

SYNTACTIC PROPERTIES AND INFORMATION STRUCTURE OF CONSTRUCTIONS WITH PLURAL-MARKED ADJECTIVES IN BESERMAN

Maria Usacheva, Maria Brykina^a

^a *Universität Hamburg, DE*

mashastroeva@gmail.com, maria.brykina@uni-hamburg.de

Abstract. The present article investigates Beserman constructions which contain adjectives inflected for number and nouns that they modify semantically. Prototypically adjectives do not show agreement in number with the head noun. Under certain circumstances, however, they may be marked for number by a nominal plural suffix *-(j)os* and a 3Sg possessive marker, or by a predicative adjectival suffix *-(j)es*. Elicitation and corpus data show that constructions with the suffix *-(j)os* and a 3Sg possessive marker are used in contrastive contexts. As for *-(j)es*-marked adjectives, we claim that two types of construction should be distinguished. Postposed *-(j)es*-marked adjectives, according to syntactic tests, retain their original predicative properties. Preposed *-(j)es*-marked adjectives share important properties with “prototypical” attributes in Beserman, and may be used under various information structure conditions, thus drifting towards holding the status of pure agreement constructions.

Keywords: Beserman, Udmurt, plural, adjectives, information structure, agreement

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2024.15.1.08>

1. Introduction

Beserman belongs to the Permic branch of the Finno-Ugric languages. It is spoken in North-Western Udmurtia, Russia, by a distinct ethnic group, the Besermans. Beserman is very close to Northern Udmurt, at least lexically (see Arkhangelskiy 2021 for lexicostatistical evidence on the supradialect continuum of Northern Udmurtia). For this reason, it is traditionally treated as one of the Udmurt varieties. However, Beserman speakers clearly differentiate their spoken language both from Standard Udmurt and from Udmurt dialects. Moreover, they

consider the language to be the most important feature of the ethnic group they belong to. A large sociolinguistic survey carried out by Škljaev in 1995 shows that 72.6% of Beserman respondents think that Beserman is a distinct language (Škljaev 1997: 112).

The present study deals with Beserman constructions which contain plural-marked adjectives and nouns semantically modified by these adjectives. Prototypically the structure of the noun phrase in Beserman, as in Udmurt, is head-final, and adjectives are not required to show agreement in number with the head noun. However, as mentioned in Žiževa (1952: 35–36), Perevoščikov et al. (1962: 128), Bartens (2000: 131–132), Winkler (2011: 81–83), Karpova (2015: 88), Rießler (2016: 129–13), Saporova (2018), sometimes they do agree in number with plural head nouns. Singular value is not marked morphologically on adjectives, whereas adjectives in the plural attach special suffixes.

In cases when Beserman (and Udmurt) adjectives do agree with the head noun, they can attach two different plural markers: *-(j)os*, obligatorily combined with the third singular possessive suffix *-âz(/-ez/-iz/-z/-s)*, and *-(j)eś*.¹ Let us illustrate this with an example from the Beserman multimedia corpus (Arkhangelskiy, Usacheva et al. 2003–2023), where all three possibilities occur in one sentence (1).²

(1)	<i>Vož</i>	<i>kâšet-en</i>	<i>pići</i>	<i>nâl'-l'os</i>	<i>vâl-e</i>
	green	kerchief-INS	small	girl-SUB.PL	on-ILL
	<i>put</i>	<i>gord</i>	<i>pomidor</i>	<i>pići-os-s-e</i>	
	put.IMP.SG	red	tomato	small-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC	

1 The notations *-(j)os* and *-(j)eś* are used as labels for all allomorphs of the plural markers of adjectives. The substantive plural suffix can be realized by the following variants: *-jos* after stems ending in a consonant, *-os* after stems ending in a vowel, and *-l'os/-ńos/-d'os/-t'os/-śos/-źos*. The last set of allomorphs appears as the result of palatalization and gemination after stems ending in coronals. These processes are optional but are considered preferable by most of our Beserman consultants. The adjective plural suffix has two allomorphs. The first, *-eś*, appears after stems ending in consonants and in *-o*, *-a* (mostly at a fluent rate of speech), and sometimes after stems ending in *-i* or *-â*. The second, *-jeś*, is used in all other contexts. Before the adjective plural suffix, stem-final *-â* usually becomes *-i*, and stem-final *-a* can sometimes be elided. For a detailed description of Beserman morphophonology, see Arkhangelskiy, Cheremisinova & Usacheva (forthcoming).

2 This example comes from an experimental study in which one participant instructed the other to manipulate pictures of various objects.

i kuž-eš ogréž-jos-tâ, zozul'a-z-e.
 and long-ADJ.PL cucumber-SUB.PL-ACC.PL zozulja-POSS.3SG-ACC
 'Put [the picture of]³ the small red tomatoes and long cucumbers, Zozulja
 (a variety of cucumber), on [the picture of] the little girls in green
 kerchiefs.' (corp.)

In the phrase *pići nâl'-l'os* 'little girls', the head noun is marked for plural, whereas the modifying adjective is not. In the phrase *gord pomidor pići-os-s-e* 'small red tomatoes', the first adjective *gord* 'red' is likewise unmarked for plural, while the postposed adjective *pići* 'small' attaches the nominal plural suffix *-(j)os*, the third singular possessive suffix, and the accusative suffix.⁴ In the phrase *kuž-eš ogréž-jos-tâ* 'long cucumbers' the adjective bears another plural marker, *-(j)eš*, but no possessive or case suffix.

Both *-(j)eš-* and *-(j)os-*marked adjectives may precede or follow the noun they modify. Thus, the default Beserman translation for the sentence 'Beautiful girls need expensive dresses' is (2a), with a preposed non-marked adjective, but (2b–2e) with plural-marked adjectives are perfectly grammatical as well:

- (2) a. *Ćeber nâl'-l'os-lâ duno plat't'a-os kule.*
 beautiful girl-SUB.PL-DAT expensive dress-SUB.PL be_needed
- b. *Ćeber-eš nâl'-l'os-lâ duno plat't'a-os kule.*
 beautiful-ADJ.PL girl-SUB.PL-DAT expensive dress-SUB.PL
 be_needed
- c. *Ćeber-jos-âz-lâ nâl'-l'os-lâ duno*
 beautiful-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-DAT girl-SUB.PL-DAT expensive
plat't'a-os kule.
 dress-SUB.PL be_needed

3 In the Beserman examples here and below, the text in parentheses “()” provides explanations about the meaning of certain words, literal translations of example fragments, or extralinguistic comments provided by the authors of the article. Square brackets “[]” mark fragments which are absent from the Beserman examples but necessary to interpret the translation correctly. The broad context of the examples is given in curly braces “{ }” if necessary.

4 On the absence of the plural marker on the noun *pomidor* 'tomatoes' see section 3.2.1.

- | | | | |
|----|---|--|--------------------------|
| d. | <i>Nâl'-l'os-lâ,</i>
girl-SUB.PL-DAT
<i>plat't'a-os</i>
dress-SUB.PL | <i>ćeber-eś,</i>
beautiful-ADJ.PL
<i>kule.</i>
be_needed | <i>duno</i>
expensive |
| e. | <i>Nâl'-l'os-lâ</i>
girl-SUB.PL-DAT
<i>plat't'a-os</i>
dress-SUB.PL | <i>ćeber-jos-âz-lâ</i>
beautiful-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-DAT
<i>kule.</i>
be_needed | <i>duno</i>
expensive |
- 'Beautiful girls need expensive dresses.' (el.)

According to our consultants' judgements, example (2d) is grammatical only if it is pronounced with pauses before and after *ćeber-eś* 'beautiful-ADJ.PL'; we have indicated this by using commas in the transcription. However, the Beserman multimedia corpus contains examples with postposed *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives in subject and direct object positions which are pronounced without pauses, see (26).

Udmurt constructions with preposed adjectives marked for plural, as in (2b-c), have received a great deal of attention from various researchers (see sections 3.1 and 4.1), whereas the possibility of using postposed adjectives marked for plural, as in (2d-e), is not always mentioned in the corresponding studies, though at least in Beserman speech this option is no rarer (see Tables 1 and 2). Moreover, as far as we know, the distribution of plural-marked adjectives in such constructions in speech has never been the subject of a dedicated study. The goal of our work is to fill in some of the gaps in the comparative description of the syntactic properties and information structure of these four constructions, additionally listed in (3).

- (3) Adj-*(j)eś* + N (preposed Adj-*(j)eś*)
 Adj-*(j)os* + N (preposed Adj-*(j)os*)
 N + Adj-*(j)eś* (postposed Adj-*(j)eś*)
 N + Adj-*(j)os* (postposed Adj-*(j)os*)

In his typological survey of adjectival modification, Riebler (2016) analyses attributive adjective constructions in Udmurt and claims that the three which are present are juxtaposition (non-marked adjectives), attributive nominalization (*-(j)os*-marked adjectives), and appositional

head-driven agreement (preposed *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives). As Beserman is very close to Udmurt, Rießler's analysis of Udmurt adjectives can be expected to work for Beserman as well. The description of the *-(j)os*-marked attributive adjectives as nominalized (in Rießler's terms) and used in contrastive focus fits the Beserman data quite well, though we will provide examples where they are also used in the context of contrastive topic (section 6). As for the *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives, it should be checked whether they are attributes or predicates, because the prototypical function of the *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives in Beserman (and in Udmurt) is to be used as adjectival predicates. We argue that the position of the *Adj-(j)eś* in respect to the noun it modifies is crucial for its syntactic analysis. According to our syntactic tests (see section 5), postposed *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives do indeed retain their original predicative properties. Meanwhile, preposed *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives do demonstrate syntactic properties of attributes. The possibility of a correlation between information structure and the use of *-(j)eś*-marked attributive adjectives has not been widely discussed in the literature, so we have conducted preliminary research on these factors as well.

The article is structured as follows. In section 2, we describe the data our study is based on and the methods we used to analyse these data. Sections 3 and 4 provide an overview of the usage of plural markers *-(j)os* and *-(j)eś* respectively. First, we present a summary of previous research on plural-marked adjectives in Udmurt. We illustrate claims made for Udmurt with analogous examples from Beserman to show that what has been stated for Udmurt also holds for Beserman. We then supplement this information with some new evidence from Beserman. We also consider the distribution of various functions of plural-marked adjectives in the Beserman corpus. In section 5, we present the results of the syntactic tests which we used to check whether plural-marked adjectives can be considered as attributes. We also describe some additional attribute-like and predicate-like properties of *Adj-(j)eś*. In section 6, we analyse the information structure of constructions with plural-marked adjectives in Beserman, using corpus data and the results obtained from a questionnaire. Section 7 is devoted to conclusions.

