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The present paper is part of on-going research into the morphology of Tungho Saisiyat (see Zeitoun et al. in preparation), a Formosan language spoken in Miaoli County, northwestern Taiwan, and focuses on coordination and comitativity. We first compare the syntactic distribution, use, and functions of the comitative ki marker ‘and, with’ as opposed to the coordinator =o ‘and, as well’ by demonstrating that ki should be treated as a comitative case marker, as shown in previous analyses (cf. Starosta 1974, Li 1978[2004], Yeh 1991, and Hsieh 2009). We go a step further, however, by demonstrating that when followed by personal nouns, ki can be marked as plural (cf. ki-l) while =o cannot (cf. *=o-l). Based on these findings, we argue that a new set of pronouns—the “comitative” ki-set—should be recognized in Saisiyat, while the case marking system of this language needs to be further re-assessed. At the same time, we show that ki can also function as a coordinator, as first hypothesized by Li (1978[2004:377]). We provide a number of syntactic tests (word order, negation, and verb classification) to distinguish the conjunctive and comitative usages of ki.
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1. Introduction

The present paper is part of on-going research into the morphology of Saisiyat (see Zeitoun et al. in preparation), a Formosan language spoken in northwest Taiwan in Hsinchu and Miaoli Counties, and discusses issues of coordination and comitativity in this language.

Saisiyat is made up of two dialects: Taai, spoken in Wufeng Township, Hsinchu County, and known as the Northern dialect; and Tungho, spoken in Nanchuang and Shihitan Townships, Miaoli County, and referred to as the Southern dialect. The major

* The research on which this paper is drawn was carried out with a three-year NSC grant entitled “A typological study of coordination and comitativity in French, Mandarin Chinese and some Formosan languages” (NSC 95-2411-H-158-004, NSC 96-2411-H-158-001, NSC 97-2410-H-158-009). This paper was presented at the Workshop on Coordination and Comitativity in Austronesian Languages, hosted by the Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica, November 7-8,
The difference between these two dialects is said to lie in their phonologies: the voiced flap \( r \) is preserved in Taai but has been lost in Tungho (Li 1978[2004]). The present research is based on data drawn from the Tungho dialect.

Stassen (2000) and Haspelmath (2004) point out that the world’s languages vary in terms of their strategy to mark coordination and comitativity; i.e. while some languages exhibit a distinction between coordination and comitativity, others do not.

There are two markers in Saisiyat that are used for coordination and comitativity, viz. \( =o \) ‘and, as well’ (1a) and \( ki \) ‘and, with’ (1b).

(1) a. \( paza’=o \) \( ’obay \) makak-si’ael.  
Paza=Conj Obay Rec:eat-eat  
‘Paza and Obay are both married.’

b. \( paza’ \ ki \) \( ’obay \) makak-si’ael.  
Paza  Com/Conj Obay Rec:eat-eat  
‘Paza and Obay are married.’

We first provide a brief assessment of earlier studies on the use and functions of \( =o \) and \( ki \) in Saisiyat (§2). In §3, we compare the syntactic distribution, use and functions of \( ki \) ‘and, with’ as opposed to the coordinator \( =o \) ‘and, as well’ by demonstrating that \( ki \) should be treated as a comitative case marker, as shown in previous analyses (cf. Starosta 1974, Li 1978[2004], and Yeh 1991). We go a step further, however, by arguing that a new set of pronouns, i.e. a “comitative” \( ki \)-set, should be recognized in Saisiyat; another consequence is that the case marking system of this language also needs to be re-assessed (§4). Finally, we show in §5 that \( ki \) also functions as a coordinator, as first hypothesized by Li (1978[2004:377]). We provide a number of syntactic tests (word order, verb classification) to distinguish the conjunctive and comitative usages of \( ki \).
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2. Literature review

*ki* has been mentioned in previous studies, but its form and function remains controversial.

Starosta (1974:326) mentions a number of case markers in Saisiyat, as shown in (2). Among these, he treats *ki* as a comitative case marker.

(2) Saisiyat case markers (based on Starosta 1974:326)

| Nom, Acc: | ka [-pers], hi [+pers]; Ø |
| Gen: | ni |
| Loc: | mina [+src] w/Loc, kah w/Dat |
| Ins: | no, noka |
| Com: | ki |
| Man: | na |

Li’s (1978[2004]) classification of construction markers [case markers in this paper] is listed in (3). He mentions that the distribution of *ki* “seems to indicate that [it] behaves more like a conjunctor than a preposition.” (Li 1978[2004:377])

(3) Saisiyat case markers (based on Li 1978[2004])

| Acc: | ka, 'ini [+1st/2nd person pronouns], hi [+3rd person pronouns] |
| Gen/Inst: | noka |
| Gen/Ben: | no [+nonpersonal proper nouns] |
| Gen: | ni [+personal nouns] |
| Com: | ki |
| Loc: | ray |
| Dir: | kah [+personal nouns] |

Yeh (1991) claims that Saisiyat exhibits seven sets of case markers, including Nominative, Accusative, Genitive, Possessive, Benefactive, Locative, and Comitative, which further divide into two subsets: one subset serves to mark personal nouns; the other precedes common nouns.

Table 1: Saisiyat case markers (Yeh 1991:37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nom</th>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Poss</th>
<th>Ben</th>
<th>Loc</th>
<th>Com</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal nouns</td>
<td>Ø, hi</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>'an-...-a</td>
<td>'ini</td>
<td>kan, kala</td>
<td>kir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common nouns</td>
<td>Ø, ka</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>noka, no</td>
<td>'an-noka-...-a</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ray</td>
<td>kir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hsieh (2009) refers also to two comitative forms, *kir* and *ki*, which are treated as variants; *ki/kir* are categorized as “comitative conjunctors”. Hsieh (2009) also attempts
to compare the use of o as opposed to ki/kir and suggests that “the marker o behaves more like a coordinator than the marker kir in that what o connects [is] always symmetrical” (p.36). She also deals with verbal phrase (VP) and clausal coordination and shows that “the marker o can connect both semantically coherent and semantically opposite elements...” (p.45)

This brief literature review raises the following questions: (1) Which is the right form, ki (cf. Starosta 1974, Li 1978[2004]) or kir (Yeh 1991, Hsieh 2009)? (2) What is its function? A case marker as proposed by both Starosta (1974) and Yeh (1991), a coordinator as suggested by Li (1978), or a preposition? Could it have two different functions? In other words, could it be (i) a case marker and a coordinator; (ii) a case marker and a preposition, or (iii) a coordinator and a preposition? We can, at the outset, respond to the first question and ascertain that the comitative form is ki rather than kir, which was mis-transcribed for the plural form ki-l; this is further discussed in §3.2.

3. Coordination vs. comitativity in Saisiyat: =o vs. ki

In this section, we compare the syntactic distribution, use and functions of the coordinator =o ‘and, as well’ as opposed to ki ‘and, with’.

3.1 Use and functions of =o

The clitic =o ‘and, as well’ can be treated as a general coordinator: it can conjoin (i) two common/non-common nouns as in (4a-b) and (4c-d) respectively; (ii) two numerals as in (5); (iii) two verbs as in (6); or (iv) two clauses as in (7).

(4) a. hiza minkoringan=o korkoring rima’ raremean k<om>ita’
   that woman=Conj child go Hsiang Tian Hu <AV>see
   ka ’a-pashta’ay.
   Acc Ger-Pashta’ay
   ‘That woman and the child went to Hsiang Tian Hu to see the Pashta’ay festival.’

   b. kaysa’an yako k<om>si’ael ka ’aelaw. pazay=o ’aewpir.
   today 1S.Nom eat<A V>eat Acc fish rice=Conj sweet potato
   ‘Today, I ate fish, rice, and sweet potatoes for lunch.’

