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1. Introduction

1.1 Linguistic taxonomy of Tundra Yukaghir, its dialects and genetic affiliation

Tundra Yukaghir (henceforward TY), along with Kolyma Yukaghir (henceforward KY), was for a long time treated as one of the two surviving dialects of the common Yukaghir language (Jochelson 1900, Krejnovič 1958, 1968, 1982). It was not until the beginning of the 21st century that one began to apply the term ‘language’ to these idioms (Kurilov 2001, 2003, Maslova 2003a and 2003c) systematically. Nikolaeva (2006) recognizes the existence of both taxonomic approaches but does not opt decisively for either of them, referring to TY and KY now as idioms, now as varieties, but also as languages. The title of her book suggests that TY and KY, as well as the extinct varieties reflected in it, constitute together the Yukaghir language. At the same time, she finds it appropriate to speak of the ‘Yukaghir family’ (Nikolaeva 2006:viii).

It is mainly the differences in the lexicon and in the sound system that justify regarding TY and KY as languages and not mere dialects. Suffice it to say that 7 of the first 20 items from the Swadesh (1972:283) list do not show in TY and KY any resemblance at all. They are listed below, accompanied by the ordinal numbers they are assigned in the Swadesh (1972:283) list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. ‘all (of number)’</th>
<th>jawnej</th>
<th>čumut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. ‘many’</td>
<td>pajuod’e</td>
<td>ningej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ‘one’</td>
<td>maarqan</td>
<td>irkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ‘two’</td>
<td>kin</td>
<td>ataqun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ‘fish’</td>
<td>al’γa</td>
<td>an’il</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ‘person’</td>
<td>köde³</td>
<td>šoromo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ‘bird’</td>
<td>ujen’ ejrukun</td>
<td>nodo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This kind of situation is uncommon in pairs of closely related languages whose separate status is widely accepted. Thus, English and Dutch would differ from each other only in the positions 10 and 20, as far as the above 7 words are concerned. If one replaced English in this pair by a less ‘contaminated’ West Germanic language, such as German, the cognates would be apparent in all seven positions. That this 7:7 proportion reflects the linguistic reality more objectively than 5:7 of the English/Dutch pair is indirectly confirmed by the situation in Slavonic languages, where the relation 7:7 obtains even in

---

¹ In view of that the title of Kurilov (2006), which is dedicated specifically to TY, is inconsistent.
² In the concluding sentences of his work Krejnovič (1968:451) admits that ‘the lexical differences between the dialects are so great that the mutual understanding among their speakers is almost completely excluded’ and acknowledges the possibility that future research may make it necessary to treat the two varieties as independent Yukaghir languages.
³ It has to be noted that köde ‘person’, ‘man’, ‘male’ does have a cognate in KY, but the meaning of the latter does not coincide with that of the TY cognate. The KY word köj means ‘lad’, ‘young male’. This meaning, in turn, is rendered in TY by the word kejp. TY lacks a cognate of the KY šoromo ‘person’. Generally, this list is not a list of mutually missing cognates but an illustration of considerable synchronic divergences in the basic lexicons of TY and KY.
languages belonging to different subgroups, e.g. between Russian (East Slavonic) and Serbo-Croatian (South Slavonic), which show straightforward cognates for all 7 of the listed concepts. Even languages from different groups of the Indo-European family would seem to differ less from each other than TY does from KY: Italian (Romance) would still find its cognates with the same meaning in German (Germanic) at least\(^4\) for the numerals ‘one’ and ‘two’. A great deal of other words that belong to the basic lexicon of a language differ in TY and KY\(^5\). The following selection from Kurilov (2003:9-10) illustrates that. The ordinal numbers indicate the positions in the Swadesh (1972:283) list where applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TY</th>
<th>KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75. ‘water’</td>
<td>lawje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. ‘stone’</td>
<td>qajl’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. ‘path’</td>
<td>jawul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. ‘to be yellow’</td>
<td>norine-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. ‘to be new’</td>
<td>n’id’erpe-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘light’</td>
<td>čajle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘spirit’</td>
<td>kiid’e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to be deep’</td>
<td>iskel’uol-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to laugh’</td>
<td>ayal’we-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to cry’</td>
<td>oorin’e-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘slowly’</td>
<td>lad’id’aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘already’</td>
<td>motiney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, even here a comparison between Russian and Serbo-Croatian, well established, though related, separate languages would yield a nearly 100% correspondence, with only the two last words being different: medlenno vs. sporo\(^6\) and uže vs. već respectively.

An overview of the major phonetic correlations between TY and KY can be found in Collinder\(^8\) (1940:89-95), Krejnovič (1958:17-19) and Kurilov (2003:10-11). Probably

---

\(^4\) The German word Person ‘person’, which is a loan, would be a third cognate but it is not counted here as its status in German differs, after all, from that in Italian, or even English, where it is the main lexical device to render the concept ‘human being’ in a variety of contexts, whereas in German it has to compete with the word Mensch.

\(^5\) The pronounced differences in the lexicon between TY and KY led Nikolaeva and Chelinskij (1996:155) to the conclusion that the languages went separate ways around 2000 years ago.

\(^6\) The hyphen indicates that the word form is a base.

\(^7\) An amusing subsidiary observation can be made here. Russian has an absolutely homophonous, if one disregards the weakening of the unstressed /o/ in the second syllable, equivalent of the Croatian sporo ‘slowly’. However the Russian word is antonymous to it, it has the meaning ‘quickly’. One could argue therefore that these words are cognates with the opposite meaning, which would diminish the difference between Croatian and Russian for this set of words yet more.

\(^8\) Collinder (1940:93-95) provides also examples of what he calls the intra-dialectal alternation, meaning the alternations existing within either TY or KY and not between them.
the most profound difference in the sound system is the lack of the fricatives /ʃ/ and /ʂ/ in TY as compared to KY\(^9\).

Significant differences between TY and KY in the lexicon and sound system contrast with a great degree of resemblance of their grammars. In Jochelson’s (1905:371) opinion ‘the phonetical and morphological peculiarities of the Tundra dialect [which set it apart form KY] are rather insignificant’. Kurilov (2006:11) states that in the morphological system between TY and KY ‘there are no essential differences’. Among the most conspicuous of them are:

- the presence of the velar nasal \(\eta\) in some verbal endings in TY, which is opposed by its absence in the KY counterparts
- the shape of the nominal focus marker: –ᠯ_
\(\eta\) in TY vs. –leton in KY
- the instrumental case ending: –leton in TY and –le in KY

The cross-linguistic rarity of a simultaneous divergence of the basic lexicon and likeness in the grammar among closely related languages, in the degree they exist between TY and KY, makes it a phenomenon deserving a separate study\(^10\). As appears from Kurilov (2003:24), a superficial examination lets one identify only a relatively small portion of Even borrowings in TY accounting for the lexical differences between the latter and KY. These words include primarily kin terms, terms connected with reindeer keeping and some unrelated concepts. A presence of ‘a considerable quantity of Tungus stems’ (Jochelson 1905:372) is a relative assessment\(^11\).

