i*
one woman live-NPST boy-POSS.3SG-INS live-NPST
'One woman lives, lives with her son'
(VChA: case 54, text 12)

The instrumental suffix is mainly used in coordinating ComCs (58) and inclusory ComCs (59).

(58) *T. Ɔ.*[11] *mȯs nè-**l*** *aku̯ āni-n ūnt-s-ɿγ*
bear man Mosh woman-INS one bowl-LAT sit-PST-3DU
'A bear man and a Mosh woman sat down at the same plate'
(VChA: case 51, text 1)

(59) *mēn ruɕ āγi-**l** xal-mēn jōm-iγt-as-men*
1DU Russian girl-INS between-POSS.1DU walk-ASP-PST-1DU
'The Russian girl and I went together'
(ULMC: AEJ_SP_030218_lovestory)

In these constructions, the dual possessive marker may be used to refer to the two conjoined NPs (Murphy 1968 : 86—87), as in (60)—(61). Example (61) in particular shows that the marker does not have its literal possessive meaning ('my husband' rather than 'the husband of the two of us').

(60) *ań ōjka ēkwa-te āγi-tēn-**təl** sas rāt-s-aγ(-e)*
now man woman-POSS.3SG girl-POSS.3DU-INS both beat-PST-DU.O-3SG.S
'That man beat his wife and daughter'
(Ромбандеева 1973 : 54)

(61) *Мēн ōйка-мēн-**тыл** аквхойпулув тāл аквъёт ōл-ы-мēн*
*mēn ōjka-mēn-**təl** akwxojpluw tāl akwjot*[12] *ōl-i-mēn*
1DU man-POSS.1DU-INS eleven year together be-NPST-1DU
'My husband and I have been living together for eleven years'
(Бахтиярова & Динисламова 2016 : 13)

Finally, there is the lexeme *tāγ(ə)l* 'full,' which is used primarily in depictive ComCs; see also Sipőcz 2017. It occurs with a noun marked by the attributivizer *-əŋ* 'PROP.' It can be considered a holistic comitative marker because it contributes the meaning of 'wholeness' and is typical in such contexts (62)—(64) (see Хомченкова & Жорник 2025 for further discussion).

(62) *tār-əŋ **tāγl** nōx=xart-s-an-e*
root-PROP full up=pull-PST-PL.O-3SG.S
'He uprooted them' (lit. 'pulled them out along with the roots')
(Сайнахова 1966 : 137)

(63) *Ё̄рнкол-ыӈ **тāйыл** сӯй-ын вāнтл-аӈкв*
*jōrnkol-əŋ **tāγəl** sūj-ən wāntl-aŋkw*
chum-PROP full pine_forest-LAT move-INF

[11] T. Ɔ. — the abbreviated spelling of *torew* 'bear (white)' and *ōjka* 'man'.
[12] The adverb *akwjot* consists of discernible elements *akw* 'one' and the comitative postposition *jot*, however, for clarity we prefer to gloss it as one word meaning 'together', since the meaning is not compositional.

'Move to a pine forest with your chum'
(Бахтиярова & Динисламова 2016 : 98)

(64) *luw-iŋ lūt-iŋ* ***tayil*** *jol-uj-is*
horse-PROP SIMIL-PROP full down-swim-PST[3SG]
'He drowned with his horse and everything'
(Munkácsi & Kálmán 1986 : 278)

Because of its holistic semantics, it is difficult to draw a clear boundary between genuine and depictive ComCs with *tāγəl*. For some speakers, *tāγ(ə)l* is possible with animate NPs (65). Unlike the basic comitative marker *jot*, however, it does not function as a simple pluralizing device. When used in such contexts, it emphasizes the subordinate status of the referent of the comitative NP in relation to that of the core NP. This interpretation is particularly apparent with proper names, although such uses of *tāγəl* are rather marginal: the construction conveys that the referents of the core and comitative NPs do not have equal status; cf. (66a) and (66b).