2. Data and methods

The present article is based on examples taken from the Beserman multimedia corpus (Arkhangelskiy, Usacheva et al. 2003–2023) and elicited examples.

The Beserman multimedia corpus (270,150 tokens) contains quasi-spontaneous experimental texts, as well as spontaneous dialogues and monologues recorded in the 21st century. Most of the experimental texts were recorded during experiments carried out using the referential communication tasks method described in (Usacheva 2021). On the one hand, this method gives an opportunity to model such factors of information structure as contrast, topic/focus, emphasis, and activation cost. The experimental texts in general contain many more examples with inflected attributive adjectives than the spontaneous texts do, since object properties, typically expressed by adjectives, often played a distinctive role in the experiments. On the other hand, inflected attributive adjectives expressing new information are rare in these texts, since the speakers mostly verbalize those characteristics which correspond to specially modelled distinctions and are thus highly activated (see section 6.3 for details).

Corpus examples are indicated with the note “(corp.)” after the translation. For the sake of brevity, many corpus examples are cited here without extended context, which can be found in the Beserman multimedia corpus freely accessible online.

Most corpus examples were cross-checked with five Beserman speakers, and in this situation the context was provided to the consultants. If no figures follow after the note “(corp.)”, this means that the example was accepted by all five consultants during cross-checking. If the example was rejected by some speakers, the number of speakers who accepted it and the overall number of speakers with whom the example was checked are given, separated by a slash. For example, the note “(corp., 3/5)” means that the example was confirmed by three out of five speakers and rejected or considered dubious by the other two.

The corpus data were used to establish the functions and the position of plural-marked adjectives in Beserman (see section 4.2.1, Tables 1 and 2) to find out the compatibility of *-(j)os* and *-(j)eś* markers with various types of attributes (section 5.1) and to explore the information structure (IS) of the constructions with plural-marked adjectives (section 6.2).

In order to cross-check our conclusions based on corpus data and to acquire additional data and negative examples, we ran three series of working sessions with questionnaires. During these sessions, the speakers were asked for grammaticality judgements on Beserman stimuli we constructed ourselves. The sessions took place in the village of Shamardan (Yukamenskoe district, Udmurtia, Russia) in 2021–2023. Every sentence in the questionnaires was presented to five or six Beserman speakers over forty years of age who were bilingual with Russian but used Beserman constantly in everyday communication.

During the first series of elicitation sessions, various forms which can be used adnominally in Beserman were checked for their ability to attach *-(j)es* and *-(j)os* (section 5.1). The questionnaire consisted of 252 sentences. The second series of elicitation sessions (576 sentences) was devoted to syntactic tests on constituency (section 5.2). The aim of this series of sessions was to find out whether plural-marked adjectives form a constituent with the noun they characterize semantically. The third series of elicitation sessions (69 sentences) was conducted in order to cross-check which IS configurations are acceptable for adnominal adjectives marked for plural (section 6.1).

Elicited examples are indicated with the note “(el.)” after the translation. As with the corpus examples, if the consultants’ judgements were not unanimous, the number of speakers who accepted the example and the total number of those consulted are given.

The following conventions are used to reflect acceptability judgements. An example is considered acceptable (unmarked) if confirmed by all or all but one of the consulted speakers. The asterisk “*” is used if an example was rejected by all or all but one of the consultants. Intermediate cases are labelled with a question mark “?”.

It is important to note that the current article takes a descriptive, pre-theoretical approach. Constructions with inflected adjectives in Udmurt seem to have been described relatively briefly, apart from the case of *N'*-ellipsis, and the corresponding constructions in Beserman have not yet been treated at all. Accordingly, one of the aims of our article is to present as much data concerning inflected adjectives in Beserman as possible. We believe that constructions with adnominal inflected adjectives in Beserman deserve a detailed formal syntactic analysis, but this is a task for the future.

3. The nominal plural suffix *-(j)os*

3.1. Previous research

The suffix *-(j)os* is a nominal plural marker, used with nouns in any syntactic position (Perevoščikov et al. 1962: 73–77; Alatyrev 1983: 567; Winkler 2011: 36). Examples (4) and (5) demonstrate this for Beserman.

- (4) *Purt'-t'os-s-e* *pun* *otčâ.*
 knife-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC put.IMP.SG there.ILL
 ‘Put the knives here.’ (corp.)
- (5) *Ben, maska-os-ân* *d'îsa-šk-âl-i-z-â* *fšakij.*
 yes mask-SUB.PL-INS put_on-DETR-ITER-PST-3-PL different
 ‘Yes, one puts on various masks.’ (corp.)

When used with adjectives, *-(j)os* occurs in the context of N'-ellipsis and is obligatorily followed by a 3Sg possessive marker and a case marker (6).

- (6) *A pl'ita pušk-a-z* *pun*
 and stove inner_space.OBL-ILL-POSS.3SG put.IMP.SG
kâk piči-os-s-e.
 two small-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
 ‘And put two small [pans] into the oven.’ (corp.)

Constructions with N'-ellipsis and the use of the 3Sg possessive marker in such constructions in Udmurt are well described (see Alatyrev 1983: 586–587; Bartens 2000; Winkler 2011: 81–82; Rießler 2016: 131; É. Kiss & Tánčzos 2018; Georgieva 2020). Apart from “nominal ellipsis” (Georgieva 2020), the terms “substantivization” (Bartens 2000), “nominalization” (Winkler 2011; É. Kiss & Tánčzos 2018) and “attributive nominalization” (Rießler 2016) are often used. The 3Sg possessive marker may be also referred to as the “determinative” marker (Winkler 2011: 82) or as the “deictic affix” (Alatyrev 1983: 586).

Adjectives marked by *-(j)os* can appear together with the nominal head (Timerxanova 2011: 65; Karpova 2015: 88). In Beserman, they may precede or follow the head noun, see examples (1), (2c), (2e). Let us provide two more examples from the corpus (7–8).

- (7) *So śana muket'-t'os-s-e*
 that except other-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
d'erevña-os-s-e ug tod-išk-â.
 village-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC NEG.PRS know-DETR-NEG.SG
 'I do not know any other villages except this one.' (corp.)
- (8) *Tare ogreć-jos-s-e*
 then cucumber-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
vakći-os-s-e bašt-â.
 small-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC take-IMP.SG
 'Then take the small cucumbers.' (corp.)

Beserman adjectives marked by *-(j)os*, like those in Udmurt, cannot attach possessive suffixes other than 3Sg (9).

- (9) *Kız-jos-s-e/*Kız-jos-t-e*
 thick-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC/thick-SUB.PL-POSS.2SG-ACC
kor-d-e vaj.
 log-POSS.2SG-ACC bring.IMP.SG
 'Bring the thick logs.' {not the thin ones} (el.)

Constructions with *-(j)os*-marked attributive adjectives (in case the head noun is not elided) have attracted less attention in the literature. Perevoščikov et al. (1962) do not mention such constructions at all, and neither does Alatyrev (1983). Timerxanova (2011: 65) simply cites one example without discussing it. Winkler (2011: 82) provides several examples of inflected attributive adjectives which appear to the left of the noun. Bartens (2000: 132) treats *-(j)os*-marked attributive adjectives as resulting from substantivization and considers the whole construction to be appositional. Rießler (2016: 130) also analyses such attributive adjectives as nominalized. The distinction between non-marked and *-(j)os*-marked attributive adjectives in Udmurt is that the latter are used under contrastive focus (Rießler 2016: 130; É. Kiss & Tánzos 2018; Georgieva 2020).

3.2. Additional evidence from Beserman

3.2.1. Semantically plural nouns without plural marker

Nouns which do not denote humans may bear no plural marker and still trigger plural agreement in Beserman.⁵ In example (1) above, *pomidor* ‘tomatoes’ is in the singular, but the postposed adjective *pićiosse* ‘small’, which modifies it, is in the plural. The same agreement schema is possible for preposed plural-marked adjectives (10) and for adjectives in predicate position (11).

- (10) *I zək-jos-s-e pomidor?*
 and big-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC tomato
 ‘[Should I put] the big tomatoes (lit. ‘tomato’) [there] too?’ (corp.)
- (11) *Kartoška zək-eš.*
 potato big-ADJ.PL
 ‘Potatoes (lit. ‘potato’) are big.’ (corp.)

It is noticeable that this pattern is mostly demonstrated by inanimate mass nouns. In the Beserman multimedia corpus one can also find examples like (12), which contain inanimate non-mass nouns. Examples like (13) with non-human animate nouns were rejected by half of the speakers. Sentences like (14) with non-marked human nouns were universally rejected:

- (12) *A gord, gord kšet-en-jos-âz-lâ*
 and red red scarf-INS-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-DAT
šot-i-z-â mur-eš tabeš.
 give-PST-3-PL deep-ADJ.PL bowl
 ‘And [the girls] in red scarves were given deep bowls.’ (corp.)

5 Such cases may support Marija Privizentseva’s claim that there are languages which do have nominal agreement in spite of the fact that adnominal modifiers in these languages generally do not inflect. In another Finno-Ugric language, Moksha Mordvin, Privizentseva (2023) demonstrates that nominal agreement can be realized after ellipsis only. This seems to be in line with the Hungarian data too, as it has been suggested in Ronai & Stigliano (2020) that Hungarian predicative adjectives which inflect both for number and case result from clausal ellipsis, and those which inflect for number only are parts of clauses with a null subject and a null copula. In our opinion, examples like (1, 10–11) can be analysed as containing nouns which are inherently plural but whose plurality is not expressed by a plural suffix. If so, the same analysis could hold for attributive adjectives which can be treated as inherently plural, but whose plurality can overtly be expressed only in constructions resulting from head noun ellipsis.

- (13) *ʔKək-s-e* *zək-eś* *kureg-z-e*
 two-POSS.3SG-ACC big-ADJ.PL hen-POSS.3SG-ACC
sośed-e *baśt-i-z,* *a* *kwiń-z-e*
 neighbour-POSS.1SG buy-PST-3SG and three-POSS.3SG-ACC
pići-jeś *kureg-z-e* *mon.*
 small-ADJ.PL hen-POSS.3SG-ACC I.NOM
 {– Who bought what?} ‘– My neighbour bought two large chickens, and I bought three small chickens.’ (el., 3/6)
- (14) *Magazín* *dor-ân* *sâl-o* *źużât-eś/źużât'-t'os-âz*
 store near-LOC stand-PRS.3PL tall-ADJ.PL/tall-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG
*ad'ami-os/*ad'ami.*
 human-SUB.PL/human
 ‘The tall people are standing near the store.’ (el.)

