NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Valeria Morozova

COORDINATION AND GENDER AGREEMENT IN KINA RUTUL

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: LINGUISTICS
WP BRP 83/LNG/2019

Valeria Morozova[1]

COORDINATION AND GENDER AGREEMENT IN KINA RUTUL[2]

This paper discusses the rules of agreement with a conjoined NP in Kina Rutul (Lezgic, East Caucasian). The study is based on field data. There are two possible strategies of agreement with a conjoined controller, semantic and syntactic. Rutul data shows elements of both strategies. An elicitation experiment revealed considerable variation among consultants, challenging the analysis of these constructions.

JEL Classification: Z

Keywords: coordination; gender agreement; Rutul; East Caucasian

1 Linguistic Convergence Laboratory, HSE University, Research assistant, tito_alba@mail.ru

2 The publication was prepared within the framework of the Academic Fund Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE) in 2018–2019 (grant №19-04-040) and by the Russian Academic Excellence Project "5-100".

1. Introduction

Rutul is a Lezgic language spoken in Southern Dagestan (Caucasus, Russia) and Azerbaijan. It has morphologically ergative alignment (both in case marking and agreement) and mostly agglutinative morphology. Data for the current study was collected in 2019 in the village of Kina (Rutulsky District, Daghestan).

Agreement in Kina Rutul involves the categories of number (singular or plural) and gender. Four genders are showing, depending on the target, various patterns of semantic contrasts, including that of biological sex (male vs. female), rationality (human vs. non-human) and animacy (animate vs. inanimate). Gender 1 includes males, Gender 2 includes females, Gender 3 mostly includes animates but also some inanimates (e.g. vehicles), and Gender 4 mostly includes inanimate nouns, but also some animates (e.g. small animals and insects). Gender is not expressed on the controller noun itself.

While in the singular gender markers tend to be assigned lexically, in that one cannot predict the distribution of nouns between Genders 3 and 4, in the plural, the agreement is mostly semantic. Namely, in the plural, there is a distinction between human plural (marked as HPL below), with the latter subdivided, on some targets, into non-human animate plural (APL) and inanimate plural (NPL). E.g. the nominative NP *gʷalaχ* 'job' triggers Gender 3 agreement in the singular, but in the plural it belongs to NPL:

(1)	za-d=xa	gʷalaχ	w-aʔa-r-i-j[3]
	I.OBL-ERG=ADD	work**[3]**	**3**-do.IPFV-CVB-COP2-PST

'I was working too.' *(corpus example)*

(2)	gal-a	d-ɨxɨ-r	gʷalaχ-bɨr	haʔa-r=a
	Gal-IN	HPL-go.PFV-CVB	job**[3]**-PL	**NPL.**do.IPFV-CVB=be

'[They] left to Gal (a valley in Azerbaijan) and work there.' *(corpus example)*

Table 1 shows the full set of gender markers in Kina Rutul. There are 5 series of markers that differ in position or form. Columns stand for marker series and rows stand for gender markers.

Table 1. Series of agreement markers

3 Note that in current work we prefer not to gloss nominative case as we consider nominative a basic unmarked nominal form. See the list of abbreviations in the paragraph "Glosses" below.

	prefix ∅−series		**prefix/infix ∅−series**	**infix ∅−series**	**suffix/infix r-series**
	j-initial verbs	h-initial verbs			
1	∅− (j−)	∅− (h−)	∅−	−∅− (−j−)	-r-
2	r-	r-	ru-	-r-	-r-
3	w-	w-	wu-	-w-, -b-	-b-, -p-, -p'-
4	∅− (j−)	∅− (h−)	∅−	−∅− (−j−)	-d-, -t-, -t'-
HPL	d-	d-	du-	−l−, −d−, −∅−	-d-
APL	∅−, r− (j−)	∅− (h−)	∅−, l−	−∅−, −l−	-d-
NPL	∅− (j−)	∅− (h−)	∅−	−∅−	-d-

With rare exceptions, Rutul verbal agreement is controlled by the nominative argument of the clause. In the examples below, three possible positions are shown where a nominative triggers the agreement on the verb: the single argument of an intransitive verb (3a), the patient of a transitive verb (3b) and the stimulus of an affective verb (3c).