(65) *mōt nak-t am ńāwram-əŋ* ***tāγəl*** *joxt-ēγ-m*
other occurrence-LOC 1SG child-PROP full come-NPST-1SG
'Next time I will come with my child'
(Сайнахова 1966 : 137)

(66) a. *Жēня Ӯнтя ёт ёхт-ыс*
jēńa ūńťa ***jot*** *joxt-əs*
Eugene Andrew COM come-PST[3SG]
'Eugene came with Andrew'

b. *ʔЖēня Ӯнтя-ŋ* ***тāгыл*** *ёхт-ыс*
jēńa ūńťa-ŋ ***tāγəl*** *joxt-əs*
Eugene Andrew-PROP full come-PST[3SG]
'Eugene came with Andrew' (e.g., if Andrew is Eugene's younger brother or son)
(Хомченкова & Жорник 2025 : 101)

Table 5 provides a summary.

Table 5

Comitative and related constructions in Northern Mansi

ComC	***jot*** **'COM'**	***-l*** **'INS'**	***tāγəl*** **'full'**
Genuine	OK	–	?
Depictive	?	–	OK
With polyadic predicates	OK	–	–
Coordinating	OK	OK	–
Inclusory	OK	OK	–

The functions of the Southern Mansi postpositions *jitəl* and *jortəl* are broadly similar to those of Northern Mansi *jot*, except that the former were not attested in depictive ComCs. The Southern Mansi comitative suffix *-nat/ -nät* is likewise comparable to the Northern Mansi instrumental suffix *-l*, since both are predominantly used in coordinating constructions. The Northern Mansi suffix *-l*, however, is also attested in inclusory ComCs, whereas *-nat/ -nät* was not found in this function in Southern Mansi. At the same time,

-nat/-nät is attested in genuine ComCs, unlike the Northern Mansi instrumental suffix *-l*. The latter appears to have had this function at an earlier stage but subsequently lost it. The Southern Mansi instrumental, in turn, has no comitative functions. Of the construction types discussed in this section, it occurs only in depictive constructions, as in (38)—(39) in Section 5.5. A summary of the Southern Mansi system is provided in Table 6.

Table 6

Comitative and related constructions in Southern Mansi

ComC	***jit-əl* 'with-ins'**	***jortəl* 'with'**	***-l* 'INS'**	***-nat/-nät* 'COM'**
Genuine	OK	OK		OK
Depictive			OK	
With polyadic predicates	OK	OK		
Coordinating	OK	OK		OK
Inclusory	OK			

There is also a lexeme *täul* 'full' in Southern Mansi (with the variants *täul*, *tɛül*, *tɛil*, and *täjl* attested in the corpus); see (67). This lexeme is cognate with Northern Mansi *tāγəl*, but it was not attested in any comitative constructions.

(67) *äm jü-täj-äp-iü-m* ***täjl***
1SG in-eat-MOM-PASS-1SG full
'… he is going to eat me …'
(KAI_19040202_BoyAndFox_flk.034)

7. Typological profile of Mansi comitatives

Three major typological works address the cross-linguistic properties of comitatives: Stassen 2000; Stolz & Stroh & Urdze 2006; Arkhipov 2009. Mansi comitative constructions have already been analyzed within the framework proposed by Arkhipov (2009). In this section, we first discuss the Mansi data in terms of Stassen's (2000) distinction between AND-languages and WITH-languages, which is based on the availability of a coordinating marker. We then turn to comitative/instrumental syncretism and discuss the classification proposed by Stolz & Stroh & Urdze (2006) from this perspective.

7.1. AND-languages and WITH-languages

Stassen (2000) divides languages into two main groups: AND-languages and WITH-languages. AND-languages have both a coordinating strategy (e.g., *Ann and Peter left*) and a comitative strategy (e.g., *Ann left with Peter*), whereas WITH-languages have only a comitative strategy (Stassen 2000 : 21, 23). These two groups differ in their frequency and stability. In Stassen's (2000) sample, AND-languages are approximately twice as numerous as WITH-languages. At the same time, there is a tendency for WITH-languages to develop coordinating constructions (see also Mithun 1988; Heine & Kuteva 2002 : 80—82). Thus, WITH-languages may become AND-languages.