2 Hsieh’s (2009) paper was presented at the same workshop as our own paper, and though our conclusions differ somewhat, we cite the same references (e.g. Haspelmath 2004 and Stassen 2000) as a basis for our respective research.
c. **yanik tapash=ën** koko’ rima’ lamsong baeiw
daughter-in-law Tapash=Conj mother-in-law go Nanchuang buy
ka ’aelaw.
Acc fish
‘Daughter-in-law Tapash and (her) mother-in-law went to Nanchuang to buy fish.’

d. **yako k<om>ità’ hi-l ’oemaw, ’okay=ë’ obay.**
1S.Nom <AV>see Acc-plur Oemaw Okay=Conj Obay
‘I saw Oemaw, Okay, and Obay.’

(5) a. **shayboshi(i)=ë’ aehae’**
six=Conj one
‘7’

b. **langpez=ë’ shayboshi(i)=ë’ aehae’**
ten=Conj six=Conj one
‘17’

c. **sham’iaeh=ë’ shayboshi(i)=ë’ aehae’**
twenty=Conj six=Conj one
‘27’

(6) a. **yako sa’sa’ilh ka ririm’an an taa-nepen=ë’ ni-masa’**.
1S.Nom every Lig morning wash-tooth=Conj wash-eye
‘Every morning, I wash my teeth and my face.’

b. **hiza ray ta-tatimae’-an ’ima=’in-’inaro’-an=ë’ pezngesan**
that Loc Red-vegetable-LocNmz SubjNmz=Red-long-prop=Conj purple
s<in>’el-an kano’ ‘isaa?
<Perf>grow-LocNmz what that.Emph
‘In that garden, what is a bit long and purple?’

(7) a. **yami ’am rima’ ra-ra’oeoe, ’okay k<om>oshaa: “yao**
1PE.Nom want go Rec-drink Okay <AV>say 1S.Nom
’am=rima”=ë’ oka’=ila=’i ’osha’, matna-kahoe(oe)=ila.
Irr=go=Conj Neg=CS=Lig go AV:leave-stay behind=CS
‘We want to go to a banquet. Okay said that she would go but she did not go. She
gave up on her trip.’

b. **sha=ila pal-tooboe’ ka tataa=ë’ poshni=ila.**
go:Imp.AV=CS kill-behead:Imp.AV Acc chicken=Conj scald=CS
‘Go cut the chicken and scald it.’

Note that in noun phrases, informants usually prefer the use of **ki** over that of **=ëo**, unless:
(i) nouns are enumerated as in (4a-b, d); cf. also, ’**oemaw(=ëo)**, lalo’(=ëo),
kizaw(=ëo), ’okay=ë’ obay ‘(there were) Oemaw, Lalo, Kizaw, Okay and Obay’; or
(ii) =o attaches to an extended NP as in (4c). On the other hand, the use of the coordinator =o in (5) is obligatory, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (5′) below. In (6)-(7), =o can be omitted, but the two verbs/clauses must be understood as independent verbs/clauses, not coordinated verb/clauses, as shown in (6′)-(7′).

(5′)  

| a. | *shayboshii | 'aehae' |
|    | six         | one     |
| b. | *langpez    | shayboshii | 'aehae' |
|    | ten         | six     | one     |
| c. | *sham'iaeh  | shayboshii | 'aehae' |
|    | twenty      | six     | one     |

(6′)  

| a. | *yako sa'sa'ih ka ririm'anan taa-nepen ti-masa'. |
|    | 1S.Nom every Lig morning wash-tooth wash-eye |
| a′. | yako sa'sa'ih ka ririm'anan taa-nepen, ('isaa) ti-masa'. |
|    | 1S.Nom every Lig morning wash-tooth (then) wash-eye |
|    | ‘Every morning, I brush my teeth, wash my face.’ |

| b. | *hiza ray ta-tatimae'-an 'ima='in-'inaro'-an pezngesan |
|    | that Loc Red-vegetable-LocNmz SubjNmz=Red-long-prop purple |
|    | s<in> 'el-an kano' 'isaa? |
|    | <Perf>grow-LocNmz what then |

| b′. | hiza ray ta-tatimae'-an 'ima='in-'inaro'-an, |
|    | that Loc Red-vegetable-LocNmz SubjNmz=Red-long-prop |
|    | ('ima=)pezngesan s<in> 'el-an kano' 'isaa? |
|    | (SubjNmz=)purple <Perf>grow-LocNmz what then |
|    | ‘In that garden, what is a bit long and what is purple?’ |

(7′)  

| a. | yami 'am rima' ra-ra'oeoe, 'okay k<om>oshaa: “yao |
|    | IPE.Nom want go Rec-drink Okay <AV>say 1S.Nom |
|    | 'am=rima.” (‘isaa) 'oka'=ila='i 'osha', matna-kahoe(oe)=ila. |
|    | Irr=go (then) Neg=CS=Lig go AV:leave-stay behind=CS |
|    | ‘We want to go to a banquet. Okay said that she would go. Then she did not go. She gave up on her trip.’ |

3 In this configuration, the term “extended NP” is used to refer to a personal name, e.g. tapash used in apposition to another kinship term; cf. yanay ‘daughter-in-law’ as in yanik tapash ‘daughter-in-law Tapash’.

4 Based on Ogawa & Asai’s (1935:115-128) Taai Saisiyat texts, it can be hypothesized that the original function of =o was to be a _clausal connector_, before it developed as an NP _coordinator_. Besides being a conjunction, it also functions as a filler (cf. the above examples, and expressions such as 'oka'=ila=o ‘besides, furthermore’).
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b. sha’=ila pal-tooboe’ ka tataa’, (sha’=ila)
poshnih=ila.
scald:Imp.A V=CS
‘Go cut the chicken and scald it.’

3.2 Use and functions of ki

The marker ki ‘and, with’ can also conjoin two nouns, as in (8).

(8) a. tatini’ ki korkoring rima’ ray pong-pongaeh-an.
old (wo)man Com/Conj child go Loc Red-flower-LocNmz
‘The old (wo)man and the child went to the garden.’

b. yako mo-bay ka rayhil ka kamamanraan ki minkoringan.
1S.Nom AV-give Acc money Acc man and woman
‘I gave money to the man and the woman.’

c. kizaw ki baki’ parain tatoroe’ ka
Kizaw Com/Conj grandfather Parain learn Acc
ka’-al-no-shayshiat.
Nmz-speak-Dat-Saisiyat
‘Kizaw learns Saisiyat with Grandfather Parain.’

d. baki’ parain t<om>ortoroe’ ka ka’-al-no-shayshiat
grandfather Parain <AV>teach Acc Nmz-speak-Dat-Saisiyat
hi kizaw ki ’okay.
Acc Kizaw and Okay
‘Grandfather Parain taught/is teaching Saisiyat to Kizaw and Okay.’

On the other hand, it cannot conjoin: (i) two numerals (9a); (ii) two verbs (9b-c); or (iii) two clauses (9d). To each ungrammatical example with ki, we provide a correct counterpart with =o, for ease of comparison.