3.2.2. *The distribution of the functions of Adj-(j)os in the corpus*

In order to get an impression of how frequently adjectives marked by *-(j)os* are used in three main types of constructions (namely, preposed to the head noun, postposed to it, and with N'-ellipsis), we have annotated the positions of all *-(j)os*-marked adjectives in a subcorpus of the Beserman multimedia corpus. Several types of examples are excluded from our sample. First, we included no examples containing meta-usages of adjectives that appear when the speakers discuss how the adjectives may be marked. Second, we did not include short utterances containing only a single adjective or an adjective with a noun, since in such cases it is often impossible to determine the syntactic structure unambiguously even with the help of the context. Third, we did not consider plural forms of adjectives which have been lexicalized as nouns and which are already used without a 3SG possessive marker after *-(j)os* (such as *l'egit't'os* ‘young people’, *pereśjos* ‘old people’ or *gorotskojjos* ‘townspeople’).

The results of the annotation of *Adj-(j)os* forms are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Constructions with Adj-(j)os in the Beserman multimedia corpus.

Construction	Count	Percentage
N'-ellipsis	54	68%
N+Adj-(j)os	16	20%
Adj-(j)os+N	6	8%
unclear	3	4%
Total	79	

One can see that -(j)os-marked adjectives are most often used when the head noun is elided. When the head noun is present, -(j)os-marked adjectives tend to appear more often in postposition. In section 5.2 we will check whether the groups with postposed Adj-(j)os, which have gone almost unnoticed in the previous literature, behave syntactically like those with preposed Adj-(j)os.

4. The adjectival plural suffix -(j)eś

4.1. Previous research

According to Žiževa (1952: 36), the Udmurt suffix -(j)eś ‘is a predicative marker which indicates agreement between the subject and the adjectival predicate in the plural’ (see also Perevoščikov et al. 1962: 128; Winkler 2011: 83; Saparova 2018). In Beserman, such agreement with a plural subject is obligatory only when the subject is expressed by a noun denoting humans, as in (15–16):

- (15) *Mil'am emespi-os-m-â*
 we.GEN son_in_law-SUB.PL-POSS.1-PL
*ârod-eś/*ârod-jos-(âz)/*ârod.*
 bad-ADJ.PL/bad-SUB.PL-(POSS.3SG)/bad
 ‘Our sons-in-law are bad.’ (corp./el.)
- (16) *So-len piňal'-l'os-âz*
 that-GEN child-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG
*ju-iś-eś/*ju-iś-jos-(âz)/*ju-iś.*
 drink-PTCP.ACT-ADJ.PL/drink-PTCP.ACT-SUB.PL-(POSS.3SG)/drink-PTCP.ACT
 ‘His children are heavy drinkers (lit. drinking).’ (corp./el.)

For subjects which do not denote humans, agreement in plural for adjectival predicates is not obligatory. This can be seen in corpus examples with nouns denoting animate beings (17) and inanimate objects (18).

- (17) *Matka-os-âz* *d'és-d'és* *val.*
 queen_bee-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG good-good be.PST
 'The queen bees were very good.' (corp.)
- (18) *Tatân* *mil'am* *muzjem-jos* *jod-en* *marâm.eto* *naçar.*
 here.LOC we.GEN soil-SUB.PL iodine-INS HES poor
 'Our soils here are, well, poor in iodine.' (corp.)

We should underline, however, that this strategy is not widespread. Thus, it would be much more common to mark the adjectives in (17–18) for plural.

Unlike *-(j)os*, the suffix *-(j)es* is not used with nouns, even in predicative position (19).

- (19) *Mar ta, babam-jos=a/*babam-es=a* *ma ta-os?*
 what this old_man-SUB.PL=Q/old_man-ADJ.PL=Q well this-SUB.PL
 'Who are they, are they old men?' (corp./el.)

Udmurt adjectives marked by *-(j)es* can also be used to the left of the modified noun as attributes (Žiževa 1952: 35; Perevoščikov et al. 1962: 128; Alatyrev 1983: 572; Timerxanova 2011: 66; Winkler 2011: 83). For Beserman, we have already seen such usages of *Adj-(j)es* in examples (1) and (2b), see also example (20) from the corpus.

- (20) *So-os-len* *pumât'-a-z-â* *pot-i-z-â*
 that-SUB.PL-GEN towards-ILL-POSS.3-PL come_out-PST-3-PL
ârod-es *ad'ami-os.*
 bad-ADJ.PL man-SUB.PL
 'Bad people came out towards them.' (corp.)

It has been stated that such constructions are quite rare in Udmurt. As for their analysis, Bartens (2000: 132–133) does not make any distinction between constructions with *-(j)es*- and *-(j)os*-marked attributive adjectives, treating both as appositional. Rießler (2016: 133) considers

the *-(j)eś*-marked attributive adjectives to be instances of appositional head-driven agreement. In his typological survey on adjectives he calls “head-driven agreement” the case when the head spreads its syntactic or morphological features to its modifier (Rießler 2016: 33). If the head spreads its features directly, Rießler talks about “true head-driven agreement”. If the modifier depends on the modified noun semantically but not syntactically, i.e. if the appositional modifier has an empty head which is co-referential with the head noun of the apposed noun phrase, this is treated as “appositional head-driven agreement”. His main argument is that these *-(j)eś*-marked attributive adjectives are restricted to contrastive focus constructions:

According to Csúcs (1990: 63), head-driven agreement marking in constructions without the ‘determinative suffix’ is the result of analogy. The fact that their use is still restricted to contrastive focus constructions, and is therefore an appositional attribution marking device, is crucial for the analysis as appositional head-driven agreement (as opposed to true head-driven agreement) (Rießler 2016: 133).

There exist several more reasons for using attributive *Adj-(j)eś* instead of unmarked adjectives. It was noticed that they are used when the speaker wants to attract attention to the adjective (Perevoščikov et al. 1962: 128), and that the head noun in such constructions denotes a set of referents rather than some kind of indivisible whole (Winkler 2011: 83).

Unlike adjectives marked by *-(j)os*, adjectives marked by *-(j)eś* cannot directly attach possessive and case suffixes (21). However, as mentioned by Winkler (2011: 83) they may attach the nominal plural marker *-(j)os*, and in this case they obligatorily bear possessive and case suffixes (22). Such examples are very rare in Beserman corpora, but they do exist and are confirmed by our consultants. They are also sometimes produced by Beserman speakers when translating from Russian into Beserman (23). We will discuss such cases in more detail in section 5.3.

- | | | |
|------|---|---------------------|
| (21) | <i>*Ĉeber-eś-âz-lâ</i> | <i>nâl'-l'os-lâ</i> |
| | beautiful-ADJ.PL-POSS.3SG-DAT | girl-SUB.PL-DAT |
| | <i>duno</i> | <i>plat't'a-os</i> |
| | expensive | dress-SUB.PL |
| | | <i>kule.</i> |
| | | be_needed |
| | ‘Beautiful girls need expensive dresses.’ (el.) | |

- (22) Udmurt (Winkler 2011: 83):

badžim-eš-jos-a-z *gurt-jos-ın*
 big-ADJ.PL-SUB.PL-LOC/ILL-POSS.3SG village-SUB.PL-LOC
 ‘in the large villages’

- (23) *Ježgurt* *pala-šen* *lâkt-o* *kâk*
 Ezhevo side.OBL-EGR come-PRS.3PL two
zek-eš-jos-âz *mašına-os,* *Bagurt-lašan*
 big-ADJ.PL-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG car-SUB.PL Abashevo-RCS
kâk *pići-ješ-jos-âz.*
 two small-ADJ.PL-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG

‘There are two big cars coming from the direction of Ezhevo (a village), and two little ones [coming] from Abashevo (another village).’ (el.)

4.2. Additional evidence from Beserman

4.2.1. Other functions of the adjectival plural suffix *-(j)eš*

In the Beserman multimedia corpus, there are three more contexts of usages of the adjectival plural marker *-(j)eš* that, as far as we know, have not been mentioned in the literature on Udmurt. First, it attaches to adjectives functioning as secondary predicates, mainly subject-oriented depictives (24).

- (24) *Kartoška* *tue* *so* *betća-ješ*⁶ *bud-em.*
 potato this_year this big.as-ADJ.PL grow-PST2.3SG
 ‘The potatoes have grown big (lit. as big as that) this year.’ (corp.)

Second, *-(j)eš* appears on adjectives after head noun ellipsis, either without any additional marking (25) or in combination with the nominal plural marker *-(j)os* followed by possessive and case suffixes, see the numeral phrase *kâk pići-ješ-jos-âz* ‘two little ones’ in example (23).

6 In Beserman, there is a closed set of lexemes which express comparison in some characteristics. This set includes *kad* ‘like’, *betća* ‘as big as’, *žužda* ‘as tall/high as’, and about 15 other lexemes, all of which require dependents. Perhaps for this reason their Udmurt analogues have traditionally been thought of as postpositions (Winkler 2011: 133). However, the Beserman lexemes in question demonstrate adjective-like morphological and syntactic properties, and their internal syntax differs from that of postpositions. That is why we take them to be adjectives. See Arkhangelskiy, Cheremisina & Usacheva (forthcoming) for details.

- (25) *A pl'ita vâl-ân kâk piçi-jeś sâl-o.*
 and stove on-LOC two small-ADJ.PL stand-PRS.3PL
 {There are two big pots on the table.} ‘And on the stove there are two
 small ones.’ (corp.)

Finally, *Adj-(j)eś* may be used after the noun they modify semantically (2d, 26) in contexts similar to those where preposed *Adj-(j)eś* is used, as described in section 4.1. It is important to mention that when speaking about postposed *Adj-(j)eś* we only mean clauses which have a separate main predicate, most often a verb. In such clauses, the postposed *Adj-(j)eś* may be pronounced without any pause after the modified noun, being fully integrated into the clause prosodically, and thus not interpreted as an afterthought.

- (26) *Gaz pl'ita vâl-e pun kâk kastr'ul'a žužât-eś'.*
 gas stove on-ILL put.IMP.SG two pot high-ADJ.PL
 ‘Put two deep pots on the gas stove’. (corp.)

4.2.2. *The distribution of the functions of Adj-(j)eś in the corpus*

To get an impression of which functions of *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives are primary and which are not, we annotated *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives in a subcorpus of the Beserman multimedia corpus. The annotation procedure was identical to that used for *-(j)os*-marked adjectives (see section 3.2.2 for details). The results of the annotation are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Constructions with *Adj-(j)eś* in the Beserman multimedia corpus.

Construction	Count	Percentage
<i>Adj-(j)eś</i> as main predicate	95	64%
<i>Adj-(j)eś</i> as secondary predicate	10	7%
N+ <i>Adj-(j)eś</i>	14	10%
<i>Adj-(j)eś</i> +N	19	13%
N'-ellipsis	8	5%
unclear	2	1%
Total	148	

One can see that the main function of *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives in Beserman is expressing plural agreement in the position of the main predicate. All the other functions are attested much more rarely, though at the same time they do not seem to be completely marginal.