(3a) daʿʔwi-ja-la babadid jiq'i-r
war-OBL-SUP.EL grandfather**[1]** **1**.die.PFV-CVB
'Grandfather died in the war.' *(corpus example)*

(3b) riš ubl-i-ra dagul r-aʔa-r=a
girl**[2]** wolf-OBL-ERG steal **2**-do.IPFV-CVB=be
'The wolf kidnaps the girl.' *(corpus example)*

(3c) maχamad-i-s χabar w-ac'i-r
Muhammad-OBL-DAT news**[3]** **3**-know.PFV-CVB
'Muhammad found out the news.'

Also, in the case of complement clause construction, the argument position can be

filled with a clause. In this case, the main predicate agrees in Gender 4.

(4) fatima-s hac'a-r=a [get q-ɨ<b>xɨ-r]
Patimat[2]-DAT **4.**know.IPFV-CVB cat[3] RE-<3>go.PFV-CVB
'Patimat knows that the cat has returned.'

In the present paper, I will discuss the agreement in the context of NP coordination. In Kina Rutul, noun phrases may be coordinated in two ways: with a conjunction clitic *=na* and with an additive clitic *=xa*. Clitic *=na* attaches to the first conjunct, as in (5):

(5) za-d get=na t'ɨla χo<w>qu-r=a
I.OBL-ERG cat**[3]**=AND dog**[3]** <3>catch.PFV-CVB=be
'I caught a cat and a dog.'

Clitic *=xa* may be used in two ways: it can be hosted by a single, non-conjoined noun phrase (6) or by each of the two conjuncts in coordination (7). Single *=xa* has additive semantics, while the second construction tends to have coordinative meaning '[one object] and [another object]'.

(6) ti-baj-dɨ dux-re=xa d-ɨ<r>q'i-r
yonder-CONTR-ATTR son-PL=ADD HPL-<HPL>die.PFV-CVB
'The last three sons have died, too.' *(corpus example)*

(7) ha-ji-k^{w}an sel^{j}sow^{j}et-waldɨ=xa
that-OBL.N-COM village.council[R]-ABSTR=ADD
kowχa-waldɨ=xa l-a<p>t'u-r
elder-ABSTR=ADD PV-<3>end.PFV-CVB
'With that both his service as a village council and as a village leader has ended.'
(corpus example)

In the present study, we will only look at *=na* coordination. Judging from our data, *=na* does not have any other function and can only be attached to nouns. The purpose of this paper is to determine the factors that affect the choice of agreement marker in the case of a conjoined controller and to propose rules that describe it.

2. Coordination and agreement in typological perspective

Typologically, there is a range of ways that languages use to resolve gender agreement in coordination. According to Corbett (1991: 246), gender agreement with conjoined NPs differs dramatically from language to language and shows the highest diversity as compared to a person or number agreement, the latter two usually being based on

semantics. In the case of coordination, there are two principles of the agreement at work: semantic and syntactic (Corbett 1991: 269-290).

Semantic agreement is a set of rules that involve reference to the meaning of NP (or a group of NPs) as a whole, while the gender or other morphological values of the individual nouns are neglected. For example, in English, there are nouns like *committee, government, team* that are morphologically singular but denote a group of humans or objects. In certain dialects of English such nouns are allowed to control both the expected singular agreement on the verb and also plural agreement (compare the pairs 8a-b and 8c-d, examples from (Smith 2017: 824)). So, in such case semantics of a noun prevails over its morphological features, so, it the way semantic agreement works.

(8a) The government **has** approved the measure.

(8b) The government **have** approved the measure.

(8c) The committee **decides** who is hired.

(8d) The committee **decide** who is hired.

Consider now the example of semantic agreement in (9) from Kina Rutul. Both conjuncts are Gender 1 nouns, and agreement is resolved in human plural, because the conjoined NP as a whole has a plural human reference, like in (8c).