Stassen (2000 : 26) also identifies a third group, mixed WITH-languages, in which coordinating and comitative strategies are formally distinct, but the same comitative marker is used in both types of construction. In other

words, a comitative marker can occur not only in genuine ComCs but also in coordinating ComCs in Arkhipov's (2009) terminology.

Arkhipov modifies Stassen's classification as follows (Архипов 2009 : 161):

- AND-languages (e.g., English): coordinating constructions are available, but coordinating ComCs are not;
- WITH-languages (e.g., Samoan < Austronesian): neither coordinating constructions nor coordinating ComCs are available;
- mixed AND-languages (e.g., Russian): both coordinating constructions and coordinating ComCs are available;
- mixed WITH-languages (e.g., Acehnese < Austronesian): coordinating constructions are unavailable, but coordinating ComCs are available.

Stassen's WALS map (Stassen 2013) adopts an even simpler classification than the original proposal (Stassen 2000). AND-languages are those in which the markers corresponding to 'and' and 'with' are distinct, whereas WITH-languages are those in which they are identical. Mansi is not represented on this map.

Based on the data presented above, both Mansi languages can be classified as AND-languages in Stassen's (2013) terminology and as mixed AND-languages in Arkhipov's (2009) classification. Both languages have coordinating constructions: juxtaposition is the basic strategy in Southern Mansi, while several coordinating strategies are available in Northern Mansi (Хомченкова & Жорник 2021). Both languages also have coordinating ComCs.

7.2. Instrumental/comitative syncretism

Stolz, Stroh and Urdze (2006) investigate the categories with which comitative markers are syncretized, with particular attention to comitative/instrumental syncretism. They distinguish three major types: A, B, and C. In A-type languages, the comitative and instrumental are expressed by separate markers. In B-type languages, a single marker expresses both comitative and instrumental meanings (like English *with*). C-type languages are further divided into two subtypes. In the first, the comitative subtype, a comitative-instrumental marker coexists with a separate comitative marker that does not have instrumental functions. In the second, the instrumental subtype, a comitative-instrumental marker coexists with a separate instrumental marker that does not have comitative functions (Stolz & Stroh & Urdze 2006 : 102). C-type languages are relatively rare.

The corresponding WALS map (Stolz & Stroh & Urdze 2013) distinguishes three groups: identity (B-type languages), differentiation (A-type languages), and mixed (C-type languages). This classification is somewhat simpler because C-type languages are not divided into the two subtypes described above. In the WALS sample, 66% of languages are classified as A-type, 24% as B-type, and 10% as C-type.

According to Stolz & Stroh & Urdze 2013, Mansi is classified as a mixed language. This classification is based on the data in Kálmán (1976), who states that the Northern Mansi instrumental marker is used to express an instrument or an accompanying person (Kálmán 1976 : 42). The postposition *jot* is also listed among the postpositions and is translated as 'with' (Kálmán 1976 : 54).

Our data present a more complex picture (see Table 7). There is evidence that earlier Northern Mansi was a C-type (mixed) language of the comitative subtype. Contemporary Northern Mansi, however, can be classified as an A-type (differentiation) language, since the instrumental marker is no longer used in genuine ComCs. Southern Mansi likewise belongs to the A-type, as its instrumental marker has no comitative functions.

Table 7

Types of Mansi languages in terms of Stolz & Stroh & Urdze 2013

Language	Type	Comment
Southern Mansi	Differentiation (A-type)	The instrumental marker has no comitative functions.
Northern Mansi (earlier)	Mixed (C-type, comitative subtype)	The instrumental marker has comitative functions; a separate comitative marker (the postposition *jot*) is also available.
Northern Mansi (contemporary)	Differentiation (A-type)	The instrumental marker has no comitative functions.

8. Conclusion

This study has described the system of comitative markers in the extinct Southern Mansi language on the basis of corpus data and compared it with the comitative system of Northern Mansi, which is still spoken today. The typological profiles of both languages were then established with reference to Stassen 2000, Stolz & Stroh & Urdze 2006, and Arkhipov 2009.