Constructions of the types *Adj-(j)eś+N* and especially *N+Adj-(j)eś* (where *Adj-(j)eś* is not the main predicate in the clause) have received less attention in the literature than *Adj-(j)eś* in the main predicate position. While the constructions of the type *Adj-(j)eś+N*, according to previous descriptions, behave like attributes, those of the type *N+Adj-(j)eś* need further investigation. In order to find out whether postposed attribute-like *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives are in fact attributes or predicates we performed several syntactic tests, comparing them to preposed *Adj-(j)eś* and to *Adj-(j)os* (section 5).

5. Adjectives with adjectival plural suffix: syntactic properties

In the current paper, we investigate plural markers used primarily with non-derived non-loaned adjectives. However, they can be attached to other kinds of adnominal attributes as well. Therefore, in section 5.1 we provide a short overview of those types of attributes which are otherwise excluded from our description.

Among the four constructions listed in (3) that we focus on, only the construction of the type *N+Adj-(j)eś* has not been analysed syntactically before, so we start by testing it for constituency. We compare the results of these tests with the results for the three other constructions with plural-marked adjectives (section 5.2). In section 5.3, we discuss examples where both plural markers are attached to the same adjective and propose a hypothesis that *-(j)eś* in *Adj-(j)eś+N* constructions is being reinterpreted as a pure attributive agreement suffix. Finally, we consider the ability of plural-marked adjectives to be combined with the emphatic clitic *=uk*, which is normally attached to predicates only.

5.1. Compatibility of *-(j)os* and *-(j)eś* with various kinds of attributes

Apart from non-derived non-loaned adjectives, there are other kinds of adnominal attributes that may form a noun phrase in Beserman. The ones we investigate here include: nouns with attributive suffixes *-tem* and *-o*, personal pronouns in the genitive case, past participles, active participles, adjectives recently loaned from Russian, and adnominal nouns in the instrumental and elative cases.

The types of attributes *-(j)os* and *-(j)eś* can or cannot be attached to are summarized in Table 3. In general, the marker *-(j)os* freely attaches to the majority of attributes, whereas the possibility of attaching the adjective plural suffix *-(j)eś* to attributes of different types is more limited. Both markers can be used with non-derived non-loaned adjectives. Unlike *-(j)os*, *-(j)eś* cannot be attached to personal pronouns in genitive, past participles, and adnominal nouns in the elative. For certain attributes, such as adjectives recently loaned from Russian and adnominal instrumental forms, the speakers' judgements vary regarding the possibility of attaching plural markers.

Table 3. Different types of attributes and their ability to be marked for plurality.⁷

Attribute type	<i>-(j)os</i>	<i>-(j)eś</i>	Example
non-derived non-loaned adjectives	+	+	(1)
N- <i>tem</i>	+	+	(27)
N- <i>o</i>	+	+	(28)
personal pronouns in genitive	+	*	(29)
past participles	+	*	(30)
active participles	+	?	(31), (16)
adjectives recently loaned from Russian	?	?	(32)
adnominal nouns in instrumental	?	?	(33)
adnominal nouns in elative	?	*	(34)

⁷ In Table 3, the asterisk “*” and the question mark “?” are used in the same way as “*” and “?” in the context of example sentences (see section 2), and “+” is used for combinations judged acceptable.

- (27) a. *śur-tem-jos-âz* *ta-os-âz*
 horn-ATTR.NEG-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG this-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG
 ‘these big [cows]’ (corp., 4/5)
- b. *Sre odig ul’l’o śur-tem-eś skal’-l’os-tâ.*
 then one herd horn-ATTR.NEG-ADJ.PL COW-SUB.PL-ACC.PL
 ‘Then [put the picture of] one herd of hornless cows [there].’ (corp., 3/3)
- (28) a. *Gord-en-śed-en skal’-l’os śur-o-os-âz*
 red-INS-black-INS COW-SUB.PL horn-ATTR-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG
mân-o bur-lań.
 go-PRS.3PL right-APPR
 ‘Red cows with horns and black cows with horns go to the right.’
 (corp., 3/3)
- b. *I pumât’-a-z śed’-i-z-â*
 and opposite-ILL-POSS.3SG get_unexpectedly-PST-3-PL
jun śur-o, zęk śur-o-jeś,
 very horn-ATTR big horn-ATTR-ADJ.PL
kuź śur-o-jeś skal’-l’os.
 long horn-ATTR-ADJ.PL COW-SUB.PL
 ‘Very horned cows came out to meet her, cows with large horns, with long horns.’ (corp., 3/3)
- (29) *So-lâś nâl’-l’os-s-e et’-i-z-â*
 that-ABL⁸ girl-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC invite-PST-3-PL
*Moskva-je, a mâniaštâm-jos-s-e/*mâniaštâm-eś*
 Moscow-ILL and I.ABL-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC/I.ABL-ADJ.PL
nâl’-l’os-s-e e-z.
 girl-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC NEG.PST-3SG
 ‘His daughters were invited to Moscow, but my daughters were not.’ (el.)
- (30) *Wal’l’ana kâl’-em-jos-s-e/*kâl’-em-eś*
 vintage remain-PTCP.PST-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC/remain-PTCP.PST-ADJ.PL
pići plat’l’a-os-tâ kofta-os-tâ abi-os
 small dress-SUB.PL-ACC.PL blouse-SUB.PL-ACC old_woman-SUB.PL
kaći-jen vand-âl-i-z-â polovik kert-ânâ.
 scissors-INS cut-ITER-PST-3-PL rug knit-INF
 ‘Old women used scissors to cut small dresses and blouses left over from earlier times (lit. vintage leftover little dresses and blouses) in order to knit rugs [from the resulting strips].’ (el.)

8 In Beserman, genitive adnominal modifiers are replaced by ablatives when the NP appears in direct object position.

- (31) a. *Abi* *berd-âš-jos-s-e*
 old_woman cry-PTCP.ACT-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
piñal'-l'os-s-e *majal'l'a.*
 child-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC stroke.PRS.3SG
- b. [?]*Abi* *berd-âš-eš* *piñal'-l'os-s-e*
 old_woman cry-PTCP.ACT-ADJ.PL child-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
majal'l'a.
 stroke.PRS.3SG
 'An old woman strokes those children who cry.' (el., a:5/5, b:2/5)
- (32) – *Mar* *pun-ono* *žek* *vâl-e?*
 what put-DEB table on-ILL
- a. – *Kanfet'-t'os-s-e* *českât-jos-s-e*
 candy-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC tasty-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
šokoladnij-os-s-e.
 chocolate-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
- b. – [?]*Českât-jos-s-e* *šokoladnij-os-s-e*
 tasty-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC chocolate-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
kanfet'-t'os-s-e.
 candy-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
- c. – [?]*Českât-eš* *šokoladnij-eš* *kanfet'-t'os-s-e.*
 tasty-ADJ.PL chocolate-ADJ.PL candy-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
 '– What should be put on the table? – Delicious chocolates (lit. delicious chocolate sweets).' (el., a: 5/6, b: 2/6, c: 2/4)
- (33) a. *Gord* *šaska-jen* *miska-os* *žek* *vâl-ân*
 red flower-INS saucepan-SUB.PL table on-LOC
sâl-o.
 stand-PRS.3PL
- b. [?]*Gord* *šaska-jen-jos-âz* *miska-os* *žek*
 red flower-INS-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG saucepan-SUB.PL table
vâl-ân *sâl-o.*
 on-LOC stand-PRS.3PL
- c. [?]*Gord* *šaska-jen-eš* *miska-os* *žek*
 red flower-INS-ADJ.PL saucepan-SUB.PL table
vâl-ân *sâl-o.*
 on-LOC stand-PRS.3PL
 'There are the saucepans with red flowers on the table.' {And the ones with yellow flowers on the stove.} (el., a: 5/5, b: 3/5, c: 2/5)

- (34) a. *Azbar-âś* *vedra-os-âz* *pož-eś.*
 yard-EL bucket-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG dirty-ADJ.PL
- b. [?]*Azbar-âś-jos-âz* *vedra-os-âz* *pož-eś.*
 yard-EL-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG bucket-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG dirty-ADJ.PL
- c. **Azbar-âś-eś* *vedra-os-âz* *pož-eś.*
 yard-EL-ADJ.PL bucket-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG dirty-ADJ.PL
 ‘The yard buckets (buckets used in the yard; lit. buckets from the yard) are dirty.’ (el., a: 5/5, b: 2/5, c: 0/5)

To explain why a given type of attribute can or cannot bear plural marking of a particular kind will require a detailed description of the syntactic structures of different Beserman NPs, which is a subject for a separate study.

5.2. Tests for constituency

For the four constructions with preposed and postposed Adj-(j)eś and Adj-(j)os listed in (3), four syntactic tests for constituency (Radford 1988; Testelec 2001) were conducted:

- sentence fragment (answering a question),
- topicalization (fronting),
- proform substitution,
- parcellation.⁹

We have checked the following positions of the noun semantically modified by the plural-marked adjective: subject, direct object, indirect object (marked by dative), adnominal dependent in genitive, adnominal dependent in instrumental, dependent in PP, adjuncts (marked by illative and comitative). In general, examples with adjectives in the plural in all syntactic positions were considered grammatical by our consultants, with the exception of the adnominal dependent in genitive case, which was judged problematic. For the sake of brevity, further on we provide only one example for each test, since all the others exhibited the same results.

9 We also conducted a pied-piping test, but we cannot rely on its results since the construction per se was taken to be very “heavy” and “unnatural” by our consultants. We therefore exclude this test from our analysis.

5.2.1. Sentence fragment (question test)

According to this test, a noun phrase which can serve as the answer to a question forms a constituent. The results show that in the N+Adj-(j)eś construction the noun and the adjective do not form a constituent, whereas in all the other constructions they do (35).

- (35) – *Kiń-lâ* *kule* *duno-jeś* *plat't'a-os?*
 who-DAT be_needed expensive-ADJ.PL dress-SUB.PL
- a. – *Ćeber-eś* *nâl'-l'os-lâ*.
 – beautiful-ADJ.PL girl-SUB.PL-DAT
- b. – **Nâl'-l'os-lâ* *ćeber-eś*.
 – girl-SUB.PL-DAT beautiful-ADJ.PL
- c. – *Ćeber-jos-âz-lâ* *nâl'-l'os-lâ*.
 – beautiful-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-DAT girl-SUB.PL-DAT
- d. – *Nâl'-l'os-lâ* *ćeber-jos-âz-lâ*.
 – girl-SUB.PL-DAT beautiful-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-DAT
 ‘– Who needs expensive dresses? – Beautiful girls [need them]’. (el.)