(9) za-s maxamed=na rasul bit'ra-na
I.OBL-DAT Muhammad[1]=AND Rasul[1] beautiful-ADV
ʁe-d-ü<l>ge-r=a
PV-HPL-see<IPFV>-CVB=be
'I like Muhammad and Rasul.'

If the agreement is controlled by gender of only one of the conjuncts; in other words, if the rule has to look inside the conjoined NP for a category value to be used in the agreement, we conclude that this is called **syntactic agreement**. In contrast to the semantic agreement, under the syntactic agreement, it is the gender value of one of the conjuncts that prevail over the meaning of the conjoined NP as a whole. The syntactic agreement also exists in Rutul. For instance, in (10c) both nouns are inanimate, but *šagar* 'sugar' is Gender 4 and *q'el* 'salt' is Gender 3. Despite the semantics of the complex NP (inanimate plural), the predicate agrees in Gender 3 in the singular.

(10a) za-d q'el le<w>šu-r=a
I.OBL-ERG salt[3] <3>take.PFV-CVB=be
'I have bought some salt.'

(10b) nin-e šagar ara q-aʔa-r=a
mother.OBL-ERG sugar[4] there RE-4.do.IPFV-CVB=be
‘Mother has put some sugar into [the pan].’

(10c) za-d šagar=na q’el le<w>šu-r=a
I.OBL-ERG sugar[4]=AND salt[3] <3>take.PFV-CVB=be
‘I have bought sugar and salt.’

Corbett (1991: 270-284) suggests a list of cross-linguistic factors that may influence the choice of one of the nouns as the controller in the syntactic agreement, e.g.:

- animacy (animate conjunct is more likely to be a controller)
- distance between the controller and the target (more commonly it is the nearest conjunct that controls agreement; in some languages, however, agreement is controlled by the one further away from the target)

According to Corbett, both types of agreement, semantic and syntactic, may be present within one language. The interaction of different factors and strategies may produce a system that is unique to a language.

There is a number of studies on the agreement under coordination in Dagestanian languages. In Tsakhur (< Lezgic), there is evidence for both semantic and syntactic agreement rules. Kibrik (1999: 360-361) provides the following examples:

(11) a<**w**>χ^{w}-īm-**mi** sa brigadir=ī sa
<**HPL**>remain.PFV-ATTR-**PL** one foreman[1]=AND one
čoban
shepherd[1]
‘[This year our shepherds left,] only one foreman and one shepherd remained.’

(12) še-n-ɢ^{w}-ē suk=ī sik’ił$_{j}$
that-ATTR-OBL.1-ERG wheat**[3]**=AND rye**[3]**
ali<**w**>k-āʔ-a wo=**b**
<**3**>mix-**3**.do-IPFV COP=**3**
‘He mixes up wheat and rye (cannot tell wheat from rye).’

Example (11) shows semantic agreement with two animates (humans); in (12) agreement is syntactic. Though Tsakhur data provided are not conclusive, Kibrik suggests that in (12) the two conjuncts describe one entity, and this is why singular agreement is used. Kibrik does not consider this a case of syntactic agreement.

In Bezhta (Tsezic), according to Khalilova (2017: 9-11), only semantic agreement is

attested. Khalilova presented the following set of agreement rules for Bezhta:

1. If all conjuncts denote humans, the target agrees in human plural;
2. If at least one of the conjuncts denotes a human, target agrees in human plural; (in fact, this rule seems to be a special instance of the first one)
3. If all nouns denote non-humans, the agreement is resolved in non-human plural.

In the next sections, we consider Kina Rutul field data.

3. The structure of the experiment and the data

Standard elicitation methods of asking to provide grammaticality judgments proved to be inefficient for Kina Rutul because choosing the category value seems to be highly variable. Instead of this, I decided to analyse the rules in terms of preferences. I recorded several questionnaires with the same set of stimulus sentences from multiple consultants of different ages. Interestingly, in some cases, it was difficult to see even a tendency.