Considering great differences in the lexicon, enhanced by differences in the grammar, it is not surprising that, as Kurilov (2003:9) reports, speakers of TY and KY have to resort to Russian or Yakut to secure mutual intelligibility. Speakers of TY have confirmed the correctness of this observation to me. Mutual intelligibility being one of the most objective criterions for distinguishing languages\(^12\), one has to recognize that TY and KY represent two separate languages. Just how closely they are related, has yet to be investigated.

---

\(^9\) The loss of /ʂ/ may be a recent change since Jochelson ([1926] 2005:84) states that there was the word šukunmalqel ‘year’, which is nowadays sukunmol’γal. Generally, there are many instantiations of the sound [s] in the textual material of that period (Jochelson 1900, [1926] 2005).

\(^10\) The only area with a similar situation I am aware of is the Sepik-Ramu basin, specifically the languages of Lower Sepik-Ramu family. Genetic links have to be established for the languages of that family not as much on a shared lexicon as on the basis of morpheme cognates, precisely plural markers (Foley 2012:2).

\(^11\) Jochelson ([1926] 2005:92) used one cover ethnonym for Tungusic people of north-eastern Siberia as he shared the view that Evens (the old name for Lamuts) and Tungus (the old name for Evenki) were one ethnicity. No matter how significant the influence of Even on TY lexicon really is, there are still a number of very common words that differ in TY and KY but cannot be explained away as borrowings from Even. Among such words are a priori all words with /l/ in the word initial position, since liquids do not occur in Even word-initially (see e.g. lawje ‘water’ and lad’id’aa ‘slowly’ above). However, this argument is not valid if one assumes borrowings from Evenki, where /l/ in inlaut is not only possible but frequent and alternates with /n/ in Even, e.g. laam(u)/laame ~ nam ‘sea’. Curiously, Lamuts (‘sea-shore people’, or ‘Tungus living at sea’) would then have to refer to Evenki and not to Evens as it actually does.

\(^12\) An objection that e.g. some German or Italian dialects may be mutually unintelligible is refuted by pointing out the political dimension present in the decision not to regard them as separate languages. In the case of Yukaghir languages this political dimension is not present as their speakers have never perceived themselves as peoples constituting a common state.
Having established that Tundra Yukaghir is a language in its own right, it is reasonable to inquire into its dialectal structure. However intriguing this question may be, it will hardly ever be possible to give a satisfactory answer (Kurilov, personal communication). This is conditioned by the socio-linguistic factors: a limited size of the area in which TY is still spoken, merging and the subsequent leveling of the potential dialectal differences. As a result of placing speakers of different geographical origin into one settlement (see section 1.6) decades ago, an artificial mixture of the potentially present dialects was created. An additional problem is the frequent lack of the possibility to trace the precise geographic origin of the present day speakers’ ancestors. At the present stage it can only be stated that there is a considerable amount of intra-linguistic phonetic variation in TY (see also Collinder 1940:91, 94) along various parameters. These variations manifest themselves tautomorphologically as well as at morpheme and word boundaries:

- tautomorphologic variation:

- vowel length:

  a ~ aa
  kečinunŋa ~ kečinunŋaa ‘[they] used to bring’
  pajpe ~ paajpe ‘woman’

  i ~ ii
  kečinunŋa ~ kečinunŋa ‘[they] used to bring’

- vowel quality and vowel quality plus length:

  o(o) ~ a(a)
  pojuol- ~ pajuol- ‘to be numerous’
  mon- ~ man- ‘to say’
  odunj ~ adunj ‘that’
  moorquon’ ~ maarquon’ ‘only’
  wojčil’elum ~ waajčil’elum '[s/he] pulled a few times’
  molγodamunŋa ~ molγadamunŋa ‘up to the breast’
  ton ~ tan ‘and’, ‘but’
  ayuol- ~ oyuol- ‘to stand’

  o ~ u

  munajd’ii ~ moŋojd’ii ‘married woman’

  o(o) ~ uo
  id’igajgir ~ id’iguojgir ‘morning’
  oorin’e- ‘to cry’ ~ uorin’emut ‘cry.2PL.1TRG’
  qoolemwm ~ quolemwm '[s/he] did smb. in’
ö ~ o
me juötem ~ me juotem ‘[s/he] will see’
örd’e ~ ord’a ‘middle’

e ~ a
čiïyet ~ čiïyat ‘from the people’
mítqe ~ mitqa ‘at ours’
juöseýen ~ juöseýan ‘let him show’
el’ideýe ~ el’idaya ‘first’
maranme ~ maranma ‘simply’
med’uolde vs. med’uolda ‘having been born’
me qadaa ~ maqadaa ‘somewhere’

e ~ o
jolle ~ jollo ‘moss’
möñer ~ möñor ‘noise’

i ~ a
wayîne ~ wayane ~ ‘personal’
saabind’e ~ saaband’e ‘fishing net’
jalmisče ~ jalmasče ‘third’
arin’n’e- ~ arann’e- ‘to be deft’

i ~ e
n’iîjîl’ite- ~ n’iîjîl’ete- ‘to abuse each other’
paad’iduo ~ paad’eduo ‘daughter’
čiribe ~ čirebe ‘plummet’
maranmi ~ maranma ‘simply’
jeleklisče ~ jeleklesče ‘forth’

u ~ e
surun’e- ~ suren’e- ‘to be fat’
jeruguu ~ jereguu ‘plain’
n’angumu ~ n’angemu ‘purposely’
ummun ~ emmun ‘every’
-pul ~ -pel ‘PL’

u ~ i
saburqa ~ sabirqa ‘plane’

- consonants:

d ~ r
čunjde ~ čunjre ‘mind, thought’
janjde ~ janjre ‘goose’
$r \sim s$

ugurče $\sim$ ugusče ‘foot, leg’

$n’ \sim m$

n’id’erpe- $\sim$ mid’erpe- ‘to be new’

$n’ \sim n$

ten’i $\sim$ teni ‘here’

$η \sim n$

suijdii- $\sim$ sundii- ‘to throw around’

tiŋjii $\sim$ tiŋjii- ‘to grudge’

$j \sim l’$

juku $\sim$ l’uku ‘small’

- variation at morpheme boundaries:

  - adverb formation: maaruojiŋne $\sim$ maaruoλneŋ ‘happily’ (-neŋ ‘ADV’)
  - nominalized participles: soljiŋde ‘gathering’ $\sim$ soljindjeŋa ‘at a gathering’
    (-d’e $\sim$ -nd’e ‘PTCP’)

- variation at word boundaries:

  wadun aruu $\sim$ wadud aruu ‘the Yukaghir language’

tude gedeyane $\sim$ tude kedeljane ‘himself’

el taat pan $\sim$ el taat ban ‘[it] is not like that’

taat kurčiinuni $\sim$ taat gurčiinuni ‘[it] used to happen so’

It is hard to say whether these alternations are influenced by dialectal differences. In some cases it is safe to assert they are not because they can be observed in one and the same speaker. Prokopyeva (personal communication) made similar observations for KY. In a number of instances the differences are noticed only thanks to the diverging spelling of the same word or suffix used by a speaker to represent his speech in writing (specifically in the transcripts of one’s own speech). Such ambivalent judgment of a speaker reflected in the spelling testifies either of the imperfectness of the writing system 13 or of the fact that there is really a lot of phonetic variation in TY. A graphic illustration of how mixed-up the language has become is the use of the TY form of the interrogative pronoun neme ‘what’ by one sibling and its KY equivalent leme by another sibling. On the other hand, sometimes one can assume dialectal differences. This appears plausible when phonetic differences are manifest in people originating from distinctly different areas. Historically, two neighboring areas with TY speech communities could and still can be distinguished geographically: the Olyora tundra and the Khalarcha tundra.

