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The present paper examines coordination and comitativity in Squliq Atayal and investigates the similarities and differences between coordinative and comitative constructions. It includes a discussion of the status of conjoined elements, a semantic-functional comparison, and a syntactic comparison of the two named constructions. Furthermore, based on Stassen’s (2000) classification, Squliq Atayal can be categorized as an AND-language. It is hoped that the findings may shed some light on the typological study of coordination and comitativity in Austronesian languages.
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1. Introduction

Atayal is one of the Austronesian languages spoken in Taiwan. It has two major dialects, namely, Squliq and C’uli’, with the former being more innovative and the latter more conservative. The present paper examines the constructions of coordination and comitativity in the language, specifically in Squliq Atayal as spoken in Jianshi Township, Hsinchu County.

The term coordination, as stated by Haspelmath (2004:3), refers to syntactic constructions in which two or more units of the same type are combined into a larger unit and still have the same semantic relations with other surrounding elements. The units may be words (e.g. verbs), phrases (e.g. noun phrases), subordinate clauses, or full sentences. Haspelmath (2004:5-6) further indicates that such coordinate constructions divide into conjunctive coordination (i.e. ‘and’-coordination), disjunctive coordination...
(i.e. ‘or’-coordination), adversative coordination (i.e. ‘but’-coordination), or causal coordination (i.e. ‘for’-coordination). In this paper, in order to compare coordination and comitativity in Atayal, only conjunctive coordination will be examined.

The term comitativity, on the other hand, prototypically expresses the relation of accompaniment which is often translated as ‘with’ in English. Furthermore, as will be shown below, a comitative construction may sometimes resemble a coordinating construction. However, while a coordinating construction may combine words/phrases or clauses/sentences, a comitative marker only combines noun phrases to form a larger unit.

Before we discuss the constructions of coordination and comitativity in Squiliq Atayal, let us consider the following two English sentences:

(1) John and Mary are going to Taipei.
(2) John is going to Taipei with Mary.

Note that sentence (1) containing the word and designates a coordinating construction, whereas sentence (2) having the word with illustrates a comitative construction. Comparing these two constructions, we may observe that they exhibit some syntactic, semantic and pragmatic distinctions:

(i) With respect to part of speech, and is a conjunction and with a preposition.
(ii) With respect to syntactic distribution, and may conjoin verb phrases (VPs) and clauses (CLs), in addition to noun phrases (NPs), whereas with can only conjoin NPs, as exemplified below:

(3) a. John is [singing and dancing]VP.
   b. [John is going to Taipei, and Mary is going to Tainan]CL.
(4) a. *John is [singing with dancing]VP.
   b. *[John is going to Taipei, with Mary is going to Tainan]CL.

(iii) With respect to meaning, while sentence (2) only indicates that the two participants go to Taipei together (a collective reading; i.e. the two participants simultaneously perform the named action), sentence (1) gives two readings (collective and distributive; i.e. the two participants may perform the named action simultaneously or separately), as paraphrased in (5a-b):¹

¹ Such semantic-functional differences between the constructions containing ‘and’ and ‘with’ are observed by many scholars, e.g. Stassen (2003:765).
(5)  a. John and Mary are going to Taipei together.
   b. John and Mary are going to Taipei separately.

(iv) With respect to pragmatic functions, while sentence (2) views the event from John’s perspective (i.e. John is the grammatical subject and thus the verb is is), sentence (1) views the event from both John and Mary’s perspective (i.e. John and Mary together serve as the grammatical subject and thus the verb is are).

The distinctions between coordinating and comitative constructions in English seem quite clear, as shown above. However, this does not appear to be the case in Squliq Atayal. In the following sections, we shall investigate the similarities and/or differences between the coordinating and comitative constructions in Squliq Atayal with respect to the status of conjoined elements (either NPs, VPs or CLs), and from semantic-functional and syntactic perspectives, including inclusory construction, topic construction, negative construction, and interrogative construction.

2. Status of conjoined elements

In Squliq Atayal, there are two markers that are used in coordinating and comitative constructions; namely, ru’ and ki’. In this section, the status of elements being conjoined by ru’ and ki’ will be examined.

2.1 Status of ru’-conjoined elements

Egerod (1999:ix) treats ru’ as a particle, just like the other pre-nominal markers qu’, na’, nqu’, sa, squ’, te and ki’, and more specifically he calls it a ‘particle of coordination’. Rau (1992) and Huang (1993), on the other hand, categorize ru’ as a conjunction, since it can conjoin two (or more) elements into a larger unit. The elements being conjoined are not restricted to NPs; they can be VPs or CLs as well. Below are some examples with ru’ conjoining two NPs. Note that the conjoined NPs can be kinship terms or common nouns, and that common nouns can be animate (either human or non-human) or inanimate (either concrete or abstract).²

² Atayal examples given in this paper are mostly taken from our own fieldnotes, unless specified otherwise. They follow the writing system co-claimed by the Ministry of Education and the Council of Indigenous Peoples on December 15, 2005. Most of the symbols are identical to IPA symbols except for the following: b ⇒ voiced bilabial fricative /β/, g ⇒ voiced velar fricative /ɣ/, ng ⇒ voiced velar nasal /ŋ/, n_g ⇒ consonant cluster /n/ & /g/; y ⇒ palatal glide /j/, and ’ ⇒ glottal stop /ʔ/.
(6) NP₁ ru’ NP₂
   a. kinship terms
      m-usa’=ku’ m-ita’ [yaba’ ru’ yaya’].³
      AF-go=1S.Nom AF-see father Conj mother
      ‘I am going to see Father and Mother.’
   b. common nouns (animate – human)
      m<n>wah taypak qu’ [bnkis ru’ laqi’].
      AF<Prf>come Taipei Nom old:man Conj child
      ‘The old man and the child went to Taipei (and are back now).’
   c. common nouns (animate – non-human)
      sizy-on=maku’ qu’ [hozil ru’ ngyaw].
      like-PF=1S.Gen Nom dog Conj cat
      ‘I like dogs and cats.’
   d. common nouns (inanimate – concrete)
      swa’=su’ m-tbzyeh [ngasal ru’ pqwasan] krryax pi?
      why=2S.Nom AF-come:and:go home Conj school often Part
      ‘Why do you often come and go between home and school?’ (Based on
      Hayung 2008:23)
   e. common nouns (inanimate – abstract)
      pspung hiya’ ga’, s<m>pung squ’ [maqux ru’ slaqux].
      judge Emp Top <AF>decide Loc winning Conj losing
      ‘As for a judge, he decides (who is) the winner or loser.’ (Based on Hayung
      2008:97)

When there are more than two NPs to be conjoined, ru’ may only precede the last
coordinand though it may precede all the coordinands except for the first one, as shown
below:

³ Symbols and abbreviations used in this paper are as follows. =: indicates that the following
bound pronoun is a clitic; < >: the enclosed element is an infix or its gloss; 1PE: first person
plural exclusive; 1PI: first person plural inclusive; 1S: first person singular; 2P: second person
plural; 2S: second person singular; 3P: third person plural; 3S: third person singular; AF: Agent
Focus; BF: Beneficiary Focus; Com: Comitative; Conj: Conjunction; Dist: Distal; Emp:
Emphatic; Gen: Genitive; IF: Instrument Focus; Imp: Imperative; Imp afr: Imperfective aspect;
Irr: Irrealis; LF: Locative Focus; Loc: Locative; NAF: Non-Agent Focus; Neg: Negation; Neu:
Neutral; Nom: Nominative; Nrf: Non-referential; P: Plural; Part: Particle; PF: Patient Focus;
Prf: Perfective aspect; Prox: Proximal; Rec: Reciprocal; Red: Reduplication; Rem: Remote; Rf:
Referential; Top: Topic.
(6) NP₁, (ru’) NP₂ ru’ NP₃
   f. ana’ nanu’ cyux=nya’ bir-un, yan [l-lukus, l-yamil, any what Imprf.Rem=3S.Gen buy-PF like P-clothes P-shoe ru’ l-habuk]. Conj P-belt
   ‘She buys everything, such as clothes, shoes, and belts.’ (Based on Hayung 2008:120)

   ‘She buys everything, such as clothes, shoes, and belts.’

As for the VP and CL coordinating constructions, the distinctions between them are not clear to us yet. Rau (1992:186-187) distinguishes conjoined VPs from conjoined CLs by means of the subject’s being present once (VP coordination) or more than once (CL coordination). In a similar way, this paper utilizes the criterion⁴ whether each coordinand has an overt NP manifesting the subject argument in differentiating between VP and CL coordinations; that is, coordinands without the presence of the subject arguments are regarded as conjoined VPs (e.g. (7a-b)), and only full clauses are treated as coordinating CLs (e.g. (8a-b)).

(7) VP₁ ru’ VP₂ (VP₁, VP₂ ru’ VP₃)
   a. [plquy ru’ qruyux] ngurus=nya’.
      white.AF Conj long.AF beard=3S.Gen
      ‘His beard is white and long.’

   b. [m-usa’ ngasal=mu ru’ m-aniq qulih] kryay qu’ ciwas.
      AF-go house=1S.Gen Conj AF-eat fish often Nom Ciwas
      ‘Ciwas often goes to my house and eats fish.’

---

⁴ Similarly, Haspelmath (2004:11) points out that in many languages, clausal and verbal coordinations cannot be easily distinguished. Because it is quite unclear what criteria one may use to argue whether he/she is dealing with clausal or verb-phrase conjunction, the notion “verbal conjunction” often lumps together clauses and verb phrases. Since such a distinction is not crucial to the present paper, the discussion stops here; further investigations may be left for future research.
(8) CL₁ ru’ CL₂
   a. [m-aniq=saku’] ru’ [m-ita’=saku’ biru’].
      AF-eat=1S.Nom Conj AF-see=1S.Nom book
      ‘(lit.) While I am eating, I am reading a book.’
   b. [t<m>apih tapih limuy] ru’ [m-qwas sayun].
      <AF>fan fan Limuy Conj AF-sing Sayun
      ‘When Limuy is fanning a fan, Sayun is singing.’

2.2 Status of ki’-conjoined elements

Next let us consider the status of ki’-conjoined elements. Egerod (1999.ix) regards
ki’ as a particle of inclusion and treats it as a noun particle meaning ‘also, and, together
with’ (1999:118). Rau (1992:189), on the other hand, analyzes ki’ as a conjunction
meaning ‘together with’ which ‘is used to join the subject to the noun referring to
person or person with whom the subject is doing the action.’ The present paper considers
ki’ a case marker because syntactically it only precedes an NP and semantically it
designates the following NP as having an accompaniment role,⁵ and is thus a Comitative
case marker:

(9) ki’ functioning like a Comitative case marker: NP₁ ki’ NP₂ (NP₂: personal
proper nouns or kinship terms)
   a. m-qwas qu’ tali’ ki’ ciwas krryax.
      AF-sing Nom Tali’ Com Ciwas often
      ‘Tali’ often sings with Ciwas.’
   b. wal mngka’ qu’ sayun ki’ yaya’=nya’.
      go.AF.Prf Taipei Nom Sayun Com mother=3S.Gen
      ‘Sayun went to Taipei with her mother.’