The questionnaire I compiled consists of sentences with SVO and SOV word orders to control for the position of the controller wrt the target. OVS and OSV orders were not examined because, in Rutul, they are highly marked or sound unnatural; and do not provide additional evidence for my research question. Each sentence contains a transitive or an affective predicate with <ERG, NOM> or <DAT, NOM> case frame. The nominative position of each predicate is occupied by two singular conjuncts.

I have covered a range of possible combinations of nouns of all four genders. I did not, however, use coordination of humans (Genders 1 and 2) with inanimates of Genders 3 and 4, because the consultants consider such sentences pragmatically unacceptable. Thus, sentences like (13a) were deemed infelicitous; the situation would rather be described with a sequence of two clauses, as in (13b):

(13) a. * musa=na wilka ʒɨl-e
Musa**[1]**=AND fork.**4** flour-OBL(SUP)
l-uku-r=a
UP-**1/4**.fall.PFV-CVB=be

b. musa l-uku-r=a, wilka
Musa**[1]** UP-**1**.fall.PFV-CVB=be fork.**4**
ʒɨl-e l-uku-r=a
floor-OBL(SUP) UP-**4**.fall.PFV-CVB=be

‘Musa and a fork fell on the floor.’

The gender combinations that we controlled are shown in Tables A1 and A2 in the Appendix. As Gender 3 and Gender 4 include both animate and inanimate nouns, and animacy is a typologically probable factor, I used various combinations that differ in animacy. At the moment, the data is not complete, and some rows in the tables are empty.

Translations of the questionnaires were collected from Kina Rutul speakers between 1957 and 2005 years of birth. We have collected the questionnaire from 10 consultants for SVO word order and from 6 consultants for SOV word order. Not all of SOV orders have been elicited with the same consultant as SVO orders.

For each questionnaire, Russian stimuli were given in the relevant word order (SVO or SOV). In elicitation, consultants tend to produce the same word order as given in a Russian stimulus. We took into account only the first responses to the stimuli, because consultants often started to re-think their responses and could change their mind completely, or even became unable to decide which of the variants they were suggesting sounded better. We thus consider the first response to be the most natural one.

Unless marked otherwise, all examples below are obtained through elicitation of the questionnaire.

4. Main findings

The results of my study show that Kina Rutul allows both semantic (approximately 66% of all responses) and syntactic (34% of responses) agreement. Many gender combinations show the coexistence of several possible agreement options. There is no evidence that individual speakers have consistent systems of agreement rules; it is not true that one consultant always produces semantic agreement or vice versa.

At the same time, some clear tendencies hold for all speakers:

1. **When both conjuncts are human, the target agrees semantically (takes a human plural gender)**.

As the data in Tables 2 and 3 show, neither gender nor order of conjuncts matters if both conjuncts denote human beings. Rows show the combination of genders in the stimulus, and columns stand for the agreement value selected by the consultant. Numbers in table cells show the number of consultants who suggested this pattern when translating the sentence from the questionnaire.

Table 2. Gender 1 and 2 in SOV

conjuncts	1	2	3	4/NPL	HPL	APL	semantic	syntactic

1+1	2	0	0	0	17	0	89%	11%
2+2	0	1	0	0	17	0	94%	6%
1+2	1	0	0	0	17	0	94%	6%
2+1	0	0	0	0	17	0	100%	0%

Table 3. Gender 1 and 2 in SVO

conjuncts	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4/NPL**	**HPL**	**APL**	**semantic**	**syntactic**
1+1	0	0	0	0	11	0	100%	0%
2+2	0	1	0	0	11	0	92%	8%
1+2	0	0	0	0	13	0	100%	0%
2+1	0	0	0	0	12	0	100%	0%

In (14), we see a conjunction of two Gender 1 nouns; in (15), a conjunction of two Gender 2 nouns; and in (16), a conjunction of two nouns of different genders. Exceptions to the semantic agreement, when the agreement is triggered by one of the conjuncts, are rare (less than 5% of all cases where human NPs are conjoined).