---

13 For instance, a good deal of [a] $\sim$ [e] variation could be explained by the lack of a grapheme representing a schwa, which is the way /a/ is realized in certain positions.
The Olyora tundra extends from the Alazeya River in the west to the river Bolshaya Chukochya in the east. The Bolshaya Chukochya River forms the western border of the Khalarcha tundra, which stretches as far as Kolyma River in the east. It is tempting to regard differences in the speech of people originating from these two areas as dialectal and conventionally designate the two varieties of TY as Olyora and Khalarcha dialects. The former would be spoken in Andryushkino and the neighboring tundra while the latter would be represented by a few families in Kolymskoye. Representatives of both of these dialects would dwell in Cherski, which is the administrative center of the region. This division would not be unproblematic, though. For one, it suggests at least relative homogeneity of the respective dialects. The divergences presented above testify sufficiently that such homogeneity does not exist in the hypothetical Olyora dialect. There are no unambiguous data in my possession that would confirm its existence for the Khalarcha dialect. Considering the small size of the Khalarcha speech community\(^{14}\), the homogeneity of the dialect is more probable. The assumed dialects would have to differ from each other systematically. On the basis of, admittedly very superficial, observations I could not draw such a conclusion. Quite on the contrary, due to the heterogeneity of the hypothetical Olyora dialect, some of its manifestations could be found that are closer to the Khalarcha dialect. For instance, in the available corpus a word \(\text{muŋajd}'ii\) ‘a married woman’ is attested. It is supposed to have been used by a senior representative of the posited Olyora dialect. At the same time, in Kurilov (2001:256) one finds instead the form \(\text{moŋajd}'ii\). This latter version of the word is used by a representative of Khalarcha dialect as well. Now Kurilov originates from Olyora tundra. Moreover, he is a son of the senior female speaker referred to above. The intra-family variation makes it difficult, if not impossible, to set dialectal boundaries. Not discarding completely the idea of the division of TY in two quasi-dialectal varieties, Olyora, centered around Andryushkino, and Khalarcha, with its core in Kolymskoye, at present it seems safer to state that TY exhibits a great amount of variation, which might eventually be attributed to dialectal influences.

It is very interesting that speakers of TY themselves are quite aware of this variation and have verbalized the concept reflecting this state of affairs as \(\text{aruun n’anduol}\) ‘the excess of speech’. It essence is explained in the example below.

\begin{quote}
(1) \textit{Maarqad aruu kin jaan n’iedeln’ej, taγi aruu n’anduolek.}
\end{quote}

\begin{tabular}{lllll}
\textit{maalqa-n-d} & \textit{aruu} & \textit{ki-n} & \textit{jaa-n} & \textit{n’iede-l-n’e-j} \\
\textit{one-GEN-0} & \textit{word} & \textit{two-GEN} & \textit{three-GEN} & \textit{pronounce-GER-VBLZ-INTR.3SG} \\
\hline
\textit{taγi} & \textit{aruu-n} & \textit{n’anduol-ek} \\
\text{INVS.DEM} & \textit{speech-GEN} & \textit{exceed[GER]-COP} \\
\end{tabular}

‘One [and the same] word can be pronounced in two or three ways – that’s “aruun n’anduol” (the language’s being excessive\(^{15}\)).’

\(\text{(Kurilov 2001:53, aruu n’anduol)}\)

\(^{14}\) According to a rough assessment by a speaker originating from Kolymskoye only about three families consistently use TY in their households.

\(^{15}\) \text{n’anduol} can also mean ‘to be better’. Thus, metaphorically, this expression can mean ‘the improvement of speech’.
Other speakers may take a decisively critical stance when seeing other’s ‘deviations’. Thus, I learnt about a senior TY speaker complaining about the linguistic quality of regular radio broadcasts in TY from Yakutsk. Surprisingly – or by now, not surprisingly – the dissatisfied listener and the radio speaker were both from Olyora tundra. The listener’s frustration with the ‘twisting’ of the mother tongue was so intense that she strongly dissuaded her granddaughter from listening to those broadcasts. On another occasion a competent speaker of TY felt sorry about the quality of the translation from Russian into TY of a leaflet about building up a pension, made by a speaker of the presumably same variety of TY, and said that it would have been better not to translate it at all than to have it translated so poorly. This mutual criticism and constant corrections are a serious challenge for a descriptivist, especially if there is an ambition to compile a normative grammar, which is often a very important goal in projects connected with endangered languages, whose achievement is seen as a means of keeping the dying language alive.

Tundra Yukaghir, or wadud aruu (alternatively wadun aruu⁴⁶) ‘the language of Waduls’, as Yukaghirs themselves call their idiom, is ‘conventionally regarded as a language isolate. Factually it is remotely related with the Uralic languages although it does not form a part of the Uralic family in the strict sense of the word [...]’ (Nikolaeva and Chelimskij 1996:155)¹⁷. This preliminary, in my opinion very probable, conclusion was arrived at in the course of decades of research. The ethnographer V.I. Jochelson, the first dedicated explorer of the Yukaghir languages¹⁸, who lived and studied KY amongst its speakers for several years, denied a genetic relation between the Yukaghir languages and the Uralic or Altaic languages of Siberia (Jochelson 1905:370). He saw a link between the Yukaghir languages and the languages of the American Indians instead (Jochelson 1899 cited by Krejnovič 1958:5). However, Jochelson’s opinion was mainly based on certain cultural parallels, as linguistic material necessary to postulate such a link was not available to him. Jochelson’s view found in recent times a supporter in the indigenous scholar and native speaker of TY, G.N. Kurilov (2003). Kurilov (2003:54-64) dedicates a section in his book to the discussion of potential links between TY and Wintun, a representative of the Penutian languages, spoken in the northern part of California, USA. With reference to the works by Pitkin (1984, 1985), Kurilov (2003:54-64) points out several similarities between the two languages, lexical as well as grammatical ones, whose existence he refuses to ascribe to chance (Kurilov 2003:64). Kurilov does not go as far as to claim that the similarities are due to the common origin of TY and Wintu, preferring to account for them by language contact. Yet he remarks that it allegedly occurred to Collinder for the first time that TY and the Finno-Ugric languages might be related, when the latter discovered similar parallels between TY and that language group (Kurilov 2003:58), thus suggesting that a genuine genetic link between TY and Wintu

---

¹⁶ Some speakers reject the alternative as decidedly incorrect. Some others accept both.