When there are more than two conjoined NPs, ki’ may only precede the last coordinand;
no other possibility is allowed, as shown below:

-----
⁵ Pre-nominal markers like ki’ in Formosan languages are called differently among linguists; for
12) and Cauquelin (1991:42), and ‘case markers’ by Li (1997). For a more detailed discussion
(9) NP₁ (*ki’) NP₂ ki’ NP₃
   c. m-qwas qu’ tali’, temu ki’ ciwas krryax.
      AF-sing Nom Tali’ Temu Com Ciwas often
      ‘Tali’ often sings with Temu and Ciwas.’

c’. *m-qwas qu’ tali’ ki’ temu ki’ ciwas krryax.
      AF-sing Nom Tali’ Com Temu Com Ciwas often
      ‘Tali’ often sings with Temu and Ciwas.’

c”. *m-qwas qu’ tali’ ki’ temu, ciwas krryax.
      AF-sing Nom Tali’ Com Temu Ciwas often
      ‘Tali’ often sings with Temu and Ciwas.’

Concerning the distribution of the marker ki’, it mostly precedes personal proper nouns or kinship terms, as exemplified by (9a-b). However, ki’ sometimes appears before common nouns that manifest human beings. For instance:

(10) ki’ functioning like a Comitative case marker: NP₁ ki’ NP₂ (NP₂: common nouns)
   a. m-qwas qu’ tali’ ki’ kneril=nya’ krryax.
      AF-sing Nom Tali’ Com woman=3S.Gen often
      ‘Tali’ often sings with his wife.’

   b. wal mngka’ qu’ sayun ki’ tmosiq qasa.
      go.AF.Prf Taipei Nom Sayun Com gum (in eyes) that
      ‘Sayun went to Taipei with that good-for-nothing.’

Furthermore, while elder and perhaps more sophisticated Atayal speakers only use ki’ when conjoining proper nouns, most young people use ru’ in substitution of ki’. For instance:

(9) NP₁ ru’ NP₂
   a’. m-qwas qu’ tali’ ru’ ciwas krryax.
      AF-sing Nom Tali’ Conj Ciwas often
      ‘Tali’ and Ciwas often sing (together or separately).’

---

6 It is interesting to note that in Huang et al. (2000) (Collection of Atayal Data and Vocabularies), out of 40,000 words or so, the word ki’ appears 38 times and ru’ 923 times. Apparently, the latter is more often used. However, whether the marker ki’ will completely be replaced by ru’ deserves future observation.
b’. wal mangka’ qu’ sayun ru’ yaya’=nya’.
   go.AF.Prf Taipei Nom Sayun Conj mother=3S.Gen
   ‘Sayun and her mother went to Taipei (together or separately).’

However, notice that the meanings of (9a-a’b’) and (9b-b’) are not exactly identical. We shall return to this issue in §3.

Though ki’ may conjoin NPs, unlike the conjunction ru’ (see (7a-b) & (8a-b)), it cannot conjoin VPs or CLs, as exemplified below:

(7) *VP₁ ki’ VP₂
   a’. *[plquy ki’ qruyux] ngurus=nya’.
      white.AF Com long.AF beard=3S.Gen
      ‘His beard is white and long.’
   b’. *[m-usa’ ngasal=mu ki’ m-aniq qulih] krryax qu’ ciwas.
      AF-go house=1S.Gen Com AF-eat fish often Nom Ciwas
      ‘Ciwas often goes to my house and eats fish.’

(8) *CL₁ ki’ CL₂
   a’. *[m-aniq=saku’] ki’ [m-ita’=saku’ biru’].
      AF-eat=1S.Nom Com AF-see=1S.Nom book
      ‘While I am eating, I am reading a book.’
   b’. *[t<m>apih tapih limuy] ki’ [m-qwas sayun].
      <AF>fan fan Limuy Com AF-sing Sayun
      ‘When Limuy is fanning a fan, Sayun is singing.’

2.3 Summary

To sum up the present discussion, we conclude that:

(i) The element ru’ is a conjunction and can conjoin NPs, VPs, or CLs, whereas ki’ is a Comitative case marker and can only conjoin NPs.

(ii) In conjoining NPs, ki’ mostly precedes proper nouns or kinship terms and sometimes precedes common nouns manifesting human participants, whereas ru’ extends its original usage and is able to conjoin all kinds of NPs.

(iii) In conjoining more than two NPs, ru’ may either precede all the coordinands except for the first one or only precede the last coordinand, while ki’ only precedes the last coordinand without any other possibility being allowed.
3. Semantic-Functional comparison

In this section, we shall explore the semantic-functional similarities and differences between constructions containing \( ru' \) and \( ki' \) in Squiliq Atayal. As will be shown below, depending on the type of verb the named construction has, different readings are obtained. That is, whether the verbs are ordinary verbs, reciprocal verbs,\(^7\) deictic verbs, AF (Agent Focus)\(^8\) verbs, or NAF (Non-Agent Focus) verbs, the named constructions may yield either collective, distributive, locative, and/or directional readings.

3.1 Collective and distributive readings

Recall that, as discussed in §1, the coordinating and comitative constructions in English may designate different meanings. That is, the coordinating construction may yield both collective and distributive readings (i.e. the two participants perform the named action simultaneously or separately), while the comitative construction only presents a collective reading (i.e. the two participants simultaneously perform the named action). Such semantic-functional distinctions also appear in Squiliq sentences containing the markers \( ru' \) and \( ki' \), as examples in (9)-(10) (repeated below) demonstrate:

(11) a. m-qwas qu’ tali’ kw’ ciwas krryax. (=9a)
   AF-sing Nom Tali’ Com Ciwas often
   ‘Tali’ often sings with Ciwas.’

   a’. m-qwas qu’ tali’ ru’ ciwas krryax. (=9a’)
   AF-sing Nom Tali’ Conj Ciwas often
   i. ‘Tali’ and Ciwas often sing together.’
   ii. ‘Tali’ and Ciwas often sing separately.’

   b. wal mngka’ qu’ sayun kw’ yaya=nya’. (=9b)
   go.AF.Prf Taipei Nom Sayun Com mother=3S.Gen
   ‘Sayun went to Taipei with her mother.’

   b’. wal mngka’ qu’ sayun ru’ yaya=nya’. (=9b’)
   go.AF.Prf Taipei Nom Sayun Conj mother=3S.Gen
   i. ‘Sayun and her mother went to Taipei together.’
   ii. ‘Sayun and her mother went to Taipei separately.’

---

\(^7\) Following Lichtenberk (1994) (as cited in Chuang 2007:77), “reciprocal verbs are defined as requiring two (or more) participants involved in the same action. These two participants may either act one upon the other … or take part in the same action together.”

\(^8\) Please refer to Huang (1993, 1995, 2000) for a detailed discussion of the focus system in Atayal.
Note that the verbs in the above sentences (i.e. *mqwaś* ‘sing’ and *wal* ‘went’) are neither reciprocal nor deictic. Also as indicated in the English glosses, Atayal sentences (11a-b) containing *ki’* only give a collective reading, while sentences (11a’-b’) containing *ru’* present a collective and a distributive reading; in other words, both constructions can entail collective readings, and only the coordinating construction may also give a distributive reading.

In addition, the Comitative case marker *ki’* gives the sense of accompaniment (as indicated by the English preposition ‘with’ in the glosses of (11a-b)); that is, the participant manifested by the *ki’*-introduced NP is not the major participant of the event but an adjunct one. On the other hand, the participants manifested by the *ru’*-conjoined NPs are both major participants of the event (as indicated by the English conjunction ‘and’ in the glosses of (11a’-b’)).

Note that the above sentences are all AF constructions. Below let us consider some NAF sentences in the language:

(12) a. tcing-un=maku’ qu’ tali’ *ki’* sayun.
    beat-PF=1S.Gen Nom Tali’ Com Sayun
    ‘Tali’ and Sayun will be beaten by me.’

   a’. tcing-un=maku’ qu’ tali’ *ru’* sayun.
    beat-PF=1S.Gen Nom Tali’ Conj Sayun
    ‘Tali’ and Sayun will be beaten by me.’

b. tcing-un=myan qu’ tali’ *ki’* sayun.
    beat-PF=1PE.Gen Nom Tali’ Com Sayun
    ‘Tali’ and Sayun will be beaten by us.’

   b’. tcing-un=myan qu’ tali’ *ru’* sayun.
    beat-PF=1PE.Gen Nom Tali’ Conj Sayun
    ‘Tali’ and Sayun will be beaten by us.’

Note that NAF sentences containing either *ki’* or *ru’, (i.e. (12a-a’) & (12b-b’)), make no semantic distinctions (nor any syntactic distinctions, as will be demonstrated by (22c) & (30c)); they present only a collective reading—both *tali’* and *sayun* manifest Patient participants instead of Agent ones, and they both get involved in the event ‘beating’ simultaneously. In other words, the marker *ki’* in sentences with NAF verbs functions

---

9 As shown here and in §3.2, the marker *ki’* may exhibit diverse functions. However, since such multifunctional features are due to the semantics of cooccurring verbs, *ki’s* in all the Squliq examples have the morphemic gloss ‘Com’.
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more like a coordinator and presents a coordinative interpretation without the accompaniment sense. On the other hand, sentences containing the marker \textit{ru’} only give a collective (but not a distributive) reading,\footnote{Our Atayal informants consider that sentences like (12a’) only yield a collective reading, and the distributive reading can only be given by means of coordinating CLs, as exemplified below: (12) a”. tcing-un=maku’ qu’ tali’ ha \textit{ru’} tcing-un=maku’ uzi qu’ sayun. beat-PF=1S.Gen Nom Tali’ Part Conj beat-PF=1S.Gen too Nom Sayun ‘Tali’ will be beaten by me, and (then) Sayun will be beaten by me, too.’} just like sentences containing the marker \textit{ki’}.

Similar situations can also be found in the following NAF sentences:

\begin{align*}
(13) & \quad \text{a. tcing-un=saku’ ni’ tali’ \textit{ki’} sayun.} \\
& \quad \text{beat-PF=1S.Nom Gen Tali’ Com Sayun} \\
& \quad \text{‘I will be beaten by Tali’ and Sayun.’} \\
& \quad \text{a’. tcing-un=saku’ ni’ tali’ \textit{ru’} sayun.} \\
& \quad \text{beat-PF=1S.Nom Gen Tali’ Conj Sayun} \\
& \quad \text{‘I will be beaten by Tali’ and Sayun.’} \\
& \quad \text{b. tcing-un=sami ni’ tali’ \textit{ki’} sayun.} \\
& \quad \text{beat-PF=1PE.Nom Gen Tali’ Com Sayun} \\
& \quad \text{‘We will be beaten by Tali’ and Sayun.’} \\
& \quad \text{b’. tcing-un=sami ni’ tali’ \textit{ru’} sayun.} \\
& \quad \text{beat-PF=1PE.Nom Gen Tali’ Conj Sayun} \\
& \quad \text{‘We will be beaten by Tali’ and Sayun.’}
\end{align*}

Again the marker \textit{ki’} in (13a-b), like \textit{ru’} in (13a’-b’), functions more like a conjunction. Thus, all these four sentences present only a collective reading: both Agent participants (i.e. \textit{tali’} and \textit{sayun}) get involved in the named event simultaneously.