Southern Mansi has three comitative markers: the postpositions *jitəl* and *jortəl* and the suffix *-nat/-nät*. All three occur in genuine ComCs. Unlike the postpositions, the comitative suffix cannot attach to personal pronoun stems.

In addition to genuine ComCs, the postpositions are also attested in ComCs with polyadic predicates and in coordinating ComCs, where they occur in the structure "X Y-COM." The postposition *jitəl* is additionally attested in split-type inclusory ComCs. The suffix *-nat/-nät*, by contrast, occurs predominantly in coordinating ComCs with the structure "X-COM Y." The use of comitative markers in these "quasi"-ComCs is typologically widespread.

Northern Mansi lacks a comitative case marker, and its basic comitative marker is the postposition *jot*. This marker occurs in genuine ComCs, ComCs with polyadic predicates, coordinating ComCs, and inclusory ComCs in Arkhipov's (2009) classification. It is cognate with the Southern Mansi postpositions *jitəl* and *jortəl*, which have a similar distribution.

The instrumental case marker in Northern Mansi appears to have had comitative functions at an earlier stage, but this function has apparently been lost. In contemporary Northern Mansi, the instrumental is mainly used in coordinating and inclusory constructions.

The instrumental marker in Southern Mansi has no comitative functions. Its functions in coordinating constructions are fulfilled by the comitative suffix *-nat/-nät*. The instrumental is attested in depictive constructions ('come with a bag'), whereas Northern Mansi primarily uses the lexeme *tāγəl* 'full' in such contexts. The cognate Southern Mansi lexeme *täul* 'full,' with the

variants *täul*, *tɛül*, *tɛil*, and *täjl* in the corpus, was not attested in comitative constructions.

In terms of Stassen (2000), as modified by Arkhipov (2009), both Mansi languages are mixed AND-languages, since both have coordinating constructions as well as coordinating ComCs.

In terms of the classification of Stolz & Stroh & Urdze 2006; 2013, Southern Mansi is a language with differentiation (A-type), since it has separate comitative and instrumental markers. Contemporary Northern Mansi likewise belongs to this type, as the instrumental marker no longer has comitative functions. Earlier Northern Mansi, however, appears to have been a mixed language (C-type, comitative subtype), since the instrumental marker had comitative functions while a separate comitative marker, the postposition *jot*, was also available.

Data availability statement: Data are contained within the article.

Acknowledgments. The research has been supported by the Russian Science Foundation (project No. 22-18-00285-П, Lomonosov Moscow State University). We would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable suggestions and for pointing us to some useful references, which we included in the article.

The publication costs of this article were covered by the Estonian Academy of Sciences.

Addresses

Irina Khomchenkova
Lomonosov Moscow State University (Moscow)
E-mail: irina.khomchenkova@yandex.ru

Daria Zhornik
Institute of Linguistics, RAS (Moscow)
E-mail: daria.zhornik@yandex.ru

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 — 1st, 2nd, 3rd person; ABL — ablative; ACC — accusative; ADD — additive; ADJZ — adjectivizer; ASP — aspectual marker; ATTR — attributivizer; CAUS — causative; COM — comitative; COND — conditional; CVB — converb; DEF — definite; DIM — diminutive; DU — dual; EMPH — emphatic particle; FRQ — frequentative; IMP — imperative; INF — infinitive; INS — instrumental; LAT — lative; LOC — locative; M — masculine; MD — middle voice; MOM — momentative; NEG — negation; NMLZ — nominalization; NOM — nominative; NPST — non-past tense; O — object marker; OBL — oblique form; PASS — passive voice; PL — plural; POSS — possessive; PRED — predicative; PRF — perfective; PROP — proprietive; PRS — present tense; PST — past tense; PTCL — particle; PTCP — participle; REFL — reflexive; S — subject marker; SG — singular; SIMIL — similative; TRL — translative.