¹⁷ As an isolate, TY is frequently grouped on ethnographic grounds with the Paleo-Asian languages (Nikolaeva and Chelimskij 1996:155, Batjanova and Turaev 2010:11-12)

¹⁸ Strictly speaking Jochelson was mainly concerned with Kolyma Yukaghir which in his time along with TY was regarded as a dialect of the common Yukaghir language. This detail is irrelevant in the discussion of the genetic classification of TY. The same is applicable to references to Krejnovič who did not study TY exclusively, but what was considered the Yukaghir language in its entirety.
may, at least, not be excluded. What are these similarities? As for the lexicon, Kurilov (2003:64) claims to have detected three word pairs which exhibit a semblance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TY</th>
<th>Wintu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>kiileč</em> ‘s/he flew up swiftly’</td>
<td><em>kʰilit</em> ‘to shoot up, ‘to fly up swiftly’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qoyore-</em> ‘to shout’</td>
<td><em>kʰoʰora</em> ‘to shout/to scream (for a long time)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qayime</em> ‘raven’</td>
<td><em>kʰoʰimma</em>¹⁹ (raven)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actually, the precise meanings of the Wintun words are as follows: *kʰilit* ‘fly, flies’ (Pitkin 1985:232), *kʰoʰora* ‘to make a noise continuingly’ (Pitkin 1985:209). All in all, these seem to be just a few look-alikes, which can probably be found for any pair of languages, no matter how distantly the may be related.

Let’s turn to the grammatical properties of Wintun resembling those of TY, according to Kurilov (2003). Most importantly it is the resemblance between the negation markers *el, elen’* and *ewl’e* in TY and the negators *ʔelew* and *ʔel* of Wintun, the other parallel being the genitive suffixes –*un* and –*n* in Wintun and TY, respectively (Kurilov 2003:58). Ironically, the segments conveying a negative meaning in TY and Wintun do not coincide. In TY it is the (first) syllable *el* that is the actual negating device. The form *ewl’e* is most probably a result of dissimilation: *ewl’e* < *el* ‘NEG’ + l’e- ‘be[3SG]’. In Wintun, on the other hand, the negative meaning is imparted by the privative suffix *{w}* (Pitkin 1984:164). As for *ʔel*, it functions as a copula or an evidential (Pitkin 1985:779).

Details about the Wintun forms *ʔelew* and *ʔel* can be found in Pitkin (1984:164, 174, 196):

‘The three copulas (which include the seven auxiliaries {ʔelew} […] ) are distinguished by their morphological composition and external functions. The negative preverb {ʔelew} is derived from the negative copula of the same shape, and as a preverb is invariant in stem-form and may only occur with the negative suffix {mina}. It can probably be reconstructed as based on a demonstrative root *{ʔE}* and a stative *{l}* or future suffix {le} […] and the privative radical-forming root-deriving suffix *{w}*. The forms {ʔiy}, {ʔuw}, and {ʔel} seem also to be based on demonstrative roots *{ʔE}, {ʔu}, and *{ʔE} + *{l}* , respectively;’

‘The third member of the class of demonstrative copulas, {ʔel}, which indicates visual evidence, is syntactically dependent in that it may never be the main verb of a predication and is always dependent on the preceding verb in the verb phrase. It is stative in function and occurs both as the only auxiliary following a main independent verb and as a dependent, suffixed (bound) verb following the three aspectual auxiliaries when they function as location-position-indicating main verbs.’

¹⁹ I am not sure about the spelling of this word as I failed to find it in Pitkin (1985). Kurilov (2003:64) renders it as kʰoʰimma. The other two words are spelt in Kurilov (2003:64) as kʰ’ilit and kʰoʰora.
‘Two preverbs, the prohibitive /be`di/ and the negative /?elew/, are distinguished on the basis of their syntactic patterns. Morphologically, they seem to be subtypes of auxiliaries, [...] /?elew/ possibly being a derived stem-form of the visual evidential stative copula {?el} plus the privative suffix *{w}.’

It is obvious from this that there is no likeness between the TY and Wintun morphemes compared. As for the similarity of the genitive case markers, it is not sufficient on its own to substantiate a relation, which would specifically tie TY and Wintun, since a similar suffix is found in Uralic, Altaic and Yenisseic languages (Krejnovič 1958:6-7). Therefore, the suggested link between TY and Penutian languages is not a tenable idea in the absence of other indications of their relation, genetic or contact induced.

Another prominent scholar of TY, E.A. Krejnovič, was skeptical about Jochelson’s view. Initially, Krejnovič (1958:5) was cautious about grouping TY with other languages:

“The Yukaghir language takes up an isolated position among the neighboring languages. Till the present time, its origin has not been ascertained. For this reason it is interesting not only as an object of linguistic study but also as an object of historical research.”

Regarding classifying TY as a Uralic language, Krejnovič (1958:7) adopted Angere’s (1957) negative view by saying that ‘J. Angere is right when he categorically claims in his most recent work that the Yukaghir language cannot be counted among the Uralic languages. This conclusion is preceded by a convincing critique by Krejnovič (1958:7) of some of the points made by Collinder’s (1940) to promote the view that the Yukaghir language is related to the Uralic family. It is only in his last major work that Krejnovič (1982) expressed himself in favor of the Uralic kinship of TY. He based his changed opinion on a considerable number of morphological parallels between TY and various Uralic languages indicating them throughout his book. The most important argument supporting the genetic relationship between TY and the Uralic family is, as Krejnovič (1982:5) believes, the existence in TY of two types of stems, namely those ending in /a/ and those ending in /e/, and two series of suffixes correlating with those stems, which is reminiscent of the situation in Proto-Uralic where disyllabic stems terminated only in these vowels.

20 In fact, Angere (1957:VII) is not at all so categorical. What he says is that the similarities between the Yukaghir language and the Uralic family are comparable with those between Uralic and Altaic or Indo-European or even Chukchi. In other words, the relation of Yukaghir with the Uralic, as seen in the middle of the 20th century, isn’t specific enough to accept its membership within the Uralic language family.

21 Not denying the plausibility of the assumption of a genetic relationship of TY and Uralic languages and accepting the existence of two types of stems in TY, it has to be noted, however, that the suffix correlation does not seem to exist at least in some modern speakers. They accept alternative forms as equally correct, e.g. nimetege ~ nimetke ‘a big house’, al’γate ~ al’γatege ‘a big fish’. The fact that underived nouns ending in consonants invariably attach the augmentative suffix –tege may, in fact, synchronically have to do with the syllabic structure of these words and not with their membership in one of the two nominal classes postulated by Krejnovič (1982:35-36). For nouns ending in a vowel even Krejnovič (1982:37) admitted that it is very hard to establish what factors trigger the choice of either allomorph. Nevertheless he puts disyllabic nouns with the final /e/ into the class attaching –tege, while disyllabic nouns terminating in
One of the more recent influential contributions supporting the assumption of a genetic relationship between TY and Uralic languages was made by Nikolaeva (1988a), in which the first attempt of reconstructing Proto-Yukaghir and its comparison with Proto-Uralic is made.