Next, let us examine coordinating and comitative constructions that contain reciprocal verbs. Consider the following Atayal sentences:

\begin{align*}
(14) & \quad \text{a. cyux \textit{m-tucing} qu’ watan \textit{ki’}/\textit{ru’} temu’.} \\
& \quad \text{Imprf.Rem AF.Rec-beat Nom Watan Com/Conj Temu’} \\
& \quad \text{‘Watan and Temu’ are fighting against each other.’} \\
& \quad \text{b. \textit{m-p-cbeng} qba’ krryax qu’ mlkuy \textit{ki’}/\textit{ru’} kneril qasa.} \\
& \quad \text{AF-Rec-hold hand often Nom male Com/Conj female that} \\
& \quad \text{‘That man and that woman often hold hands.’ (Based on Hayung 2008: 249)}
\end{align*}
c. cyux m-p-kayal 'i’ lesa’ ki’/ru’ tmosiq qasa.
   Imprf.Rem AF-Rec-say Nom Lesa’ Com/Conj gum (in eyes) that
   ‘Lesa’ and that good-for-nothing are conversing with each other.’

d. m-syutas qu’ atung ki’/ru’ yupas.\textsuperscript{11}
   AF.Rec-be:relative:by:marriage Nom Atung Com/Conj Yupas
   ‘Atung and Yupas are relatives to each other by marriage.’ (Based on
   Hayung 2008:25)

e. m-p-stwahiq ngasal=myan ki’/ru’ ngasal=nya’.
   AF-Rec-distant house=1PE.Gen Com/Conj house=3S.Gen
   ‘Our house and his house are distant from each other.’ (Based on
   Hayung 2008:247)

Note that all the above sentences contain reciprocal verbs; i.e. \textit{mtucing} ‘beat each other’,
\textit{mpcbeng} ‘shake (hands) with each other’, \textit{mpkayal} ‘converse with each other’, \textit{msyutas}
‘be relatives to each other by marriage’; \textit{mpstwahiq} ‘distant from each other’. Each
sentence thus requires two arguments, manifesting arguments’ acting upon each other
(e.g. (14a-b)), arguments’ taking part in the named event (e.g. (14c)), or some kind of
relationship between arguments (e.g. by marriage in (14d) or mutual spatial distance in
(14e)). Also note that both \textit{ki’} and \textit{ru’} may appear in these sentences, and moreover,
these sentences containing either \textit{ki’} or \textit{ru’} make no semantic distinctions, as English
glosses indicate. In other words, the marker \textit{ki’} in sentences with reciprocal verbs
functions more like a coordinating conjunction and presents a coordinative interpretation
(excluding the sense of accompaniment); and sentences containing the marker \textit{ru’} only
give a collective (but no distributive) reading, just like sentences containing the marker
\textit{ki’}.

3.2 Locative and unidirectional readings

While the marker \textit{ru’} only serves as a coordinating conjunction, the element \textit{ki’}
may be interpreted differently in different contexts, e.g. functioning like a Locative
marker, in addition to being a Comitative case marker or functioning like a coordinating
conjunction. Consider the following example:

\textsuperscript{11} The reciprocal marker in Squliq Atayal is \textit{p-}. When the AF marker \textit{m-} is added to a \textit{p-} prefixed verb, \textit{p-} may either coappear with \textit{m-} or be elided; thus, \textit{mtucing} in (14a) can be \textit{mptucing};
\textit{mpcbeng} in (14c) can be \textit{mcbeng}, etc. The reason is perhaps because both \textit{m-} and \textit{p-} are
bilabial sounds. The replacement of \textit{p-} with \textit{m-} is discussed in Huang & Hayung (2008:
506-508).
(15)  *ki’* functioning like a Comitative/Locative marker

a.  m-usa’=saku’  m-’abi’  *ki’* taru’  kira’.
   AF-go=1S.Nom  AF-sleep  Com  Taru’  later
   i.  ‘I am going to sleep with Taru’ later.’
   ii.  ‘I am going to sleep at Taru’s (house) later.’

As indicated above, sentence (15a) has two readings; the marker *ki’* may serve as a Comitative marker (and thus (i) the accompaniment sense) or as a Locative marker (and thus (ii) the proper noun *taru*’ designating ‘Taru’s house’). In the latter sense, *ki’* functions somewhat like the Locative case marker *te* in (15b) which precedes a common noun *ngasal* ‘house’ designating a place:

(15)  b.  m-usa’=saku’  m-’abi’  *te* ngasal taru’  kira’.
   AF-go=1S.Nom  AF-sleep  Loc  house  Taru’  later
   ‘I am going to sleep at Taru’s house later.’

Besides functioning as a Comitative or Locative marker, the element *ki’* may serve to indicate a unidirectional relationship between the two arguments and thus be analyzed either as an Ablative (i.e. source-oriented) or Allative (i.e. goal-oriented) marker when sentences have deictic verbs like *pqsyu* ‘borrow’ and *tbzirun* ‘sell’:

(16)  *ki’* functioning like an Ablative marker
   unagat  pila’=maku’  ru’  yasa  *pqsyu*=saku’  *ki’* yumin.
   Neg  money=1S.Gen  Conj  so  Irr-borrow.AF=1S.Nom  Com  Yumin
   ‘I have no money, and so I will borrow (money) from Yumin.’

(17)  *ki’* functioning like an Allative marker
   unagat  lukus  ni’  limuy  ru’  *tbzir-un*=maku’  lukus  *ki’* limuy.
   Neg  clothes  Gen  Limuy  Conj  sell-PF=1S.Gen  clothes  Com  Limuy
   ‘Limuy does not have clothes, and so I will sell clothes to Limuy (her).’

In the two examples above, *ki’* serves to introduce the source and the goal of the named events. When *ki’* cooccurs with source-oriented verbs like *pqsyu* ‘borrow’ (e.g. (16)), it introduces the source of the event ‘borrow’ and hence functions like an Ablative marker. On the other hand, when *ki’* cooccurs with goal-oriented verbs like *tbzirun* ‘sell’ (e.g. (17)), it introduces the goal of the event ‘sell’ and thus functions like an Allative marker.13

---

12 Concerning the case marking system of Squliq Atayal, please refer to Huang (1993:55).
13 A discussion of similar diverse functions of *ki’* in Mayrinax Atayal, another dialectal variant
Before ending the present discussion, we may wonder whether \textit{ki}'s having comitative, coordinative, locative, ablative and allative functions should be analyzed as one morpheme (and thus a polysemous one) or different morphemes, and whether any grammaticalization process has taken place.\footnote{Many scholars, e.g. Stolz (2001) and Stolz et al. (2006), point out that in certain languages, comitative, instrumental, and directional/locational might somehow be related.} In this paper, it is postulated that \textit{ki'} in Atayal has multifunctional usages; that is, a one-morpheme approach is adapted, and diverse functions associated with \textit{ki'} seem to be determined by the semantics of cooccurring verbs.

### 3.3 Summary

To sum up the present discussion, we conclude that:

(i) While \textit{ru}' merely serves as a coordinating conjunction, the element \textit{ki'} has multifunctional usages.

(ii) With respect to collective and distributive readings (i.e. either performing simultaneous or separate actions), \textit{ru'}-conjoined NPs generally allow both readings, whereas NPs conjoined by \textit{ki'} only give a collective reading (i.e. performing simultaneous actions).

(iii) In NAF constructions and reciprocal constructions, \textit{ki'} functions more like a coordinating conjunction; and the named constructions, either with \textit{ru'} or \textit{ki'}, only entail a collective reading, without accompaniment or distributive sense.

(iv) Depending on the cooccurring verbs (either a motion verb, a source-oriented verb, or a goal-oriented verb), \textit{ki'} may function like a Locative, an Ablative, or an Allative marker respectively.
4. Syntactic comparison

In this section, inclusory construction, topic construction, negative construction, and interrogative construction containing markers *ki’* and *ru’* will be examined.

### 4.1 Inclusory construction

Recall that in examples (9)-(10), the marker *ki’* is used in conjoining two nouns (i.e. NP1 *ki’* NP2), proper and/or common nouns that manifest or are related to human beings. Now consider the following examples with one of the involved participants manifested by a bound pronoun\(^{16}\) (i.e. Pronoun *ki’* NP):

(18) a. m-qwas=\textit{sami} \textit{ki’} ciwas krryax.  
AF-sing=1PE.Nom Com Ciwas often  
‘I often sing with Ciwas.’

b. wal=\textit{simu} mngka’ \textit{ki’} yaya’=nya’?  
go.AF.Prf=2P.Nom Taipei Com mother=3S.Gen  
‘Did you go to Taipei with her mother?’

c. nyux=\textit{sami} m-tucing \textit{ki’} temu’.  
Imprf.Prox=1PE.Nom AF.Rec-beat Com Temu’  
‘Temu’ and I are fighting against each other.’

d. nyux=\textit{simu} m-p-kayal \textit{ki’} sayun?  
Imprf.Prox=2P.Nom AF-Rec-say Com Sayun  
‘Are you and Sayun conversing with each other?’

Notice that the pronouns in the above sentences are all plural, i.e. *sami* ‘we’ and *simu* ‘you (pl.)’, instead of their singular counterparts, i.e. *saku’* ‘I’ and *su’* ‘you (sg.)’. Also, each event presented in (18a-d) involves two participants. In other words, the plural pronouns under discussion count in the participant manifested by the Comitative marker *ki’*-introduced NP (i.e. *ciwas* in (18a), *yaya’ nya’* in (18b), *temu’* in (18c) and *sayun* in (18d)), and thus form ‘inclusory construction’. Such a syntactic property seems to be widely observed throughout the Austronesian language family (Haspelmath 2007: 15).

\[^{15}\] In this paper, the term “inclusory construction” is adopted (ref. Lichtenberk 2000, Haspelmath 2004 and Reid 2009), instead of “inclusive plural pronouns” as used in Huang (1993, 1995, 2006).

\[^{16}\] For the complete pronominal system of Squilq Atayal, please refer to Huang (1993:17).
Following Haspelmath (2004:25), the pronoun is called ‘the inclusory pronoun’ (i.e. the one denoting the total set) and the NP ‘the included NP’.

However, each of the sentences in (18a-d) may be given a second reading, as shown below:

(18)  

a. \( m\)-qwas=\textbf{sami} \( ki' \) ciwas krryax.  
\text{AF-sing=1PE.Nom Com Ciwas often}  
i. ‘I often sing with Ciwas.’  
ii. ‘We often sing with Ciwas.’

b. wal=\textbf{simu} \( mngka' \) \( ki' \) yaya'=nya’?
\text{go.AF.Prf=2P.Nom Taipei Com mother=3S.Gen}  
i. ‘Did you go to Taipei with her mother?’  
ii. ‘Did you all go to Taipei with her mother?’

c. \( nyux\)=\textbf{sami} \( m\)-tucing \( ki' \) temu’.  
\text{Imprf.Prox=1PE.Nom AF.Rec-beat Com Temu’}  
i. ‘Temu’ and I are fighting against each other.’  
ii. ‘Temu’ and we are fighting against each other.’

d. \( nyux\)=\textbf{simu} \( m\)-p-kayal \( ki' \) sayun?
\text{Imprf.Prox=2P.Nom AF-Rec-say Com Sayun}  
i. ‘Are you and Sayun conversing with each other?’  
ii. ‘Are you all and Sayun conversing with each other?’

Note that, as indicated by the two readings, the plural pronouns in (18a-d) may either refer to the total set of participants (i.e. an inclusory meaning), or refer to plural participants and the participant manifested by the included NP (i.e. an additive meaning). In other words, like Haspelmath (2004:25) points out, inclusory constructions may be ambiguous—as depicting an inclusory meaning and an additive meaning. However, it is not yet certain whether such an additive interpretation in Atayal is because the marker \( ki' \) is gradually replaced by the conjunction \textit{ru’} (recall (9a’-b’)), or because the element \( ki' \) may denote a coordinative meaning while co-appearing with reciprocal verbs (recall (14a-e)).