(9) a. *shybooshi ki ’aehae’
six and one

b. *yao t<om>non ka kala’, (h)aeili’, ’aewhay kita’-en,
1S.Nom <AV>weave Acc bag imbalanced bad see-UVP
babih-in ki papiko-’izaeh-en naehan.
undo-UVP and repair-again-UVP again

vs. b’. yao t<om>non ka kala’, (h)aeili’, ’aewhay kita’-en,
1S.Nom <AV>weave Acc bag imbalanced bad see-UVP
babih-in=o papiko-’izaeh-en naehan.
undo-UVP=Conj repair-again-UVP again
‘I wove a bag but it was uneven and ugly (so I) undid it and made it again.’
3.3 Distributional differences

A comparison of the above examples, cf. (4)-(9), shows that the distribution of =o ‘and, as well’ and ki ‘and, with’ overlaps in noun phrases. More examples are given in (10):

(10) a. kamamanraan=o minkoringan rima’ ray baala’ pit’aelaw.
man=Conj woman go Loc river fish
‘The man and the woman went to the river to fish.’

a’. kamamanraan ki minkoringan rima’ ray baala’ pit’aelaw.
man Com/Conj woman go Loc river fish
‘The man and the woman went to the river to fish.’

b. baki’ sh<om>pan ka tataa’=o bibii.
grandfather <AV>raise Acc chicken=Conj duck
‘Grandfather raises chicken and ducks.’

b’. baki’ sh<om>pan ka tataa’ ki bibii.
grandfather <AV>raise Acc chicken and duck
‘Grandfather raises chicken and ducks.’

c. kizaw, paza’=o ’obay k<om>or-koring hi ’oemaw.
Kizaw Paza=Conj Obay <AV>Red-beat Acc Oemaw
‘Kizaw, Paza as well as Obay keep on beating Oemaw.’

c’. kizaw, paza’ ki ’obay k<om>or-koring hi ’oemaw.
Kizaw Paza Com Obay <AV>Red-beat Acc Oemaw
‘Kizaw, Paza and Obay keep on beating Oemaw.’

d. toay k<om>ita’ hi bashi’=o hi lalo’.
Toay <AV>see Acc Bashi=Conj Acc Lalo
‘Toay saw Bashi and Lalo.’
\[ \text{ki as a Marker of Coordination and Comitativity in Saisiyat} \]

d'. \text{toay } \langle \text{om}\rangle \text{ita’ hi bashi’ ki lalo’}.  
\text{Toay } <\text{AV}>\text{see Acc Bashi and Lalo}  
\text{‘Toay saw Bashi and Lalo.’}  

However, the distribution of \(=o\) ‘and, as well’ and \text{ki} ‘and/with’ differs in many respects, as demonstrated below.

First, a constituent introduced by \text{ki} can occur adjacent to the first NP (11a) or after the verb (11a’). A constituent conjoined by \(=o\) as in (11b) cannot be split; cf. the ungrammaticality of (11b’-b”).

(11) a. \text{paza’ ki ’obay makak-si’ael.}  
Paza Com/Conj Obay Rec:eat-eat  
\text{‘Paza and Obay are married (to each other).’}  

a’. \text{paza’ makak-si’ael ki ’obay.}  
Paza Rec:eat-eat Com Obay  
\text{‘Paza and Obay are married (to each other).’}  

b. \text{paza’=o ’obay makak-si’ael.}  
Paza=Conj Obay Rec:eat-eat  
\text{‘Paza and Obay are both married.’}  

b’. *\text{paza’ makak-si’ael=o ’obay.}  
Paza Rec:eat-eat=Conj Obay  

b”. *\text{paza’=o makak-si’ael ’obay.}  
Paza=Conj Rec:eat-eat Obay

In the same vein, an element—such as the negator \text{’okik} ‘do/did not’ (12a), the irrealis clitic \text{’am}= ‘will’ (12b), or the temporal adverb \text{kakhayza’an} ‘in the past’ (12c)— can occur before a \text{ki} phrase but cannot divide an \(=o\) phrase (13a-c).

(12) a. \text{paza’ ’okik ki ’obay ka-koring.}  
Paza Neg Com Obay Rec:eat  
\text{‘It is not with Obay that Paza fights/fought.’}  

b. \text{paza’ ’am=ki ’obay ka-koring.}  
Paza Irr=Com Obay Rec:eat  
\text{‘It is with Obay that Paza will fight.’}  

c. \text{paza’ kakhayza’an ki ’obay ka-koring.}  
Paza in the past Com Obay Rec:eat  
\text{‘Paza fought with Obay in the past.’}  

(13) a. *\text{paza’ ’okik=’obay ka-koring.}  
Paza Neg=Conj Obay Rec:eat
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The reason for such a distribution is explained partly by the fact that =o is a phrasal/clausal enclitic. We treat =o as a clitic because it produces phonological liaison; e.g. langpe’=o too’ [laŋpə̈do too?] ‘thirteen’, (h)in-aseb=o hing-hingha’-an [(h)inaθþo hinghïŋha’an] ‘half past five’ and more specifically as a phrasal(/clausal) enclitic because it attaches at the end of a phrase (or a clause), as shown in (14).

(14) a. ma’an mama’ ’iban=’ ata’ kizaw rima’ lamsong.
   1S.Gen uncle Iban=Conj aunt Kizaw go Nanchuang
   ‘My uncle Iban and my aunt Kizaw went to Nanchuang.’

≠ b. ma’an mama’=o ’iban, ’ata’ kizaw rima’ lamsong.
   1S.Gen uncle=Conj Iban aunt Kizaw go Nanchuang
   ‘My uncle and Iban, (and) aunt Kizaw went to Nanchuang.’

c. *ma’an=’o mama’ ’iban ’ata’ kizaw rima’ lamsong.
   1S.Gen=Conj uncle Iban aunt Kizaw go Nanchuang

The nouns coordinated by =o ‘and, as well’ are case-marked identically (15a)-(15b). Note, however, that the insertion of a case marker after =o is optional (15a’)-(15b’).

(15) a. ’oemaw shekla’ hi koko’ paza’=’o hi baki’ parain.
   Oemaw know Acc grandmother Paza=Conj Acc grandfather Parain
   ‘Oemaw knows grandmother Paza and grandfather Parain.’

a’. ’oemaw shekla’ hi koko’ paza’=’o Ø baki’ parain.
   Oemaw know Acc grandmother Paza=Conj Ø grandfather Parain
   ‘Oemaw knows grandmother Paza and grandfather Parain.’

b. ’oemaw koring-in ni paza’=’o ni ’obay.
   Oemaw beat-UVP Gen Paza=Conj Gen Obay
   ‘Oemaw were beaten by Paza as well as Obay.’
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b’. ˈoemaw koring-in ni paza’=o Ø ˈobay.
Oemaw beat-UVP Gen Paza=Conj Ø Obay
‘Oemaw were beaten by Paza as well as Obay.’

On the other hand, nouns conjoined by ki ‘and, with’ cannot be identically case-marked: the insertion of a case marker is illicit. Compare the grammaticality of (16a)-(16a’) and (16b)-(16b’):

(16) a. *ˈoemaw shekla’ hi koko’ paza’ ki hi
Oemaw know Acc grandmother Paza Com Acc
baki’ parain.
grandfather Parain

a’. ˈoemaw shekla’ hi koko’ paza’ ki Ø
Oemaw know Acc grandmother Paza Com Ø
baki’ parain.
grandfather Parain
‘Oemaw knows Grandmother Paza and Grandfather Parain.’

b. *ˈoemaw koring-in ni paza’ ki ni ˈobay.
Oemaw beat-UVP Gen Paza Com Gen Obay

b’. ˈoemaw koring-in ni paza’ ki Ø ˈobay.
Oemaw beat-UVP Gen Paza Com Ø Obay
‘Oemaw was beaten by Paza and Obay.’

Finally, while both ki and =o can be followed by a noun marked as plural, as in (17a)-(17b), only ki can attract the plural marker -l (18a), while =o cannot (18b) (see Zeitoun 2009).