1.2 Origin of the etnonym ‘Yukaghir’ and the autonym wadul

There are different opinions as regards the etymology of the word ‘Yukaghir’. Jochelson (1898 in Krejnović 1958:3) saw it as a hybrid: the Yukaghir root jukə meaning ‘far’ is married to a Tungusic suffix –gir. Krejnović (1958:3) did not consider plausible the possibility of borrowing a foreign word by Tungusic people and combining it with a native suffix. As he had no alternative explanation, Krejnović (1958:3) was compelled to state that “[t]he origin of the designation “‘Yukaghir” is unknown.” To my knowledge, Krejnović never readdressed this issue. Kurilov (2003:7), probably following Tugolukov (1979:5), derives the word from the combination of the Tungusic dju and gir which

---

/lal/ are placed into the class suffixing the allomorph –tke. The examples above demonstrate that this correlation is not strict.

22 The word is given in Jochelson’s transcription as quoted in Krejnović (1958:3). According to Maslova (2003:547) and Nikolaeva (2006:106) the [u] is long in the adverb ‘far’ in KY, the main object of Jochelson’s study. Nikolaeva (2006:106) gives also the reconstructed form *ju:kə. The loss of the vowel length in the root presumably borrowed by the Tungusic neighbours of the Yukaghirs is suspicious as the opposition long vs. short vowels is characteristic not only of both Evenki and Even but of all Tungusic languages and is phonemic in the Evenki language (Andreeva 2008:64). As for TY, in Kurilov’s (2001) dictionary, which is taken as the source of the standard orthography for this work, the adverb ‘far’ surfaces as jöke.

23 Burykin (2011:389) points out that there had been assumptions that the ethnonym ‘Yukaghir’ was based on the words jukə ‘cold’ or joke ‘far’ that presumably existed in the Even language itself. These words cannot be found in Robbek and Robbek (2005), probably the most comprehensive dictionary of the Even language to date. Moreover, another designation for Yukaghirs, the word bulon ‘enemy’, is listed in it instead. Apart from that, the sequences <ju> and <jo> seem to be inexistent in Even (Levin 1936, Lebedev 1978, Robbek 2007). The few words beginning with the word-initial segments <ju> and <jo> respectively which are contained in the dictionary of Robbek and Robbek (2005) are borrowings from Russian. The sequence <ju(u)> is possible word-initially in Evenki but neither Myreena (2004) nor Boldyrev (1994, 2000) register a word even remotely resembling the lexemes mentioned by Burykin (2011:389). The sequence <jo> can be found in Evenki only in the ethnonym jokoo ‘Yakut’ and its derivates indicating that jokoo may be a loanword.

Given these phonotactic and lexicological facts of Even and Evenki, Burykin (2011:393) tries to solve this problem by assuming that at a certain stage the ethnonym joke may have existed in Even as a borrowing. Unlike Jochelson he sees the source language not in Yukaghir itself but in Chukchi or Koryak, since, as he claims, prior to the advent of Russian explorers Evens did not have direct contacts with Yukaghirs and probably learnt about them from Koryaks. The hypothetical Even word joke was a result of a distorted borrowing from either Chukchi ajakət or Koryak ajavako both meaning ‘the remote ones’. It is essential to note here, that Chukchis and Koryaks themselves did not use these words to refer to Yukaghirs but resorted to the twisted Yukaghir autonyms etelət and eteləlglyn (Burykin 2011:392). Therefore this idea only makes sense if one makes another assumption, namely that at an historical period which is not recorded, Chukchis and Koryaks did apply the words ajakət and ajavako as the name for Yukaghirs, supplied that term to Evens and at a later point switched to the above-mentioned autonym. Later on the Evenki suffix –gir had to attach somehow to the assumed loanword joke.

24 To be more precise the Even word for ‘ice’ is djuk, and its Evenki cognate, from which it was probably borrowed in a distorted form by Russians as a part of the ethnonym ‘Yukaghir’, is djuk.
mean ‘ice’ and ‘tribe’ respectively yielding a meaning of ‘ice people’, ‘people living in the icy area’. Interestingly, the Even word *djuk* does not mean just any type of ice but only the thick ice on a river or lake. A general word for ice in Even is *bokes* (*bokes djiu* ‘ice house’ (Robbek 2007:545, Robbek and Robbek 2005). There are indications that a similar relation exists in Evenki between *djuke* and *buukse* (Myreeva 2004). The tundra in which Yukaghirs live is the riverine tundra par excellence. It is also strewn with myriads of lakes, all of which, naturally, freeze in winter that lasts up to seven months. Thus, large stretches of frozen water surface determine the landscape there, justifying the Tungus choice of the word26.

There are, however, certain problems with the derivation of the ethnonym ‘Yukaghir’ from the hypothetical lexeme *djukegir*. First and foremost, the modern Evenki language does not know such a word, instead Evenkis say *jukagir* (Prokopjeva, personal communication) and historically both Evens and Evenkis used the word *bulen* ‘enemy’ to refer to Yukaghirs (Okladnikov 1955:289, Robbek and Robbek 2005:64). It seems unlikely that Evenkis would substitute the Russian distorted loanword borrowed from Evenki for their own original term, if it had ever existed. On the other hand, one cannot completely exclude the reverse borrowing. Apart from the apparent lack of a record of the word *djukegir* there is one little obstacle more to embrace wholeheartedly the ‘icy’ theory. It is not impossible to have the sequence <dju> in Russian word-initially. This raises a question why the word was not borrowed by Russians in its original form *djukegir*.

As for the origin of the autonym *wadul* used by the speakers of TY, there is no full clarity either. According to what is sometimes called a popular belief existing among Yukaghirs themselves it means ‘strong’28 (e.g. Batjanova and Turaev 2010). This etymology – apart from the fact that it reflects indigenous understanding and thus should be taken seriously – is quite reasonable for linguistic reasons. In modern TY there is a verbal root *war*– ‘to be firm’, ‘to be hardy’, which Nikolaeva (2006:449) traces back along with the KY cognate *ad* with the same meaning to the reconstructed form *wað*. Even in the contemporary language the sounds [r] and [d] are in free variation after nasals, e.g. *janre* ~ *jande* ‘goose’, *memdej-* ~ *memref-* ‘to hand in’. If one assumes such

---

25 This suffix is listed in Vasilevič (1958:751). Keeping in mind Tugolukov’s (1979:5) remark that the suffix –*gir*, typical of Tungusic clan names expresses multitude, one may be tempted to speculate that –*r* is the plural marker. According to the morphophonological rules of Evenki (Vasilevič 1958:671, Konstantinova 1964:42) the stem this allomorph of the plural marker is attached to should ends in *n* which is replaced by the plural ending. This would result in the underlying suffix –*gin* preceding the plural ending. And indeed, there is such a suffix in the Sym and Nepa dialects of Evenki. In the former it derives nominal nouns denoting ‘a woman belonging to a specific clan’, in the latter it produces the meaning ‘a member of an organization’ (Vasilevič 1958:751). Thus the composition of the hypothetical word *djukegir* is as follows: *djuke* (root) + *gin* (derivational suffix) + *r* (inflexional suffix).