There is another thing that deserves further attention. All the inclusory constructions given above seem to allow the plural pronouns (i.e. inclusory pronouns) to be substituted by singular pronouns in Jianshi Atayal, as exemplified below.\footnote{It is well-known that Squiliq Atayal is rather innovative, with a lot of structural properties disappearing. The absence of inclusory pronouns in (18a’-d’) seems to evidence such an observation.}
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(18) a’. m-qwas=\textit{saku’} ki’ ciwas krryax.
AF-sing=1S.Nom Com Ciwas often
‘I often sing with Ciwas.’

b’. wal=\textit{su’} mngka’ ki’ yaya’=nya’?
go.AF.Prf=2S.Nom Taipei Com mother=3S.Gen
‘Did you go to Taipei with her mother?’

c’. nyux=\textit{saku’} m-tucing \textit{ki’} temu’.
Imprf.Prox=1S.Nom AF.Rec-beat Com Temu’
‘Temu’ and I are fighting against each other.’

d’. nyux=\textit{su’} m-p-kayal \textit{ki’} sayun?
Imprf.Prox=2S.Nom AF-Rec-say Com Sayun
‘Are you and Sayun conversing with each other?’

Determining whether the inclusory construction in Squliq Atayal as spoken in Jianshi, Hsinchu County, is disappearing merits future observation.

Before ending this subsection, note that though \textit{ru’} may substitute for the Comitative marker \textit{ki’} ((9a-b) vs. (9a’-b’)), the substitution of \textit{ki’} with the conjunction \textit{ru’} is not allowed in inclusory construction, as demonstrated by the following ungrammatical sentences:

(19) a. *m-qwas=\textit{sami} \textit{ru’} ciwas krryax.
AF-sing=1PE.Nom Conj Ciwas often
‘We and Ciwas often sing.’

b. *wal=\textit{simu} mngka’ \textit{ru’} yaya’=nya’?
go.AF.Prf=2P.Nom Taipei Conj mother=3S.Gen
‘Did you all and her mother go to Taipei?’

c. *nyux=\textit{sami} m-tucing \textit{ru’} temu’.
Imprf.Prox=1PE.Nom AF.Rec-beat Conj Temu’
‘We and Temu’ are fighting against each other.’

d. *nyux=\textit{simu} m-p-kayal \textit{ru’} sayun?
Imprf.Prox=2P.Nom AF-Rec-say Conj Sayun
‘Are you all and Sayun conversing with each other?’

A possible explanation for the ungrammaticality of (19a-d) is that the conjunction \textit{ru’} is to conjoin elements of the same status, and since the plural pronouns used here are bound forms, they cannot be conjoined with free NPs. Sentences (19a-d) can be corrected if
the corresponding free Neutral pronouns of the above-mentioned bound pronouns are used and appear in Topic constructions, which will be discussed in §4.2.2.

4.2 Topic construction

Atayal allows only the grammatical subject to appear as Topic. Below let us examine Topic construction with *ki’* and that with *ru’* respectively.

4.2.1 Topic construction with *ki’*

In the following discussion, we shall investigate sentences having the grammatical subject encoded by free nouns or bound pronouns. First, consider sentence (20a) with the marker *ki’* conjoining free nouns manifesting Agent participants (i.e. NP¹ *ki’* NP²) and their corresponding Topic constructions (20b-e):

(20) a. m-qwas qu’ sayun *ki’* ciwas krryax.
    AF-sing Nom Sayun Com Ciwas often
    ‘Sayun often sings with Ciwas.’

b. sayun *ki’* ciwas ga’, m-qwas krryax.
    Sayun Conj Ciwas Top AF-sing often
    ‘As for Sayun and Ciwas, they often sing (together).’

c. sayun ga’, m-qwas *ki’* ciwas krryax.
    Sayun Top AF-sing Com Ciwas often
    ‘As for Sayun, she often sings with Ciwas.’

d. *ciwas ga’, m-qwas sayun krryax.
    Ciwas Top AF-sing Sayun often
    ‘*As for Ciwas, Sayun often sings with her.’

e. *ki’* ciwas ga’, m-qwas sayun krryax.
    Com Ciwas Top AF-sing Sayun often
    ‘*As for Ciwas, Sayun often sings with her.’

Examining the above sentences, we note that (i) either NP¹ *ki’* NP² (i.e. the Subject along with an adjunct participant introduced by *ki’*) or NP¹ alone (i.e. the Subject) may serve as Topic (e.g. (20b–e)), but (ii) NP² by itself cannot, as illustrated by (20d–e), which seems to indicate that the status of NP² is not identical to that of NP¹, and that NP² plays a less important role in the named event (or is ‘backgrounded’ in Stassen’s terminology (2003:765)).
A similar phenomenon is also observed in sentences containing reciprocal verbs with ki’ functioning more like a coordinating conjunction (recall (14a-e)) or conjoining two NPs designating Agent participants, as exemplified below:

(21) a. m-tucing ’i’ tali’ ki’ sayun.
   AF.Rec-beat Nom Tali’ Com Sayun
   ‘Tali’ and Sayun are beating each other.’

   b. tali’ ki’ sayun ga’, m-tucing.
      Tali’ Com Sayun Top AF.Rec-beat
      ‘As for Tali’ and Sayun, they are beating each other.’

   c. tali’ ga’, m-tucing ki’ sayun.
      Tali’ Top AF.Rec-beat Com Sayun
      ‘As for Tali’, he and Sayun are beating each other.’

   d. *ki’ sayun ga’, m-tucing ’i’ tali’.
      Com Sayun Top AF.Rec-beat Nom Tali’
      ‘*As for Sayun, Tali’ and she are beating each other.’

   e. *sayun ga’, m-tucing ’i’ tali’.
      Sayun Top AF.Rec-beat Nom Tali’
      ‘*As for Sayun, Tali’ and she are beating each other.’

Again we may note that either NP1 ki’ NP2 or NP1 alone (i.e. the grammatical subject) may serve as Topic (e.g. (21b-c)), but NP2 by itself cannot (e.g. (21d-e)), which further supports that the status of NP2 is not identical to that of NP1.

Next, consider NAF sentences with ki’ conjoining two NPs manifesting Patient arguments and Genitive bound pronouns serving as an Agent participant:

(22) a. tcing-un=maku’ qu’ tali’ ki’ sayun. (=12a)
   beat-PF=1S.Gen Nom Tali’ Com Sayun
   ‘Tali’ and Sayun will be beaten by me.’

   b. tali’ ki’ sayun ga’, tcing-un=maku’.
      Tali’ Com Sayun Top beat-PF=1S.Gen
      ‘As for Tali’ and Sayun, they will be beaten by me.’

   c. *tali’ ga’, tcing-un=maku’ ki’ sayun.
      Tali’ Top beat-PF=1S.Gen Com Sayun
      ‘*As for Tali’, he and Sayun will be beaten by me.’
d. *sayun ga’, tcing-un=**maku’** qu’ tali’.
   Sayun Top beat-PF=1S.Gen Nom Tali’
   ‘*As for Sayun, Tali’ and she will be beaten by me.’

(23) a. tcing-un=*myan* qu’ tali’ ki’ sayun.
    beat-PF=1PE.Gen Nom Tali’ Com Sayun
    ‘Tali’ and Sayun will be beaten by us.’

b. tali’ ki’ sayun ga’, tcing-un=*myan*.
   Tali’ Com Sayun Top beat-PF=1PE.Gen
   ‘As for Tali’ and Sayun, they will be beaten by us.’

c. *tali’ ga’, tcing-un=*myan* ki’ sayun.
   Tali’ Top beat-PF=1PE.Gen Com Sayun
   ‘*As for Tali’, he and Sayun will be beaten by us.’

d. *sayun ga’, tcing-un=*myan* qu’ tali’.
   Sayun Top beat-PF=1PE.Gen Nom Tali’
   ‘*As for Sayun, Tali’ and she will be beaten by us.’

Note that the above sentences with NP1 ki’ NP2 manifesting two Patient participants and serving as the grammatical subject do not work exactly in the same way as AF sentences (20)-(21) with NP1 ki’ NP2 manifesting two Agent participants and serving as the grammatical subject. That is, while NP1 sayun in (20c) and tali’ in (21c) may serve as Topic, (22c) and (23c) with NP1 tali’ alone appearing in the Topic position are not acceptable with the intended meanings. A possible explanation is that when Patient argument NP1 appears alone in the Topic position, NP2 sayun and the 1st participant maku’ ‘1S.Gen’ in (22c) or myan ‘1PE.Gen’ in (23c) (i.e. the Agent(s) of the event) are left behind to form a larger unit, but they play different semantic roles (i.e. sayun serving as one of the Patients, and maku’/myan the Agent(s)). However, if NP2 sayun manifests another Agent participant like maku’ or myan, they together then represent the Agent participants of the event ‘beating’, as shown in (24a)-(25a), with their non-Topic counterparts (24b)-(25b):

(24) a. tali’ ga’, tcing-un=**maku’ ki’** sayun.
   Tali’ Top beat-PF=1S.Gen Com Sayun
   ‘As for Tali’, he will be beaten by Sayun and me.’

b. tcing-un=**maku’ ki’** sayun qu’ tali’.
   beat-PF=1S.Gen Com Sayun Nom Tali’
   ‘Tali’ will be beaten by Sayun and me.’
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(25) a. tali’ ga’, tcing-un=myan ki’ sayun.
   Tali’ Top beat-PF=1PE.Gen Com Sayun
   ‘As for Tali’, he will be beaten by us and Sayun.’

   b. tcing-un=myan ki’ sayun qu’ tali’.
   beat-PF=1PE.Gen Com Sayun Nom Tali’
   ‘Tali’ will be beaten by us and Sayun.’

The above discussion basically deals with free NPs conjoined by ki’ and manifesting either Agent or Patient participants. Next, consider sentences with the grammatical subject being bound pronouns manifesting the Agent participant(s), and ki’-conjoined NPs serving as adjunct participants:

(26) a. tcing-un=saku’ ni’ tali’ ki’ sayun.
   beat-PF=1S.Nom Gen Tali’ Com Sayun
   ‘I will be beaten by Tali’ and Sayun.’

   a’. kuzing ga’, tcing-un ni’ tali’ ki’ sayun.
   1S.Neu Top beat-PF Gen Tali’ Com Sayun
   ‘As for me, I will be beaten by Tali’ and Sayun.’

   b. tcing-un=sami ni’ tali’ ki’ sayun.
   beat-PF=1PE.Nom Gen Tali’ Com Sayun
   ‘We will be beaten by Tali’ and Sayun.’

   b’. sami ga’, tcing-un ni’ tali’ ki’ sayun.
   1PE.Neu Top beat-PF Gen Tali’ Com Sayun
   ‘As for us, we will be beaten by Tali’ and Sayun.’