5 Reid (2009:278-279) mentions that in the Philippine languages, “common NPs are typically unmarked for plurality, and can be interpreted as either singular or plural, depending on the context and sometimes on the form of the lexical noun. In many languages […] they can be made explicitly plural by the addition of an independent morpheme […] Personal noun phrases on the other hand are typically said to be marked for plurality with one form appearing before singular personal nouns […] and another, usually described in the literature as ‘plural’, appearing before personal nouns. The lexical item immediately following such ‘plural’ forms, however, is not itself plural, but is an associated noun, representing a group.” He refers to such sequences as associative nominal constructions (ANCs). In the Formosan languages, and in Saisiyat in particular, the plural affix can be attached either to non-common nouns and/or human nouns or to preceding case markers (and carries the associative meaning mentioned by Reid 2009) but also marks the plural on pronominal forms. The term ‘plural’ is thus used as a cover term.
(17) a. paza’ ki la-’obay k<om>oring hi ’oemaw.
Paza Com plur-Obay <AV>beat Acc Oemaw
‘Paza and Obay (and friends) beat Oemaw.’

b. kizaw, paza’=o la-’obay k<om>oring hi ’oemaw.
Kizaw Paza=Conj plur-Obay <AV>beat Acc Oemaw
‘Kizaw, Paza as well as Obay (and his friends) are fighting with Oemaw.’

(18) a. paza’ ki-l ’obay k<om>oring hi ’oemaw.
Paza Com-plur Obay <AV>beat Acc Oemaw
‘Paza and Obay (and friends) beat Oemaw.’

b. *kizaw, paza’=o-l ’obay k<om>oring hi ’oemaw.
Kizaw Paza=Conj-plur Obay <AV>beat Acc Oemaw

The distribution of ki and =o is summarized in a tabular form below:

Table 2: Distributional differences between ki and =o

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>ki ‘and, with’</th>
<th>=o ‘and, as well’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP ki NP</td>
<td></td>
<td>NP= o NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Num ki Num</td>
<td></td>
<td>Num= o Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*VP ki NP</td>
<td></td>
<td>VP= o VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*S ki S</td>
<td></td>
<td>S= o S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP ki NP X</td>
<td></td>
<td>NP= o NP X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP X ki NP</td>
<td></td>
<td>*NP X= o NP ~ *NP= o X NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NP= o NP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plurality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP ki la-NP</td>
<td></td>
<td>NP= o la-NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP ki-l NP</td>
<td></td>
<td>*NP= o-l NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above distributive contrast between ki and =o does not tell us whether ki should be treated as a comitative case marker, a conjunction, or a preposition. However, we can now ascertain that there are actually two related comitative forms, viz. ki and ki-l. The marker ki is either followed by a singular or a plural (common/personal) noun whereas ki-l is followed by a noun unmarked for plurality.

4. Further investigation of the case marking function of ki

In this section, we further investigate the possibility that ki should be treated as a comitative case marker, as suggested in previous studies (Starosta 1974, Li 1978[2004] and Yeh 1991) and show that this claim calls for a re-assessment of the case marking and the pronominal systems in Saisiyat.
4.1 Some terminological clarifications

Some clarifications need to be made about the terminology used in this paper. We will refer to (pre)nominal phrase marking particles as “case markers”. They are understood as carrying out two distinct functions, the first syntactic and the second semantic: (i) on the syntactic level, they mark the grammatical relations of the NPs they precede; and (ii) on the semantic level, they indicate two semantic properties: the major distinction that is commonly marked is that of common vs. personal, but another distinction in plurality is also made as shown in §3 (pp.87-88).6

In the literature, case markers have been referred to as construction markers (Ferrell 1982), phrase markers (Ross 2002), noun class markers (Chang et al. 1998), but the use of specific terminology usually reflects the theoretical assumptions of the authors. Reid (2002) shows that phrase markers should not be treated as determiners in the Philippine languages; he demonstrates that some of these forms should be analyzed as a subclass of (extension) nouns. Reid (2006) further shows that the Philippine languages reflect “the array of grammaticalization processes by which nominal demonstratives move from being nominal heads of their noun phrases into nominal specifier positions with deictic functions, and ultimately into prepositional case-marking positions without deictic function, before being dispossessed of even the case-marking functions and being lost altogether.” Himmelmann (to appear) argues that at least in Tagalog the status of phrase marking particles is not homogenous and that they differ significantly in their distributional properties: ang and ng can be treated on the same level as demonstratives as “they head higher-level phrases” than sa, which can be treated as a preposition, because it heads prepositional phrases.

For the time being and as far as Saisiyat is concerned, we follow Payne’s (1997:100) “rule of thumb” which states that “case marking is the morphosyntactic categorization of noun phrases that is imposed by the structure within which the noun phrase occurs. Adpositions are free of such configurational constraints.” In Saisiyat, there is a neutralization of forms (syncretism, cf. Blake 1994, Teng 2009) in the nominative and accusative and to some extent word order in Saisiyat has become a competing mechanism to mark the subject (as opposed to non-subjects); i.e. the subject usually occurs in sentence-initial position (see above examples). But the case marking of a noun phrase as dative or accusative, for instance, is determined by the grammatical subcategorization of the verb and is not “imposed by some other grammatical element in the configuration” (Payne 1997:100). Compare the grammaticality of (19)-(20):

---

6 In the Formosan languages, other distinctions include animacy, referentiality, visibility etc.
(19) a. ‘oya’ ‘a=mo-bay ka korkoring soe’hae’ ka ka-kaat.
    Mother Irr=AV-give Acc child give:one Lig Red-write
    ‘Mother gave one pen to the child.’

    a’. *‘oya’ ‘a=mo-bay no korkoring soe’hae’ ka ka-kaat.
    Mother Irr=AV-give Dat child give:one Lig Red-write

    b. ‘oya’ ‘am=baeiw no korkoring soe’hae’ ka ka-kaat.
    Mother Irr=buy Dat child give:one Lig Red-write
    ‘Mother bought one pen for the child.’

    b’. *‘oya’ ‘am=baeiw ka korkoring soehae’ ka ka-kaat.
    Mother Irr=buy Acc child give:one Lig Red-write

(20) a. ‘oya’ sharara’ ka korkoring.
    Mother like Acc child
    ‘Mother likes the child.’

    a’. *‘oya’ sharara’ no korkoring.
    Mother like Dat child

    b. ‘oya’ tikot no shibai’.
    Mother afraid Dat snake
    ‘Mother is afraid of snakes.’

    b’. *‘oya’ tikot ka shibai’.
    Mother afraid Acc snake

What we do not exclude at this stage is that certain (pre)nominal case marking particles may actually not be case markers, or that they may play a dual role (e.g. as case markers and prepositions).

4.2 ki as a case marker

As shown in (21a), ki is never followed by another case marker:

(21) a. *‘oemaw koring-in ni ‘okay ki ni ‘obay.
    Oemaw beat-UVP Gen Okay Com Gen Obay

    b. *‘oemaw koring-in ni ‘okay ki Ø ‘obay.
    Oemaw beat-UVP Gen Okay Com Ø Obay
    ‘Oemaw was beaten by Okay and Obay.’