26 Here it could be noted that at least one more possible etymology for the first half of the ethnonym ‘Yukaghir’ may be suggested: in Even, the Tungusic language spoken by the closest geographical neighbours of Yukaghirs, there is a word *djukak* ‘neighbour’.

27 Admittedly, words beginning with <dju> are extremely rare in Russian even if one counts the loans in, but they do exist. Dal’ (1998) lists at least two such words for which no foreign etymology is proposed by Vasmer (1953) and a few more Vasmer (1953) did not deal with. Ironically, according to Dal’ (1998) in the variety of Russian spoken in the Vladimir region there is a word *djuka* ‘taciturn or sullen person’, which almost fully matches the Evenki root *djuke* phonetically.

28 Jochelson ([1926] 2005:47) was probably the first scholar to point out this explanation. He derived the KY autonym *odul* from the verb stem *at-* ‘to be strong/powerful’.
an alternation to have once existed between war- and *wad-, a derivation of wadul from the latter variant does not seem far fetched. A weak point of this analysis is that instances of this alternation in intervocalic position are not known for modern TY. An arguably related verb wadurči-, with the variant [d], has the meaning ‘to make efforts (to act properly, in a good way)’, ‘to endeavor’, expressing thus a concept that has to do with exerting (mental) force. Consequently, it seems to belong to the semantic field of the verb war-/*wad- ‘to be firm’, ‘to be strong’, making the assumed alternation [r]/[d] in this verb more plausible.

Another attempt to explain the etymology of the designation wadul is to connect it with the listener-proximal demonstrative aduŋ. The intended meaning is assumed to be ‘the local one/the one of this place’ (http://lingsib.iea.ras.ru/ru/languages/yukagir.shtml, accessed on 31.01.12). Burykin (2011:391) seeks to substantiate a similar interpretation turning to words like wayane ‘one’s own/of one’s kin’ and wayariil ‘native/indigene/forefather’.

1.3 Origin of the ethnicity ‘Yukagir’ and interactions with the neighbouring peoples

Yukaghirs are considered to be autochthons of Eastern Siberia. According to the prevalent opinion, their forefathers settled there in the Neolithic, which has additionally been confirmed by the finding that the ornaments on the traditional Yukaghir caftan parallel the neolithic petroglyphes in Yakutia (Żukova 2010:315). Early researchers, such as Jochelson, grouped modern Yukaghirs, Chukchi and Koryaks together as the so called ‘americanoid peoples’ and believed that they were secondary immigrants from the New World (Jochelson 1928:44 cited by Krejnovič 1958:6).

Yukaghirs were exposed to the influence of other peoples for a long period of time. The traces of other cultures manifested themselves in that of Yukaghirs so obviously that Jochelson ([1926] 2005:51) regarded them as a mixed ethnos. The process of mutual assimilation had advanced so far in his view that it was impossible to speak of the Yukaghir people as opposed to the Tungus people. In fact, Jochelson ([1926] 2005:50, 92-91) even claimed that the forefathers of the people whose language is the object of the present study were essentially yukaghirized Tungus, who appropriated the Yukaghir autonym and adopted the Yukaghir language. He tried to substantiate this radical opinion by the fact that the so called forest Yukaghirs living in the upper reaches of Kolyma and its tributaries, who spoke KY, did not count the Yukaghirs inhabiting the tundra among oduls, which is the Yukaghir autonym used by forest Yukaghirs. Ironically, the tundra Yukaghirs considered their southern Yukaghir relatives Tungus. All my principal informants are only half Yukaghir by descent. The other half is represented by a parent who was either a yukaghirized Even or Yakut. From the 17th century on, Yukaghirs have been in intense contact with Russians. Along with Itelmens and sea shore Koryaks they were very receptive to the Orthodox Christianity brought along by Russian settlers. Christianization of Yukaghirs promoted intermarriages with Russians (Batjanova

---

29 The irony of this situation is enhanced by the fact that the members of the numerically strongest Tungus clan that was assimilated by Yukaghirs called themselves Waqaqaril (Jochelson [1926] 2005:92), which is most probably a distorted form of wayariil ‘the name of a truly Yukaghir clan of the tundra’ or ‘indigenous’ (Kurilov 2001:59).
and Turaev 2010:16) and contributed to the further watering down of their ethnos30. This secondary assimilation increased as a result of a reinforced migration of representatives of non-indigenous peoples to the Russian North during the years of its industrial development in the 20th century (Batjanova and Turaev 2010:17).

As for the linguistic influence, already on the threshold of the 19th and 20th century it was significant (Jochelson [1926] 2005:90). This influence could generally be characterized as a process of assimilation, which went both ways. While the Yukaghirs populating the tundra between Kolyma and Alazeya, the core region where TY is spoken nowadays, preserved their language and imposed it on the arriving Tungusic tribes, the Yukaghirs living between Indigirka and Yana had been fully assimilated by Tungus and kept only a certain number of Yukaghir words. Further westwards, beyond Yana, the assimilated Yukaghirs underwent together with the Tungus, who assimilated them earlier, a secondary assimilation, adopting the Yakut language. Eastwards of Kolyma, only a small number of Chuvans, representing a branch of the Yukaghir folk, were roaming together with Chukchis at the times of Jochelson’s ([1926] 2005:30) visit and dissolved subsequently in that latter people. Along with the nomadic Chuvans a group of Chuvans and Yukaghirs settled along the Anadyr River together with Russians.

