7. Prominent internal possessors in Bashkir

Abstract

Bashkir (Turkic) definite possessors are invariably coded by genitives. Bashkir quasi-coordinate constructions in which the non-finite clause is headed by the converb in –p normally require co-referential subjects, but are sometimes acceptable if there is co-reference between a genitival possessor in either clause and the subject in the other clause. Typically, these prominent possessors are animate, topical and affected by the event, possessive relations are inalienable, and the respective possessed nominals are inanimate. However, none of these absolute requirements is obligatory; possessor’s ability to control co-reference is determined relatively: it must occupy the leftmost position in the clause and be more salient than other available noun phrases. The ability of genitival nominals in Bashkir to function as prominent possessors is related to their other exceptional properties: Bashkir genitives are used in many contexts where other languages switch to clause-level possessors.
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7.1 Introduction

In Bashkir, a Turkic language spoken in the Southern Urals, genitival possessors can sometimes be co-referential with the main clause subject in a bi-clausal construction which normally requires identity of subjects:

(1) **Bolat-təŋ kős-ö bööt-öp eʃ-tän tuqta-nə**

Bulat-GEN strength-POSS.3 end-CVB work-ABL stop-PST

‘Bulat got exhausted and stopped working’; literally: ‘As Bulat’si strength finished, (he,) stopped working’

The possessor in the dependent clause in (1) meets the definition of the prominent internal possessor (PIP) adopted in this volume: it is located within the subject noun phrase in the dependent clause but controls the same-subject relation across the two clauses. This kind of uses, even though arguably a marginal pattern in Bashkir, is the primary focus in this study.

My analysis of the PIPs in Bashkir is largely based on the ample questionnaire by Nikolaeva et al. (2015), see also Chapter 1 (this volume). In particular, my aim is to identify those specific properties which make it possible for an internal possessor to be prominent for purposes of clause combining in Bashkir. Based on elicitation data, I will argue that these

---

1 I am greatly indebted to Daria Mishchenko, Maria Ovsjannikova and other co-expeditioners for fruitful discussions that helped me conduct this study and analyze its results. I am also grateful to the organizers and participants of the Workshop on Prominent Internal Possessors that took place at SOAS, University of London, on 22-23 September 2016, for their insightful feedback. Last but not least, I benefited a lot from detailed comments from the anonymous referee of earlier versions of this paper. The usual disclaimers apply.

2 The following abbreviations are used in this paper: 1, 2, 3 — 1st, 2nd, 3rd person; ABL — ablative; ACC — accusative; AG — agent; ANT — anterior; CAUS — causative; CMPR — comparative; COND — conditional; COP — copula; CVB — converb; DAT — dative; GEN — genitive; IMP — imperative; IPFV — imperfective; JUSS — jussive; LOC — locative; NEG — negation; NMLZ — nominalization; NOM — nominative; NUM — numeral; ORD — ordinal; POSS — possessive; PASS — passive; PTCP — participle; PL — plural; POT — potential; PST — past; Q — question; REFL — reflexive; SG — singular; SUBST — substantivizer; TERM — terminative.
properties are best described in relative, rather than absolute, terms: in order to be able to control same-subject relation, the possessor must outrank competing noun phrases available in the same clause in terms of several scales, such as animacy, definiteness and topicality. I will also situate this ability of Bashkir genitival possessors in a broader context of their salient properties.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 7.2, I introduce the language and methods used in this study. Section 7.3 is the longest and empirically central: here, I discuss quasi-coordinate uses of the converb in –p, and focus on those constructions where possessors are involved in establishing co-reference across clauses. In Section 7.4, I briefly analyze other clause-combining strategies in Bashkir and show that possessors are irrelevant for those other strategies. Section 7.5 presents some general properties of genitival possessors in Bashkir and focuses on constituency tests with respect to various possessive constructions. The main findings of the study are summarized in Section 7.6.

7.2 Setting the stage: language and method

7.2.1 The language

Bashkir belongs to the Kipchak branch of Turkic languages and is spoken by some 1,4 million speakers, mostly in the republic of Bashkortostan and several adjacent regions of Russia. Most speakers of Bashkir are currently bilingual with Russian.

Typologically, Bashkir is a typical Altaic-type language. Its basic word order is SOV, although deviations are not infrequent, in particular, non-subject topics can be left-dislocated (Nikitina 2017: 178). Most types of phrases, including noun phrases and adpositional phrases, are consistently head-final. Bashkir has no genuine 3rd person personal pronouns: demonstratives are sometimes used in the function of personal pronouns, but pro-drop is very widespread in natural texts. Grammatical relations are signalled by both flagging (6 cases, accusative alignment, Altaic-type differential object marking) and indexing: the verb obligatorily agrees with 1st and 2nd person subjects, there is also optional agreement with 3rd person plural subjects.

An important even if somewhat elusive characteristic is that morphological marking in Bashkir is associated with specific syntactic configurations rather than with lexical category of individual words. One facet of this general feature is high part-of-speech flexibility in terms of Hengeveld (1992). However, there are also other facets. For example, there are several suffixal verb forms that can function as nominal modifiers, as heads of complements clauses and as independent predicates. Such forms are traditionally referred to as “participles”. The crucial fact is that further morphological marking of these forms depends on their syntactic function: they are unmarked in adnominal position (similarly to most other adnominal modifiers); they are case-marked when used as heads of complement clauses (similarly to verb’s nominal objects); and they take subject person-number markers when used as independent predicates, similarly to all other elements in this syntactic positions (subject person-number suffixes can appear not only on finite verbs, but also on adjectives, nouns, locatives expressions etc.).

After a brief discussion of methodology in Section 7.2.2, I will highlight two domains in the grammar of Bashkir, which are especially relevant for the present study: possessive constructions (7.2.3) and clause-combining (7.2.4).

7.2.2 Data and methods

This study is mainly based on data obtained through fieldwork. It is part of a larger collective project devoted to the field-based study of the Bashkir language. In particular, I transcribe and interlinearize Bashkir data in accordance with the conventions that have been collectively developed by the team of researchers from the Institute for linguistic studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, and St. Petersburg State University during their field trips to Bashkortostan in 2011-
2017. These conventions are discussed in (Say et al. 2017); other papers published in the same
volume contain some of the findings obtained in our collective project.

I undertook a pilot study of PIPs in Bashkir in St. Petersburg in May, 2016, when I worked
with Lilija Ajsoyna Buskunbaeva and Linara Kamilovna Ishkildina, who are linguists and native
speakers of Bashkir. The main bulk of data was further gathered in August 2016 in the village of
Raxmetovo (Bashkortostan), where I worked with 10 different speakers. Constructions where
possessors control same-subjects relations between clauses are fairly marginal in Bashkir, so it
was not feasible to collect sufficient amount of data from natural texts. Thus, I mostly relied on
grammaticality judgments obtained from native speakers. For that purpose, I used various
combinations of potentially relevant features (animacy, type of the referential device, the nature
of the possessive relation etc., see Section 7.3 for details) in both Russian sentences, which I
asked my consultants to translate into Bashkir, and Bashkir sentences, which I constructed
myself and whose grammaticality was evaluated by the consultants. I elicited between 2 and 7
grammaticality judgments for each sentence I used in the study; overall, I used 240 different
sentences which (potentially) involve PIPs. As PIPs are a borderline phenomenon in Bashkir,
grammaticality judgments were often mixed or indeterminate. Thus, it was very important for me
to differentiate between degrees of acceptability. Throughout this paper, all elicited sentences are
accompanied by symbols that represent averaged speakers' judgments according to the scheme
in Table 7.1.

<<Insert Table 7.1 somewhere around here>>

Apart from elicitation, I used natural data whenever possible (this is especially relevant for
sections with background information). Natural examples are not accompanied by
grammaticality symbols; instead they are followed by a reference to the source. Sources used
include i) «Machine fund of the Bashkir language» (sic!), a corpus-like collection of literary
texts run by IHLL RAS, Ufa (http://mfbl2.ru), and ii) «Corpus of oral Bashkir» (referred to as
COB), a small corpus of oral texts that were gathered in and around Raxmetovo in 2011-2017
(total duration 5 hours); these texts have been annotated in ELAN and Toolbox and are available

7.2.3 Possessive and other nominal constructions

In Bashkir, as in other Turkic languages, there are several constructions where nouns function as
modifiers to other nouns. One of these constructions involves both head-marking (the possessed
nominal is marked for the person and number of the possessor) and dependent-marking (the
possessor is marked for the genitive case), as in (2):

(2) qәәð-ðәŋ ata-hә-n
girl-GEN father-POSS.3-ACC
‘the girl’s father (acc.)’

Constructions like that in (2) are sometimes referred to as “Izafet (sometimes also ezafe) III” in
traditional (Soviet-style) Turkology. These structures co-exist with two other types of nominal
constructions: Izafet I, which involves no head- or dependent-marking, see (3), and Izafet II,
which involves head-marking only, see (4).

(3) timer kәәrәk-te
iron spade-ACC
‘iron spade (acc.)’

Minor changes have been made to abbreviations in order to comply with the requirements of this volume. These changes did not affect conventions of segmentation and categorization.
The distribution of the three Izafet constructions in Bashkir is a complicated phenomenon, see Dmitriev’s classical grammar (1948: 223–228) for Bashkir, as well as Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2003: 649) and Graschenkov (2007) for a wider Turkological perspective. Simplifying somewhat, the possessor is marked for the genitive case if it is definite; thus, the double-marked structure is the default choice for encoding legal ownership, kinship and part-whole relations. Morphologically unmarked nominal dependents typically denote “non-anchoring” relations in Koptjevskaja-Tamm’s (2002) terms, and thus form constructions which are referred to as “modification-by-noun” by Nikolaeva & Spencer (2013). Semantic interpretation of such nominal dependents encompasses, but is not limited to, such domains as material (typical of Izafet I constructions), function, purpose and quality (typical of Izafet II).