Lūimā Sēripos — The newspaper "Лӯимā Сэ̄рипос" in Northern Mansi. https://khanty-yasang.ru/luima-seripos; **ULMC** — D. Zhornik, S. Pokrovskaya, V. Kharitonov, Upper Lozva Mansi Corpus. Available upon request; **VChA** — V. Chernetsov's archive. V. M. Florinsky Museum of the History, Archaeology and Ethnography of Siberia, exhibit 869.

REFERENCES

Arkhipov, Alexandre 2009, Comitative as a cross-linguistically valid category. — New Challenges in Typology. Transcending the Borders and Refining the Distinctions, Berlin—New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 223—246.

Bakró-Nagy, Marianne 2024, 19th century fieldwork methodology in Southern Mansi and the reliability of data [Presentation]. https://www.babel.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/media/downloads/bakro-nagy_leiden_presentation.pdf.
Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Sipőcz, Katalin & Skribnik, Elena 2022, North Mansi. — The Oxford Guide to the Uralic languages, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 537—564.
Camacho, José 2000, Structural restrictions on comitative coordination. — Linguistic Inquiry 31 (2), 366—375.
Fokos, Dávid 1907, A *-nál* rag eredete. — Magyar Nyelvőr 36, 22—23.
Forsberg, Ulla-Maija 2018, Short Grammatical Description of Khanty. — Ostiacica, Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society (Manuscripta Castreniana, Linguistica V), 11—37.
—— 2024, Mansi dialects. — The Languages and Linguistics of Northern Asia. Volume 1: Language Families, Berlin—Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 281—304.
Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania 2002, World Lexicon of Grammaticalization, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Himmelmann, Nikolaus & Schultze-Berndt, Eva 2005, Issues in the syntax and semantics of participant-oriented adjuncts: An introduction. — Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1—67.
Honti, László 1975, System der paradigmatischen Suffixmorpheme des Wogulischen Dialektes an der Tawda, Berlin—Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
—— 1984, Chrestomathia Ostiacica, Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
—— 1988, Die obugrischen Sprachen I: Die wogulische Sprache. — The Uralic Languages: Description, History and Foreign Influences, Leiden: Brill, 147—171.
Kálmán, Béla 1976, Chrestomathia Vogulica, Budapest: Tankönyvk.
Kannisto, Artturi 1951, Wogulische Volksdichtung. Gesammelt und übersetzt von Artturi Kannisto, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Matti Liimola. I. Band. Texte mythischen Inhalts, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura (MSFOu 101).
—— 1955, Wogulische Volksdichtung. Gesammelt und übersetzt von Artturi Kannisto, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Matti Liimola. II. Band. Kriegs- und Heldensagen, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura (MSFOu 109).
—— 1956, Wogulische Volksdichtung. Gesammelt und übersetzt von Artturi Kannisto, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Matti Liimola. III. Band. Märchen, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura (MSFOu 111).
—— 1958, Wogulische Volksdichtung. Gesammelt und übersetzt von Artturi Kannisto, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Matti Liimola. IV. Band. Bärenlieder, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura (MSFOu 114).
—— 1963, Wogulische Volksdichtung gesammelt und übersetzt von Artturi Kannisto, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Matti Liimola. VI. Band. Schicksalslieder, Klagelieder, Kinderreime, Rätsel, Verschiedenes, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura (MSFOu 134).
Keresztes, László 1998, Mansi. — The Uralic Languages, London—New York: Routledge, 387—427.
Mithun, Marianne 1988, The grammaticalization of coordination. — Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 331—359.
Munkácsi Bernát 1894, A vogul nyelvjárások szóragozásukban ismertetve. — Ugor füzetek 11, Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
—— 1896, Vogul népköltési gyűjtemény IV/1. Életképek: sorsénekek, vitézi énekek, állati énekek. Néprajzi apróságok. A vogul föld helynevei, Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
Munkácsi, Bernát & Kálmán, Béla 1986, Wogulisches Wörterbuch, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Murphy, Lawrence 1968, Sosva Vogul Grammar. PhD thesis, Bloomington: Indiana University.
Rédei, Károly 1970, Die syrjänischen Lehnwörter im Wogulischen, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Riese, Timothy 2001, Vogul, München: Lincom Europa.
Sherwood, Peter 1996, Megjegyzések a tavdai vogul végnapjairól. — CIFU VIII. Pars IV, 244—248.
Sipőcz Katalin 2017, Még egyszer a *-stul/-stül* toldalékról egy manysi grammatikalizációs folyamat tükrében. — Nyelvelmélet és diakrónia 3, Budapest—Piliscsaba: Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem BTK, 126—136.