TY has borrowings from the neighboring Tungusic languages, obvious ones on the lexical level and potential ones in the grammar, e.g. the future tense suffix –te. It is not surprising for a language to borrow a word from another language, but when the loans represent items from the basic vocabulary it must be recognized that the recipient language was under a strong influence of the donor language. Some of the core kin terms of TY are borrowings from Even/Evenki: en’ie < en’e/enii; amaa < ama/amii, amaa31

1.4 Area inhabited by Yukaghirs: previously and nowadays

Yukaghirs are believed (Levin and Potapov 1956:885, Gurvič 1966:11, Okladnikov et. al. 1968:409) to have occupied vast stretches of land in Siberia extending from the lower reaches of Lena in the west to the basin of the Anadyr River in the east. There are indications that Yukaghirs spread westwards even further, as far as the river Olenek (Gurvič 1966:14). An opinion (ibid.), supported by Okladnikov (et al. 1968:409), is maintained that the spatial intrusion of the Tungus people between Yukaghirs and Samoyedic peoples is a recent event, which entails that Yukaghirs and Samoyeds shared a border running presumably along the rivers Kheta and Khatanga River, and that is the eastern porch of the Taimyr Peninsula. Latitudinally, Yukaghirs occupied the area between the coast of the Arctic Ocean and the upper reaches of Jana, Indigirka and Kolyma. According to some estimates, they dwelled as far as Vitim in the south (Okladnikov 1955:292). Toponymy also corroborates the assumption that the forefathers of the Yukaghirs inhabited the banks of the Lena, one of the three major Siberian rivers along with Ob and Yenisei in the west. In my opinion, Burykin (2001:80) offers a convincing testimony for that: the Yukaghir words jojl ‘steep bank (of a river)’ and enu

30 To what extant this process can affect the ethnic self-determination is illustrated by the emergence of Kamchadals, who are the descendants of such intermarriages between Itelmens and Russians. Kamchadals demanded for themselves the status of a separate indigenous folk and were granted it in 2000 (Batjanova and Turaev 2010:14).
31 The homophonous form amaa exists in Tokka and Iengra subdialects.
‘river’. The combination of these two words can be traced in the Yakut name for Lena, namely *Joljune*. Further apparently Yukaghir hydronyms in that area (e.g. *Marcha* < *morga* ‘dwarf birch’) solidify this etymology. Even for the toponym Baikal a speculative Yukaghir etymology was suggested by Burykin (2001:80): the name could be derived from the TY word *wajjuol* ‘wood washed ashore’. Apart from the lack of convincing linguistic proof, a potential objection against this assumption is the fact that in KY the corresponding lexeme is *pierienžaa* (Spiridonov 1997). Baikal Lake is situated closer to the area where KY is spread. Therefore, if the name of the lake were a Yukaghir word, it would be natural to expect it in KY too. The approximate eastern border of the area once inhabited by Yukaghirs can be drawn as the line connecting the eastern shore of the Chaun Bay and Penzhina river continuing further south in the vicinity of the Sea of Okhotsk (Burykin 2001). The southern limit to which Yukaghirs extended the area of their dwelling is uncertain. Burykin (2001:81) points out an old name of the Anyuy river, a tributary of Amur, which is Dondon and believes that it is of Yukaghir origin. The coast of the Arctic Ocean forms the natural northernmost edge of *terra iucagirica*.

Ethnographic archeology confirms the onomastic findings and pushes the frontiers of the Yukaghir land yet further. One sees a link between the ancestors of Yukaghirs and the late Paleolithic cultures spread as far as Taimyr Peninsula in the west, Anadyr River in the east and the area to the west of Baikal in the south (Batjanova and Turaev 2010:14).

Nowadays Yukaghirs mainly live in three districts of the Republic Sakha (Yakutia): Verkhnekolymsk, Nizhnekolymsk and Allaikha. Apart form that they reside in Anadyr and Bilibino districts of Chukotka as well as in Srednekan district of Magadan region (Batjanova and Turaev 2010:13). Those speaking TY are confined to Nizhnekolymsk district shown on the first map on the following page (see the end of section 1.6 for the details of their distribution within the district). The second map roughly locates the area (black oval) where TY is spoken in northern Eurasia.
1.5 Economics

Originally, Yukaghirs were hunters and fishers. The only domesticated animal the ancient Yukaghirs kept was the dog. The tundra Yukaghirs adopted from the neighboring Evens reindeer herding at some point in the history and since then reindeer breeding has played a crucial role in their economy. During the Soviet time this sector of production reached its height. Reindeer herds of 20,000 heads were not unusual. After the liberalization of the Russian economy in the beginning of the 90s the overall economic decline in the country also affected the Yukaghirs and the size of an average reindeer suffered a tenfold decrease. Nowadays, some Yukaghirs subsist entirely on fish. Luckily, the rivers and lakes between Kolyma and Alazeya teem with different sorts of high quality fish. Some Yukaghirs, including most of my informants, who maintained the necessary knowledge and manual skills, supplement their income by sewing traditional fur clothes to order, privately or organized in small ateliers. A few men provide for their households by searching for mammoth tusks in the tundra and selling them for good money to some semi-legal middlemen. Some Yukaghirs, just as representatives of other minorities living in the Alazeya tundra, have no regular income or simply remain jobless and have to live off their elders' pensions. Of course, the very remoteness of the Kolyma region and the harsh climate (the territory between Yana and Kolyma is the coldest region in Russia with -71°C as the lowest temperature ever recorded in the northern hemisphere) aggravates things yet more.

An essential aspect of every economy is transportation, and transportation has for years been a serious problem for the inhabitants of the Nizhnekolymsk district. In the Soviet times there was a daily plane connection between Andryushkino and Cherski, which is the administrative center of the Nizhnekolymsk district situated some 300 km. away from the former, allowing one to take care of the necessary business and return home on the same day, now only irregular helicopter (about twice a month or even less) flights take place between these two settlements. Since this frequency does not even approximately satisfy the needs of the local populations, one has to register for a prospective flight well in advance. This does not always secure a seat because it can never be excluded that in the meantime an official books the same flight and takes the seat of an ordinary passenger, who will then end up on the waiting list. For this reason, people sometimes cannot fly out for months. People desiring to fly from Cherski further, to the republican capital Yakutsk, are confronted with a different problem. There are regular flights Cherski – Yakutsk three times a week, but the fares are so incredibly high – up to 23,000 rubles (almost 600 euros) for a one way ticket – that many people have to save money literally for months because they simply cannot afford it. I met a young

---

32 The aerial connection is essential for Andryushkino, where most of the tundra Yukaghirs live, because apart from the period from February till May when the ice on the lakes becomes thick enough to guarantee a safe passage to buses and cars, the village can be reached only by flying or, in summer, by boat. This latter option can hardly be of much use, a quick look at the geographical map explains why.

33 By the time of my last field trip a return ticket cost already 52,000 rubles and the locals told me that there was a period when the price rose to 60,000 rubles, after which people filed outraged complaints with the administrative authorities and the airplane company had to reduce the price again.

34 The average salary in Nizhnekolymsk district amounts to 36,000 rubles. It ranges from some 15,000 rubles to slightly below 100,000 rubles (Jakutija 05.03.2013:2).
father of two in Cherski whose monthly earnings hardly exceeded 5 000 rubles. Such people are practically prisoners in their own district.

Food supply, the key aspect of economy, is also deficient in the Nizhnekolymsk district. My informants told me that in the era of planned economy fresh vegetables and fruits were common products on the shop shelves in Andryushkino and available for a moderate price. Today it is almost impossible to find them for a reasonable price, if at all. Therefore many people are compelled to grow their own vegetables.

The bad economic situation is one of the most important causes for the reluctance of the Yukaghirs of Andryushkino and Cherski to initiate and sustain a planned and steady revival campaign for their language. As one of my key informants told me, it is hard to think of saving the language as long as Yukaghirs are preoccupied with securing their daily bread.