The internal structure of Bashkir noun phrases is rather rigid. The genitival possessor, if present, is normally in the leftmost position, as follows from what was said in the beginning of this section, if there is a genitival nominal dependent, the head always bears a possessive suffix (the reverse is not true). Constructions with pronominal possessors generally follow the double-marked schema, although two deviations are possible: i) if independent 1st / 2nd person pronouns in the genitive are present, the head sometimes lacks possessive suffixes (this is common for 1PL and 2PL possessors, especially in the speech of younger speakers); ii) the use of independent pronouns is optional (sometimes even felt to be redundant) if the head nouns bears the relevant possessive suffixes. However, in what follows I assume that constructions with pronominal possessors constitute a subtype of genitival constructions.

Genitival possessors allow unlimited recursion, as long as there is a chaining relation between possessors, see (6). However, it is hardly possible to use noun phrases with two stacked genitival possessors pertaining to the same head, see (7). This seems to be a structural constraint, although the semantic basis for such constructions is itself very limited.

(i) təw-yan kön-ö bul-də-mə äle Israfil-dəŋ?
be.born-PTCP.PST day-POSS.3 be-PST-Q yet Israfil-GEN
≈ ‘His birthday has not yet passed, Israfil’s?’ (COB)

4 Very rarely in texts, possessors are detached, as in (i); these examples are probably best analyzed as resulting from some sort of afterthought phenomena:

(6) 1beð-ðeŋ mäktäb-ebed-ðeŋ direktor-œ-nəy aya-hə-ña
we-GEN school-POSS.1PL-GEN director-POSS.3-GEN elder.brother-POSS.3-DAT
‘to our school’s director’s elder brother’
“Have you seen my map of Ufa?”

Genitival possessors in Bashkir, as elsewhere in Turkic, are invariably analyzed as adnominal (that is, NP-internal) dependents. On closer examination, however, the issue of constituency is not quite straightforward, see Section 7.5 for details.

The use of the genitive is by far the most widespread strategy to encode possession in Bashkir. Other strategies are rather peripheral. In particular, constructions with canonical properties of external possessive constructions are barely attested in Bashkir. The closest Bashkir gets to external possessor construction is found with a few agentive verbs of contact, where the possessor occupies the direct object slot, whereas the body part is expressed in a peripheral position, as in (8):

(8)  min [besäj-ðe] [arqa-ho-nan] həjpə-nə-m
    I  cat-ACC back-POSS.3-ABL stroke-PST-1SG
    ‘I stroked the cat on its back’

Structures like (8) meet only a subset of the defining criteria of external possessive constructions as e.g. proposed by König (2001: 971); they belong to the type identified as “possessor splitting constructions” by Podlesskaja and Rakhilina (1999). Importantly, possessor splitting constructions coexist with two different types of constructions with regular possessors in the genitive: in one of them (9), the possessed nominal occupies the direct object slot, and in another (10), it occupies the same peripheral slot as in the split construction illustrated in (8).

(9)  min besäj-ðeŋ arqa-ho-n həjpə-nə-m
    I  cat-GEN back-POSS.3-ACC stroke-PST-1SG
    ‘I stroked the cat’s back’

(10) min besäj-ðeŋ arqa-ho-nan həjpə-nə-m
    I  cat-GEN back-POSS.3-ABL stroke-PST-1SG
    ‘I stroked along the cat’s back’

Structures like (10) are unusual in that here, the peripheral encoding of the possessed nominal is not accompanied by the “promotion” of the possessor to the direct object slot. A similar phenomenon is observed with several Bashkir three-place verbs such as e.g. huq- ‘hit’, as discussed by Ovsjannikova (2017). With these verbs, the goal argument can be expressed as either the direct object or an oblique (dative) argument, as in (11).

(11)  Yabbas mulla ... [linejka menän] [unəŋ us-o-na] huq-tə
    Gabbas mulla ruler with this.GEN palm-POSS.3-DAT hit-PST
    ‘Mulla Gabbasi … recently hit his palm with a ruler’ (mfbl2.ru) via (Ovsjannikova 2017: 199)

Ovsjannikova shows that the use of a body part rather than the human possessor as the verb’s argument (‘hit his palm’, not ‘hit him’) correlates with the choice of the peripheral syntactic position of this argument. However, the dative encoding of the possessed nominal is not accompanied by any possessor “promotion” (see the use of the regular genitival pronominal form in (11)), unlike some familiar types of external possessor constructions. Constructions like those in (9)–(11) are relevant because they show that the functional contrasts that are signaled by the...
choice between internal vs. external possessor constructions in many other languages can be achieved in Bashkir without ousting the possessor from its default genitive position.

According to the definition adopted in this volume (see Chapter 1), the prominence of internal possessors can manifest itself in two ways. Bashkir adnominal possessors never display one of these features: they never trigger agreement with the main predicate. This is particularly telling in the case of 3rd person plural possessors, because in this case the relevant morphological forms of the possessed nominal are ambiguous, cf. *bala-lar-ə* <child-PL-POSS.3> a. ‘his/her children’, b. ‘their child’, c. ‘their children’. However, even though the plural marker in such forms can signal either the number of possessed nominals, or the number of possessors (or both), these forms can never trigger verb agreement if the number of possessed objects is singular. In (12), the plural form of the verb is only possible if the plural marker on the noun signal the number of possessed nominals (‘children’), not possessors.

(12)  

\[
\text{bala-lar-ə ös-önsö klass-ta uqø-j-ðar}
\]

\[
\text{child-PL-POSS.3 three-ORD class-LOC study-IPFV-PL}
\]

‘His/her/their children are in the third year’ / *‘Their child is in the third year’

Even though Bashkir possessors in the genitive case never trigger agreement on the verb, they do sometimes display another property which is indicative of their prominence, namely, they are able to control same-subject relations across clauses, as will be discussed in Section 7.3.

7.2.4 Clause-combining in Bashkir

7.2.4.1 General profile

Bashkir clause-combining has a general profile which is fairly typical of Altaic languages. Dependent clauses almost always linearly precede main clauses (sometimes they follow main clauses; medial position of dependent clauses is extremely rare except for participial relative clauses). Dependent clauses are very often headed by non-finite forms, so that natural discourse, especially in the case of elder speakers, is usually organized in chains of non-finite clauses followed by just one finite clause (see e.g. Johanson 1995: 330ff. for a pan-Turkic perspective on the phenomenon). Conjunctions are used infrequently; the only non-borrowed elements that function as conjunctions are grammaticalized non-finite forms of the verb of speech, viz. *tip* <say.CVB> and *tigän* <say.PTCP.PST>. The distribution of possible morphosyntactic strategies across main types of clause-combining is shown in Table 7.2.

The term “participle” needs a brief comment here: this is a traditional label in Turkology, which is applied to any verb form which can function as head of a relative clause. However, all Bashkir “participles” can also be used finitely and as heads of complement clauses; in this latter function, they could be labeled “nominalizations” or “gerunds”. Using any specific term highlights just one type of uses at the expense of other functions. For this reason, I deliberately stick to the traditional term “participle”, even though it might be confusing in some contexts.

In what follows I focus on adverbial and narrative clause-combining constructions; by narrative constructions I refer to structures where linearly preceding clauses denote events that are on the time-line and belong to the foreground, but are morphologically asymmetrical vis-à-vis the linearly final clause in the sequence (see discussion of quasi-coordination in Section 7.2.4.2). With both finite and non-finite dependent clauses of these types the following natural tendency is generally observed: non-identical subjects are overtly expressed in each clause, whereas identical subjects are expressed only once, typically in the beginning of the first clause,
see (13a) as opposed to (13b); for a brief discussion of constituency in same-subject configurations, see Sections 7.3.1 and 7.3.2.

(13) a  'Zöxrä qajt-qan-da Bolat qəwan-da
Zuxra come-PTCP.PST-LOC Bulat rejoice-PST
‘Bulat was glad when Zuxra returned’

b OK Bolat xat-tə uqə-yan-da qəwan-da
Bulat letter-ACC read-PTCP.PST-LOC rejoice-PST
‘Bulat, was glad when he read the letter’, *‘He, was glad when Bulat, read the letter’

However, this tendency is not a strict rule of grammar. Rather, it is a common discourse-oriented reference-tracking device, which can be violated in both directions, that is, overt pronouns are sometimes redundantly used in same-subject configurations, and sometimes there is no overt subject even though the understood referent is not identical to the subject from the preceding clause. Both possibilities are exemplified in the following example from a natural narrative.

(14) {Left context: A soldier from among the enemies was harassing Jamila, and she plotted revenge. She invited him for a walk along the river}.  
_____i Ayidel-deŋ iŋ tärän jer-e-nä jet-käs, _____i tege
Agidel-GEN most deep earth-POSS.3-DAT reach-CVB.ANT that
haldat-tə=la, iŋ tärän jer-gä
soldier-ACC=also drag-CVB self-POSS.3=also most deep earth-DAT
tašla-n-a, ___i+j ül-ä-lär
throw-REFL-IPFV die-IPFV-PL

‘When she reaches the deepest part of (the river of) Agidel, she drags the soldier and throws herself into this deepest part, (so that) they (both) die’ (COB)

In the third clause of (14), there is an overt emphatic subject pronoun (üd-e=lä, ≈ ‘she herself’) even though it is co-referential with the subject from the previous clause; in the final clause there is no overt subject, but the verb form overtly signals plurality of subjects, which means that in fact both of the main protagonists died; thus, there is only partial co-reference with the preceding clause.

Importantly, reference-tracking in narrative and adverbial clauses is primarily dependent upon the use of NPs, overt pronouns and zeros, as well as word order, intonation and similar cues, whereas the choice of verb forms (finite vs. non-finite) plays a relatively minor role: substituting a finite form with a non-finite one or vice versa mainly affects temporal and causal relations between events, as well as grounding, but not the referential structure of discourse.

Converbs do not agree with their arguments. Most types of converbs (as well as case-marked participles, which are functionally similar to converbs) can be used with (as in 13a, 15b) or without (15a) an overt subject, and in both same-subject (13b and 15a) and different-subject configurations (13a and 15b).