(14) za-d bibidid=na did ʁa-ʔ
I.OBL-ERG grandfather**[1]**=AND father**[1]** outside-LAT
ʁ-e<**d**>i-r
OUT-<**HPL**>kick.PFV-CVB
'I kicked out my father and grandfather.'

(15) jiʁa za-d nin=na babaj
today I.OBL-ERG mother**[2]**=AND grandmother**[2]**
güzet **d**-aʔa-r=a
waiting**HPL**-do.IPFV-CVB=be
'Today I am waiting for my mother and grandmother, [they are supposed to visit my place].'

(16) za-s did=na nin
I.OBL-DAT father**[1]**=AND mother**[2]**
q-i<**d**>ga-r=a

RE-<**HPL**>love.IPFV-CVB=be

‘I love my father and mother.’

2. **When two conjuncts are rational, the agreement tends to be semantic.**

In cases when only one of the conjuncts denotes a human and the other a non-human animate, I consider HPL agreement controlled by the human conjunct (higher on the animacy hierarchy) as a case of semantic agreement. In these configurations, HPL agreement is very frequently preferred; cf. (17).

(17) maxl-ij-a za-s χɨdɨl-dɨ=na zer
outdoors-OBL-IN I.OBL-DAT woman**[2]**-ATTR=AND cow**[3]**
ʁ-e<d>gü-r
PV-<**HPL**>see.PFV-CVB

‘I saw a woman and a cow outdoors.’

In cases of singular (and thus syntactic) agreement, the human NP is rarely selected. The only case of syntactic agreement can be seen for 3(a)+2 combination with SOV word order (18): an agreement in Gender 2 is as frequent as a semantic one (HPL).

(18) jakʷas za-s zer=na χɨdɨldɨ
early.morning I.OBL-DAT cow**[3]**=AND woman**[2]**
ʁ-a<**r**>gu-r
PV-<**2**>see.PFV-CVB
‘I saw a cow and a woman early in the morning.’

Here, word order plays a role. Semantic agreement with animacy sharing occurs only if a human conjunct is closer to the verb, otherwise, agreement tends to be controlled by Gender 3 conjunct syntactically. Compare (19) and (20):

(19) rɨˤq’-a za-s χabaˤqan=na cʼɨ
road.OBL-IN I.OBL-DAT shepherd**[1]**=AND lamb**[3]**
ʁ-o<**w**>gu-r
PV-<**3**>see.PFV-CVB

‘On the way I came across a shepherd and a lamb.’

(20) naq’a dam-a sir-ra t’ɨla=na ʁɨˤʁčeqan
yesterday forest-IN bear-ERG dog**[3]**=AND hunter**[1]**
di-liʔi-r
HPL-eat.PFV-CVB

‘A bear ate a dog and a hunter in the forest yesterday.’

The only exception is 3(a) + 1 combination in SVO, where we expect to see a bias

towards the syntactic agreement in Gender 3, as non-human conjunct is closer to the target, but we see here HPL agreement instead. Therefore, the generalization about HPL agreement cannot be considered as a strict rule but rather a tendency.

In tables 4-5 the data on observed combinations of humans and Gender 3 nouns is summarized.

Table 4. Humans + non-humans in SOV

conjuncts	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4/NPL**	**HPL**	**APL**	**semantic**	**syntactic**
1+3(a)	2	0	14	0	2	1	6%	84%
3(a)+1	1	0	6	0	12	0	63%	37%
2+3(a)	0	1	14	1	1	0	12%	88%
3(a)+2	0	8	2	1	8	0	67%	53%

Table 5. Humans + non-humans in SVO

conjuncts	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4/NPL**	**HPL**	**APL**	**semantic**	**syntactic**
1+3(a)	1	0	1	0	10	0	83%	17%
3(a)+1	1	0	2	0	9	0	75%	25%
2+3(a)	0	4	1	2	13	0	60%	40%
3(a)+2	0	1	3	0	1	0	20%	80%

3. **If both conjuncts denote inanimates, the verb tends to agree semantically in non-human plural class (NPL).**

Consider example (21) with 3(n) + 4 combination:

(21) ustar-a-ra darwaza=na rak hɨʔɨ-r
master-OBL-ERG gate**[3]**=AND door**[4]**4/**NPL**.do.PFV-CVB
'An artisan made a gate and a door.'