5.2.2. Topicalization

It is generally assumed that only constituents can be topicalized. Both Adj-(j)eś+N and N+Adj-(j)eś constructions can be topicalized in Beserman. But according to our consultants, the N+Adj-(j)eś construction in this case is understood as an independent clause (37), while the other construction is understood as a topic (36).

- (36) a. *Zęk pińal'-l'os,* *so-os* *pići-jeś* *even*.
 big child-SUB.PL that-SUB.PL small-ADJ.PL no_more
- b. *Zęk-eś* *pińal'-l'os ...*¹⁰
 big-ADJ.PL child-SUB.PL
- c. *Zęk-jos-âz* *pińal'-l'os...*
 big-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG child-SUB.PL

10 Here and below, when a set of examples is given under the same number, the first one (a) is given in full, while in all the others the shared part is replaced by an ellipsis “...”.

- d. *Piňal'-l'os* *zək-jos-əz...*
 child-SUB.PL big-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG
 'Big children, they are not little anymore.' {They can go to school by themselves.} (el.)

- (37) *Piňal'-l'os* *zək-eš,* *so-os* *pići-ješ* *even.*
 child-SUB.PL big-ADJ.PL that-SUB.PL small-ADJ.PL no_more
 *'Big children, they are not little anymore.' {They can go to school by themselves.}

OK 'The children are big, they are not little anymore.' (el.)

5.2.3. Proform substitution

This test assumes that only constituents may be substituted (or referred to) by pronouns. The N+Adj-(j)eš construction cannot be substituted by a pronoun (38c). For all the other constructions (38b, 38d-e) substitution of this kind is possible:

- (38) a. *Ćuž* *d'erem-jos-tê* *e-n* *bašt-ə,*
 yellow shirt-SUB.PL-ACC.PL NEG.PRS-2 take-SG
so-os *lêz* *štan-en* *u-z* *tupał-e.*
 that-SUB.PL blue trousers-INS NEG.FUT-3 match.EXP-PL
- b. *Ćuž-eš* *d'erem-jos-tê...*
 yellow-ADJ.PL shirt-SUB.PL-ACC.PL
- c. **D'erem-jos-tê* *ćuž-eš...*
 shirt-SUB.PL-ACC.PL yellow-ADJ.PL...
- d. *Ćuž-jos-s-e* *d'erem-jos-tê...*
 yellow-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC shirt-SUB.PL-ACC.PL
- e. *D'erem-jos-tê* *ćuž-jos-s-e...*
 shirt-SUB.PL-ACC.PL yellow-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
 'Don't buy yellow shirts: **they** will not match blue trousers.' (el.)

5.2.4. Right dislocation

According to Testelec (2001: 134–138), only constituents can be right-dislocated. He calls this phenomenon “parcellation” and defines it as “dislocating a segment of a sentence to its end; it is crucial that the segment is separated from the rest of the sentence by a pause” (Testelec

2001: 134). For preposed and postposed (*j*)*eś*-marked adjectives, the right-dislocation test produced interesting results. All the consulted speakers considered right dislocation to be acceptable for both preposed and postposed (*j*)*os*-marked adjectives (39d-e) and impossible for postposed (*j*)*eś*-marked adjectives (39c, 40c). As for preposed (*j*)*eś*-marked adjectives, all speakers considered them to be perfectly grammatical in subject position (40b), but two of the six speakers rejected them in direct object position (39b).¹¹

- (39) a. *Mon jun jarat-iško! Gord jablok-jos-tâ!*
 I.NOM very like-PRS.1SG red apple-SUB.PL-ACC.PL
Kâće čekât-eś so-os!
 how delicious-ADJ.PL that-SUB.PL
- b. ... [?]*Gord-eś jablok-jos-tâ! ...*
 red-ADJ.PL apple-SUB.PL-ACC.PL
- c. ... **Jablok-jos-tâ gord-eś! ...*
 apple-SUB.PL-ACC.PL red-ADJ.PL
- d. ... *Gord-jos-s-e jablok-jos-tâ! ...*
 red-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC apple-SUB.PL-ACC.PL
- e. ... *Jablok-jos-tâ gord-jos-s-e! ...*
 apple-SUB.PL-ACC.PL red-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
 'I really like [them]! Red apples! How delicious they are!' (el., b:4/6)
- (40) a. *Ažâ, a'žâ, ot'i vel't'-o!*
 look.IMP.SG look.IMP.SG there.PROL walk-PRS.3PL
Čeber nâl'-l'os!
 beautiful girl-SUB.PL
- b. ... *Čeber-eś nâl'-l'os!*
 beautiful-ADJ.PL girl-SUB.PL
- c. ... **Nâl'-l'os čeber-eś!*
 girl-SUB.PL beautiful-ADJ.PL
 'Look, look, walking there (lit. are walking there)! Beautiful girls!' (el.)

11 Both anonymous reviewers of our paper suggested that the reason why (40b) was accepted by our Beserman consultants is its ability to be analysed as an inverted copular clause. In other words, it is possible to treat the adjective *čeber-eś* 'beautiful' as an adjectival predicate which precedes the subject. The same interpretation is implausible for example (39b) since the noun *jablok-jos-tâ* 'apples' is accusative-marked and cannot be interpreted as a subject.

5.3. Attribute-like properties of preposed Adj-(j)eś

According to our data, preposed Adj-(j)eś share three important properties with unmarked adjectives, which we treat as prototypical attributes. Nouns with some case markers which can be used adnominally – namely, genitive, instrumental, ablative, and elative – demonstrate the same patterns as well.¹²

First, in the vast majority of cases, adnominal attributes appear to the left of the nominal head without any additional marking, as in (41).

- (41) *Pići mǎš-jos-tǎ so-in śud-o.*
 small bee-SUB.PL-ACC.PL that-INS feed-PRS.3PL
 ‘It (beebread) is fed to small bees.’ (corp., not verified with native speakers)

Second, attributes can (and mostly, but not always, do) take inflectional markers of the elided nominal head under N'-ellipsis. In the resulting constructions the case and number suffixes are retained, and the third singular possessive marker is obligatory. Compare an example with an adjective (42) and a noun in the genitive (43):

- (42) *Zęk-s-e odig i pići-os-s-e*
 big-POSS.3SG-ACC one and small-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
kǎk bašt-ono.
 two take-DEB
 ‘One should take one big [bottle of milk] and two little [bottles of milk].’
 (corp., 4/5)

- (43) *Kǎk; Azrak-len-ez aź pal sǎl-e, ben.ved’?*
 two Azrak-GEN-POSS.3SG front side stand-PRS.3PL right
 {– Now someone has bought and brought along two new tractors.}
 ‘– [Yes,] two; Azrak’s one is in front, isn’t it?’ (corp.)

Finally, attributes which have attached case marking, nominal number, and a 3Sg possessive suffix (as after ellipsis of the nominal head) can appear together with the noun they modify semantically. They can be placed either to the left or to the right of the noun and usually mark contrastive focus on the attribute. Compare examples with non-derived

¹² See Arkhangelskiy & Usacheva (2018) for a detailed description of such constructions in Beserman.

adjectives in singular (44)–(45), and with nouns marked for instrumental (46)–(47):

- (44) *L'egit'-ez* *matka,* *so* *zol=ges* *puza.*
 young-POSS.3SG queen_bee that much=CPR lay_eggs.PRS.3SG
 ‘A young queen, she lays more eggs...’ (corp., not verified with native speakers)
- (45) *Salat* *muket-s-e* *vand-âl-i-z-â=ni.*
 salad other-POSS.3SG-ACC cut-ITER-PST-3-PL=already
 ‘The other salad has already been cut.’ (corp., not verified with native speakers)
- (46) *A,* *kâće* *jârçi-jen-ez* *babam-ez*
 and which hair-INS-POSS.3SG old_man-POSS.3SG
košk-e?
 go_away-PRS.3SG
 {There are men with different hair colours in the pictures.} ‘What hair does the old man who is leaving have (lit. the old man with which hair is leaving)?’ (corp., not verified with native speakers)
- (47) *Kanfet-s-e* *śot-i-z-â* *pići* *pi-lâ*
 candy-POSS.3SG-ACC give-PST-3-PL small boy-DAT
gord *jârçi-jen-ez-lâ.*
 red hair-INS-POSS.3SG-DAT
 ‘These candies were given to the boy with red hair.’ (corp., not verified with native speakers)

Proposed *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives share all these three properties with adnominal attributes. First, they appear to the left of the noun they modify semantically without additional marking. Second, Beserman adjectives marked by *-(j)eś* can directly attach nominal inflectional suffixes together with the 3Sg possessive marker after N'-ellipsis (23, 48). Third, having acquired nominal morphology, they can be used adnominally (23).

- (48) *Pići* *pi-lâ* *kwiń* *zək* *kanfet'-t'os-tâ* *śot,*
 small boy-DAT three big candy-SUB.PL-ACC.PL give.IMP.SG
pići *nâl-lâ* *kwat'* *pići-jeś-jos-s-e.*
 small girl-DAT six small-ADJ.PL-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
 ‘Give the boy three big candies, [and] the girl six small ones.’ (corp., 4/5)

Examples like (48) and (23) are especially interesting since they contain forms which are in fact double-marked for plural, containing both adjectival and nominal plural suffixes. The question arises as to what the semantic contribution of both plural suffixes is. We think that the existence of *-(j)es-jos*-forms is made possible by the reinterpretation of *-(j)es* as a pure agreement marker (bearing no additional semantics or IS characteristics). If this is true, then in forms with double plural marking *-(j)es* expresses agreement between the attribute and the elided head, and *-(j)os* together with case and possessive suffixes comes as the result of “copying” morphological markers from the elided head to the attribute in contrastive contexts. Michael Rießler, who treats certain cases of inflected adjectives in different languages as results of nominalization, mentions that “nominal constituents can also be nominalized, i.e., they can be syntactically licensed as constituents in larger syntactic units” (Rießler 2016: 51). Obviously, forms with double plural marking require further syntactic analysis.

There is one interesting aspect concerning interspeaker variation in the use of double-marked forms. Most, but not all, of our consultants considered examples containing both *-(j)es*- and *-(j)os* suffixes to be grammatical. We have not asked enough consultants to be able to draw any firm conclusions, but we have the impression that the factor of age is potentially relevant. For instance, elder speakers accepted the attachment of nominal inflectional morphology to *-(j)es* in direct object position and in most cases in subject position. Younger speakers, however, accepted the uses not only in direct object and subject positions, but also with the dative, instrumental and sometimes even spatial cases. The younger the consultants were, the more syntactic positions they considered to be acceptable. This may mean that the interpretation of the marker *-(j)es* as an agreement marker is an actively developing process in Beserman, but this issue needs further investigation.