(15) a unda higeð-ense klass-qa jet-känse uqə-nə-q
that.LOC eight-ORD class-DAT reach-CVB.TERM study-IPFV-1PL
‘We studied there until (we) reached the eighth year’ (COB)

b milicija kil-gänse,
police come-CVB.TERM
ular üd-ə=kär-e-nəŋ yäjeb-e-n tanə-nə-lär
they self-PL-POSS.3-GEN fault-POSS.3-ACC know-PST-PL
‘Before the police came, they (= the burglars) acknowledged their fault’ (COB)

However, there is one converb which behaves unusually with respect to co-reference in clause combining. This converb is marked by the suffix –p; it is glossed simply as CVB throughout the paper. Structures with this converb are discussed separately in the following section.

7.2.4.2 The converb in –p

The converb in –p is the most frequent (Smetina 2017: 394) and fairly multifunctional type of converb. For example, it is frequently used as the non-finite part in several types of bi-verbal monoclausal structures which are often referred to as “complex verbs” (and also “quasi auxiliary constructions”, “clause union construction”, “serial verb constructions” etc.) in Turkic studies. In these structures, the converb expresses the lexical meaning, whereas the grammaticalized finite form expresses an aspectual, modal or spatial meaning. In (16), there are two instances of complex verbs involving the converb in –p.

(16) ikmäg-e-n täörä-gä ultør-əp quj-yan=da,
    bread-POSS.3-ACC window-DAT sit-CVB put-PTCP.PST=also
    üd-e səy-əp kit-kän
    self-POSS.3 go.out-CVB go.away-PTCP.PST
    ‘(She) placed the leavened dough on the window sill, and then she went away’ (COB)

However, in what follows I will concentrate on a completely different pattern involving the converb in –p. This pattern can be referred to as quasi-coordination. What is common to all of these uses is that the structures at issue are clearly biclausal, and the converb is the head of the linearly preceding (or, very rarely, centre-embedded) clause. In what follows I will refer to the clause headed by the converb as the ‘dependent’ clause, as opposed to the ‘main’ clause, although these conventional labels are not entirely unproblematic, as will follow from the discussion immediately below. The exact semantic interpretation of the relations between the two clauses significantly varies from one example to another; it can range from temporal sequence to manner of action and from causal relationship to mere conjunction, see (Dmitriev 1948: 187–188 and especially Juldashev (ed.) 1981: 301–308 for the discussion of the many functions of this form). Typically, the choice of the interpretation depends on contextual clues, such as aspectual properties of the verbs involved, intonation, etc. However, sometimes there are no unequivocal clues, and a biclausal structure is open to several semantic interpretations which can scarcely be teased apart, see several possible translations for the following example.

(17) ¹ at-əm sogor-ya gola-p toš-öp
    horse-POSS.1SG pit-DAT fall-CVB descend-CVB
    ajay-ə-n hən-dor-ðə
    foot-POSS.3-ACC break-CAUS-PST
    ‘My horse fell into a pit and broke a leg’ / ‘When my horse fell into a pit, it broke a leg’ / ‘My horse broke a leg, because it fell into a pit’

Quasi-coordinate constructions are unusual in that they combine properties that are associated with coordination and subordination. For example, on the one hand, the clause headed by the converb in –p is within the scope of the illocutionary operators in the finite clause, as in (18).

(18) ⁰ ok klass-tan səy-əp išek-te jap-hən
    class-ABL go.out-CVB door-ACC close-JUSS
    ‘Let him go out of the classroom and close the door’
The first clause in (18) is within the scope of the jussive marker which is attached to the verb in the main clause. This pattern, which can be referred to as “conjunct illocutionary force”, is not typical of structures with canonical subordinate clauses, see Bickel (2009: 52ff.) for discussion and further references. And indeed, other non-finite forms are outside of the scope of illocutionary force operators located in the main clause, as in (19).

(19)  
\[
\text{ok} \quad \text{klass-tan} \quad \text{sq-qan-da} \quad \text{išek-te} \quad \text{jap-hon} \\
\text{class-ABL} \quad \text{go.out-PTCP.PST-LOC} \quad \text{door-ACC} \quad \text{close-JUSS} \\
\text{‘Let him close the door after he goes out of the classroom’}
\]

On the other hand, quasi-coordinate constructions involving converbs in –p allow NP-extraction, that is, do not display island constraints which are expected for genuine coordinate structures. Extraction is possible for purposes of e.g. questioning or relativization; the latter possibility is illustrated in (20).

(20)  
\[
\text{ok} \quad \text{qojma aša tös-öp} \quad \text{järäxtå-län-ep} \quad \text{quj-yan} \\
\text{fence} \quad \text{through descend-CVB} \quad \text{wound-CVB} \quad \text{put-PTCP.PST} \\
\text{barmay-öm} \quad \text{jünäl-má-j} \\
\text{finger-POSS.1SG} \quad \text{fix-NEG-IPFV} \\
\text{‘My finger that got hurt when I was climbing over the fence is not healing up’ (Cf. ‘My finger that \{I was climbing over the fence and it\} got hurt] is not healing up’)}
\]

Very rarely in texts, converbial clauses in –p are centre-embedded, which is a strong argument against treating them as coordinate clauses. To sum up, quasi-coordinate structures of this kind display a combination of properties associated with canonical coordination and subordination.

This situation is fairly typical of Altaic languages: in many of them there are structures that are not easily classifiable into coordination vs. subordination, see e.g. various contributions to (Haspelmath & Koenig 1995) and (Vajda 2008), Johanson’s work (e.g. 1995) on Turkic converbs and especially Pazelskaya’s contribution in (Tatevosov et al. eds.) 2017: 637–648) on the Mishar dialect of Tatar, which is closely related to Bashkir. The complex picture in Bashkir lays the ground for plethora of theoretical interpretations. Many of these possibilities have been actually proposed with respect to similar data from other languages; for an overview of approaches couched in a functional-typological perspective see (Cristofaro 2003: 15–29). One possibility is to hypothesize that there is structural ambiguity: bi-clausal structures involving converbs in –p can theoretically represent two (or more) distinct structures with straightforwardly coordinate or subordinate properties; Kwon and Polinsky (2008) advocate this solution for Korean data, which are superficially reminiscent of the Bashkir pattern discussed; Göksel & Öztürk (Chapter 6, this volume) briefly discuss it for Turkish. Another possibility is to avoid a strict coordination vs. subordination dichotomy altogether, either by postulating a third mixed pattern, e.g. “cosubordination” in Foley & Van Valin’s (1984) terms, or by assuming a prototypical approach, following e.g. Haiman & Thompson (1984), or by building bottom-up clusterization of clause-linkage types based on a fine-grained multivariate typology, see Bickel (2009).

For empirical purposes, it suffices to say that quasi-coordinate structures involving the converb in –p are different from both the clear cases of converbial subordination, and co-ordinate structures involving conjunctions; this is exactly the arena where Bashkir possessors can play a role in establishing co-reference across clauses, the pattern to be discussed in Section 7.3.

7.3 PIPs in quasi-coordination

---

6 This property has been also reported for the cognate converb in the closely related Mishar Tatar (Pazelskaya, Shluinskij 2007).
7.3.1 Same-subject constraint in quasi-coordination

Quasi-coordinate constructions, as identified in Section 7.2.4.2, stand out from other clause-combining strategies because this strategy normally requires the two clauses to have the same subject. Two overt subjects in each of the quasi-coordinate clauses usually are not accepted, although some exceptions will be discussed throughout Section 7.3, especially in 7.3.6. By far the most typical pattern of quasi-coordination involving the converb in \( p \) is the situation when the two clauses have the same subject, but it is overtly expressed no more than once, typically in the beginning of the sentence, as in (21a). It is not entirely clear whether the full noun phrase should be viewed as structurally present in the main or in the dependent clause, see the two possible alternative structures in (21b) and (21c).

(21) a unəŋ ata-hə ügäj āsääj al-əp ül-gän ti
that.GEN father-POSS.3 step- mother take-CVB die-PTCP.PST say.IPFV
‘Her father married once again and died’ or ‘After marrying once again her father died’

b unəŋ ata-hə [____i ügäj āsääj al-əp] ül-gän ti

The same-subject constraint in quasi-coordination is clearly visible when it coerces a pragmatically implausible interpretation. In (22), the unexpressed subject is obligatorily interpreted as co-referential with the overt subject from another clause, even though this creates a less realistic scenario in terms of causal relationships between clauses.

(22) kemder Bolat-təŋ tanaw-ə-n jemer-ep bolnica-la jat-a
someone Bulat-GEN nose-POSS.3-ACC destroy-CVB hospital-LOC lie-IPFV
‘Someone broke Bulat’s nose so that / and he, is now in the hospital’

Examples like those just discussed show that nominative subjects (S or A arguments) function as pivots for purposes of quasi-coordination. Violation of strict co-reference often causes ungrammaticality: (23a) is ungrammatical regardless whether there is an overt pronominal subject in the first clause, because this subject is distinct from the grammatical subject (A-argument) of the second clause. A possible mechanism to achieve grammaticality in this situation is to passivize the second clause, as in (23b).

(23) a (*min) qaranyə uram-dan bar-əp arqa-m-a kem-der huq-tə
I.NOM dark street-ABL go-CVB back-POSS.1SG-DAT who-maybe hit-PST
Expected meaning: ‘I was walking along a dark street when / so that someone hit me in the back’

b OK qaranyə uram-dan bar-əp kem-dän-der arqa-m-a
dark street-ABL go-CVB who-ABL-maybe back-POSS.1SG-DAT
hit-PASS-PST-1SG
‘I was walking along a dark street when / so that I got hit by someone in the back’

There is evidence that both types of structures are in fact possible in closely related Mishar Tatar, see Tatevosov et al. (eds) (2017: 630–631). Whether this is also the case in Bashkir should be explored elsewhere.
In Dixon’s (1994: 144) terms, passivization in examples like (23b) is a ‘pivot-feeding’ operation: it promotes the necessary noun phrase to the pivot position, that is, the nominative subject position in the case of Bashkir, and makes the clause-combining strategy grammatically acceptable. Interestingly, Bashkir can sometimes use causativization to the same syntactic effect, cf. (24a) and (24b).