It has been shown in the past that a preposition can be followed by a case marker, but that two case markers cannot occur in the same slot (Huang et al. 1998:24). This excludes the possibility that ki functions as a preposition and validates the claim that it might be a case marker.
In the following examples, it is clear that $ki$ exhibits the same distribution as other case markers, e.g. $ka$ ‘Nom/Acc’ (+common nouns) or $hi$ ‘Nom/Acc’ (–common nouns):

(22) a. ’okay ka-koring $ki$ ’oemaw.
Okay Red-beat Com Oemaw
‘Okay fights/is fighting with Oemaw.’

b. ’okay k<om>oring $ka$ tatini’.
Okay <AV>beat Acc old (wo)man
‘Okay beats the old (wo)man.’

c. ’okay k<om>oring $hi$ ’oemaw.
Okay <AV>beat Acc Oemaw
‘Okay beats Oemaw.’

Besides, it follows also the same word ordering as other case markers with respect to relative clauses:

(23) a. ’obay ka-koring $ki$ ’ima=h<oem>angih ’oemaw.
Obay Rec-beat Com SubjNmz=<AV>cry Oemaw
‘Obay is fighting with Oemaw who is crying.’

b. ’obay k<om>oring $ka$ ’ima=h<oem>angih korkoring.
Obay <AV>beat Acc SubjNmz=<AV>cry child
‘Obay is beating the child who is crying.’

b’. ’obay k<om>oring ’ima=h<oem>angih $ka$ korkoring.
Obay <AV>beat SubjNmz=<AV>cry Acc child

The distribution of $ki$ shows that it should be treated as a case marker, and this claim thus requires a re-assessment of the Saisiyat case marking system, as shown in Table 3. Like Starosta (1974) we recognize a comitative set but we further make a distinction between [±common] nouns along with the feature [±plural] for [–common] nouns.
Table 3: A re-assessment of the Saisiyat case marking system
(Zeitoun et al. in preparation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Nom</th>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Poss</th>
<th>Dat</th>
<th>Loc</th>
<th>Com</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Common nouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+plur</td>
<td>Ø,  hi-l</td>
<td>Ø,  hi-l</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>'an-a=...=a</td>
<td>'inina -</td>
<td>ki-l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-plur</td>
<td>Ø,  hi</td>
<td>Ø,  hi</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>'an=...=a</td>
<td>'ini kan, kala ki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Common nouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+sing</td>
<td>Ø,  ka</td>
<td>Ø,  ka</td>
<td>noka</td>
<td>'i(n)-noka=...=a no ray</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is well-known that Saisiyat, among the Formosan languages, exhibits one of the most complex pronominal systems in terms of case distinctions (Huang et al. 1998). Though there is neutralization between different cases, e.g. Nom and Acc (see Table 3 and discussion in §4.1), it is also well-known that it distinguishes nearly as many cases in its nominal case marking system as it does in its pronominal system (Yeh 1991). The following examples show that Saisiyat exhibits a comitative pronominal set, which has, to our knowledge, never been reported to date.

(24) a. *yako kisho'on 'a=makak-si'ael.*
   1S.Nom 2S.Com  Irr=Rec:eat-eat
   ‘You and I will get married (to each other).’

   b. *bashi' raawak kiaakin.*
   Bashi Rec:hold hands 1S.Com
   ‘Bashi dances with me.’

   c. *yako kilasia rima' ray pinatiay.*
   1S.Nom 3P.Com go Loc field
   ‘I go to the field with them.’

   = c'. *yako kilisia rima’ ray pinatiay.*
   1S.Nom 3P.Com go Loc field
   ‘I go to the field with them.’

Based on the above examples, we thus propose a re-assessment of the Saisiyat case marking system, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: A re-assessment of the Saisiyat pronominal system
(Zeitoun et al. in preparation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Nom</th>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Poss</th>
<th>Loc</th>
<th>Dat</th>
<th>Com</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td><em>yako yao</em></td>
<td>'iakin ma'an</td>
<td>'anmana'a</td>
<td>'inmana'a</td>
<td>kanman</td>
<td>'iniman</td>
<td>kiaakin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td><em>sho'o</em></td>
<td>'isho'on nisho'</td>
<td>'anshoa'a</td>
<td>'inshoa'a</td>
<td>kansho'</td>
<td>'insho'</td>
<td>kisho'on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. *ki* as a coordinator

We have rejected the claim that *ki* could function as a preposition and shown that it is a comitative case marker. Li (1978[2004:377]) shows that *ki* can also function as a coordinator, and we further provide support for this hypothesis in §5.1, where we show that the distribution of *ki* varies according to whether it is used as a case marker or as a coordinator, and this in turn is determined by the type of verb with which it is used. These verb types are illustrated in §5.2.

### 5.1 Evidence that supports the claim that *ki* can also function as a coordinator

We have shown above that NP *ki* NP can form a constituent or be split in two, with the first NP occurring in subject position and *ki* NP occurring after a verb, a negator or the modal clitic *’am=*. More examples are given in (25) below:

(25) a. **toay  ki  kizaw  ka-kita’**.
   Toay Com Kizaw Rec-see
   ‘Toay and Kizaw met each other.’

   a’. **toay  ka-kita’  ki  kizaw**.
   Toay Rec-see Com Kizaw
   ‘Toay and Kizaw met each other.’

   b. **toay  ki  kizaw  ’okip  ka-kita’**.
   Toay Com Kizaw Neg:Lig:Rec Rec-see
   ‘Toay and Kizaw did not meet each other.’
b'. toay 'okik ki kizaw ka-kita'.
Toay Neg Com Kizaw Rec-see
‘Toay and Kizaw did not meet each other.’

c. toay ki kizaw 'a=ma’oenhal kishkaat.
Toay Com Kizaw Irr=AV:together study
‘Toay and Kizaw study together.’

c'. toay 'am=ki kizaw ma’oenhal kishkaat.
Toay Irr=Com Kizaw AV:together study
‘Toay and Kizaw will go study together.’
(‘It is with Kizaw that Toay will go study.’)

However, this is not always the case, as shown in (26). In (26a-b), ki NP cannot occur after the verb or at the end of the clause, and in (26c), it cannot occur after the negator 'okik ‘not’.

(26) a. 'oemaw ki lalo’ makak-bishbish ka ta’oloeh.
Oemaw and Lalo Rec:Stat.NFin-hurt Acc head
‘Oemaw and Lalo both have a headache.’

a'. *'oemaw makak-bishbish ki lalo’ ka ta’oloeh.
Oemaw Rec:Stat.NFin-hurt and Lalo Acc head

b. yanay ki koko’ rima’ lamsong baeiw ka ’aelaw.
daughter-in-law and mother-in-law go Nanchuang buy Acc fish
‘The daughter-in-law and the mother-in-law went to Nanchuang to buy fish.’

b'. *yanay rima’ lamsong baeiw ka ’aelaw ki koko’.
daughter-in-law go Nanchuang buy Acc fish and mother-in-law

c. paza’ ki lalo’ shekla’ hi kizaw.
Paza and Lalo know Acc Kizaw
‘Paza and Lalo know Kizaw.’

c'. *paza’ 'okik ki lalo’ shekla’ hi kizaw.
Paza Neg and Lalo know Acc Kizaw

The distribution of ki is, in that case, identical to that of =o, and we treat it as a coordinator.

(27) a. 'oemaw=o lalo’ makak-bishbish ka ta’oloeh.
Oemaw=Conj Lalo Rec:Stat.NFin-hurt Acc head
‘Oemaw as well as Lalo have a headache.’

a’. *'oemaw makak-bishbish=o lalo’ ka ta’oloeh.
Oemaw Rec:Stat.NFin-hurt=Conj Lalo Acc head
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The examples above show that the distinction between *ki* as a coordinator and *ki* as a case marker lies in the fact that when *ki* functions as a coordinator, word order is fixed and the coordinated constituent cannot be split. The distinction between *ki* as a coordinator and as a case marker can be schematized as follows:

### Distribution of *ki* in Noun Phrases

#### a. *ki* as a coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NP</th>
<th><em>ki</em></th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>*NP</th>
<th>X</th>
<th><em>ki</em></th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syn.of</td>
<td>=o</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>=o</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>*NP</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### b. *ki* as a case marker

| NP | *ki* | NP | X | vs. | NP | X | *ki* | NP |

Interestingly enough, a similar distinction can be made between comitative pronouns and nominative pronouns preceded by the coordinator *ki*, as shown in (29):

#### a. *yako kisho’on makak-si’ael.*

1S.Nom 2S.Com Rec:eat-eat

‘You and I got married (to each other).’