Sipőcz, Katalin & Wagner-Nagy, Beáta 2025, INEL Tavda Mansi Corpus. Version 1.0. Publication date 2025-05-15. Archived at Universität Hamburg. https://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-FE69-6; https://inel.corpora.uni-hamburg.de/TavdaMansiCorpus/search.
Skribnik, Elena & Laakso, Johanna 2022, Ugric: General introduction. — The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 523—536.
Stassen, Leon 2000, AND-languages and WITH-languages. — Linguistic Typology 4 (1), 1—54.
—— 2013, Noun Phrase Conjunction. — WALS Online (v2020.4) [Data set]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13950591; http://wals.info/chapter/63.
Stolz, Thomas & Stroh, Cornelia & Urdze, Aina 2006, On Comitatives and Related Categories. A Typological Study with Special Focus on the Languages of Europe, Berlin—New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
—— 2013, Comitatives and Instrumentals. — WALS Online (v2020.4) [Data set]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13950591; http://wals.info/chapter/52.
Szilágyi Norbert 2015, A déli manysi tárgyjelölés szintaktikai szempontú vizsgálata. — LINGDOK 14. Nyelvészdoktoranduszok dolgozatai, Szeged: Szegedi Tudományegyetem, 199—220.
Архипов А. В. 2003, Проблемы автоматического анализа комитативных групп в русском языке. — Компьютерная лингвистика и интеллектуальные технологии. Труды Международной конференции Диалог'2003 (Протвино, 11—16 июня 2003 г.), Москва: Наука, 36—42.
—— 2009, Типология комитативных конструкций, Москва: Знак.
Бахтиярова Т. П. & Динисламова С. С. 2016, Мансийско-русский словарь (верхне-лозьвинский диалект), Тюмень: ООО «Формат».
Коряков Ю. Б. 2022, Изменение этноязыковой территории западных и южных манси в XVII—XX вв. Часть I. Предуралье и бассейн Туры. — Урало-алтайские исследования 2, 58—78.
Ромбандеева Е. И. 1973, Мансийский (вогульский) язык, Москва: Наука.
Сайнахова А. Н. 1966, Служебные слова в мансийском языке. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, Москва: Институт языкознания АН СССР.
Скрибник Е. К. & Афанасьева К. В. 2007, Практический курс мансийского языка. Ч. I, Ханты-Мансийск: Полиграфист.
Хомченкова И. А. 2026, Холистические комитативные конструкции. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук, Москва: Институт языкознания РАН.
Хомченкова И. А. & Жорник Д. О. 2021, Именное сочинение и комитативные конструкции в северных диалектах мансийского языка. — Урало-алтайские исследования 4, 125—149.
—— 2025, Комитативные конструкции с единицами *tāγəl* 'полнота' и *lūt* 'все прочее' в северномансийском языке. — Урало-алтайские исследования 1, 94—117.
Чернецов В. Н. 1937, Мансийский (вогульский) язык. — Языки и письменность народов Севера. Ч. 1. Языки и письменность самоедских и финно-угорских народов, Москва—Ленинград: Учпедгиз, 163—192.