(24) a *Bolat jər-ðə təŋla-ðə ber xāl ið-e-nā tōs-tō
   Bulat  song-ACC listen-CVB  one  state.of.affairs  mind-POSS.3-DAT descend-PST

   Expected meaning: ‘When Bulat was listening to the song, a story (from the past) came to his mind’

b OK Bolat jər-ðə təŋla-ðə ber xāl ið-e-nā
   Bulat  song-ACC listen-CVB  one  state.of.affairs  mind-POSS.3-DAT
   tōs-ðər-ðə
   descend-CAUS-PST
   ‘When Bulat was listening to the song, a story (from the past) came to his mind’

The noun phrase ber xāl ‘a story (from the past)’ is the grammatical subject of the second clause in (24a), hence ungrammaticality of this sentence. In (24b), the second clause is causativized, so that Bulat now occupies its subject slot. In this configuration, the two clauses have the same subject, and quasi-coordination becomes possible. Interestingly, the second clause in (24b) is transitive (causativized), even though the human participant has no real control over the situation: the meaning ‘to (purposefully) recollect’ is not possible for the causative verb tōs-ðər- (literally ‘to bring down’) when it is used in isolation. Thus, the use of the causative in (24b) is at least partially triggered by the need to feed the syntactic pivot. The role of causatives in pivot-feeding and reference-tracking in several Altaic languages is discussed in more detail in Say (2009) and Smetina (2016).

7.3.2 PIPs: overt vs. zero realization

Although normally clauses involved in quasi-coordination have the same subject, sometimes coreference is observed between a subject in one clause and a possessor in another clause, as in the following example.

(25) at, [qarw-ə qajt-əp], tiddän baš bir-ðe
   horse  force-POSS.3  come-CVB  soon  head give-PST

   Literally: ‘The horse, once / because its force was gone, yielded (to those who were chasing it)’ (mfbl2.ru)

Unlike most instances of quasi-coordination, in (25) both clauses have overt subjects: ‘the horse’ in the main clause and, literally, ‘its (horse’s) force’ in the dependent clause; importantly both are in the clause-initial position, which is typical of subjects in general. The possessor in the dependent clause is not expressed lexically; however, there is a possessive suffix in the subject noun phrase, and the kind of possessive relations expressed here belongs to the type which would require the use of the possessor in the genitive (Izafet III) if it were lexical. The structure in (25) is grammatical because there is a co-reference relation between the subject in one clause and the possessor in another clause. This means that here the possessor displays one of the two

---

8 The anonymous reviewer hypothesized that the dependent clause as a whole can be the subject of the main clause. In fact, this is not plausible, because i) in similar structures with a non-third person protagonist, there are explicit agreement markers in the main clause and ii) clauses headed by the converb –p are not used as nominalizations (similarly to all other converbs and unlike genuine nominalizations and so-called “participles”).
properties that are thought to suffice to be qualified as a PIP in accordance with the definition adopted in this volume. The grammatically of (25) is due to the fact that the possessor is functionally ‘prominent’ (for the discussion of functional prominence of possessors, see Section 3.3 in Chapter 1, this volume): the dependent clause in (25) expresses the state of the horse, its being physically exhausted. This state is causally related to the meaning of the main clause, even though ‘the horse’ is not the syntactic subject in the dependent clause.9

The sentence in (25) is a rare example of a construction with a PIP encountered in a natural text. However, elicitation data show that speakers tend to accept many structures of this kind. In the remainder of Section 7.3, I discuss several generalizations that emerge from the comparison of elicited data concerning various conditions in quasi-coordination.

The essence of the phenomenon of PIPs is that in these structures the possessor functions as if it were a subject in the relevant clause. Not surprisingly, it terms of overt vs. zero expression PIPs obey the generalization which is normally typical of co-referential subjects: the co-referential argument is lexically expressed only in one of the clauses. Two overt realizations are often felt to be redundant, if not entirely ungrammatical, cf. grammaticality judgements for the two variants of (26).

(26) [Bolat-tnə, iθ-e-ña  ber xāl tōš-āp]  
Bulat-GEN mind-POSS.3-DAT one state.of.affairs descend-CVB  
ok / 7l, q̄əsq̄ar-āp kōl-dō  
that.NOM cry-CVB laugh-PST  
‘A story came to Bulat’s mind and (he) started laughing out loud’

This generalization imposes a restriction on the linear structure and the distribution of overt NPs in constructions involving PIPs. For example, if the PIP is the syntactic subject of the non-finite clause, there are three main possibilities. One possibility is to use a full NP in the genitive in the beginning of the dependent clause, to place the whole clause before the main clause and to use zero realization in the main clause; for this option, see (26) or (27a). Two other possibilities involve a full nominative NP in the finite clause, either in the linearly leftmost position, which creates an embedding configuration, see (27b) and also (25) above, or immediately after the non-finite clause, as in (27c).

(27) a 1[Bolat-tnə, asəw-ə kil-ep] išek-te šapəldat-əp jəp-tə  
Bulat-GEN anger-POSS.3 come-CVB door-ACC slam-CVB close-PST  
‘Bulat got angry and slammed the door’

b 1Bolat, [asəw-ə kil-ep] išek-te šapəldat-əp jəp-tə  
c ok[asəw-ə kil-ep] Bolat, išek-te šapəldat-əp jəp-tə

All the three variants in (27) are judged grammatical, but the third option seems to be dispreferred; this means that linear precedence determines the choice of the locus for the overt expression of the shared argument to a larger extent than the distinction between finite vs. non-finite clause (dominance).10

9 The use of non-3rd person possessive markers in the dependent clause in (25) would have led to ungrammaticality, because there would have been no coherence between ‘my’/‘your’ being exhausted and the horse’s yielding to chasers.

10 In closely related Mishar Tatar, PIPs are similar to those in Bashkir in a number of ways; however, the range of possibilities in terms of overt vs. zero expression is slightly different from that observed in Bashkir (Tatevosov et al. (eds) 2017: 515). Pazelskaya and Shluinsky scrutinize arguments concerning the structural status of zero elements in Mishar Tatar PIP constructions; eventually, they hypothesize that these elements are pros, but admit that the evidence is mixed (Tatevosov et al. (eds) 2017: 515–523).
Examples in (25)–(27) are indicative in two respects. First, they are acceptable even though normally quasi-coordination requires the clauses involved to have the same subject. Second, they show that quasi-coordination is different from other clause-combining strategies in terms of zero vs. overt expression of shared NPs. Indeed, with strategies which allow different subjects, switch-reference (non-identity of subjects) is signaled by pronominal anaphora, even if one of the subjects is co-referential with the possessor from another clause, see (28)–(29).

(28) \[\text{Bolat-təŋ, käjef-e tōš-tō häm *(}u_l{)} \text{ oğ-ōdā ultər-a} \]
Bolat-GEN mood-POSS.3 descend-PST and that.NOM house-LOC sit-IPFV
‘Bulat’s mood got spoiled and he, is staying at home’.

(29) \[\text{I min Bolat-təŋ, tanaw-ə-n həndər-vəs,} \]
Bulat-GEN nose-POSS.3-ACC break-CVB.ANT
\[ul_1 \text{ ila-j bašla-nə} \]
that.NOM cry-IPFV begin-PST
‘I broke Bulat’si nose and he, started to cry’

The structure in (28) is a clear case of clause coordination signaled by a genuine coordinate conjunction (this strategy is sometimes claimed to be triggered or at least reinforced due to contact with Russian and other languages, see Dmitriev 1948, and also Johanson 2002 for a wider pan-Turkic perspective and Grenoble 2012 for a still wider North Eurasian perspective). The structure in (29) involves a converb in -ɣəs (‘anterior converb’); this converb can head dependent clauses both in same-subject and different-subject configurations. Despite the many differences that there are between structures in (28) and (29), they both involve pronominal anaphora: the possessor from the linearly preceding clause is resumed by an explicit subject pronoun in the main clause. Thus, both of these strategies differ from quasi-coordination patterns discussed above.

7.3.3 PIPs in main vs. dependent clauses

PIPs participate in establishing co-reference between quasi-coordinate clauses, that is, in structures which otherwise share the subject argument. In examples (25)–(27), there was a possessive noun phrase in the dependent clause and its possessor was co-referential with the subject of the main clause; for the clarity of comparison the same possibility is also exemplified in (30). However, this is not the only configuration; in (31), the relevant possessive noun phrase is the syntactic subject of the main clause, and its possessor is co-referential with the subject in the dependent clause. Example (32) contains a quasi-coordinate structure in which co-reference is established between two possessors, which shows that both clauses in quasi-coordinate structure can simultaneously have PIPs.

(30) \[\text{Bolat_i [____(GEN), baş-ə awərt-əp] kitap} \]
Bulat head-POSS.3 ache-CVB book
\[uqə-w-ə-n tuqta-t-tə \]
read-NMLZ-POSS.3-ACC stop-CAUS-PST
‘Bulat’s head started to ache and he, stopped reading the book’

(31) \[\text{[____(NOM), bāşmīk aša-p] Bolat-təŋ, es-e awərt-tə} \]
mushroom eat-CVB Bulat-GEN inside-POSS.3 ache-PST
‘Bulat’s stomach ached because he, ate some mushrooms’ (or ‘Bulat,i ate some mushrooms and hisi stomach started to ache’)

(32) \[u_l-əm təw-əp künəl-em kütər-el-de \]
When my son was born my spirits got higher’ / ‘My son was born and my spirits got higher’ / ‘My spirits got higher because my son was born’

If we assume that the essence of the PIP phenomenon is that some possessors can behave as if they were subjects for purposes of quasi-coordination, then the acceptability of structures in (30)–(32) is easily explainable: in each case there is co-reference between the relevant noun phrases in the two clauses and these noun phrases are either genuine subjects or PIPs.