#### a’. *yako ki sho’o makak-si’ael.*

1S.Nom 2S.Nom Rec:eat-eat

‘You and I (both) got married.’

---

The examples above show that the distinction between *ki* as a coordinator and *ki* as a case marker lies in the fact that when *ki* functions as a coordinator, word order is fixed and the coordinated constituent cannot be split. The distinction between *ki* as a coordinator and as a case marker can be schematized as follows:

### Distribution of *ki* in Noun Phrases

#### a. *ki* as a coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NP</th>
<th><em>ki</em></th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>*NP</th>
<th>X</th>
<th><em>ki</em></th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syn.of</td>
<td>=o</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>=o</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>*NP</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### b. *ki* as a case marker

| NP | *ki* | NP | X | vs. | NP | X | *ki* | NP |

Interestingly enough, a similar distinction can be made between comitative pronouns and nominative pronouns preceded by the coordinator *ki*, as shown in (29):

#### a. *yako kisho’on makak-si’ael.*

1S.Nom 2S.Com Rec:eat-eat

‘You and I got married (to each other).’

#### a’. *yako ki sho’o makak-si’ael.*

1S.Nom 2S.Nom Rec:eat-eat

‘You and I (both) got married.’
a”.  yako=o sho’o makak-si’ael.
   1S.Nom=Conj  2S.Nom  Rec:eat-eat
‘You and I got (both) married.’

b.  yako ‘am=kisho’on makak-si’ael.
   1S.Nom  Irr=2S.Com  Rec:eat-eat
‘You and I are going to marry (each other).’

b’. *yako ‘am=ki sho’o makak-si’ael.
   1S.Nom  Irr=Conj  2S.Nom  Rec:eat-eat

b”’. *yako=o ‘am=sho’o makak-si’ael.
   1S.Nom=Conj  Irr=2S.Nom  Rec:eat-eat

(30) Distribution of ki with personal pronouns
a.  ki as a coordinator
   ProNom  ki  ProNom  X  vs.  * ProNom  X  ki  ProNom
   syn.of =o  ProNom=o  ProNom  X  vs.  * ProNom  X=o  ProNom
   * ProNom=o  X  ProNom

b.  Comitative pronouns marked by ki
   ProNom  ProCom  X  vs.  ProNom  X  ProCom

The examples in (31) show that ki cannot appear twice in the same NP (31b), or in the same phrase (31d).

(31) a.  paza’ ka-koring ki ‘oemaw=o ’obay.
   Paza  Rec:beat  Com  Oemaw=Conj  Obay
   ‘Paza is fighting with Oemaw and Obay.’

b. *paza’ ka-koring  ki  ‘oemaw  ki  ’obay.
   Paza  Rec:beat  Com  Oemaw  and  Obay

vs.  c.  paza’ k<om>oring  hi  ‘oemaw  ki  ’obay.
   Paza  <AV>beat  Acc  Oemaw  and  Obay
   ‘Paza is beating Oemaw and Obay.’

d. *paza’  ki  ‘oemaw  ka-koring  ki  ’obay.
   Paza  and  Oemaw  Rec:beat  Com  Obay

vs  e.  paza’  ki  ‘oemaw  k<om>oring  hi  ’obay.
   Paza  and  Oemaw  <AV>beat  Acc  Obay
   ‘Paza and Oemaw are beating Obay.’
5.2 *ki* in co-occurrence with different types of verbs

In this section, we examine the co-occurrence of *ki* with different types of verbs and show that the behavior of *ki* is determined by the verb type it co-occurs with.

We divide verbs as follows: (i) stative non-reciprocal verbs (§5.2.1); (ii) stative/dynamic reciprocal verbs (§5.2.2); (iii) dynamic non-reciprocal verbs (including non-motion verbs and motion verbs) (§5.2.3).

### 5.2.1 *ki* in co-occurrence with stative non-reciprocal verbs

In co-occurrence with stative verbs, *ki* can only function as a coordinator.

(32) a. **bashi’** _ki_ **’oemaw’** _’ima=bain._
  Bashi and Oemaw SubjNnz=lazy
  ‘Bashi and Oemaw are lazy.’

b. **paza’** _ki_ **kizaw’** _kama=tortoroe’._
  Paza and Kizaw SubjNnz=teach
  ‘Paza and Kizaw are teachers.’

c. **tiwash’** _ki_ **maya’** (h)asha’ **mal-no-shayshiat.**
  Tiwash and Maya ignore AV:speak-Dat-Saisiyat
  ‘Tiwash and Maya do not know how to speak Saisiyat.’

*ki* NP cannot move after the verb as shown in (33):

(33) a. *bashi’’* _’ima=bain_ **ki’** _’oemaw._
  Bashi SubjNnz=lazy and Oemaw

b. *paza’’* _kama=tortoroe’_ **ki’** _kizaw._
  Paza SubjNnz=teach and Kizaw

c. *tiwash **(h)asha’** _ki’** maya’’* **mal-no-shayshiat.**
  Tiwash ignore and Maya AV:speak-Dat-Saisiyat

While a negator, the modal clitic *’am=* ‘will’ or an adverb can occur after, as in (34), no constituent can intervene between the two coordinands, as shown in (35):

(34) a. **bashi’** _ki_ **’oemaw’** _’okik_ **bain._
  Bashi Conj Oemaw Neg:Lig:Stat.NFin lazy
  ‘Bashi and Oemaw are not lazy.’

b. **paza’** _ki_ **kizaw’** _’am=kama=tortoroe’._
  Paza Conj Kizaw Irr=SubjNnz=teach
  ‘Paza and Kizaw will be teachers.’
(35) a. *bashi' ˈoːiki ki ˈoemaw ˈima=bain.
   Bashi Neg Conj Oemaw SubjNmz=lazy
   ‘Bashi and Oemaw are both lazy.’

b. *paza' ˈam=ki ki kizaw kama=tortoroe'.
   Paza Irr=Conj Kizaw SubjNmz=teach
   ‘Paza and Kizaw are both teachers.’

c. *tiwash ma' ki maya' (h)asha' mal-no-shayshiat.
   Tiwash also Conj Maya ignore AV:speak-Dat-Saisiyat
   ‘Tiwash and Maya do not know how to speak Saisiyat either.’

As a coordinator, ki can have two different readings: a distributive reading and a collective reading. The fact that a ki phrase can co-occur with saboe'h ‘all’ (36) but not ma'oenhal (37) shows that in co-occurrence with stative verbs, the coordinator ki can only have a distributive reading:

(36) a. bashi' ki ˈoemaw ˈima=bain saboe'h.
   Bashi and Oemaw SubjNmz=lazy all
   ‘Bashi and Oemaw are both lazy.’

b. paza' ki kizaw kama=tortoroe' saboe'h.
   Paza and Kizaw SubjNmz=teach all
   ‘Paza and Kizaw are both teachers.’