However, agreement in Gender 4 and agreement in non-human plural are always syncretic in Kina Rutul. We cannot be sure that in this case we necessarily deal with a semantic agreement. We decided to consider such cases as semantic agreement by ways of generalization of the preference of Kina Rutul towards the semantic agreement which we have observed with human plural agreement, where there is no marker homonymy. However,

other interpretations are also available.

Anyway, this rule cannot be considered consistent, because the available data show that semantic inanimate plural agreement competes with the syntactic singular agreement. In combinations involving a Gender 3 noun, the choice of an affix allows us to define the type of agreement unambiguously.

In table 6-7 the data on combinations of inanimates is summarized.

Table 6. NPL in SOV

conjuncts	1	2	3	4/NPL	HPL	APL	semantic	syntactic
3(n)+4(n)	0	0	5	18	1	0	79%	21%
4(n)+3(n)	0	0	12	7	0	0	63%	37%

Table 7. NPL in SVO

conjuncts	1	2	3	4/NPL	HPL	APL	semantic	syntactic
3(n)+3(n)	0	0	7	5	0	0	42%	58%
3(n)+4(n)	0	0	1	5	0	0	83%	17%
4(n)+3(n)	0	0	3	16	0	0	84%	16%

4. Distance between target and controller

This factor can be seen clearly in the sentences where one of the controllers is of Gender 3. Sometimes Gender 3 wins over Gender 1 and 2 (humans), like in (17), despite the animacy hierarchy-based expectations that human nouns are supposed to have a priority as agreement controllers. In 83% of cases where one or both of the conjuncts have Gender 3, the target agrees in Gender 3. It should be noted that, in such cases, the position of the controller influences agreement to some degree: where a Gender 3 controller is closer to the target, the probability that it triggers agreement in Gender 3 is higher (see tables A1 and A2 in appendix).

5. Towards a generalization

Considering the tendencies we have discussed, we can try to come up with a set of principles that Kina Rutul follows when agreeing with a coordinated controller. We assume that two factors are relevant for the choice of gender category:

1. Animacy
2. The linear distance between a target and a controller

The higher is the NP up the animacy hierarchy and the closer to the target, the more likely it is to control agreement. If these factors contradict each other (e.g. the furthest conjunct is animate, but the closest is not), distance seems to have a priority over animacy. It follows from the fact that, e.g., 3(a) + 4(n) combination with SOV word order is resolved in 4/NPL agreement (that is, distance has a priority over animacy), but there are no cases where animacy wins over distance.

The choice between semantic and syntactic agreement also depends on the gender of the conjuncts. Thus, if an agreement is controlled by Gender 1 or 2 conjuncts, agreement tends to be semantic. On the other hand, Gender 3 controllers usually trigger syntactic agreement.

6. Conclusion

Describing agreement with coordinated NPs in Kina Rutul meets a number of challenges. In this pilot study, we have analysed transitive clauses with SOV and SVO word orders with a range of gender combinations of the conjuncts. As I have shown, Kina Rutul seems to lack a strict system of rules to resolve agreement conflicts, as most of the combinations allow more than one agreement strategy that are often in a strong competition across speakers. Besides, the majority of our consultants do not possess any straightforward sets of rules even within their idiolect.

Available data show that Kina Rutul combines syntactic and semantic agreement. The choice of the strategy depends on the controller (Gender 1 and 2 frequently control semantic agreement, while Gender 3 favor syntactic agreement). The choice of the controller is determined by animacy and linear distance from the target.

As the next step in this research, we intend to collect more data for the cases where the speakers diverge and analyse missing gender configurations. Another line to follow would be to include the agreement in intransitive clauses or agreement in disjunction.