7.3.4 Syntactic role of the possessed nominal

In most examples involving PIPs so far, these possessors were internal to noun phrases that served as subjects in their respective clauses. However, this is not the only possibility. In fact, possessors of other arguments can function as PIPs as well, as shown by (26) above, which is repeated here as (33), as well as by (34) and (35).

(33) OK[Bolat-tayi iθ-e-nu ber xai tōš-op] 
Bulat-GEN mind-POSS.3-DAT one state.of.affairs descend-CVB 
q̥osq̥ar-ap k̥ōl-dō cry-CVB laugh-PST
‘A story came to Bulat’s mind and (he) started laughing out loud’

(34) OK[____i huθan tura-p] kūd-θār-em-dān jāθ aγ-a
onion chop-CVB eye-PL-POSS.1SG-ABL tear flow-IPFV
Literally ‘While ____i chopping onions, tears were welling in myi eyes’

(35) OK[____i alma-no tešlā-p] teš-em-deŋ
apple-ACC bite-CVB tooth-POSS.1SG-GEN 
ber ̣ölōš-ō tōš-tō
one part-POSS.3 descend-PST
‘I bit an apple and a piece of my tooth fell apart’.

Examples (33)–(35) differ in several respects. For example, the common argument is lexically expressed in the dependent clause in (33), whereas in (34) and (35) it is only overtly present in the form of the possessive suffix. These examples also differ in terms of the syntactic position of the relevant possessive noun phrase: in (33), it is in the dative case, in (34), in the ablative case, and in (35), the PIP is syntactically the possessor of the possessor of the subject. What is, however, common to all of these examples is that the relevant possessive noun phrase occupies the leftmost position within its clause. This is exactly the reason why PIPs are usually possessors of subjects: typically, the clause-initial argument in Bashkir is the syntactic subject; however, if other syntactic arguments are fronted, as is the case in (33) and (34), their possessor can control co-reference in quasi-coordination. By contrast, examples with non-initial possessors as controllers in quasi-coordinates constructions are predominantly judged unacceptable, see e.g. the contrast between (24a) and (33).11

7.3.5 Semantic and pragmatic properties of PIPs

11 It is not very easy to check whether there is a structural constraint that PIP possessors must be clause-initial (cf. ungrammaticality of 24a once again), or rather it is part of a broader tendency to place shared arguments in clause chains at the left periphery of these clauses. Pazelskaya and Shluinsky do mention Mishar Tatar examples where pro in the main clause has an overt non-initial subject in the linearly preceding adverbial clause as its antecedent, but admit that these examples are not very natural (Tatevosov et al. (eds) 2017: 631).
In those languages for which PIPs have been reported, there are often semantic and pragmatic factors which contribute to possessor’s ability to function as a PIP or favour the choice of the PIP construction if it competes with a construction where the possessor is not prominent. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this volume (see Section 3.3, “Functional prominence of PIPs”), it is cross-linguistically typical of PIPs to be definite or specific, animate, affected by or involved in the event, and also to display some kind of information structural prominence (e.g. be topical); inalienability of possessive relations is another factor which can be crucial for structural prominence of internal possessors, especially the kind of inalienability which involves part-whole relations, such as those between (inanimate) body-parts and their animate possessors.

In a certain way, Bashkir does reflect these typological expectations. This can be partially seen from those examples in Sections 7.3.2–7.3.4 which have received positive grammaticality judgments: these examples display many if not all of the properties just mentioned. Moreover, the sentences which are most unanimously accepted as perfectly grammatical and natural contain possessive constructions in which the possessed nominal denotes a body part or especially a ‘spiritual part’ (such as ‘spirit’, ‘mind’, ‘humour’), the whole clause describes the possessor’s emotional or mental state, and possessor, who is also the experiencer, is the topic, as in (27b) repeated here as (36).

(36) \[Bolati\ [___i asw-ə kil-ep] išek-te šapəldət-əp jap-ə
Bulat anger-POSS.3 come-CVB door-ACC slam-CVB close-PST
‘Bulat got angry and slammed the door’

Similar idiomatic expressions can also be found in (25), (26), (32) etc. In these examples possessors are animate, definite and topical, possessive relations are inalienable, whereas possessed nominals are referentially bleached: they do not establish any real discourse referent, but rather are abstract entities that serve to denote possessor’s state.\(^{12}\)

Given that the properties just mentioned (animacy and definiteness of the possessor; inalienability; inanimacy of the possessed nominal) are so frequently found in PIP configurations that are judged grammatical by the speakers, it is tempting to claim that at least some of these properties are categorical (binary) and constitute necessary conditions for the PIP construction in Bashkir. However, intriguingly, most of these properties are not truly obligatory in this categorical sense for a felicitous PIP construction in Bashkir. Indeed, in my data there are occasional examples of acceptable quasi-coordinate constructions in which the possessor is inanimate (37), non-specific (38), or the possessive relation is alienable (39), or the possessed nominal is animate (40).

(37) \[OK[___i olon-o ser-ep] ayas_i qola-ə
trunk-POSS.3 rotten-CVB tree fall-PST
‘When its trunk got rotten, the tree fell down’

(38) \[kem-der_i bəʃmək aša-p] [___i es-e awərt-ha]
who-maybe mushroom eat-CVB inside-POSS.3 ache-COND
tabip-qa šaltəra-t-Ə-wəð doctor-DAT ring-CAUS-IMP-2PL
‘If anyone eats mushrooms and their stomach starts to ache, call the doctor’

(39) \[OK[Bolat_i tið bar-əp] [___i mašina-hə hən-ə]
Bulat fast go-CVB car-POSS.3 break(vi)-PST
‘Bulat was driving fast and his car broke down’

\(^{12}\) These idiomaticized constructions denoting the psychological state of the experiencer are very similar to the only kind of syntactic environment which makes PIPs grammatical in Turkish, see Chapter 6 (this volume) for the discussion.
There are two more properties for which it is more difficult to unequivocally show that they are only typical, but not quite obligatorily required for the grammaticality of quasi-coordinate constructions involving possessors, namely PIPs’ being i) topical and ii) affected by or involved in the event. Both topicality and affectedness definitely do play a role as factors which influence acceptability of quasi-coordination involving PIPs. The problem is that these two parameters are not easily represented as binary and categorical. I will briefly discuss these two properties one by one.

Topic is often defined as one of two parts of a sentence’s information structure, which is opposed to “focus” or “comment”. An often quoted definition of topic along these lines is Lambrecht’s: “a referent is interpreted as the topic of a proposition if in a given situation the proposition is construed as being about this referent, i.e. as expressing information which is relevant to and which increase’s the addressee’s knowledge of this referent” (1994: 131). It is clear that PIPs in Bashkir do not always meet this rigid understanding of topicality. For example, the possessor in (38) is non-referential, so that the addressee has no prior knowledge of this referent. However, the sentence in (38) is acceptable precisely because the protasis of this conditional construction is construed as a sequence of events pertaining to the same non-specific protagonist (‘someone’). Thus, locally, within the context of its clause (‘their stomach starts to ache’), the possessor can be claimed to display some degree of topicality if the latter is viewed as a scalar phenomenon, see e.g. Schroeder’s analysis of “degrees of topicality” in Turkish, including its reflection in the use of genitive modifiers (1999: 51–53 and elsewhere). The topicality requirement is also echoed by the linear restriction discussed above: PIPs are possible if the relevant noun phrases occupy the initial position within their clause, and the clause-initial position is normally occupied by the clause-level topic in Bashkir.

Affectedness is similarly problematic. In many studies devoted to transitivity and aspect, affectedness is understood as a persistent change in the state of an argument, see e.g. Beavers (2011) for an overview of possible approaches to this notion. In this narrow sense, affectedness is clearly not an obligatory property of PIPs in Bashkir; for example, in (39) the lexical meaning of the verb hən- ‘break (vi)’ entails that it is the ‘car’ which undergoes a visible change of state, rather than its possessor. However, in a looser sense, Bashkir PIPs can be viewed as affected by the situations denoted by respective clauses. For example, the situation of Bulat’s son being born in (40) has important consequences for Bulat; the same event can be construed as pertaining to Bulat (e.g. ‘Bulat became a father of a son’). Other situations where ‘Bulat’s son’ is the syntactic subject can have much less effect on Bulat’s life (e.g. ‘Bulat’s son learned French’ or ‘Bulat’s son got fired’) and in these situations, Bulat cannot control same-subject relations across clauses.

Even though it is not easy to point out the necessary and sufficient properties which determine the ability of possessors to behave as PIPs for purposes of quasi-coordination, it does not mean that any possessor can be prominent. One clear restriction identified is Section 7.3.4 is that the relevant noun phrase must be clause-initial. This property is indicative of the relative nature of the conditions on acceptability of PIPs: the relevant noun phrase must not necessarily be the subject, but it must linearly precede other noun phrases in the same clause (see Nikitina 2017 on word order in Bashkir, including left-dislocated topics). This finding is part of a bigger generalization which is the main empirical finding of this study: the one property that is shared by all PIPs is their relative salience. Within the context of their clauses, PIPs must be more salient than all other available NPs. The scales of animacy, definiteness, topicality and affectedness all contribute to this overall relative salience. In this respect, examples like (37)–(40) are especially valuable. Even though these sentences contain possessors and possessed
nominals which fail to meet some of the atomic expectations, they conform to the relative
generalization: possessors in these examples are more salient than the possessed nominals and
their co-arguments within the clause. For example, (37) is grammatical by virtue of the ‘tree’
being more prominent than its part (‘the trunk’) even though this possessor is inanimate.
Similarly, the possessed nominal in (40) is animate, but the event of baby’s birth is construed in
such a way that the father is more salient than the newborn: the newborn’s existence is
dependent upon the possessor whose existence is established in prior discourse. The sentence in
(39) is unusual in that, technically speaking, the possessive relations are alienable; however, in
this particular context, it is implied that the owner is inside the car. Thus, the event in which the
car breaks down also affects the owner; this event occupies a position in the chain of events that
involve this person.13

All of the facts reviewed corroborate the claim that the properties which are responsible for
the ability of Bashkir possessors to be syntactically prominent are relative rather than absolute.
In those configurations where possessors do not clearly outrank other noun phrases in terms of
overall salience, the speakers are reluctant to judge the quasi-coordinate constructions as PIP
constructions. This is not only true of sentences where noun phrases containing possessed
nominals are not sentence-initial, see (22) or (24a), but also structures like (21a), repeated here
as (41): here both the possessed nominal and the possessor are equally animate and definite, and
the same-subject constraint rules out the PIP interpretation.