ИРИНА ХОМЧЕНКОВА, *ДАРЬЯ ЖОРНИК* (Москва)

КОМИТАТИВНЫЕ КОНСТРУКЦИИ В ЮЖНОМАНСИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

В статье в терминах Л. Стассена и А. В. Архипова описываются комитативные маркеры — послелоги *jitəl* и *jortəl*, а также падежный показатель *-nat*/*-nät* — в исчезнувшем южномансийском языке на основе корпусных данных, и проводится сравнение с материалом северномансийского языка. Исследуемые показатели употребляются в собственно комитативной конструкции (например, 'пойти с

кем-то'). Послелоги также используются в актантной конструкции с симметричными предикатами ('драться с кем-то') и в сочинительной комитативной конструкции (со структурой «X Y-COM V.PL»). Послелог *jitəl* встречается и в инклюзорных конструкциях ('мы с Петей' = 'я и Петя'). Суффикс *-nat/-nät* используется преимущественно в сочинительной комитативной конструкции вида «X-COM Y V.PL»; в отличие от послелогов, он не присоединяется к основам личных местоимений. В северномансийском языке комитативный падеж отсутствует, и основным комитативным показателем является послелог *jot*, имеющий схожую дистрибуцию с южномансийскими послелогами *jitəl* и *jortəl*. Ранее в северномансийском языке в комитативной функции выступал также показатель инструментального падежа *-l, -təl*, однако в современном языке он используется прежде всего в сочинительной и инклюзорной комитативных конструкциях. В южномансийском языке инструментальный падеж не имеет сочинительных или комитативных функций. Он встречается в депиктивной конструкции ('уйти с сумкой'), тогда как в северномансийском в таких контекстах используется лексема *tāγəl* 'полный'. В южномансийском корпусе когнатная лексема *täul* 'полный' в комитативных конструкциях не зафиксирована. В терминах Л. Стассена, дополненных А. В. Архиповым, оба этих языка относятся к языкам смешанного типа 'AND', поскольку в них представлены как сочинительные конструкции, так и сочинительные комитативные конструкции. По классификации Т. Штольца, южномансийский язык относится к языкам «с дифференциацией» (тип A), поскольку в нем есть отдельные комитативные и инструментальный показатели. Северномансийский язык в современном состоянии также относится к этому типу, однако на более раннем этапе, по-видимому, он принадлежал к «смешанному» типу (тип C), поскольку инструментальный падеж обладал комитативными функциями и при этом существовал отдельный комитативный показатель (послелог *jot*).

IRINA HOMTŠENKOVA, *DARJA ŽORNIK* (Moskva)

LÕUNAMANSI KOMITATIIVIKONSTRUKTSIOONID

Artiklis kirjeldatakse korpusandmete põhjal lõunamansi keele komitatiivsust väljendavaid keelendeid — tagasõnu *jitəl* ja *jortəl* 'koos' ning käändelõppu *-nat/-nät* — ja võrreldakse neid põhjamansi komitatiivikonstruktsioonidega. Põhjamansi keeles komitatiivi käänet ei ole ja selle tähendust kannab tagasõna *jot* 'koos', mille kasutamine sarnaneb lõunamansi tagasõnadega *jitəl* ja *jortəl*. Varem on põhjamansi keeles komitatiivsust väljendatud ka *l-* ja *təl-*tunnuselise instrumentaaliga. Tänapäeva põhjamansi keeles kasutatakse selle tunnusega moodustatud vorme peamiselt rinnastavates ja kaasavates komitatiivikonstruktsioonides. Lõunamansi instrumentaalil seevastu rinnastavat ega komitatiivset tähendust ei ole. L. Stasseni ja A. Arhipovi liigitusest lähtudes võib nii lõuna- kui ka põhjamansi keelt pidada segatüüpi ja-keeleks (*and-language*), sest neis esinevad nii rinnastavad konstruktsioonid kui ka rinnastavad komitatiivikonstruktsioonid. Stolzi, Stroh' ja Urdze liigituse järgi on lõunamansi keel eristav keel, sest selles on eraldi komitatiivi ja instrumentaali tunnused. Samuti kuulub samasse tüüpi tänapäeva põhjamansi keel, mis varem oli ilmselt segatüüpi keel, sest instrumentaalil oli ühtlasi ka komitatiivi tähendus ning peale selle esines eraldi komitatiivimarkerina tagasõna *jot*.