5.4. Plural-marked adjectives and the emphatic clitic =*uk*

In Beserman, there is an emphatic clitic =*uk* which almost always appears after predicates (also after focal constituents under very specific circumstances; see Arkhangelskiy 2014; Zubova 2019: 78). This clitic can be attached to postposed Adj-*-(j)es* (49a, 50), but not to preposed Adj-*-(j)es* (49b) or to preposed Adj-*-(j)os* (51a). However, half of

the speakers allowed the attachment of =*uk* to instances of postposed Adj-(*j*)*os* which do not seem to be predicates (51b).

- (49) a. *Mānam wań nil'*
 I.GEN exist.PRS four
kanfet-e/kanfet'-t'os-ā, *zėk-eś=uk.*
 candy-POSS.1SG/candy-SUB.PL-POSS.1SG big-ADJ.PL=EMPH
 'I've got four candies, [they] are big.' (Timofey Arkhangelskiy's field notes)
- b. **?Mānam wań nil' zėk-eś=uk*
 I.GEN exist.PRS four big-ADJ.PL=EMPH
kanfet'-t'os-ā.
 candy-SUB.PL-POSS.1SG
 'I've got four big candies.' (Timofey Arkhangelskiy's field notes)
- (50) *Nāl'-l'os-lā ċeber-eś=uk duno*
 girl-SUB.PL-DAT beautiful-ADJ.PL=EMPH expensive
plat't'a-os kule.
 dress-SUB.PL be_needed
 'Girls, [being] beautiful, need expensive dresses.'
- (51) a. **Ĉeber=uk/*ċeber-jos-āz-lā=uk /*ċeber-eś=uk*
 beautiful=EMPH/beautiful-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-DAT=EMPH/beautiful-ADJ.
 PL=EMPH
nāl'-l'os-lā duno plat't'a-os kule.
 girl-SUB.PL-DAT expensive dress-SUB.PL be_needed
- b. *?Nāl'-l'os-lā ċeber-jos-āz-lā=uk*
 girl-SUB.PL-DAT beautiful-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-DAT=EMPH
duno-jeś plat't'a-os kule.
 expensive-ADJ.PL dress-SUB.PL be_needed
 'Beautiful girls need expensive dresses.' (el.)

Perhaps this is due to specific conditions which allow the clitic to appear after non-predicative constituents, but this question requires further investigation.

To sum up, several syntactic tests have shown that preposed -(*j*)*eś*-marked adjectives form a constituent with the noun they modify semantically. Such adjectives do not have predicative properties but behave like attributes in some important aspects. The postposed -(*j*)*eś*-marked

adjectives retain their original predicative properties and do not form a constituent with the noun they modify semantically.

6. Information structure in the constructions with plural-marked adjectives

In this section we discuss the usage of plural-marked adjectives in terms of topic, focus and contrastiveness. Following Lambrecht (1994: 118, 206), we understand the topic as “the thing which the preposition expressed by the sentence is ABOUT”, and focus as “an element of information added to <...> the pragmatic presupposition”. Following Chafe (1976), we understand by contrastive those situations where the speaker emphasizes his choice from a predefined set of active referents; in the case of contrasted adjectives this is a set of properties.

As already mentioned in section 3.1, several researchers state that Udmurt constructions with *-(j)os*-marked adjectives and the determinative (3Sg possessive) suffix are used under contrastive focus (Rießler 2016: 130; É. Kiss & Tánčzos 2018; Georgieva 2020). However, in the Beserman multimedia corpus one can also find examples where *-(j)os*-marked adjectives appear as a contrastive topic (52).

- (52) *Dak kostrul'a-os-mâ zęk-jos-âz*
 but saucepans-SUB.PL-POSS.1SG big-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG
*zańatj=uk!*¹³
 are_occupied=EMPH
 {The speaker is searching for the big saucepans to put something into them, as the other participants are asking her to do so. Then she finds them and exclaims:} ‘But my big saucepans are already full!’ (corp.)

As for *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives, Winkler (2011:83) says that in Udmurt they are used when individual elements are foregrounded. In (Perevoščikov et al. 1962: 128), it is mentioned that they are used when the speaker wants to attract attention to the adjective. According to Timofey Arkhangelskiy (p.c.), in Beserman adjectives with *-(j)eś* can mark non-contrastive focus on the adjective (53).

13 The consultants with whom we cross-checked this example proposed to replace the Russian borrowing *zańatj=uk* with the Beserman equivalent *târo-jeś=uk* ‘full-ADJ.PL=EMPH’.

- (53) – *Kâće / kâće-ješ* *skal-jos* *ot'* *mân-o?*
 which/which-ADJ.PL cow-SUB.PL there.PROL go-PRS.3PL
 – *Gord-eś* *skal'-l'os* *otân* *mân-o.*
 red-ADJ.PL cow-SUB.PL there.LOC go-PRS.3PL
 ‘– **Which** cows are passing by there? – The **red** cows are passing by there.’ (Timofey Arkhangelskiy’s field notes)

If the whole NP is focal, ADJ.PL marking is dispreferred (54).

- (54) – *Kiñ-ňos* *ot'* *śâres* *vâl-t'i* *mân-o?*
 who-SUB.PL there.PROL road on-PROL go-PRS.3PL
 – *ʔGord-eś* *skal'-l'os* *mân-o.*
 red-ADJ.PL cow-SUB.PL go-PRS.3PL
 ‘– Who is passing there along the road? – **Red cows** are passing.’ (Timofey Arkhangelskiy’s field notes)

However, the Beserman multimedia corpus contains examples with *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives which are not focused. In example (20), the NP ‘bad people’ is mentioned for the first time, and no people other than bad ones are mentioned in the context; thus, the adjective *środ-eś* ‘bad’ is not contrasted. There are also examples in the corpus with contrasted *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives (55).

- (55) *Pal'l'an* *pal-a-z* *so-os-len* *lapeg-eś*
 left side-ILL-POSS.3SG that-SUB.PL-GEN shallow-ADJ.PL
kastr'ul'a-os-śâ *wań.*
 saucepan-SUB.PL-POSS.3PL exist.PRS
 {There are deep pans on the stove. At the table to the left there are women in green sundresses.} ‘There are shallow **saucepans** to the left of them.’ (corp.)

The data from the Beserman multimedia corpus clearly seem to complement our existing knowledge. For this reason, we decided to obtain a more detailed picture of the information structure configurations in which plural-marked adjectives can be used. With this aim we first ran a series of elicitation sessions with six Beserman speakers. The results are presented in section 6.1. In order to cross-check them we analyzed the data from the Beserman multimedia corpus (section 6.2). Finally, we discuss whether activation cost may play a role in the usage of *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives (section 6.3).

6.1. Elicitation

For preposed plural-marked adjectives, we checked the following IS configurations: narrow focus on the adjective, narrow focus on the nominal head, wide focus on the NP, topical NP. For each configuration, the following syntactic positions of the NP were tested: subject, direct object, indirect object (dative-marked), adnominal genitive, adnominal instrumental, instrumental-comitative (external), dependent in post-positional phrase. As in the syntactic tests discussed above, plural-marked adnominal adjectives were normally accepted in all syntactic positions except adnominal genitive dependents.

6.1.1. Preposed *-(j)eš*-marked adjectives

Our results demonstrate that preposed *-(j)eš*-marked adjectives are accepted in different information structure configurations: narrow focus on the adjective (56a-b), narrow focus on the nominal head (57a-b), topical noun phrase (58a-b):

- (56) a. – *Kâće nâl'-l'os ul-o Šamardan-ân?*
 which girl-SUB.PL live-PRS.3PL Shamardan-LOC
 – *Šamardan-ân ul-o éber-eš nâl'-l'os.*
 Shamardan-LOC live-PRS.3PL beautiful-ADJ.PL girl-SUB.PL
 ‘What kind of girls live in the village of Shamardan? – **Beautiful** girls live in the village of Shamardan.’ (el.)
- b. – *Kâće jablok-jos-tâ jarat-e pi-jed?*
 which apple-SUB.PL-ACC.PL like-PRS.3SG son-POSS.2SG
 – *Mânam pi-je jarat-e gord-eš*
 I.GEN son-POSS.1SG like-PRS.3SG red-ADJ.PL
jablok-jos-tâ gâne.
 apple-SUB.PL-ACC.PL only
 ‘Which apples does your son like? – My son likes only **red** apples.’ (el.)
- (57) a. *Mon jun jarat-iško vil' fruktj.*
 I.NOM very like-PRS.1SG fresh fruit
Vil'-eš jablok-jos-âz samoj éeskât-eš.
 fresh-ADJ.PL apple-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG most delicious-ADJ.PL
 ‘I like fresh fruit very much. Fresh **apples** are the most delicious.’ (el., 5/6)

- b. *Čeber kâšno evâl nal' l'a-no. Čeber*
 beautiful wife NEG.EXIST look_for-DEB beautiful
kalâk=no čeber-eś nâl'-l'os=no jun
 people=ADD beautiful-ADJ.PL girl-SUB.PL=ADD very
ažtem-eś.
 lazy-SUB.PL
 'One should not look for a beautiful wife. Beautiful people, beautiful
girls in particular, are very lazy.' (el., 5/6)

- (58) a. *Mon jun jarat-iško vil' jablok.*
 I.NOM very like-PRS.1SG fresh apple
Vil'-eś jablok-jos samoj českât-eś.
 fresh-ADJ.PL apple-SUB.PL most delicious-ADJ.PL
 'I like fresh apples very much. **Fresh apples** are the most delicious.'
 (el., 5/6)

- b. *Čeber nâl'-l'os-tâ evâl bašt-ono.*
 beautiful girl-SUB.PL-ACC.PL NEG.EXIST take-DEB
Čeber-eś nâl'-l'os ažtem-eś.
 beautiful-ADJ.PL girl-SUB.PL lazy-ADJ.PL
 'One should not marry beautiful girls. **Beautiful girls** are lazy.' (el.,
 5/6)

As for wide focus on the whole noun phrase (59a-b), *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives were rejected by half of our consultants but accepted by the other half (in keeping with Timofey Arkhangelskiy's data (54)):

- (59) a. – *Kiñ-ňos scena vâl-ân tetçal-o?*
 who-SUB.PL stage on-LOC dance.EXP-PRS.3PL
 – *Čeber-eś nâl'-l'os otân tetçal-o.*
 beautiful-ADJ.PL girl-SUB.PL there.LOC dance.EXP-PRS.3PL
 '– Who is dancing on the stage? – **Beautiful girls** are dancing there.'
 (el., 3/6)
- b. – *Mar vuzal-o magažin-ân?*
 what sell.EXP-PRS.3PL shop-LOC
 – *Otân vuzal-o gord-eś jablok-jos-tâ.*
 there.LOC sell.EXP-PRS.3PL red-ADJ.PL apple-SUB.PL-ACC.PL
 '– What does one sell in a shop? – One sells **red apples** there.' (el., 3/6)

Thus, in the idiolects of half of the consulted speakers *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives can be used in all the IS configurations checked.