(41) unəŋj ata-hə üğäj äsäj al-əp ___i, *k ül-gän ti
that.GEN father-POSS.3 step- mother take-CVB say.IPFW
die-PTCP.PST
‘Her father married once again and died’ or ‘After marrying once again her father died’
(*‘Her, father married once again and she, / her, stepmother died’) (COB)

The functional underpinnings of PIPs are clearly visible in contexts which have similar syntactic
structure but differ in terms of relevant salience of the nominals involved, cf. (42) and (43):

(42) Ok[unəŋj qarəw-ə qajt-əp], ___i eš-tän tuqta-nə
that.GEN force-POSS.3 come-CVB work-ABL stop-PST
‘When he, got exhausted, he, stopped working’ (literally: ‘when his, force was gone, he,
stopped working’)

(43) unəŋ ul-ə awərə-p, eš-tän tuqta-nə
that.GEN son-POSS.3 be.ill-CVB work-ABL stop-PST
Ok:‘When his, son got ill, he, stopped working’, *‘When his, son got ill, he, stopped
working’

The possessor in (43) cannot function as PIP in this quasi-coordinate construction because it
does not outrank the possessed nominal (the possessed nominal is equally animate and more
affected), which is the syntactic subject in the same clause and controls co-reference between
clauses according to the default pattern in quasi-coordinate constructions.14

7.3.6 Other prominent non-subjects

13 The anonymous referee raises an important question: what happens if different criteria (animacy, definiteness,
topicality and affectedness) are in conflict. I don’t know the answer to this. However, in all examples at my disposal
which were judged grammatical PIPs are not lower than other competing NPs on all relevant scales and higher than
competitors on at least one of them.
14 Apart from the ability to control co-reference in quasi-coordinate structures, Bashkir possessors can display other
syntactic properties normally associated with subjects, such as ability to control the reference of reflexives. The
exact extent of this and other prominent syntactic properties of possessors is to be investigated elsewhere.
Apart from PIPs, there are other types of noun phrases that can control clause-combining in quasi-coordinate structures. These other types of NPs include dative subject-like arguments in modal constructions of necessity and possibility (44) and subject-like genitives in clauses with nominalizations (45).

(44) ‘Not knowing a person (properly), we shouldn’t say bad (things about that person)’

(45) ‘I got hungry and started to walk faster’ (literally ‘My willing to eat came and I started to walk faster’)

The structure exemplified in (45) is a grammaticalized desiderative construction; the verb’s argument which is normally realized as its subject in finite clause is realized as the possessor of a nominalization. It is thus possible to view structures like (45) as a subtype of the PIP construction rather than one more construction where the same-subject relations are controlled by a non-nominative NP.

Apart from that, quasi-coordinate structures are possible if there are two co-existential overt noun phrases (46), if there are joint co-reference relations between subjects in the two clauses (47) or if the noun phrases involved participate in set-subset relations (48).

(46) ‘Murat has [three sons], and [all three of them] help him’

(47) ‘Bulat persuaded Mansur and they have together built a house’

(48) ‘The class won the competition and the best pupils received prizes’

Examples such as (47) and (48) involve what Stirling (1993: 33–39) refers to as “referential overlap”; Stirling shows that in many languages with switch-reference systems, configurations involving referential overlap trigger same-subject marking. The fact that structures like (46)–(48) are grammatical in Bashkir implies that conditions on the use of the converb in –p are not purely syntactic, but rather are dependent upon the referential representation of discourse.

Apart from structures involving non-subjects or partially overlapping subjects, there are even quasi-coordinate structures with two distinct non-overlapping noun phrases as subjects in the two clauses, which are nevertheless judged acceptable:

(49) ‘The winter passed and spring came’
‘The winter has passed and the spring came’

What makes sentences like (49) acceptable is that both subjects have very low saliency and, even more importantly, there are no other noun phrases in these clauses which would outrank available NPs in terms of animacy, topicality, definiteness etc. It has been reported for a number of languages with switch-reference systems that weather descriptions can be used in same-subject configurations even if they technically have a syntactic subject which is not identical to the subject of the adjacent clause, see Stirling (1993: 86ff) for a discussion. Ubrjatova and Litvin (1986:198–199 and elsewhere) observe that in several Altaic languages (not only Turkic, but also e.g. Buryat) weather predicates and clauses involving body-parts can pattern together for purposes of same-subject clause-combining strategies.

The evidence briefly discussed in 7.3.6 shows that PIPs are not the only types of nominal expressions that violate strict identity of subjects in quasi-coordinate constructions. The exact limits of acceptability of these and other possible subjects are to be discussed elsewhere. The most general restriction that can be drawn based on the data assessed so far should be formulated in negative, rather than positive terms: quasi-coordination is not possible if the most salient noun phrases in the two respective clauses are their syntactic subjects, and these subjects are referentially fully distinct.

In these very general terms, the situation in Bashkir resembles patterns that have been reported for similar clause-combining strategies in some other Turkic languages. For example, a cognate converb in Mishar Tatar has been studied by Pazelskaya and Shluinsky (2004), who arrive at the conclusion that clause-combining strategy involving this converb is possible under the condition that there is ‘a sufficiently close semantic link between the subject of the dependent clause and the subject of the main clause’ (p. 48) and that they are ungrammatical with ‘totally non-identical subjects’ (p. 59; translation mine, — S.S.).

In a similar vein, Bergelson and Kibrik analyzed clause-combining strategies in Tuvan and concluded that ‘[i]f there are two subject NPs and their referents are clearly co-referential or clearly referentially disjoint, then the same-subject marker or the different-subject marker, respectively, is chosen. If the subjects … are sufficiently nonprototypical (indefinite personal zero, nonconcrete meaning, etc.), the switch-reference mechanism “loses its orientation” and is unable to establish the identity or distinctness of insufficiently identified entities. Strictly speaking, these entities are distinct … but their distinctness is not sufficiently clear, so the same-subject marker is possible as well’ (Bergelson, Kibrik 1995: 389).

It becomes clear from these quotations that there are significant similarities between Turkic systems with respect to non-canonical uses of same-subject vs. different-subject strategies. The situation in Turkish is similar to that in Bashkir in terms of the morphosyntactic properties of PIP constructions (they involve a cognate converb in –p with a similar set of functions). However, Turkish PIPs are much more restricted than those in Bashkir, Mishar Tatar and Tuvan: in Turkish, the phenomenon is limited to idiomatic expressions denoting a psychological state in which the subject position is occupied by the experiencer’s inalienable possessee, typically a body-part, cf. göz-POSS dön- ‘(X) become irate’, lit. ‘X’s eyes turn’, see Chapter 6 (this volume) for details. Violations of strict same-subjecthood as observed in both Bashkir, Mishar Tatar and Tuvan, on the one hand, and in Turkish, on the other hand, are similar to patterns which were already observed in Old Turkic, as discussed by Erdal (2004: 463–465). However, the vectors of development must have been different: syntactic conditions on the use of converbs in –p have tightened in Turkish, but remained stable or have even loosened in other Turkic idioms mentioned here. It is thus an intriguing and complicated task to locate the Bashkir situation in a wider Turkic, or even Altaic, perspective, but it is to be pursued elsewhere.

7.4 Other clause-combining strategies
Bashkir has a wide spectrum of different strategies that are used for purposes of clause-combining, especially in the domain of dependent adverbial clauses and coordination-like (chaining) constructions. These structures vary in many respects, including the morphological marking of the dependent (linearly preceding) verb form. Clausal dependency can be signaled by dedicated adverbial forms (i.e. converbs sensu stricto), as well as by cased forms of so-called participles (see a terminological comment in Section 7.2.1), combinations of participles or nominalizations with postpositions, and by grammaticalized constructions based on direct speech, which often contain non-indicative finite verb forms. As I showed in 7.2.4.1, most of these strategies can be used in both same- and different-subject constructions and, more generally, do not impose rigid restrictions on referential cohesion (or lack thereof) between clauses. Even if co-reference or non-co-reference affects the syntax of these structures it does not normally determine the choice of the dependent verb form. However, quasi-coordinated constructions involving the converb in –p, discussed in Section 3, are not the only type of structures which are in fact sensitive to co-reference relations between clauses. There are at least two types of adverbial clauses which should be briefly discussed in this respect: adverbial clauses with imperfective converbs in –a/-j and purpose clauses.

The form in -a/-j (glossed as IPFV) has both finite (agreeing, independent) and non-finite (non-agreeing, dependent) uses. The latter type of use is historically primary, while the former developed on its basis through insubordination in the sense of Evans (2007). Descriptive grammars of Bashkir treat the two uses as distinct forms, namely the converb of manner or simultaneity and the present tense form. The converb is reported to be mainly used in the reduplicated form. It is also claimed to be possible only in same-subject configurations (Juldashev 1977: 158), as in (50).

(50) malaj-ðar uno kōt-ā-kōt-ā arə-p bōt-ō-lär
boy-PL that.ACC wait-IPFV-wait-IPFV get.tired-CVB end-PST-PL
‘The boys waited (and waited) for him and got very tired’ (or ‘The boys got very tired while waiting for him’) (Juldashev (ed.) 1981: 310)

However, despite this claim, it is possible to find occasional examples in which strict co-reference of subjects is violated, and co-reference is controlled by possessors, as in (51).