As demonstrated above, since the grammatical subject is encoded by bound pronouns saku’ and sami, their corresponding free Neutral pronouns need to be utilized when appearing in Topic position, i.e. kuzing and sami.\(^{18}\)

Some similar—yet not exactly identical—examples are given below. The major participant (manifested by the pronoun here) can appear in Topic position, with or without ki’-introduced NP (e.g. (27b-e)), and ki’-introduced NP alone cannot serve as Topic (e.g. (27f-g)):

\(^{18}\) In Squliq Atayal (but not in conservative dialects like Mayrinax), some bound Nominative pronouns and free Neutral pronouns share the same forms; namely, sami ‘1PE.Nom, 1PE.Neu’ and simu ‘2P.Nom, 2P.Neu’.
(27) a. m-qwas=sami ki’ ciwas krryax.
   AF-sing=1PE.Nom Com Ciwas often
   i. ‘I often sing with Ciwas.’
   ii. ‘We often sing with Ciwas.’

b. kuzing ki’ ciwas ga’, m-qwas=sami krryax.
   1S.Neu Com Ciwas Top AF-sing=1PE.Nom often
   ‘As for Ciwas and me, we often sing (together).’

c. kuzing ga’, m-qwas=sami ki’ ciwas krryax.
   1S.Neu Top AF-sing=1PE.Nom Com Ciwas often
   ‘As for me, I often sing with Ciwas.’

d. sami ki’ ciwas ga’, m-qwas=sami krryax.
   1PE.Neu Com Ciwas Top AF-sing=1PE.Nom often
   i. ‘As for Ciwas and me, we often sing (together).’
   ii. ‘As for us and Ciwas, we often sing (together).’

e. sami ga’, m-qwas=sami ki’ ciwas krryax.
   1PE.Neu Top AF-sing=1PE.Nom Com Ciwas often
   ‘As for us, we often sing with Ciwas.’

f. *ki’ ciwas ga’, m-qwas=sami krryax.
   Com Ciwas Top AF-sing=1PE.Nom often
   i. ‘*As for Ciwas, I often sing with her.’
   ii. ‘*As for Ciwas, we often sing with her.’

g. *ciwas ga’, m-qwas=sami krryax.
   Ciwas Top AF-sing=1PE.Nom often
   ‘As for Ciwas, I/we often sing with her.’

Note that the two readings of (27a) result in different Topic constructions (27b-e). That is, the named event may involve either two participants (i.e. Ciwas and I in (27b-c)) or more participants (i.e. we and Ciwas in (27e)), or two or more participants as denoted in (27d).

And again the ki’-introduced NP alone cannot appear in Topic position (e.g. (27f-g)).

Below are examples containing 2nd personal plural pronouns and reciprocal verbs to support the above observation:

(28) a. m-qwas=simu ki’ temu’ krryax?
   AF-sing=2P.Nom Com Temu’ often
   i. ‘Do you often sing with Temu’?’
   ii. ‘Do you all often sing with Temu’?’
b. **isu’** ki’ temu’ ga’, m-qwas=**simu** krryax?
   2S.Neu Com Temu’ Top AF-sing=2P.Nom often
   ‘As for you and Temu’, do you often sing (together)?’

c. **isu’** ga’, m-qwas=**simu** ki’ temu’ krryax?
   2S.Neu Top AF-sing=2P.Nom Com Temu’ often
   ‘As for you, do you often sing with Temu’?’

d. **simu** ki’ temu’ ga’, m-qwas=**simu** krryax.
   2P.Neu Com Temu’ Top AF-sing=2P.Nom often
   i. ‘As for you and Temu’, do you all often sing (together)?’
   ii. ‘As for you all and Temu’, do you all often sing (together)?’

e. **simu** ga’, m-qwas=**simu** ki’ temu’ krryax?
   2P.Neu Top AF-sing=2P.Nom Com Temu’ often
   ‘As for you all, do you often sing with Temu’?’

f. *ki’ temu’ ga’, m-qwas=**simu** krryax?
   Com Temu’ Top AF-sing=2P.Nom often
   ‘*As for Temu’, do you often sing with him?’

g. *temu’ ga’, m-qwas=**simu** krryax?
   Temu’ Top AF-sing=2P.Nom often
   ‘*As for Temu’, do you often sing with him?’

(29) a. **m-tucing=sami** ki’ sayun.
   AF.Rec-beat=1PE.Nom Com Sayun
   i. ‘Sayun and I are beating each other.’
   ii. ‘We and Sayun are beating each other.’

b. **kuzing** ki’ sayun ga’, **m-tucing=sami**.
   1S.Neu Com Sayun Top AF.Rec-beat=1PE.Nom
   ‘As for Sayun and me, we are beating each other.’

c. **kuzing** ga’, **m-tucing=sami** ki’ sayun.
   1S.Neu Top AF.Rec-beat=1PE.Nom Com Sayun
   ‘As for me, Sayun and I are beating each other.’

d. **sami** ki’ sayun ga’, **m-tucing=sami**.
   1PE.Neu Com Sayun Top AF.Rec-beat=1PE.Nom
   i. ‘As for Sayun and me, we are beating each other.’
   ii. ‘As for us and Sayun, we are beating each other.’
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e. **sami** ga’, **m-tucing=sami** ki’ sayun.
   1PE.Neu Top AF.Rec-beat=1PE.Nom Com Sayun
   ‘As for us, Sayun and we are beating each other.’

f. *ki’ sayun ga’, **m-tucing=sami**.
   Com Sayun Top AF.Rec-beat=1PE.Nom
   ‘As for Sayun, she and I are beating each other.’

g. *sayun ga’, **m-tucing=sami**.
   Sayun Top AF.Rec-beat=1PE.Nom
   ‘As for Sayun, she and I are beating each other.’

Note that while (28b-c)/(29b-c) indicate two participants involved in the ‘beating’ or ‘singing’ event, by contrast two or more participants take part in the named events (i.e. (28a/d) and (29a/d)), and at least three participants are involved in (28e)/(29e). Again the *ki’-introduced NP alone cannot appear in Topic position (e.g. (28f-g)/(29f-g)).

Three observations may summarize the above discussion:

(i) NP1 ki’ NP2 may appear as Topic.
(ii) NP1 alone may or may not serve as Topic (depending on whether the verb is an AF or NAF one), whereas NP2 alone can never function as Topic.
(iii) Bound pronouns may not serve as Topic; their corresponding free Neutral pronouns need to be utilized instead.

### 4.2.2 Topic construction with *ru’*

Following the discussion on Topic construction with *ki’,* we shall examine sentences containing the grammatical subject manifested by free nouns or bound pronouns. First, consider sentences (30a) and (31a) with *ru’*-conjoined free nouns manifesting the Agent participants (i.e. NP1 ru’ NP2) and their corresponding Topic constructions (30b-e):

(30) a. m-qwas qu’ sayun ru’ ciwas krryax.
    AF-sing Nom Sayun Conj Ciwas often
    ‘Sayun and Ciwas often sing (together or separately).’

b. sayun ru’ ciwas ga’, m-qwas krryax.
   Sayun Conj Ciwas Top AF-sing often
   ‘As for Sayun and Ciwas, they often sing (together or separately).’

c. *sayun ga’, m-qwas ru’ ciwas krryax.
   Sayun Top AF-sing Conj Ciwas often
   ‘*As for Sayun, she and Ciwas often sing (together or separately).’
d. *ru’ ciwas ga’, m-qwas sayun krryax.
   Conj Ciwas Top AF-sing Sayun often
   ‘*As for Ciwas, she and Sayun often sing (together or separately).’

e. *ciwas ga’, m-qwas sayun krryax.
   Ciwas Top AF-sing Sayun often
   ‘*As for Ciwas, she and Sayun often sing (together or separately).’

(31) a. m-tucing ’i’ tali’ ru’ sayun.
   AF.Rec-beat Nom Tali’ Conj Sayun
   ‘Tali’ and Sayun are beating each other.’

b. tali’ ru’ sayun ga’, m-tucing.
   Tali’ Conj Sayun Top AF.Rec-beat
   ‘As for Tali’ and Sayun, they are beating each other.’

c. *tali’ ga’, m-tucing ru’ sayun.
   Tali’ Top AF.Rec-beat Conj Sayun
   ‘*As for Tali’, he and Sayun are beating each other.’

d. *ru’ sayun ga’, m-tucing ’i’ tali’.
   Conj Sayun Top AF.Rec-beat Nom Tali’
   ‘*As for Sayun, Tali’ and she are beating each other.’

e. *sayun ga’, m-tucing ’i’ tali’.
   Sayun Top AF.Rec-beat Nom Tali’
   ‘*As for Sayun, Tali’ and she are beating each other.’

Sentences with ru’-conjoined NPs differ from sentences with ki’-conjoined NPs with respect to their ways of forming Topic constructions. Notice that NP₁ and NP₂ in the coordinating construction are of equal status, and the two together form a larger unit and neither can be extracted when serving as Topic (e.g. (30b) vs. (30c-e); (31b) vs. (31c-e)), differing from NP₁ in NP₁ ki’ NP₂ that can alone appear in Topic position (ref. (20c) & (21c)).

Next, examine the following NAF sentences with ru’-conjoined NPs manifesting Patient arguments and serving as the grammatical subject, and Genitive-bound pronouns serving as the Agent participant:

---

19 This seems to further confirm Ross’ (1967) proposal of Coordinate Structure Constraint (as cited in Haspelmath 2004:28-30). The named constraint stipulates that any conjunct or any element within a conjunct is not allowed to move out of a coordinate.
Comparing the above sentences with NAF sentences (22)-(23) containing \textit{ki’}, and ungrammatical (32c)/(33c) with grammatical (22c)/(23c), we may notice that the impossibility of having NP1 in Topic position in (32c)/(33c) and the possibility of
allowing NP1 in Topic position in (22c)/(23c) further confirm that NP1 and NP2 in NP1
ru’ NP2 are of equal status and cannot be separated; they form a tight unit, unlike NP1
ki’ NP2.

Next, let us consider some NAF sentences with the grammatical subject manifested
by bound pronouns and designating Patient participant(s), and with ru’-conjoined NPs
representing Agent participants:

(34) a. tcing-un=saku’ ni’ tali’ ru’ sayun.
   beat-PF=1S.Nom Gen Tali’ Conj Sayun
   ‘I will be beaten by Tali’ and Sayun.’

   a’. kuzing ga’, tcing-un ni’ tali’ ru’ sayun.
   1S.Neu Top beat-PF Gen Tali’ Conj Sayun
   ‘As for me, I will be beaten by Tali’ and Sayun.’

   b. tcing-un=sami ni’ tali’ ru’ sayun.
   beat-PF=1PE.Nom Gen Tali’ Conj Sayun
   ‘We will be beaten by Tali’ and Sayun.’

   b’. sami ga’, tcing-un ni’ tali’ ru’ sayun.
   1PE.Neu Top beat-PF Gen Tali’ Conj Sayun
   ‘As for us, we will be beaten by Tali’ and Sayun.’

Note that because the grammatical subject of (34a-b) is encoded by bound pronouns
saku’ and sami, their corresponding free Neutral pronouns need to be utilized when
appearing in Topic position, i.e. kuzing in (34a’) and sami in (34b’), similar to the case
with ki’ as illustrated in (26a/a’-b/b’).

Now recall the unacceptability of having the conjunction ru’ in inclusory
construction, as exemplified by ungrammatical sentences (19a-d) which have bound
Nominative pronouns and an NP introduced by ru’ (repeated below for convenience):

(19) a. *m-qwas=sami ru’ ciwas krryax.
    AF-sing=1PE.Nom Conj Ciwas often
    ‘We and Ciwas often sing.’

    b. *wal=simu mngka’ ru’ yaya’=nya’.
    go.AF.Prf=2P.Nom Taipei Conj mother=3S.Gen
    ‘Did you all and her mother go to Taipei?’

    c. *nyux=sami m-tucing ru’ temu’.
    Imprf.Prox=1PE.Nom AF.Rec-beat Conj Temu’
    ‘We and Temu’ are fighting against each other.’
d. *nyux=\textbf{simu} m-pkayal ru’ sayun?
   Imprf.Prox=2P.Nom AF.Rec-say Conj Sayun
   ‘Are you all and Sayun conversing with each other?’