(37) a. *bashi' ki ˈoemaw ma'oenhal ˈima=bain.
   Bashi and Oemaw AV:together SubjNmz=lazy
   ‘Bashi and Oemaw are both teachers.’

b. *paza' ki kizaw ma'oenhal kama=tortoroe'.
   Paza and Kizaw AV:together SubjNmz=teach
   ‘Paza and Kizaw are both teachers.’

5.2.2 ki in co-occurrence with stative/dynamic reciprocal verbs

In co-occurrence with stative reciprocal verbs, ki can function as a coordinator or a comitative case marker.

(38) a. paza' ki kizaw makak-shiae'.
   Paza Com/Conj Kizaw Rec:Stat.NFin-happy
   ‘Paza and Kizaw are both happy (/play together).’

b. bashi' ki ˈoemaw makak-shekla'.
   Bashi Com/Conj Oemaw Rec:Stat.NFin-know
   ‘Bashi and Oemaw know each other.’

c. tiwash ki maya' makak-be'ee.
   Tiwash Com/Conj Maya Rec:Stat.NFin-angry
   ‘Tiwash and Maya are angry at each other.’
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(39) a. ’obay ki kizaw ra-inoa’.
   Obay Com/Conj Kizaw Rec-like
   ‘Obay and Kizaw like each other.’

b. tiwash ki maya’ ra-ra’oeoe.
   Tiwash Com/Conj Maya Rec-drink
   ‘Tiwash and Maya drink together.’

c. bashi’ ki ’oemaw masha-shbet.
   Bashi Com/Conj Oemaw Rec-beat
   ‘Bashi and Oemaw beat each other.’

A negator can thus occur after or before ki NP, as in (40)-(41). Note, however, that ki has a double status in (40) but can only function as a comitative case marker in (41).

(40) a. paza’ ki kizaw ’okay pakak-shiae’.
   Paza Com/Conj Kizaw Neg:Lig Rec:Stat.NFin-happy
   ‘Neither Paza nor Kizaw are happy.’

b. bashi’ ki ’oemaw ’okay pakak-shekla’.
   Bashi Com/Conj Oemaw Neg:Lig Rec:Stat.NFin-know
   ‘Bashi and Oemaw do not know each other.’

c. tiwash ki maya’ ’okay pakak-be’ee.
   Tiwash Com/Conj Maya Neg:Lig Rec:Stat.NFin-angry
   ‘Tiwash and Maya are not angry at each other.’

d. ’obay ki kizaw ’okik ra-inoa’.
   Obay Com/Conj Kizaw Neg:Lig:Stat.NFin Rec-like
   ‘Obay and Kizaw do not like each other.’

e. tiwash ki maya’ ’okip ra-ra’oeoe.
   Tiwash Com/Conj Maya Neg:Lig:Rec Rec-drink
   ‘Tiwash and Maya do not drink together.’

f. bashi’ ki ’oemaw ’okay pasha-shbet.
   Bashi Com/Conj Oemaw Neg:Lig Rec-beat
   ‘Bashi and Oemaw do/did not beat each other.’

(41) a. paza’ ’okik ki kizaw makak-shiae’.
   Paza Neg Com/*Conj Kizaw Rec:Stat.NFin-happy
   ‘Paza is not happy with Kizaw.’ / ‘It is not Kizaw that Paza is playing with.’

b. bashi’ ’okik ki ’oemaw makak-shekla’.
   Bashi Neg Com/*Conj Oemaw Rec:Stat.NFin-know
   ‘Bashi and Oemaw do not know each other.’

c. tiwash ’okik ki maya’ makak-be’ee.
   Tiwash Neg Com/*Conj Maya Rec:Stat.NFin-angry
   ‘It is not Maya that Tiwash is angry with.’
d. 'obay 'okik ki kizaw ra-inowa'.
   Obay Neg Com/*Conj Kizaw Rec-like
   ‘It is not Kizaw that Obay likes.’

e. tiwash 'okik ki maya' ra-ra'oeoe.
   Tiwash Neg Com/*Conj Maya Rec-drink
   ‘It is not with Maya that Tiwash is drinking.’

f. bashi' 'okik ki 'oemaw masha-shbet.
   Bashi Neg Com/*Conj Oemaw Rec-beat
   ‘It is not with Oemaw that Bashi fought.’

When ki functions as a comitative case marker, the ki phrase can move after the
verb, as shown in (42):

(42) a. paza' makak-shiae' ki kizaw.
    Paza Rec:Stat.NFin-happy Com/*Conj Kizaw
    ‘Paza and Kizaw play together.’

b. bashi' makak-shekla' ki 'oemaw.
    Bashi Rec:Stat.NFin-know Com/*Conj Oemaw
    ‘Bashi and Oemaw know each other.’

c. tiwash makak-be'ee ki maya'.
    Tiwash Rec:Stat.NFin-angry Com/*Conj Maya
    ‘Tiwash and Maya are angry at each other.’

d. 'obay ra-inoa' ki kizaw.
    Obay Rec-like Com/*Conj Kizaw
    ‘Obay and Kizaw like each other.’

e. tiwash ra-ra'oeoe ki maya'.
    Tiwash Rec-drink Com/*Conj Maya
    ‘Tiwash and Maya drink together.’

f. bashi' masha-shbet ki 'oemaw.
    Bashi Rec-beat Com/*Conj Oemaw
    ‘Bashi and Oemaw beat each other.’

Reciprocal verbs can refer to two (or more) participants acting upon one another,
as in (38)-(39) or taking part in the same action, as in (43)-(44). In (43), verbs refer to a
distributive action (NP ki NP both…)
while in (44) verbs refer to a collective action
(NP ki NP ...together).

7 We define the term distributive as referring to the same series of events in which the
participants take part separately.
ki as a Marker of Coordination and Comitativity in Saisiyat

(43) a. paza’ ki kizaw makak-shiae’ shi-mari’ ni ’obay
Paza Conj Kizaw Rec:Stat.NFin-happy UVC-take Gen Obay
ka minkoringan.
Nom woman
‘Paza and Kizaw are both happy that Obay is going to marry.’

b. bashi’ ki ’oemaw makak-shekla’ hi baki’ parain.
Bashi Conj Oemaw Rec:Stat.NFin-know Acc grandfather Parain
‘Bashi and Oemaw both know Grandfather Parain.’

c. tiwash ki maya’ makak-be’ee no korkoring.
Tiwash Conj Maya’ Rec:Stat.NFin-angry Dat child
i. ‘Tiwash and Maya are both angry at their child.’
ii. ‘Tiwash and Maya are angry at each other because of the child.’

(44) a. bashi’ ki ’oemaw maehrachrang ka kapantamako’an.
Bashi Conj Oemaw AV:discuss Acc engagement
‘Bashi and Oemaw discuss(ed) (the) engagement.’

b. yako ma’oenhal ki mak-’obay rima’ bangka’.
1S.Nom AV:go together Com Uncle-Obay go Taipei
‘I went to Taipei together with Uncle Obay.’

With distributive verbs, ki functions as a coordinator. Thus, the ki phrase cannot move after the verb (45):

(45) a. *paza’ makak-shiae’ ki kizaw shi-mari’ ni ’obay
Paza Rec:Stat.NFin-happy Conj Kizaw UVC-take Gen Obay
ka minkoringan.
Nom woman

b. *bashi’ makak-shekla’ ki ’oemaw hi baki’ parain.
Bashi Rec:Stat.NFin-know Conj Oemaw Acc grandfather Parain

c. *tiwash makak-be’ee ki maya’ no korkoring.
Tiwash Rec:Stat.NFin-angry Conj Maya’ Dat child
i. Ungrammatical if intended as: ‘Tiwash and Maya are both angry at the child.’
ii. Accepted if understood as: ‘Tiwash and Maya are angry at each other because of the child.’