6.1.2. Preposed *-(j)os*-marked adjectives

Adjectives marked by *-(j)os* can likewise be used in all the IS configurations mentioned above. Examples (60)–(63) were accepted by all six speakers we asked:

- (60) a. – *Kâće nâl'-l'os ul-o Šamardan-ân?*
 which girl-SUB.PL live-PRS.3PL Shamardan-LOC
 – *Šamardan-ân ul-o ċeber-jos-âz*
 Shamardan-LOC live-PRS.3PL beautiful-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG
nâl'-l'os.
 girl-SUB.PL
 ‘– Which girls live in the village of Shamardan? – In the village of Shamardan **beautiful** girls live.’ (el.)
- b. – *Kâće jablok-jos-tâ jarat-e pi-jed?*
 which apple-SUB.PL-ACC.PL like-PRS.3SG son-POSS.2SG
 – *Mânam pi-je jarat-e*
 I.GEN son-POSS.1SG like-PRS.3SG
gord-jos-s-e jablok-jos-tâ gâne.
 red-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC apple-SUB.PL-ACC.PL only
 ‘– Which apples does your son like? – My son likes **red** apples only.’ (el.)
- (61) a. *Mon jun jarat-iško vil' fruktj.*
 I.NOM very like-PRS.1SG fresh fruit
Vil'-jos-âz jablok-jos-âz samoj
 fresh-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG apple-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG most
ċeskât-eš.
 delicious-ADJ.PL
 ‘I like fresh fruit very much. Fresh **apples** are the most delicious.’ (el.)
- b. *Ċeber kâšno evâl nal'l'a-no. Ċeber*
 beautiful wife NEG.EXIST look_for-DEB beautiful
kalâk=no ċeber-jos-âz nâl'-l'os=no
 people=ADD beautiful-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG girl-SUB.PL=ADD
jun aźtem-eš.
 very lazy-ADJ.PL
 ‘One should not look for a beautiful wife. Beautiful people, beautiful **girls** in particular, are very lazy.’ (el.)

- (62) a. *Mon jun jarat-iško vil' jablok.*
 I.NOM very like-PRS.1SG fresh apple
Vil'-jos-âž jablok-jos samoj českât-eš.
 fresh-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG apple-SUB.PL most delicious-ADJ.PL
 'I like fresh apples very much. **Fresh apples** are the most delicious.'
 (el.)
- b. *Čeber nâl'-l'os-tâ evâl bašt-ono.*
 beautiful girl-SUB.PL-ACC.PL NEG.EXIST take-DEB
Čeber-jos-âž nâl'-l'os ažtem-eš.
 beautiful-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG girl-SUB.PL lazy-ADJ.PL
 'One should not marry beautiful girls. **Beautiful girls** are lazy.' (el.)
- (63) a. – *Kiň-ňos scena vâl-ân tetçal-o?*
 who-SUB.PL stage on-LOC dance.EXP-PRS.3PL
 – *Čeber-jos-âž nâl'-l'os otân*
 beautiful-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG girl-SUB.PL there.LOC
tetçal-o.
 dance.EXP-PRS.3PL
 '– Who is dancing on the stage? – **Beautiful girls** are dancing there.'
 (el.)
- b. – *Mar vuzal-o magažin-ân?*
 what sell.EXP-PRS.3PL shop-LOC
 – *Otân vuzal-o gord-jos-s-e*
 there.LOC sell.EXP-PRS.3PL red-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG-ACC
jablok-jos-tâ.
 apple-SUB.PL-ACC.PL
 '– What does one sell in a shop? – One sells **red apples** there.' (el.)

It must be noted, however, that our consultants commented upon every sentence with *-(j)os*-marked adjectives even if not prompted. Thus, a comment for (60a) was 'This sentence is highly impolite, because if you say so you mean that only ugly girls live in all the other villages'; for (63a), '...and the ugly ones remain seated'; for (63b), 'The sentence is correct in case one sells not only red but also green apples in our shop', etc. From these comments one can draw the conclusion that *-(j)os*-marked adjectives are perceived by our Beserman consultants as having contrastive value.

The observation that attributive *-(j)os*-marked adjectives in Udmurt are used under contrast is in line with the functions of the 3Sg possessive marker obligatorily following *-(j)os*. Being used with nouns in non-possessive function, it can encode partitive specificity – that is, principally, it identifies the referent as a member of a previously defined set or part of a whole (see Serdobolskaya, Usacheva & Arkhangelskiy 2019 for details and references for Udmurt).

6.2. Corpus data

In order to cross-check our elicitation results, we analysed the data from the Beserman multimedia corpus. Information structure configurations in which adjectives inflected for number appear were checked on the basis of a wider context. We took into account the position of the adjective in relation to the noun it modifies semantically. The case of the head noun was annotated as well. We checked whether the adjective was separated from the noun by a pause.

We also attempted to run a prosodic analysis to check whether there is any correspondence between the prosody on the adjective and contrast or other IS configurations. In some cases (more often in N+Adj-*(j)os* constructions), adjectives demonstrate a pitch upstep before the last syllable (usually 2–4 and rarely up to 10 semitones), but so far no reliable correspondence can be established between these pitch contours and the information structure; this question needs further research.

The results of the corpus analysis are summarized in Table 4.

The corpus data presented in Table 4 do confirm our expectations. The *-(j)os*-marked adjectives appear only under contrast, whereas the *-(j)eś* marked adjectives can be used in different IS configurations. At the same time, we may notice that they are mostly used under contrast as well.

Table 4. IS and prosody of plural-marked adjectives in the Beserman multimedia corpus.

Construction	Total	Case ¹⁴	Pause	IS
Adj-(j)eś+N	24 ¹⁵	12 ACC 11 NOM 1 INS	3	15 CF 5 NCF 3 CT 1 NCT
N+Adj-(j)eś	17	7 ACC 7 NOM 3 INS	4	15 CF 2 NCF
Adj-(j)os+N	12	12 ACC	2	8 CF 4 CT
N+Adj-(j)os	19	14 ACC 5 NOM	11	15 CF 4 CT

CF – contrastive focus: both the noun and the adjective are under focus, and the adjective can be interpreted as contrasted according to context;

NCF – non-contrastive focus: both the noun and the adjective are under focus, and the adjective cannot be interpreted as contrasted according to context;

CT – contrastive topic: both the noun and the adjective are topical, and the adjective can be interpreted as contrasted according to context;

NCT – non-contrastive topic: both the noun and the adjective are topical, and the adjective cannot be interpreted as contrasted according to context.

6.3. Activation cost

Since instances of preposed Adj-(j)eś appear in different IS contexts, one may ask whether activation cost plays any role in their usage. However, it is not very easy to estimate the degree of activation in the corpus examples. It turns out that 25 examples out of 31 with preposed -(j)eś-marked adjectives in the corpus appeared in experimental referential communication texts and contain descriptions of experimental stimuli (cards and figures). Before the experiments started, all the stimuli were shown to the participants, and they discussed what to call them in Beserman. One of the participants, the Matcher, also had the

14 In all the examples the nominative corresponds to the subject position, and the accusative to the direct object position.

15 We ran this analysis in July 2023, when the Beserman multimedia corpus contained 24 examples of preposed -(j)eś-marked adjectives. Later the corpus was expanded, and there were 31 such examples by 18.12.2023.

whole set of stimuli in front of him or her throughout the experiment. Moreover, the target stimuli were designed in such a way that pairs of stimuli differed in one or two characteristics (mainly colour and/or size), and the differences between stimuli were also discussed by participants before the beginning of the experiments. For these reasons, the activation cost of experimental stimuli is very difficult to measure as we do not know exactly which cards the participants actually paid attention to before the experiment without verbalizing their descriptions, or which cards were forgotten during the experiment and which were not.

At the same time, among the experimental examples there are six sentences with preposed *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives characterizing experimental stimuli in terms of properties that were not modelled as difference factors. In all of these examples the head nouns are activated whereas the attributive *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives undoubtedly express new information. The following example (64) was recorded during an experiment in which the mushrooms did not differ in size, so the adjective *zək-eś* ‘big’ expresses new information. The head noun *gibios-âz* ‘mushrooms’ expresses activated information, since mushrooms had been mentioned in the preceding clause.

- (64) *I* *ćušjal* *vâl-a-z,* *veñ-ńos*
 and hedgehog on-LOC-POSS.3SG needle-SUB.PL
vâl-a-z *gibi* *nu-e,* *jun* *ćeber,*
 on-LOC-POSS.3SG mushroom carry-PRS.3SG very beautiful
kâk *zək-eś* *gibi-os-âz.*
 two big-ADJ.PL mushroom-SUB.PL-POSS.3SG
 ‘And the hedgehog is carrying mushrooms on his spines, very beautiful, two large mushrooms.’ (corp., not verified with native speakers)

There are also six sentences from non-experimental texts which contain adnominal *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives. In one of them the adjective expresses new information, and the head noun is activated. In the other five, including the abovementioned example (20) and the following example (65), both the adjective and the head noun express new information:

- (65) *Tiń otân odig korka dor-ân jun zek-eś*
 here there.LOC one house near-LOC very big-ADJ.PL
kâšpu-os bud-o vâlem.
 birch-SUB.PL grow-PRS.3PL be.PST2
 {Now we will tell you why the Bird Side of the village is so called.
 ‘There, near one house, very big birch trees had been growing.’ {Many
 rooks always landed on them, but on the other side of the village birds
 were almost never seen.} (corp., not verified with native speakers)

To sum up, we have 19 experimental examples where attributive *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives express information activated to a certain degree (which is very difficult to measure), and 12 examples where attributive *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives express new information; the head nouns express either new or activated information. In order to draw any conclusions, we need more data which can be compared more reliably. Currently we can neither prove nor reject the hypothesis that attaching *-(j)eś* to adjectives correlates with the activation cost of the adjective.