To help correct these AF sentences, their corresponding Topic constructions need to be used, as shown below:

(35) a. \textbf{sami} ru’ ciwas ga’, m-qwas=\textbf{sami} krryax.
   1PE.Neu Conj Ciwas Top AF-sing=1PE.Nom often
   ‘As for us and Ciwas, we often sing (together).’

   b. \textbf{simu} ru’ yaya’=nya’ ga’, wal=\textbf{simu} mngka’?
   2P.Neu Conj mother=3S.Gen Top go.AF.Prf =2P.Nom Taipei
   ‘As for you all and her mother, did you all go to Taipei (together)?’

   c. \textbf{sami} ru’ temu’ ga’, nyux=\textbf{sami} m-tucing.
   1PE.Neu Conj Temu’ Top Imprf.Prox=1PE.Nom AF.Rec-beat
   ‘As for us and Temu’, we are fighting against each other.’

   d. \textbf{simu} ru’ sayun ga’, nyux=\textbf{simu} m-p-kayal?
   2P.Neu Conj Sayun Top Imprf.Prox=2P.Nom AF-Rec-say
   ‘As for you all and Sayun, are you all conversing with each other?’

Similarly, ungrammatical NAF sentence (36a) can be corrected, as exemplified below:

(36) a. *tcing-un=\textbf{sami} ru’ sayun ni’ tali’.
   beat-PF=1PE.Nom Conj Sayun Gen Tali
   ‘We and Sayun will be beaten by Tali’.

   b. \textbf{sami} ru’ sayun ga’, tcing-un ni’ tali’.
   1PE.Neu Conj Sayun Top beat-PF Gen Tali
   ‘As for us and Sayun, we will be beaten by Tali’.

However, there are some constructions having \textit{ru’} that cannot be improved even when the grammatical subject is topicalized, perhaps because the bound Genitive pronoun\textsuperscript{20} and \textit{ru’}-introduced NP can never form a larger unit syntactically:

(37) a. *tcing-un=\textbf{maku’} ru’ sayun qu’ tali’.
   beat-PF=1S.Gen Conj Sayun Nom Tali
   ‘Tali’ will be beaten by me and Sayun.’

\textsuperscript{20} The language does not have free Genitive pronouns.
4.2.3 Summary

To summarize the discussion given in subsection 4.2, we conclude that:

(i) Either NP₁ ki’ NP₂ or NP₁ ru’ NP₂ may appear in Topic position.
(ii) NP₂ alone cannot serve as Topic in any structures.
(iii) NP₁ in NP₁ ki’ NP₂ may alone serve as Topic (if the verb is an AF one), while NP₁ in NP₁ ru’ NP₂ cannot appear in Topic position.
(iv) Bound pronouns may not serve as Topic; their corresponding free Neutral pronouns need to be utilized instead.

4.3 Negative construction

In this subsection, ki’ and ru’ in negative construction will be investigated. First, compare the following affirmative sentences and their negative counterparts:

(38) a. m-qwas qu’ sayun ki’ tali’.
    AF-sing Nom Sayun Com Tali’
    ‘Sayun sings/sang with Tali’.

b. m-qwas qu’ sayun ru’ tali’.
    AF-sing Nom Sayun Top beat-PF Nom Tali’
    ‘Sayun will be beaten by us and Tali’.

b’. m-qwas qu’ sayun ru’ tali’.
    AF-sing Nom Sayun Top beat-PF Nom Tali’
    ‘Sayun will be beaten by us and Tali’.

b”. m-qwas qu’ sayun ru’ tali’.
    AF-sing Nom Sayun Top beat-PF Nom Tali’
    ‘Sayun will be beaten by us and Tali’.

To summarize the discussion given in subsection 4.2, we conclude that:

(i) Either NP₁ ki’ NP₂ or NP₁ ru’ NP₂ may appear in Topic position.
(ii) NP₂ alone cannot serve as Topic in any structures.
(iii) NP₁ in NP₁ ki’ NP₂ may alone serve as Topic (if the verb is an AF one), while NP₁ in NP₁ ru’ NP₂ cannot appear in Topic position.
(iv) Bound pronouns may not serve as Topic; their corresponding free Neutral pronouns need to be utilized instead.
b. ini’ pqwas qu’ sayun ki’ tali’.
   Neg sing.AF Nom Sayun Com Tali’
   ‘Sayun did not sing with Tali’.

(39) a. m-qwas qu’ sayun ru’ tali’.
   AF-sing Nom Sayun Conj Tali’
   ‘Sayun and Tali’ sing/sang (together or separately).’

b. ini’ pqwas qu’ sayun ru’ tali’.
   Neg sing.AF Nom Sayun Conj Tali’
   ‘Sayun and Tali’ did not sing.

Notice that (38b) seems to mean the same as one of the readings given in (39b), i.e. the collective reading, ‘Sayun and Tali’ do not sing together.’ The syntactic and/or semantic differences between (38b) containing ki’ and (39b) containing ru’ may become clearer when we examine the following sentences:

(38) c. ini’ pqwas qu’ sayun ki’ tali’, ana’ ga, m-qwas ki’ ciwas.
   Neg sing.AF Nom Sayun Com Tali’ but AF-sing Com Ciwas
   ‘Sayun did not sing with Tali’, but she sang with Ciwas.’

d. ini’ pqwas qu’ sayun ki’ tali’, ana’ ga, m-zyugi’ hiya’.
   Neg sing.AF Nom Sayun Com Tali’ but AF-dance 3S.Neu
   ‘Sayun did not sing with Tali’, but she danced.’

e. ini’ pqwas qu’ sayun ki’ tali’, ana’ ga, m-zyugi’.
   Neg sing.AF Nom Sayun Com Tali’ but AF-dance
   ‘Sayun did not sing with Tali’, but they danced.’

(39) c. *ini’ pqwas qu’ sayun ru’ tali’, ana’ ga, m-qwas ru’ ciwas.
   Neg sing.AF Nom Sayun Conj Tali’ but AF-sing Conj 3S.Neu
   ‘*Sayun and Tali’ did not sing, but she and Ciwas sang.’

d. *ini’ pqwas qu’ sayun ru’ tali’, ana’ ga, m-zyugi’ hiya’.
   Neg sing.AF Nom Sayun Conj Tali’ but AF-dance 3S.Neu
   ‘*Sayun and Tali’ did not sing, but she danced.’

e. ini’ pqwas qu’ sayun ru’ tali’, ana’ ga, m-zyugi’.
   Neg sing.AF Nom Sayun Conj Tali’ but AF-dance
   ‘Sayun and Tali’ did not sing, but they danced.’

As shown in (38c-e), the event expressed by the added clauses may involve either the major participant Sayun alone, or Sayun with another participant (introduced by ki’).
The implication is that the named participant Sayun needs to lead the main story line (i.e. Haspelmath’s ‘topicality’ (2004:16)), with or without adjunct participant(s). Examples (39c-e) illustrate the same implication; that is, the storyline needs to be led by the grammatical subject, except that it is manifested by the two major participants Sayun and Tali’, and neither can be extracted. Consequently, the (un-)grammaticality of (38)-(39) supports the idea that constructions containing ki’ and ru’ do not function alike syntactically, though they may capture similar scenarios.

Now consider the examples containing bound pronouns that manifest one of the participants:

(40) a. m-qwas=samì ki’ tali’.
   AF-sing=1PE.Nom Com Tali’
   i. ‘I sing/sang with Tali’.
   ii. ‘We sing/sang with Tali’.

b. ini’=samì pqwas ki’ tali’.
   Neg=1PE.Nom sing.AF Com Tali’
   i. ‘I did not sing with Tali’.
   ii. ‘We did not sing with Tali’.

b’. ini’=samì pqwas ki’ tali’, ana’ ga, m-yugi’=samì.
   Neg=1PE.Nom sing.AF Com Tali’ but AF-dance=1PE.Nom
   ‘I did not sing with Tali’, but we dance.’

c. ini’=saku’ pqwas ki’ tali’.
   Neg=1S.Nom sing.AF Com Tali’
   ‘I did not sing with Tali’.

As noted in (40b-c), the negator ini’ attracts the bound pronoun samì ‘we’ and saku’ ‘I’, leaving the ki’-introduced NP behind the verb pqwas ‘sing’. Note that there are two readings given by (40b) with either two or three participants involved, but only one reading is presented in (40b’) with only two participants involved in the named event. The varying readings provided by (40b-b’) may be due to the larger context given in (40b’) and thus the second bound pronoun samì sets up the limited participants for the first samì. Some similar examples follow for further reference:

(41) a. m-qwas=simu ki’ tali’?
   AF-sing=2P.Nom Com Tali’
   i. ‘Do/Did you sing with Tali’?
   ii. ‘Do/Did you all sing with Tali’?
b. ini’=simu pqwas ki’ tali’?
   Neg=2P.Nom sing.AF Com Tali’
   ‘Didn’t you/all sing with Tali’?’

c. ini’=su’ pqwas ki’ tali’?
   Neg=2S.Nom sing.AF Com Tali’
   ‘Didn’t you sing with Tali’?’

Next, consider the following examples containing the conjunction ru’:

(42) a. *m-qwas=sami ru’ tali’.
   AF-sing=1PE.Nom Conj Tali’
   ‘We and Tali’ sing.’

b. *ini’=sami pqwas ru’ tali’.
   Neg=1PE.Nom sing.AF Conj Tali’
   ‘We and Tali’ did not sing.’

c. *ini’=saku’ pqwas ru’ tali’.
   Neg=1S.Nom sing.AF Conj Tali’
   ‘Tali’ and I did not sing.’

As noted above, none of sentences (42a-c) are correct, perhaps because: (i) the bound pronoun sami and the free NP introduced by ru’ cannot form a larger unit, as stated earlier; and (ii) the bound pronoun sami is attracted to the negator and is separated from the ru’-introduced NP, which renders ungrammatical sentences. The free Neutral pronouns may help correct such sentences, as shown below:

(42) a’. m-qwas qu’ sami ru’ tali’.
   AF-sing Nom 1PE.Neu Conj Tali’
   ‘We and Tali’ sing.’

b’. ini’ pqwas qu’ sami ru’ tali’.
   Neg sing.AF Nom 1PE.Neu Conj Tali’
   ‘We and Tali’ didn’t sing (together or separately).’

c’. ini’ pqwas qu’ kun ru’ tali’.
   Neg sing.AF Nom 1S.Neu Conj Tali’
   ‘Tali’ and I didn’t sing (together or separately).’

To conclude this subsection, we note that:
(i) In negative construction containing NP$_1$ ki’ NP$_2$, either NP$_1$ & NP$_2$, NP$_2$, or the named event can be negated, whereas in negative construction containing NP$_1$ ru’ NP$_2$, only the named event can be negated.

(ii) The negative counterpart of an inclusory construction has its bound pronoun attached to the negator, leaving the ki’-introduced NP alone behind the verb. On the other hand, while a sentence does not allow the cooccurrence of a bound pronoun and an NP conjoined by ru’, the corresponding free Neutral pronoun is used in forming such a sentence and its negative counterpart.

4.4 Interrogative construction

The last syntactic structure to be examined is interrogative construction containing the markers ru’ and ki’. First, consider the following question with the interrogative word ima’ ‘who’:

(43) a. ima’ m-usa’ mngka’?
   who AF-go Taipei
   ‘Who will go to Taipei?’

Notice that (43a) is actually an equational construction with the Nominative case marker qu’ often being omitted in oral speech. Its complete form follows:

(43) a’. ima’ qu’ m-usa’ mngka’?
    who Nom AF-go Taipei
   ‘(lit.) Who is the one that will go to Taipei? / Who will go to Taipei?’