A negator can occur after ki NP, as in (46) but not before (47):

(46) a. paza’ ki kizaw ’okay pakak-shiae’ ni ’obay
Paza Conj Kizaw Neg:Lig Rec:Stat.NFin-happy Gen Obay
sh-i-mari’ ka minkoringan.
UVC-take Acc woman
‘Neither Paza nor Kizaw is happy that Obay is going to marry.’
b. *bashi’ ki ‘oemaw ‘okik shekla’ hi baki’ parain.
   Bashi Conj Oemaw Neg:Lig:Stat:NFin know Acc grandfather Parain
   ‘Bashi and Oemaw do not know Grandfather Parain.’

c. *tiwash ki maya’ ‘okay pakak-be’ee no korkoring.
   Tiwash Conj Maya Neg:Lig Rec:Stat:NFin-angry Dat child
   ‘Neither Tiwash nor Maya is angry at their child.’

(47) a. *paza’ ‘okik ki kizaw makak-shiae’ hi ‘obay
   Paza Neg Conj Kizaw Rec:Stat:NFin-happy Acc Obay
   ’am=mari’ ka minkoringan.
   Irr=A V:take Acc woman

b. *bashi’ ‘okik ki ‘oemaw makak-shekla’ hi baki’
   Bashi Neg Conj Oemaw Rec:Stat:NFin-know Acc grandfather
   parain.
   Parain

c. *tiwash ‘okik ki maya’ makak-be’ee no korkoring.
   Tiwash Neg Conj Maya Rec:Stat:NFin -angry Dat child

With collective verbs, the function of ki is more difficult to determine. On the one hand, the ki phrase cannot move after the verb (48):

   Bashi AV:discuss Conj Oemaw Acc engagement
   ‘Bashi and Oemaw did not discuss (the) engagement.’

b. *yako ma’oenhal rima’ ki mak-’obay bangka’.
   1S.Nom AV:together go Com Uncle-Obay Taipei

But on the other hand, a negator can occur after or before the ki NP phrase:

(49) a. bashi’ ki ‘oemaw ‘okay paehraehrang ka kapantamako’an.
   Bashi Conj Oemaw Neg:Lig discuss Acc engagement
   ‘Bashi did not discuss (the) engagement with Oemaw.’

b. yako ‘okay pa’oenhal ki mak-’obay rima’ bangka’.
   1S.Nom Neg:Lig together Com Uncle-Obay go Taipei
   ‘I did not go to Taipei together with Uncle Obay.’

(50) a. bashi’ ‘okik ki ‘oemaw maehraehrang ka kapantamako’an.
   Bashi Neg Com Oemaw AV:discuss Acc engagement
   ‘Bashi did not discuss (the) engagement with Oemaw.’

b. yako ‘okik ki mak-’obay ma’oenhal rima’ bangka’.
   1S.Nom Neg Com Uncle-Obay AV:together go Taipei
   ‘I did not go to Taipei together with Uncle Obay.’
5.2.3 *ki* in co-occurrence with dynamic non-reciprocal verbs

NP *ki* NP can also occur with dynamic non-reciprocal verbs, e.g. *s<om>*i’ael ‘eat’ (51a) and *rima* ‘go’ (51b).

(51) a. baki’ *ki* koko’ *s<om>*i’ael ka pazay.
   grandfather Com/Conj grandmother <AV>eat Acc rice
   ‘Grandfather and grandmother eat rice.’

b. kizaw *ki* lalo’ rim’an ’am=rima’ bangka’.
   Kizaw Com/Conj Lalo tomorrow Irr=go Taipei
   ‘Kizaw and Lalo will go to Taipei tomorrow.’

In co-occurrence with such verbs, the status of *ki* is also ambiguous. On the one hand, the *ki* phrase cannot move after the verb (52):

(52) a. *baki’ s<om>*i’ael *ki* koko’ ka pazay.
   grandfather <AV>eat Conj grandmother Acc rice

b. *kizaw rim’an ’am=rima’ *ki* lalo’ bangka’.
   Kizaw tomorrow Irr=go Conj Lalo Taipei

But on the other, a negator can precede *ki* NP, as shown in (53):

(53) a. baki’ ’okik *ki* koko’ *s<om>*i’ael ka pazay.
   grandfather Neg Com/Conj grandmother <AV>eat Acc rice
   ‘Grandfather did not eat rice with grandmother.’

b. kizaw ’okik *ki* lalo’ rim’an ’am=rima’ bangka’.
   Kizaw Neg Com Lalo tomorrow Irr=go Taipei
   ‘Kizaw will not go to Taipei tomorrow with Lalo.’

5.3 Summary

We have shown that *ki* can function as a coordinator or as a case marker depending on the verb it co-occurs with. Below we provide a short summary in tabular form.
### Table 5: Functions of ki in co-occurrence with different types of verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Type of verbs</th>
<th>Static verbs</th>
<th>Stative/Dynamic verbs</th>
<th>Dynamic verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>Stative/Dynamic</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>–Reciprocal</td>
<td>+Reciprocal</td>
<td>–Reciprocal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+Reciprocal</td>
<td>–Motion</td>
<td>+Motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>shekla’</td>
<td>makakbishbish</td>
<td>maehrangrangi</td>
<td>mashashbet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘know’</td>
<td>‘both/all ill’</td>
<td>‘discuss’</td>
<td>‘beat each other’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP ki NP X</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP ’okik ki NP X</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP X ki NP</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki functions as:</td>
<td>coordinator</td>
<td>ambiguous</td>
<td>comitative</td>
<td>ambiguous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Conclusion

In this paper, we have compared the syntactic distribution, use, and functions of the comitative ki marker ‘and, with’ as opposed to the coordinator =o ‘and, as well’. We have shown that depending on the types of verbs it co-occurs with, ki can either function as a coordinator or a comitative case marker. In so doing, we have also argued for the reassessment of the case marking and pronominal systems of Saisiyat, with the recognition of a new set, i.e. the comitative ki-set.

We believe that beyond the exploration of coordination and comitativity, this paper has some far-reaching consequences for the analysis of the use and functions of such markers as ray, kan, and kala ‘at, be at’ which could also be said to exhibit two distinct syntactic functions, viz. case marker and preposition.
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東河賽夏語「並列」和「伴同」標記\textit{ki-}

齊莉莎    朱黛華    莊蓋·打赫斯·改擺刨

中央研究院

賽夏語為台灣南島語言之一，分布於台灣西北的新竹及苗栗縣境內，主要分為大隘和東河兩個方言。本文為正在進行中的東河賽夏語構詞研究之部分成果（請見Zeitoun et al. in preparation）。我們回應之前研究的分析（見Starosta 1974, Li 1978[2004], Yeh 1991），認為\textit{ki}應分析為伴同格位標記，並且進一步比較伴同格\textit{ki}「和、跟」和並列標記\textit{=o}「跟、還有」的句法分布、用法和功能。根據人稱專有名詞的特徵，我們證明\textit{ki}可標示複數(\textit{ki-l})，\textit{=o}卻不能(\textit{*=o-l})。依以上發現，我們認為有必要修正賽夏語的格位標記系統，同時也必須建立新的代名詞組（也就是所謂的伴同格代名詞）。另外，我們也認同李壬癸教授（Li 1978[2004:377]）的假設，認為伴同\textit{ki}也可以呈現並列的功能。我們根據不同的測試（如詞序、否定詞、動詞分類等），分別出\textit{ki}身為連結詞和伴同的不同用法。

關鍵詞：賽夏語，並列，伴同，格位標記系統，代名詞系統