(51) uqə-j-uqə-j bās-əm awərt-əp bōt-ō
study-IPFV-study-IPFV head-POSS.1SG ache-CVB end-PST
‘I studied (and studied) and my head started to ache strongly’ (Juldashev 1977: 158)

Judging from the examples like (51), it might be hypothesized that reduplicated converbs in –a/-j constitute one more syntactic environment which is diagnostic for PIPs. However, it is now difficult to explore this phenomenon using elicitation in the field, because adverbial uses of the converb in -a/-j are almost obsolete in modern spoken Bashkir (at least in the dialect in the focus and probably elsewhere).

Purpose clauses (as well as complements of some manipulative verbs, which are syntactically identical to purpose clauses) are arguably the only domain where Bashkir consistently distinguishes between co-referential and non-co-referential configurations, and lacks ambivalent forms (Gorlova 2017: 59ff). In particular, the so-called “infinitive” (morphologically, the dative form of the potential participle) can only be used in co-referential constructions. The controller in the infinitival purpose clause is always its (null) syntactic subject. Possible controllers vary depending on the type of verb in the main clause, but each verb has only one potential controller: it is the subject in monovalent verbs of motion like ‘go’ (52), the direct object in caused-motion verbs like ‘send’ (‘He sent his son to the town ____j to sell berries’), etc. Dependent infinitives cannot combine with syntactic subjects of their own and are not allowed if the control requirements are violated (53).
In non-co-referential configurations, purpose clauses are organized differently. Typically, they are headed by jussive verb forms followed by either a multifunctional complementizer tip, which is the grammaticalized converb of the verb ‘to say’, or postposition ösön ‘for’. These structures are possible if there is no co-reference between the two clauses (54); they are ungrammatical if the control requirements are met, e.g. if the dependent clause subject is co-referential with the subject of an intransitive verb of motion in the main clause (55).

Thus, co-reference is essential for the choice of the purpose clause strategy. Importantly, purpose constructions in which there is co-reference between the main clause subject and a possessor in the dependent clause are treated as different-subject constructions; this is true even if the possessors involved have functional properties which are typical of PIPs in quasi-coordinate structures, as discussed in Section 7.3. Relevant examples are shown in (56a,b): the former structure is grammatical, as expected for non-co-referential structures; infinitival dependent clause, as in the latter variant, is judged ungrammatical by most speakers.

We are now in a position to summarize the ways in which various types of clause-combining constructions in Bashkir are or are not sensitive to the presence or absence of co-reference between clauses. This information is represented in Table 7.3, which also shows whether at least some possessors can participate in establishing co-reference between clauses.

<Insert Table 7.3 somewhere around here>
adverbial clauses with reduplicated converbs in -a/-j (the latter construction is somewhat obsolete in current use).

7.5 Genitival possessors and constituency

Bashkir possessors in the genitive are routinely tacitly assumed or explicitly claimed to be internal. This assumption was briefly mentioned in 7.2.3 and served as a prerequisite for treating such possessors as PIPs throughout the paper, especially in Section 7.3. There are indeed many facts that allow one to hypothesize on a priori grounds that Bashkir possessors in the genitive are NP-internal. First, the use of nouns in the genitive case in Bashkir is only possible if there is an overt possessed nominal in the same clause; in other words, there are no constructions where the genitive is clearly governed by the verb or other non-nominal element. Second, in the vast majority of cases, possessors in the genitive form a linearly coherent structure with (the remainder of) their respective NPs (see 7.2.3 for the discussion of the linear structure of Bashkir NPs). Third, genitive is the only form which can be used to overtly express referential possessors and it is highly implausible, both empirically and typologically, that all possessors in the genitive are external.

Even this superficial and cursory evidence suggests that if one wants to make a uniform solution on the internal vs. external status of genitival possessors in Bashkir, then the former option must be preferred. However, this straightforward solution has its problems: Bashkir possessors marked with the genitive case sometimes violate expectations based on their presumed internal status. A possible research programme is to distinguish individual construction-types with genitival possessors and check them individually against available constituency tests, without ruling out the possibility that such tests can give different results for different construction-types containing genitives. This kind of analysis is offered in (Ovsjannikova and Say 2014). In the remainder of this section, I briefly summarize the methodology and basic results arrived at in this earlier study.

We investigated four types of Bashkir constructions involving genitives. The first type (A) was the Bashkir predicative possessive construction. Bashkir is among languages that employ the ‘genitive schema’ (in terms of Heine 1997: 58–59) for encoding predicative possession for both alienable (‘Bulat has a cow’) and inalienable (e.g. ‘Bulat has a daughter’) possessed nominals. It means that the predicative construction is (at least superficially) identical to the combination of the adnominal possessive construction and an existential predicate, as in (57).

(57) Morat-təŋ qəð-ə bar
   Murat-GEN daughter-POSS.3 there.is
‘Murat has a daughter’, literally ‘There exists Murat’s daughter’

The second type (B) encompasses constructions with the verbs awərt ‘ache’, təw ‘be born’ and qal ‘remain’. These verbs were chosen because in structure where their subject has a possessor, this possessor has argument-like semantic properties (cf. ‘Bulat has 1000 rubles left’, literally ‘Bulat’s 1000 rubles remain’ in Bashkir). The third type (C) includes constructions where the subject position is occupied by a body-part noun and the clause is headed by a change-of-state verb (e.g. ‘Bulat’s eyes reddened’). Finally, we compared these three ‘unusual’ structures with the baseline construction (D) in which the possessed nominal was a fully-fledged agent occupying the subject position of an agentive verb (e.g. ‘Bulat’s father has arrived’).

We applied a series of both typologically well-established and language-specific constituency tests to these four types of constructions. In each construction-type there is a possessor marked by the genitive case and the possessed nominal occupies the clause-subject position. The question, however, is whether these two nominals behave as a single constituent with respect to the various tests.
Overall, we used six different tests. The most straightforward test is separability: we checked if it is possible to use NP-external material (e.g. clause-level adverbs) between the possessor and the possessed nominal. It has been reported in the literature that separability alone is not a very reliable test for constituency (Plank 2003: 5); however, it was important to check if the four construction-types perform uniformly with respect to this test — and it turned out that they do not, as reflected by non-identical grammaticality judgments in (58), type A, and (59), type D.

(58)  
\[\text{Morat-təŋ kūptān haqal-ə bar} \]
Murat-GEN long.ago beard-POSS.3 there.is
‘Murat has been wearing a beard for a long time’

(59)  
\[\text{Morat-təŋ bögün həjar-ə kārtā-he-n jemer-gən} \]
Murat-GEN today cow-POSS.3 fence-POSS.3-ACC destroy-PTCP.PST
‘Today Murat’s cow broke his fence’

The next test was aimed at checking whether the possessed nominal can be pronominalized separately from the possessor. Eventually, this test split into two, because the procedure yielded different results for negative and interrogative pronouns, on the one hand, and for anaphoric pronouns, on the other hand. In particular, the latter pronominalization pattern is very restricted: it is only marginally possible in type-A (predicative possessive) constructions (60), and clearly ungrammatical elsewhere.

(60)  
\[\text{Morat-təŋ kōtōw-e bar, ā Bolat-təŋ unəhə=la juq} \]
Murat-GEN herd-POSS.3 there.is and Bulat-GEN that.POSS.3=also NEG.COP
‘Murat has a herd (of cows), but Bulat doesn’t have one’

In the fourth test, we checked whether the possessed nominal (without the possessor) can be the target of relativization. Two remaining tests were language-specific. The fifth test was based on the observation that if the possessed nominal bears a 1st or 2nd person possessive suffix, pronominal expression of the possessor outside that nominal is often considered redundant by Bashkir speakers. However, this is not equally true in all the four constructions. In particular, in the predicative possessive construction (type A) speakers pronouncedly preferred ‘redundant’ structures, cf. acceptability judgments for (61a) and (61b).

(61)  
\[\text{mineŋ haqal-əm bar} \]
I.GEN beard-POSS.1SG there.is
‘I wear a beard’

\[\text{haqal-əm bar} \]
beard-POSS.1SG there.is
‘I wear a beard’

Thus, lexical expression of the possessor in type-A constructions is almost obligatory. If bar, an existential copula which is used in predicative possessive and some other similar constructions, were a regular monovalent predicate, we could expect that the distinction between structures like (61a) and (61b) should obey the same rules of grammar where an argument slot is occupied by a possessive noun phrase. However, we see that this is not so: even though haqal-əm <beard-POSS.1SG> is a perfectly natural structure which is used to refer to ‘my beard’ in other contexts, in (61) speakers prefer to use an independent personal possessor. A natural explanation for this preference is that bar actually functions as a bivalent predicate and the pronoun in (61a) is structurally similar to oblique possessors in languages employing the locative schema for
predicative possessive constructions, such as Russian: [u menja] est’ [boroda], lit. ‘by me there is beard’.

The sixth test is based on the observation that Bashkir has a special suffix (glossed as POSS.SUBST) which is attached to possessors if there is no overt possessed nominal. These forms are distributionally similar to English pronouns like mine or ours; a distributionally similar suffix is also attested in Hungarian, see Dékány (2015) for a discussion. The use of this suffix is illustrated in (62), which contains two possessive constructions of the type D.

(62) MOrat-tøy qoð-ə kil-de, ä Bølat-toqə kil-mä-ne
Murat-GEN girl-POSS.3 come-PST and Bulat-POSS.SUBST come-NEG-PST
‘Murat’s daughter has come, and Bulat’s (daughter) hasn’t’

If we assume that possessors in (62) and similar structures are NP-internal, as is usually done, then the use of the suffix which is glossed as POSS.SUBST can be easily described by a straightforward rule of syntax: this suffix is used if the possessive construction is headless, that is, the possessed nominal is not overtly expressed. If, by contrast, one assumed that the possessor and the possessed nominal in the first clause of (62) do not form a phrase, then it would not be easy to explain why the two possessors in (62) have different morphological forms: indeed, under this assumption noun phrases containing possessors in the two clauses must be completely parallel to each other.

The results of applying the six tests just outlined to the four types of genitival constructions are summarized in Table 7.4.