In reply to questions (43a-a’), the following are used:

(43) b. sayun ru’ tali’ qu’ m-usa’ mngka’.
   Sayun Conj Tali’ Nom AF-go Taipei
   ‘(lit.) Sayun and Tali’ are the ones that will go to Taipei. / Sayun and Tali’ will go to Taipei.’

b’. sayun ru’ tali’ m-usa’ mngka’.
   Sayun Conj Tali’ AF-go Taipei
   ‘(lit.) Sayun and Tali’ are the ones that will go to Taipei. / Sayun and Tali’ will go to Taipei.’

b”. sayun ru’ tali’.
   Sayun Conj Tali’
   ‘Sayun and Tali’.’
The above responses either use *ru’* or *ki’* in conjoining two NPs manifesting involved participants, with the Nominative case marker *qu’* (i.e. (43b-c)), or without *qu’* (i.e. (43b’-c’)), or short responses (i.e. (43b’″-c’″)) respectively. As demonstrated here, responses containing *ru’* and *ki’* do not seem to present clear semantic-functional distinctions. Also, note that (43b) and (43c) are equational sentences (like (43a’)), and the conjoined NPs (i.e. *sayun ru’ tali’* in (43b-b’) and *sayun ki’ tali’* in (43c-c’)) serve as the predicate and appear in the sentence-initial position.

Similar examples with an additional auxiliary *cyux* and/or a reciprocal verb *mtucing* ‘beat each other’ are given below for further illustration:

(44) a. *ima’* (*qu’*) *cyux* m-qwas?
   *Who Nom Imprf.Dist AF-sing*
   ‘Who is singing?’

   b. *temu’* *ru’* *sayun* (*qu’*) *cyux* m-qwas.
   *Temu’ Conj Sayun Nom Imprf.Dist AF-sing*
   ‘(lit.) Temu’ and Sayun are the ones that are singing. / Temu’ and Sayun are singing.’

   c. *temu’* *ki’* *Sayun* (*qu’*) *cyux* m-qwas.
   *Temu’ Com Sayun Nom Imprf.Dist AF-sing*
   ‘(lit.) Temu’ and Sayun are the ones that are singing. / Temu’ and Sayun are singing.’

(45) a. *ima’* (*qu’*) *cyux* m-tucing?
   *Who Nom Imprf.Dist AF.Rec-beat*
   ‘Who are fighting?’
b. tali’ ru’ wilang (qu’) cyux m-tucing.
Tali’ Conj Wilang Nom Imprf.Dist AF.Rec-beat
‘(lit.) Tali’ and Wilang are the ones that are fighting against each other. / Tali’ and Wilang are fighting against each other.’

c. tali’ ki’ wilang (qu’) cyux m-tucing.
Tali’ Com Wilang Nom Imprf.Dist AF.Rec-beat
‘(lit.) Tali’ and Wilang are the ones that are fighting against each other. / Tali’ and Wilang are fighting against each other.’

Similar to (43b-c) and (43b’-c’), (44b-c) and (45b-c) contain two NPs being conjoined by ru’ and ki’ and functioning as the predicates of equational sentences. They are responses to questions (44a)-(45a), without making significant semantic-functional distinctions.

Note that each question discussed above uses the interrogative word ima’ ‘who’ in inquiring all of the participants involved in the named event. Next, let us examine the following question with ki’ conjoining the interrogative word ima’ and NP tali’:

(46) a. ima’ ki’ tali’ (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’?
who Com Tali’ Nom AF-go Taipei
‘(lit.) Who and Tali’ are the ones that will go to Taipei? / Who will go to Taipei with Tali’?’

Differing from questions (43a), (44a) and (45a), question (46a) inquires only the participant(s) along with tali’ instead of all the participants involved. Note that in (46a), with or without the Nominative case marker, (46a) begins with the interrogative word ima’ ‘who’ followed by ki’ introducing the known NP tali’; in other words, (46a) is from the perspective of ‘who’. In reply to the question, responses containing ki’ and ru’ are both acceptable, as exemplified below:

(46) b. sayun ki’ tali’ (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’.
Sayun Com Tali’ Nom AF-go Taipei
‘(lit.) Sayun and Tali’ are the ones that will go to Taipei. / Sayun and Tali’ will go to Taipei.’

c. sayun ru’ tali’ (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’.
Sayun Conj Tali’ Nom AF-go Taipei
‘(lit.) Sayun and Tali’ are the ones that will go to Taipei. / Sayun and Tali’ will go to Taipei.’
Similarly, the following question functions like (46a), inquiring only the participant(s) along with tali’ instead of all, but differing from (46a), it begins with the NP tali’ followed by the interrogative word ima’ ‘who’ introduced by ki’:

\[
(47) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{tali’ ki’ ima’ (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’?} \\
& \text{Tali’ Com who Nom AF-go Taipei} \\
& \text{‘(lit.) Tali’ and who are the ones that will go to Taipei? / With whom will Tali’ go to Taipei?’}
\end{align*}
\]

In terms of perspective, (47a) differs from (46a); i.e. (47a) is from Tali’; however, the question allows its responses containing either ki’ and ru’, just like (46a):

\[
(47) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{tali’ ki’ sayun (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’}. \\
& \text{Tali’ Com Sayun Nom AF-go Taipei} \\
& \text{‘(lit.) Tali’ and Sayun are the ones that will go to Taipei. / Tali’ and Sayun will go to Taipei.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(47) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \text{tali’ ru’ sayun (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’}. \\
& \text{Tali’ Conj Sayun Nom AF-go Taipei} \\
& \text{‘(lit.) Tali’ and Sayun are the ones that will go to Taipei. / Tali’ and Sayun will go to Taipei.’}
\end{align*}
\]

d. sayun.
‘Sayun.’

In other words, although the perspectives of sentences (46a) and (47a) are different, responses to each may contain either ki’ or ru’. A possible explanation is that the ki’- and ru’-conjoined NPs in initial position (e.g. (46b) vs. (46c), (47b) vs. (47c)) seem to function alike; i.e. a collective reading is given instead of the accompaniment sense denoted by ki’.

However, because of having different perspectives, (46a) and (47a) present different syntactic behaviors. Recall (46a) is from the perspective of ima’, and thus allows the movement of ki’-introduced NP:

\[
(46) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a’. } & \text{ima’ (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’ ki’ tali’?} \\
& \text{who Nom AF-go Taipei Com Tali’} \\
& \text{‘Who will be the one that will go to Taipei with Tali’?’}
\end{align*}
\]
On the other hand, (47a) is from Tali’ and the interrogative word ima’ is preceded by the marker ki’; thus, the movement of either the interrogative word ima’ or the NP tali’ is not permitted, as shown below:

(47) a'. *ki’ ima’ (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’ tali’?
Com who Nom AF-go Taipei Tali’
‘(lit.) With whom is the one that Tali’ will go to Taipei?’

a”.* tali’ (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’ ki’ ima’?
Tali’ Nom AF-go Taipei Com who
‘(lit.) *Tali’ is the one that will go to Taipei with whom?’

As illustrated above, the interrogative word ima’ preceded by the marker ki’ cannot occur in sentence-initial position, serving as the predicate of the sentence (e.g. (47a’)); neither can it be moved out of the sentence-initial/predicate position.

Next, let us examine questions with the conjunction ru’ conjoining the interrogative word ima’ and NP tali’:

(48) a. ima’ ru’ tali’ (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’?
who Conj Tali’ Nom AF-go Taipei
‘(lit.) Who and Tali’ are the ones that will go to Taipei?’

(49) a. tali’ ru’ ima’ (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’?
Tali’ Conj who Nom AF-go Taipei
‘(lit.) Tali’ and who are the ones that will go to Taipei?’

Here both NPs ima’ ru’ tali’ and tali’ ru’ ima’ serve as the predicates and appear sentence-initially, similar to (46a) and (47a). Their responses follow:

(48) b. sayun ru’ tali’ (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’.
Sayun Conj Tali’ Nom AF-go Taipei
‘(lit.) Sayun and Tali’ are the ones that will go to Taipei. / Sayun and Tali’ will go to Taipei.’

(49) b. tali’ ru’ sayun (qu’) m-usa’ mngka’.
Tali’ Conj Sayun Nom AF-go Taipei
‘(lit.) Tali’ and Sayun are the ones that will go to Taipei. / Tali’ and Sayun will go to Taipei.’
However, because the interrogative word *ima’* and the NP *tali’* in (48a)-(49a) are conjoined by the coordinator *ru’*, neither *ima’* nor *tali’* can be extracted from the sentential initial/predicate position (Recall Ross’ proposal (1967) of Coordinate Structure Constraint):

(48) a’.*ima’  *(qu’)* m-usa’ mngka’  *ru’*  tali’?
    who   Nom     AF-go   Taipei   Conj   Tali’

a”.*ru’   tali’  *(qu’)* m-usa’ mngka’  *ima’?*
    Conj   Tali’   Nom     AF-go   Taipei   who

(49) a’.*tali’  *(qu’)* m-usa’ mngka’  *ru’*  *ima’?*
    Tali’   Nom     AF-go   Taipei   Conj   who

a”.*ru’   ima’  *(qu’)* m-usa’ mngka’  *tali’?*
    Conj   who   Nom     AF-go   Taipei   Tali’

To sum up the present discussion, we conclude that:

(i) Interrogative sentences containing *ru’* or *ki’* are Equational sentences.
(ii) Either *ru’* or *ki’* can precede either interrogative word (Q) or an NP.
(iii) Either NP ru’/ki’ Q or Q ru’/ki’ NP is possible.
(iv) While *ki’ NP* can be moved away from the sentence-initial position and *ki’ Q* cannot, none of ru’ NP, ru’ Q, NP and Q can be moved away from the sentence-initial position.

5. Conclusion

Below we shall first sum up the previous discussion, and then present a brief comparison among Atayal dialects with respect to coordination and comitativity.

5.1 A summary of previous discussion

The present paper examines the coordinating and comitative constructions in Squliq Atayal. The discussion includes status of conjoined elements (either NPs, VPs, or CLs), semantic-functional comparison (either collective, distributive, locative, or unidirectional reading, determined mainly by the semantics of cooccurring verbs), and syntactic comparison (in terms of inclusory construction, topic construction, negative construction, and interrogative construction). The following table sums up the findings concerning the coordination and comitativity in Squliq Atayal:
NP₁ ki’ NP₂ | NP₁ ru’ NP₂
---|---
**1. Status of conjoined elements** | (1) ki’ conjoins NPs only. | (1) ru’ conjoins NPs, VPs, or CLs.
(2) Conjoined NPs are preferred to be proper nouns or kinship terms, and sometimes common nouns manifesting or relating to human beings. | (2) Conjoined NPs can be any kinds of nouns.

**2. Semantic-functional perspective** | (1) Collective reading only—doing something together, with the ki’-introduced participant being an accompaniment, a less important/backgrounded role. | (1) Collective and distributive readings—doing something together or separately.
(2) Locational and directional readings. | (2) NP₁ and NP₂ are of the same status.

**3. Syntactic perspective**

**3.1 Inclusory construction** | ki’ may appear in the inclusory construction. | ru’ cannot appear in the inclusory construction.

**3.2 Topic construction** | (1) NP₁ and NP₂ together (i.e. NP₁ ki’ NP₂) may appear in Topic position. | (1) Only NP₁ and NP₂ together (i.e. NP₁ ru’ NP₂) may appear in Topic position.
(2) AF sentences allow NP₁ alone to appear in Topic position, leaving ki’ NP₂ in the matrix clause, but not NAF sentences. | (2) Neither NP₁ nor NP₂ alone can appear in Topic position.
(3) NP₂ alone (with or without ki’) cannot appear in Topic position.