7. Conclusion

In the current study we have complemented what was already known about plural-marked adjectives in Udmurt with some new findings in Beserman. In addition to what is known for Udmurt, in Beserman, *-(j)eś*-marked adjectives can be used (a) in constructions with N'-ellipsis and (b) in postposition to the noun they modify semantically in a clause which contains another main predicate. In the context of N'-ellipsis they may either attach no additional marking, as in (25), or, as in (48), use the more common approach of copying a set of inflectional suffixes from the nominal head (with an obligatory 3Sg possessive marker). In the latter case, plurality is marked on the adjective twice. Such double-marked adjectives may also appear together with the noun they modify in case the adjective is contrasted (23), thus behaving like prototypical attributes. One possible explanation of this phenomenon could be the incipient reinterpretation of *-(j)eś* as an agreement marker expressing no additional IS characteristics. This is partially supported by the fact that Adj-*-(j)eś* can appear under various IS conditions, such as narrow non-contrasted or contrasted focus, wide focus or topic (although in the corpus contrastive usages of Adj-*-(j)eś* prevail).

When used postnominally in the construction N+Adj-(*j*)*eś*, -(*j*)*eś*-marked adjectives do not form a constituent with the noun, instead retaining their predicative properties. They may follow the noun they modify semantically with or without a pause, so they are not necessarily instances of an afterthought.

As for -(*j*)*os*-marked adjectives, we observed that postposed Adj-(*j*)*os*, which has gone almost unmentioned in previous literature, is (at least) no less frequent than its preposed counterpart, and that both are used in contexts where the adjective is contrasted independent of the focus/topic distinction. It turns out, then, that both -(*j*)*os*- and -(*j*)*eś*-marked adjectives appear in Beserman in contrastive contexts, but the sources for this use of the two types of plural-marked adjective are quite different. The use of Adj-(*j*)*os* in contrastive contexts may be explained by the nature of the 3Sg possessive suffix, which typically marks a member of a previously defined set of referents. The predicative postposed Adj-(*j*)*eś* serves to add some characteristic to the noun which is important to the speaker. This added characteristic can also naturally be contrastive, in which case the function of the -(*j*)*eś*-marked adjectives overlaps with that of the -(*j*)*os*-marked adjectives.

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to all our Beserman consultants for their patience and desire to share their knowledge of their mother tongue with us. We would like to express our deep gratitude to Timofey Arkhangelskiy for long discussions and for translating a very important article (Georgieva 2020) from Hungarian. We would also like to thank Alexandre Arkhipov, László Fejes, Polina Pleshak, and two anonymous reviewers of this paper for useful advice and references, Maria Ovsjanikova and Fedor Rozhanskiy for editing our paper, and Steven Kaye who helped us greatly improve the English text.

For Maria Brykina, this publication has been produced in the context of the joint research funding of the German Federal Government and Federal States in the Academies' Programme, with funding from the Federal Ministry of Education and Research and the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg. The Academies' Programme is coordinated by the Union of the German Academies of Sciences and Humanities.

Abbreviations

ABL – ablative, ACC – accusative, ADD – additive, ADJ.PL – adjective plural marker, APPR – approximative, ATTR – attributivizer, CPR – comparative, corp. – corpus example, DAT – dative, DEB – debitive, DETR – detransitivizer, EGR – egressive, EL – elative, el. – elicited example, EMPH – emphasizer, EXIST – existential, EXP – expanded stem, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, HES – hesitation marker, ILL – illative, IMP – imperative, INS – instrumental, ITER – iterative, LOC – locative, NEG – negation, NOM – nominative, OBL – oblique, PL – plural, POSS – possessive, PROL – prolative, PRS – present tense, PST – past tense, PTCP.ACT – active participle, PTCP.PST – past participle, Q – question marker, RCS – recessive case, SG – singular, SUB.PL – nominal plural marker, 1 – first person, 2 – second person, 3 – third person

References

- Alatyrev, Vasilij I. 1983. Kratkij grammatičeskij očerk udmurtskogo jazyka. In Vasilij M. Vaxrušev (ed.), *Udmurtsko-russkij slovar'*, 561–591. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.
- Arkhangelskiy, Timofey. 2014. *Clitics in the Beserman dialect of Udmurt. Basic research program. Working papers. Series: Linguistics. WP BRP 10/LNG/2014*. Moscow: National Research University Higher School of Economics. <https://publications.hse.ru/pubs/share/folder/3c20dy14t9/178195497.pdf> (18 December, 2023).
- Arkhangelskiy, Timofey, Maria Cheremisinova & Maria Usacheva (forthcoming). *A grammar of Beserman*. Leiden: Brill.
- Arkhangelskiy, Timofey & Maria Usacheva. 2018. Case compounding in Beserman Udmurt. *Eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteaduse ajakiri. Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 9(1). 111–138. <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2018.9.1.05>.
- Arkhangelskiy, Timofey, Usacheva, Maria et al. 2003–2023. *Beserman multimedia corpus*. <http://multimedia-corpus.beserman.ru/search> (18 December, 2023).
- Arxangel'skij, Timofej A. 2021. Primenenie dialektometričeskogo metoda k klassifikacii udmurtskix dialektov. *Uralo-altajskie issledovanija*, 2(41). 7–20.
- Bartens, Raija. 2000. *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys* (Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seuran toimituksia 238). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. In Charles Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 25–56. New York: Academic Press.
- Csúcs, Sándor. 1990. *Chrestomathia votiacica*. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- É. Kiss, Katalin & Orsolya Táncczos. 2018. From possessor agreement to object marking in the evolution of the Udmurt *-jez* suffix: A grammaticalization approach to morpheme syncretism. *Language* 94(4). 733–757. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2018.0052>.

- Georgieva, Ekaterina 2020. Névszói ellipsis az Udmurt nyelvben. *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok* 32. 365–380.
- Karpova, Ljudmila L. 2015. Osobennosti porjadka slov v udmurtskoj narodno-razgovornoj reči (na materiale severnyx dialektov). *Vestnik Udmurtskogo universiteta. Serija Istorija i filologija* 25(2). 85–91.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620607>.
- Perevoščikov, Petr N., Vasilij M. Vaxrušev, Vasilij I. Alatyrev, Apollinarija A. Pozdeeva & Ivan V. Tarakanov. 1962. *Grammatika sovremennogo udmurtskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfoložija*. Iževsk: Udmurtskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Privizentseva, Mariia. 2023. Nominal ellipsis reveals concord in Moksha Mordvin. *Syntax* 26(4). 355–403. <https://doi.org/10.1111/synt.12258>.
- Radford, Andrew. 1988. *Transformational Grammar: A First Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700014274>.
- Riebler, Michael. 2016. *Adjective attribution* (Studies in Diversity Linguistics 2). Berlin: Language Science Press. <https://doi.org/10.17169/langsci.b19.294>.
- Ronai, Eszter & Laura Stigliano. 2020. Adjectival sluices in Hungarian. An argument for isomorphic sources. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 38. 1197–1210. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-020-09468-w>.
- Saparova, Dar'ja A. 2018. Soglasovanie po čislu prilagatel'nyx v udmurtskom jazyke. In Maria K. Amelina, Aleksandr A. Anufriev, Vadim V. D'jačkov, Nadežda V. Makeeva, Olga V. Popova & Olga V. Sokolova (eds.), *Problemy jazyka. Sbornik statej po materialam Šestoj konferencii-školy "Problemy jazyka: vzgljad molodyx učenyx"*, 160–180. Moskva: Institut jazykoznanija RAN, Kancler.
- Serdobolskaya, Nataliya, Usacheva, Maria & Timofey Arkhangelskiy. 2019. Grammaticalization of possessive markers in the Beserman dialect of Udmurt. In Lars Johanson, Irina Nevskaya & Lidia F. Mazzitelli (eds.), *Possession in Languages of Europe and North and Central Asia* (Studies in Language Companion Series 206), 291–311. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.206.14ser>.
- Škljaev, Georgij K. 1997. Besermjane. Opyt etnostatističeskogo obsledovanija. In Georgij K. Škljaev (ed.), *O besermjanax. Sbornik statej*, 110–120. Iževsk: Udmurtskij institut istorii, jazyka i literatury UrO RAN.
- Testelec, Jakov G. 2001. *Vvedenie v obščij sintaksis*. Moscow: RGGU.
- Timerxanova, Nadežda N. (chief ed.). 2011. *Udmurt kyllen kylkabtodosez (morfoložijež)*. Iževsk: "Udmurt universitet" knigapotonni. <http://elibrary.udsu.ru/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/8564/20127.pdf>.
- Usacheva, Maria N. 2021. Dialogue-focused experiments in the field: advantages and disadvantages (a Permic experience). In Tatiana B. Agranat & Leyli R. Dodykhu-doeva (eds.), *Strategies for Knowledge Elicitation*, 27–62. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79341-8_3.

- Winkler, Eberhard. 2011. *Udmurtische Grammatik* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 81). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Zubova, Julija. 2019. Variacii v ispol'zovanii modal'nyx častic v literaturnom udmurtskom jazyke i v besernjanskom dialekte. *Uralo-altajskie issledovanija* 4(35). 71–90.
- Žiževa, Elizaveta G. 1952. O značenii suffiksa *-osj*. In Aleksandr A. Vežev (ed.), *Lingvističeskij sbornik* (Serija lingvističeskaja 2), 29–36. Syktyvkar: Komi gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo.

Kokkuvõte. Maria Usacheva, Maria Brykina: Besermani mitmuslike omadussõnadega konstruktsioonide süntaktilised omadused ja infostruktuur. Käesolev artikkel uurib Besermani keele konstruktsioone, mis hõlmavad arvus käänatud omadussõnu ja neid täiendavaid nimisõnu. Prototüüpelt omadussõnad ei ühildu arvus nominaalse põhisõnaga. Teatud tingimustel võivad nad siiski arvu väljendada nominaalse mitmuse suffiksi *-(j)os* ja kolmanda isiku ainsuse possessiivsuffiksiga või predikatiivse adjektiivsuffiksiga *-(j)eš*. Me usume, et suffiksiga *-(j)os* ja kolmanda isiku ainsuse possessiivsuffiksiga konstruktsioonid on atributiivse nominalisatsiooni näited. Korpuse andmed ja küsitlus näitavad, et neid kasutatakse kontrasti väljendamiseks. Mis puudutab *-(j)eš*-markeriga omadussõnu, siis väidame, et eristada tuleks kahte tüüpi konstruktsioone. Järelasendis *-(j)eš*-markeriga omadussõnad säilitavad süntaktiliste testide kohaselt oma esialgsed predikatiivsed omadused. Eesasendis *-(j)eš*-markeriga omadussõnad jagavad olulisi omadusi “prototüüpsete” Besermani atribuutidega ja neid võib kasutada erinevates infostruktuuri tingimustes, mis lähendab neid ühildumiskonstruktsioonidele.

Märksõnad: beserman, udmurdi keel, mitmus, omadussõnad, infostruktuur, ühildumine