<Insert Table 7.4 somewhere around here>

The results shown in table 7.4 imply that the familiar dichotomy, internal vs. external possessors, is not easily applicable to Bashkir genitives. There is at least one test that consistently indicates the phrase-internal status of all genitival possessors (special suffix used in headless possessive NPs). At the same time, the separability test yields almost the opposite results. No less important is the fact that the four types of uses do not perform uniformly with respect to constituency tests applied; rather, they form a gradation (as do the tests themselves).

Theoretical and methodological implications of these findings are outlined in (Ovsjannikova, Say 2014). What is relevant for the present discussion is that the ability to control co-reference between clauses is not the only exceptional property of Bashkir genitival possessors. Rather, it is an inherent component of a bigger picture. In order to fully grasp this picture it makes sense to go back to the discussion of external possessor constructions (see 7.2.3). It is cross-linguistically typical of external possessors to be different from internal possessor constructions both in terms of syntactic properties and in terms of morphological encoding. In particular, external possessors are very often morphologically encoded similarly to verb’s arguments or adjuncts, cf. the well-known contrast between genitive and dative possessors in many European languages.15 The distinction between two types of structures is usually functionally motivated: possessor’s animacy, topicality, affectedness etc. favour the ‘choice’ of the external possessor construction, in which the possessor is both syntactically more autonomous and morphologically distinguishable from the internal possessor. Whatever the subtle differences in semantic and pragmatic properties of individual uses are, two (or more) construction-types can be unequivocally identified based on coding devices.

In this perspective, Bashkir is both similar to and different from familiar languages that have external possessors. As was discussed in 7.2.3, Bashkir has no genuine external possessor

15 There are languages in which external possessors have been claimed to be morphologically identical with internal possessors. For example, Nikolaeva (2002) discusses Hungarian possessors marked with the dative case along these lines. However, even if dative possessors in Hungarian are structurally ambiguous, Hungarian possessors can also be morphologically unmarked, and these possessors are clearly internal.
construction with a distinct coding pattern. However, as a reward, Bashkir possessors, which are homogeneous morphologically, are very diverse syntactically. Informally speaking, Bashkir syntax seems to reflect those functional distinctions that are familiar from languages with clearly identifiable external possessor constructions, without signalling these distinctions morphologically. The pattern to control co-reference in quasi-coordinate constructions, as discussed in Section 7.3, is one aspect in which Bashkir genitival possessors are not syntactically identical to each other. Constituency-related tests as summarized in Table 7.4 constitute another aspect of the same conundrum. Importantly, the semantic conditions in which possessors acquire syntactically prominent features with respect to these two aspects are rather similar: the ‘intermediate’ construction-types in Table 7.4 (‘Bulat’s son is born’, ‘Bulat’s eyes reddened’, etc.) conform to the semantic profile of PIPs as identified in Section 7.3.5.16

7.6 Conclusions

In most clause-combining strategies in Bashkir, the form of the verb in the dependent clause is chosen regardless whether there are co-reference relations between the two clauses. Purpose clauses are different: here, the choice of the strategy is strictly determined by whether there is co-reference between an argument in the main clause and the dependent clause subject.

However, there is at least one kind of complex constructions which is somewhere in between the two poles. These are constructions in which the non-finite clause is headed by the converb in –p. They presuppose a high degree of cohesion between clauses and show a mixture of syntactic properties associated with coordination and subordination.

The two clauses in these ‘quasi-coordinate’ constructions normally have co-referential subjects. However, this is not a strict rule: under some circumstances, co-reference can be controlled by possessors in either, or even both, of the two clauses. Internal possessors that control co-reference in Bashkir quasi-coordinate constructions meet the definition of the prominent internal possessor (PIP). Bashkir PIPs normally are possessors of subjects in their respective clause, but they can be also associated with nominals in other grammatical functions, as long as these nominals are used clause-initially. This linear position is typical of topics; importantly, PIPs are normally clause-level topics, that is, PIPs are not only more topical than their respective possessed nominals, but also than other NPs in the same clause, cf. examples (33)–(35) where the possessed nominals in PIP constructions are clause-initial non-subjects. Whether PIPs are expressed lexically or only suffixally depends on the linear structure of the complex construction, and does not affect the syntactic status of PIPs as such: similarly to same-subject constructions, the shared argument is overtly expressed in one of the clauses (typically, in the linearly preceding position) and has null realization in the other clause.

One of the main goals of this study was to identify those functional properties which make it possible for Bashkir possessors to behave as PIPs for purposes of clause-combining.

Typical contexts favouring Bashkir PIP constructions are those in which the state of a human referent is expressed by a clause with the subject in which a body part or a ‘spiritual part’ is the subject, and the topical human referent, the possessor, cf. ‘his stomach aches’, ‘the boy’s mood got spoiled’ etc., see Chapter 6 (this volume) for the discussion of idiomatic expressions of this kind as the domain in which PIPs are possible in Turkish. At first glance, these and other acceptable constructions indicate the familiar set of functional properties: animate (human), definite, topical and affected possessor, inalienable possessive relations and inanimate possessed nominal; similar functional factors have been reported for other languages with PIPs, as discussed in Chapter 1 (this volume) and other chapters summarized there (see especially that Chapter’s Section 3.3).

16 It is an interesting task to apply constituency tests surveyed above to complex constructions involving PIPs; this remains to be done elsewhere and might be complicated, because some of these tests, e.g. those which involve contrastive constructions like (60) and (62), are not applicable to dependent clauses headed by converbs.
However, none of these absolute properties is obligatory in Bashkir. Restrictions on the use of PIPs are in fact relative rather than absolute: the possessor must be construed as the most salient NP in its clause. In order for such construal to be possible, the possessor must outrank other nominals available in the same clause in terms of the atomic parameters just mentioned. For example, PIPs can be non-specific, but only if the possessed and other competing nominals are also non-specific, e.g. in irrealis clauses, and the possessor outranks them by other parameters.

Now that the status of Bashkir genitival possessors as potential PIPs is established, we can situate this syntactic ability in a wider context of Bashkir grammar and connect it to two groups of other properties of Bashkir genitives.

First, Bashkir anchoring possessors are invariably marked by the genitive case; as a consequence, genital possessors are used in a very wide range of contexts, including those contexts where possessors are very salient. Informally speaking, Bashkir genitives are often used in those functional configurations where many other languages would switch to different coding devices. The fact that Bashkir employs the genitive schema for predicative possession is the clearest manifestation of the ability of Bashkir genitival nominals to be very salient. Other, weaker, manifestations were briefly discussed in Section 7.5. Even though I failed, or was reluctant, to give discrete solutions on the internal vs. external status of possessors in each particular construction-type analyzed, there is no doubt that the varying degrees of syntactic autonomy of Bashkir genitives reflect the degrees of their functional salience. In this respect, the ability to control co-reference across clauses is merely one among many exceptional properties that are typical of some, though not all, genitival possessors.

Second, there are morphosyntactic properties shared by all genitival possessors in Bashkir, and some of them can be argued to typologically correlate with syntactic salience. First, Bashkir genitives are always referential (and typically definite), because non-referential nominal modifiers are expressed by other constructions (Izafet I and II). Second, they are always in an exclusive relation to their possessed nominal: stacking of two possessors to the same head is (almost entirely) ungrammatical (similar restrictions are of course found in many — but not in all! — languages). Third, Bashkir genitives obligatorily trigger possessive marking on the possessed nominal, and such pronominal doubling is both typologically and diachronically related to topicality, see Heine (1997: 159), van Rijn (2016: 241–242). Fourth, Bashkir genitives obligatorily occupy an exceptional, leftmost, linear position relative to their respective phrases — even preceding deictic and anaphoric elements. Whether there is a causal link between these manifestations of genitives’ syntactic exceptionality on the one hand, and their ability to cover a wide range of contexts, including those where possessors are functionally salient, is an open question. However, the two sets of facts seem to nicely match each other.
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17 Even if such a link exists, its direction is not obvious. One possibility is to hypothesize that the basic morphosyntax of Bashkir NPs facilitates the use of genitives in those environments where other languages are likely to switch to different structures. An opposite possibility is to hypothesize that a high ratio of contexts where Bashkir possessors are functionally salient facilitated the spread (obligatorization) of some specific morphosyntactic patterns to all genitival contexts, including those contexts where these patterns are not functionally motivated.
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Table 7.1. Averaged grammaticality judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value: the sentence was…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>… consistently judged grammatical by native speakers, at least one speaker used this structure when translating from Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>… constructed by the investigator; consistently judged grammatical by native speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK?</td>
<td>… constructed by the investigator; predominantly judged grammatical by native speakers, but with some doubts or exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>… received mixed judgments and/or some awkwardness was reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>predominantly judged ungrammatical by native speakers, some doubts / exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>consistently judged ungrammatical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2. Main clause-combing functional types and clause-combining strategies in Bashkir

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>non-finite, no conjunction</th>
<th>finite, no conjunction</th>
<th>finite, conjunction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relative clauses</td>
<td>yes (caseless participles)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement clauses</td>
<td>yes (case-marked participles)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbial clauses</td>
<td>yes (converbs)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrative chains</td>
<td>yes (converbs)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>rare, borrowed pattern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3. Clause-combining constructions and co-reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>clause type</th>
<th>verb form</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>condition</th>
<th>PIPs (and other prominent NPs)</th>
<th>strict non-co-reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>purpose</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>POT-DAT</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose</td>
<td>jussive</td>
<td>JUSS</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quasi-coordinate</td>
<td>converb</td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbial / manner</td>
<td>reduplicated converb</td>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (?)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.4. Clause-level (Cl) and phrase-level (Ph) properties of Bashkir possessors: the four types of uses compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separability (1)</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Cl/Ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronominalization of possessed nominals: interrogative and negative pronouns (2)</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativization of possessees (4)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Cl(?)</td>
<td>Cl(?)</td>
<td>Ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligatory use of the pronominal possessors (5)</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Cl/Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronominalization of possessed nominals: anaphoric pronouns (3)</td>
<td>Ph(?)</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipsis of possessee (POSS.SUBST) (6)</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Ph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>