**3.3 Negative construction** | (1) NP₁ and NP₂ together can be negated. | (1) NP₁ and NP₂ together can be negated.
(2) NP₂ alone can be negated. | (2) Neither NP₁ nor NP₂ alone can be negated.
(3) The named event can be negated.

**3.4 Interrogative construction** | (1) Interrogative sentences with ki’ are Equational sentences. | (1) Interrogative sentences with ru’ are Equational sentences.
(2) ki’ can precede either interrogative word (Q) or an NP. | (2) ru’ can precede either interrogative word (Q) or an NP
(3) Either NP ki’ Q or Q ki’ NP is possible. | (3) Either NP ru’ Q or Q ru’ NP is possible.
(4) ki’ NP can be moved away from the sentence-initial position, but not ki’ Q. | (4) Neither NP or Q, preceded by ru’ or not, can be moved away from the sentence-initial position.

Furthermore, Stassen (2000), while conducting a typological study of noun phrase conjunction in 260 languages, divides languages into AND-languages and WITH-languages: (i) AND-languages display both the coordinate and comitative strategies;
(ii) WITH-languages only use comitative strategy for noun phrase conjunction. Based on the above discussion, we thus would like to conclude that Squliq Atayal can be categorized as an AND-language.

5.2 A brief cross-dialectal comparison

As for the other Atayal dialects, while Mayrinax and S’uli’ almost resemble Squliq Atayal with respect to their manifestations and structural properties of coordination and comitativity, Plngawan Atayal presents some exceptions. For instance, while most Atayal dialects have a coordinator ru’ and a Comitative case maker ki’, Plngawan Atayal has a coordinator lu’ and a Comitative case marker ci’. Below is a brief cross-dialectal comparison of coordinating and comitative structural features Atayal dialects present.

Each of the above-named Atayal dialects has a coordinator that can conjoin NPs, VPs and CLs, and a Comitative case marker that only conjoins NPs. However, while all Atayal dialects allow their coordinating makers (lu’ in Plngawan and ru’ in the others) to conjoin all types of nouns, these dialects still illustrate some differences regarding the nominal (sub-)classes that their Comitative case markers may conjoin:

(i) Mayrinax Atayal allows its Comitative case maker ki’ to conjoin personal proper nouns and some kinship terms like ‘father’ and ‘mother’;
(ii) Squliq Atayal allows the Comitative case maker ki’ to conjoin proper nouns and common nouns, as long as they manifest human beings or arguments related to human beings;
(iii) Plngawan Atayal allows its Comitative case marker ci’ to conjoin two proper nouns, two common nouns, proper and common nouns, as long as they manifest animate arguments, either human or non-human.

As indicated in §1, Atayal has two major dialects, Squliq and C’uli’. However, each dialect can be further categorized in terms of regional properties. For instance, the C’uli’ dialect spoken in the western coast of Taiwan (e.g. Maspazi’ [Da-ai 大隘 in Chinese], Wu-feng Township, Hsinchu County, and Mekarang [Meihua 梅花], Jianshi Township, Hsinchu County) shows, among others, /s~/c/ sound correspondence with that spoken in I-lan County, and thus the former is called S’uli’ while the latter C’uli’. In addition, the C’uli’ dialect spoken in Mayrinax (汶水) and Matabalay (大興) in Tai-an Township, Miaoli County, presents itself as a very unique C’uli’ dialect, illustrating very conservative structural properties, and thus the dialect spoken is often called Mayrinax or Matauwal. Another C’uli’ dialect spoken in Plngawan (親愛), Jen-ai Township, Nantou County, shows unique mixed properties of Atayal and Seediq (Li 1985), which may be the result of frequent contact. For a more detailed discussion on Atayal dialects, please refer to Huang (2009b).
All the dialects demonstrate the use of inclusory pronouns in the NPs conjoined by the Comitative case marker, as for instance:\footnote{22 The S’uli’ data given here are provided by Torih Syat (p.c.), and most of the work relating to Plngawan Atayal is taken from Huang (2006).}

(50) Mayrinax Atayal
   a. ma-quwas=\textit{cami} ki’ lawsing.
      AF-sing=1PE.Nom Com Lawsing
      ‘I sing with Lawsing.’
   b. m-aniq=\textit{cami} cu’ quilih ki’ lawsing kariariax.
      AF-eat=1PE.Nom Acc fish Com Lawsing often
      ‘I often eat fish with Lawsing.’

(51) S’uli’ Atayal
   a. p-tpak=\textit{sami} mari ki’ torih.
      Irr-play.AF=1PE.Nom ball Com Torih
      ‘I will play ball with Torih.’
   b. m-gluw=\textit{sami} krryax m-usa taype ki’ pagung.
      AF-together=1PE.Nom often AF-go Taipei Com Pagung
      ‘I often go to Taipei with Pagung.’

(52) Plngawan Atayal
   a. m<in>awas=\textit{min} ci’ nabhis.
      AF<Prf>sing=1PE.Nom Com old:man
      ‘I once sang with the old man.’
   b. m<in>babahiy=\textit{mamu} ci’ temu’ hira.
      AF<Prf>fight=2P.Nom Com Temu’ yesterday
      ‘You fought with Temu’ yesterday.’

Note that in all the dialects, when the two involved participants are either the speaker/the first-person participant or the hearer/the second-person participant, a bound plural Nominative pronoun is present and is attached to the sentence-initial element (e.g. (50)-(52)). However, in Plngawan Atayal, when the two participants involved are third-person participants, the third person plural Neutral pronoun \textit{laha}’ is used and it appears between the two nouns manifesting the two arguments involved, as exemplified by (52c-d):
(52) Plngawan Atayal

\begin{itemize}
  \item \text{c.} ma-m-aha tanux ka’ yumin \text{laha’ ci’} ngyaw.
    \begin{tabular}{llll}
      \text{Red-AF-go} & \text{outside} & \text{Nom} & \text{Yumin 3P.Neu Com cat} \\
    \end{tabular}
    Yumin will go outside with the cat.’
  \item \text{d.} sa-silay-un=mu ka’ huril \text{laha’ ci’} ngyaw.
    \begin{tabular}{llll}
      \text{Red-beat-PF=1S.Gen Nom dog 3P.Neu Com cat} \\
    \end{tabular}
    The dog and the cat will be beaten by me (with a stick).’
\end{itemize}

This feature is unique to Plngawan Atayal; no such requirement is present in other Atayal dialects. However, as discussed in Huang (2009a:21-29), Tgdaya Seediq has a pronoun \text{daha} meaning ‘two; 3P.Gen’\textsuperscript{23} and its Nominative case marker is \text{ka}, and the combination of the two, \text{daha ka}, seems to have been fossilized and serves as the Comitative case marker. Examples containing \text{daha ka} follow (Huang 2009a:23-24):

(53) Tgdaya Seediq

\begin{itemize}
  \item \text{a.} \text{yami daha ka} walis maha taype.
    \begin{tabular}{llll}
      \text{1PE.Neu Com Walis go.AF.Irr Taipei} \\
    \end{tabular}
    I am/We are going to Taipei with Walis; it is I/we and Walis that are going to Taipei (not anybody else).’ (As a response to ‘Who is going to Taipei?’)
  \item \text{b.} \text{yami daha ka} walis mnusa taype.
    \begin{tabular}{llll}
      \text{1PE.Neu Com Walis go.AF.Prf Taipei} \\
    \end{tabular}
    I/We went to Taipei with Walis; it was I/we and Walis that went to Taipei (not anybody else).’ (As a response to ‘Who went to Taipei?’)
  \item \text{c.} \text{yami daha ka} walis tgdikan.
    \begin{tabular}{llll}
      \text{1PE.Neu Com Walis fight.AF} \\
    \end{tabular}
    I/We fought with Walis; it was I/we and Walis that fought against each other (not anybody else).’ (As a response to ‘Who fought?’)
\end{itemize}

Comparing Plngawan Atayal and Tgdaya Seediq, we may expect that there must be some relationship between the presence of \text{laha’} followed by \text{ci’} in Plngawan and \text{daha ka} in Tgdaya.\textsuperscript{24}

---

\textsuperscript{23} For a complete pronominal system of Seediq, please refer to Holmer (1996:32).

\textsuperscript{24} That Plngawan seems to resemble Tgdaya but differs from the other Atayal dialects regarding comitative construction is perhaps due to Plngawan speakers’ being surrounded by Tgdaya speakers instead of by other Atayals. In other words, language contact must have had some effect on the indicated resemblance. A similar observation is given by Li (1985).
Another thing worth mentioning is that in Plngawan Atayal, when the Comitative case marker *ci’* is replaced by the coordinating conjunction *lu’*, the named pronoun *laha’* is not allowed to appear, as shown in the following examples containing coordinating NPs:

(54) Plngawan Atayal
a. cyel ma-sa-siliy ka’ [watan Ø lu’ temu].
   Imprf.Dist Rec-Red-beat Nom Watan Conj Temu
   ‘Watan and Temu are beating each other (with sticks).’

b. cyel m-arųy ka’ [huril Ø lu’ ngyaw].
   Imprf.Dist AF-dance Nom dog Conj cat
   ‘The dog is dancing with the cat.’

The last point deserving some attention is that, in Plngawan Atayal, when the participant involved is manifested by either the first or the second person pronoun, in addition to the plural bound Nominative pronouns, *min* and *mamu*, have to be attached to the first element of the sentence, their corresponding free Neutral pronouns *cami* and *cimu* may—though not necessarily—co-occur in such a construction and precede the Comitative case marker followed by the noun designating the accompanist. Examples are:

(55) Plngawan Atayal
a. ma-m-aha=min m-ani cami ci’ temu.
   Red-AF-go=1PE.Nom AF-eat 1PE.Neu Com Temu
   ‘I will go to eat with Temu.’

b. ma-m-aha=mamu inu’ cuxan cimu ci’ nabkis.
   Red-AF-go=2P.Nom where tomorrow 2P.Neu Com old:man
   ‘Where will you go with the old man tomorrow?’

5.3 Future research

The present paper has examined the coordinating and comitative constructions in Squliq Atayal with respect to the status of conjoined elements, and from a semantic-functional aspect and syntactic point of view. The paper has also provided a cross-dialectal comparison between Squliq and other Atayal dialects, though brief and preliminary. In order to better understand whether a grammaticalization process has been involved concerning the multifunctional features of the element *ki’*, and whether there is any relationship between the structures referred to in the Atayal and Seediq.
languages, more detailed syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic investigation and comparison of coordination and comitativity among Atayal dialects and Seediq variants need to be conducted. It is hoped that the present findings will shed some light on the typological study of coordination and comitativity in Austronesian languages.
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賽考利克泰雅語「並列」與「伴同」結構之研究
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賽考利克泰雅語是台灣南島語的一支，本篇論文主要探討該語言之賽考利克方言中表達「並列」及「伴同」的詞彙 ru’ 及 ki’ 的語法及語意異同性。文中將討論這兩個標記所能連結成分之屬性，並從語意或語用功能、及從語法結構等角度比較這兩個標記之異同。另外，根據 Stassen (2000) 的 AND- 及 WITH- 語言分類，賽考利克泰雅語應屬於 AND-語言。希望本研究之發現能提供給南島語類型學研究一些參考。

關鍵詞：賽考利克泰雅語，並列，伴同，AND-語言