Abbreviations

1 — Gender 1; 2 — Gender; 3 — Gender 3; 4 — Gender 4; HPL — human plural; APL — animate plural; NPL — non-human plural; ADD — additive; COP1 — full copula; COP2 — reduced copula; CVB — converb; DAT — dative case; DOWN — preverb "down"; ERG — ergative case; H — human; IN — in-essive case; IPFV — imperfective stem; LAT — lative case; OBL — oblique stem; RE — refactive preverb; SUPER — super-essive case; SUP.EL — super-elative case; PFV — perfective stem; PL — plural; UP — preverb "up".

Appendix

In Table A1 and A2, numbers in the first column indicate the lexical classes of the two conjuncts in the order that was presented in a given stimulus. Letters "n(on-animate)" and "a(nimate)" stand for animacy of the noun. Numbers and abbreviations in the header row stand for the agreement value selected by the verb form that was used in the translation. Each case in the tables shows how often this value was used in translations of the given stimulus. The two columns on the right provide percent of the translations corresponding to the semantic or syntactic agreement.

Table A1. Overview of SOV questionnaire

conjuncts	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4/NPL**	**HPL**	**APL**	**semantic**	**syntactic**
1+1	2	0	0	0	17	0	89%	11%
2+2	0	1	0	0	17	0	94%	6%
1+2	1	0	0	0	17	0	94%	6%
2+1	0	0	0	0	17	0	100%	0%
3(a)+3(a)	0	0	17	0	0	1	6%	94%
3(n)+3(n)								

1+3(a)	2	0	14	0	2	1	6%	84%
3(a)+1	1	0	6	0	12	0	63%	37%
2+3(a)	0	1	14	1	1	0	12%	88%
3(a)+2	0	8	2	1	8	0	67%	53%
4(n)+4(n)								
3(n)+4(n)	0	0	5	18	1	0	79%	21%
3(a)+4(n)	0	0	4	14	0	0	78%	12%
3(a)+4(a)								
4(n)+3(n)	0	0	12	7	0	0	63%	37%
4(n)+3(a)								
4(a)+4(n)								

Table A2. Overview of SVO questionnaire

conjuncts	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4/NPL**	**HPL**	**APL**	**semantic**	**syntactic**
1+1	0	0	0	0	11	0	100%	0%
2+2	0	1	0	0	11	0	92%	8%
1+2	0	0	0	0	13	0	100%	0%
2+1	0	0	0	0	12	0	100%	0%
3(a)+3(a)	0	0	5	0	1	0	17%	83%
3(n)+3(n)	0	0	7	5	0	0	42%	58%

1+3(a)	1	0	1	0	10	0	83%	17%
3(a)+1	1	0	2	0	9	0	75%	25%
2+3(a)	0	4	1	2	13	0	60%	40%
3(a)+2	0	1	3	0	1	0	20%	80%
4(n)+4(n)								
3(n)+4(n)	0	0	1	5	0	0	83%	17%
3(a)+4(n)	0	0	8	4	0	0	33%	67%
3(a)+4(a)								
4(n)+3(n)	0	0	3	16	0	0	84%	16%
4(n)+3(a)	0	0	2	4	0	0	67%	33%
4(a)+4(n)								

References

Corbett 1991 — Corbett, Greville G. Gender. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Khalilova 2017 — Khalilova, Z. M. 2017. Princypy soglasovaniya s cochinennymi imennymi gruppami v bezhtinskom yazyke // Acta Linguistica Petropolitana 13, 1: 814-829.

Kibrik 1999 — Kibrik A.E. Soglasovanie. // Kibrik A.E., Testelets Ya.G. (ред.), Elementy tsakhurskogo yazyka v tipologicheskom osveshchenii. Moscow: Nasledie, 1999.

Smith 2017 — Smith, P. 2017. The syntax of semantic agreement in English. Journal of Linguistics, 53(4), 823-863.

Morozova V.A. Research assistant at Linguistic convergence laboratory, HSE University.
tito_alba@mail.ru