1.6 Sociolinguistic situation

Jochelson (1900:xv) underestimated the living force of the Yukaghir language prophesying its possible death within several decades and reconfirming his opinion just a few years later with a rather categorical remark: ‘the days of the Yukaghir language are really counted’ (Jochelson 1905:370). Yet it has to be admitted (and, sadly, so do the native speakers themselves) that the language is moribund and only a special, determined effort can cardinally change its fate of a dying idiom. Kibrik (1991:267) placed Yukaghir into group III on his five-degree scale of endangerment among the minority languages spoken in Russia. He characterizes the languages pertaining to that group as ‘seriously threatened’. In his classification, group III contains languages at a crossroad: they can either transit to group II and become a ‘terminally ill’ (Kibrik 1991:264) language, or start showing more promising signs of recovery than just the introduction of lessons at school and the increased ethnic self-consciousness of its speakers. As for my own observations, the ethnic self-identification often does not go much further than the mere recognition of one’s ethnic origin. Occasional gatherings may serve to remind one of it and celebrate the one or the other prominent son of the Yukaghir people but do not contribute decisively to the cause of actually saving the language. There is a hope that this will change as a Council of Yukaghir Seniors was formed recently in Cherski to coordinate the efforts of the TY community necessary to promote their language among its members. It also has to be stated that teaching Yukaghir at school in Andryushkino cannot promote the revival of the language on its own because it is perceived as foreign by the children though they may officially or even sincerely call it native. Children must speak the language at home. In the case of TY it would be with one’s grandparents since the generation of today’s schoolchildren’s parents can be called ‘the lost generation’ in the linguistic sense with respect to the knowledge of the language of the ancestors. If the mother tongue is not used at home, it is like a foreign language to the children and in that sense is no different from English, which is taught in Andryushkino school too. In fact, sometimes children even take their Yukaghir lessons as an imposition. A teacher in Andryushkino told me of a pupil who told her that she would gladly learn about old customs and the traditional clothing but was not going to study declension and conjugation tables because she did not see any purpose. To my mind, this is a crucial point. If the state is to play any role in the preservation of TY, creating a possibility to
speak TY is obviously not sufficient since such a possibility has been there for decades by now. I expect that no tangible results will be seen unless and until a necessity to employ TY in the daily life appears. The lack of such a necessity and the habit of using one of the two lingua franca in Andryushkino, which are Yakut for the elderly and Russian for the young in that village, have according to some of my informants led – and I have witnessed it myself – to the unnatural default choice of Yakut, even when elderly Yukaghirs encounter one another. They all understand that it is up to them to keep their language alive but often there is lack of determination and motivation to undertake something on a regular basis to achieve that goal. In this sense the private efforts of one of my major informants, V.N. Tretyakov, residing in Cherski are highly praiseworthy. On his own initiative he has organized regular Yukaghir lessons on Sundays, which since recently take place in the school building. Since Cherski is considered a Russian settlement, Yukaghir does not form a part of the regular school curriculum there and for the Yukaghir families living there the initiative of V.N. Tretyakov is a welcome opportunity at least to initiate their children into the riches of their language. V.N Tretyakov told me about his plans to organize a nomadic school during summer holidays, where children would be immersed for a period of time into TY, which, at least temporarily, will create the necessity to resort to TY. The inception of this promising undertaking presupposes adequate financing, of course.

What were the factors that led to the present situation of TY? The natural cause that should not be underestimated is the numerical depletion of the Yukaghir people due to epidemics and exploitation under the Tsarist regime causing impoverishment and sometimes famine. Their number diminished over the centuries from the speculatively estimated 9 000 to only 754 according to the census in 1897 (Donskoj 1996:23). The lowest demographic point, 442 people according to the census in 1959 (Donskoj 1996:23) was reached as a result of the politics during the collectivization and the subsequent decades, characterized in many instances by a blatant denial of the very existence of the ethnos ‘Yukaghir’, whose representatives were not recognized as such and were registered as Evens. It is clear that such an attitude of the state authorities was a heavy blow for the prestige of TY. There was another manifestation of depriving TY of its value in the eyes of its speakers that was particularly detrimental. From the 1930s on it was customary to give one’s children to the boarding schools where schoolchildren spent five days a week most part of the year. The minority languages were banned in those schools and children were punished by e.g. being enclosed in dark rooms alone for speaking their respective minority languages. For the sociolinguistic behavior of the children this was extremely harmful. All these misdeeds conditioned a situation in which even despite positive demographic dynamics resulting in a sizable increase of the Yukaghir ethnic population up to 1142 people by the time of the census in 1989 (Donskoj 1996:23) and up to 1509 in 2002 (Batjanova and Turaev 2010:12), only about 30% of Yukaghirs mastered their language (Kurilov 2005:20).

Along with the natural cause, the growth of the number of Yukaghirs was a bureaucratic act of restoration of the Yukaghir nationality of those falsely registered earlier as Evens or Yakuts.

Compared to other minorities of north-eastern Russia, this figure is rather low. Fewer in number are only Chuvans and Aleuts. If one considers that American Aleuts count around 6 000 people (Batjanova and Turaev 2010:13) and the fact that Chuvans have lost their language, Yukaghirs are the smallest minority in the area still speaking their idiom. Their only potential ‘rival’ in this sad competition can be eight Kereks living in Kamchatka, if one acknowledges them as a folk distinct from Koryaks.
Another factor contributing to the loss of a language stressed by Kibrik (1991:260) and fully applicable to Yukaghirs was and is the living with other peoples including those whose languages enjoyed higher prestige, above all Yakut, but also Russian. This fact is the more disappointing as during the collectivization Yukaghirs had founded their own kolkhoz, which became prosperous in the beginning of the 1950s and opened its own primary school (Kurilov 2005:19-20). Yukaghirs were the majority in Tustakh-Sen, the central settlement of the kolkhoz, and determined their environment culturally and linguistically. It is only as the result of the decision made by Khrushchev to abolish small settlements and collective enterprises and combine them in larger ones that tundra Yukaghirs live in a multi-ethnic community where they are a minority.

At the present moment roughly 60 (Odé, personal communication) Yukaghirs are able to communicate in TY to varying degrees. Most of them live in the village of Andryushkino together with Yakuts, Evens and a small number of Russians and Chukchis. About one third of them live in Cherski, a Russian dominated settlement and a few speakers dwell in the village of Kolymskoe, where they are greatly outnumbered by Chukchis. Five speakers reside in Yakutsk, the capital of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia).

Unfortunately, as alluded above, there is very little willingness on the part of the native speakers to cultivate TY in their families. I know of only one senior lady who made deliberate attempts to pass the language on to one of her grandsons and the boy is said to have achieved quite some oral skills. It can only be hoped that he will maintain them since he is planning to enroll in a military school, where he certainly will not have opportunities to practice his ‘mother’ tongue. There is only one mother who taught her little daughter TY as long as she lived in a hut on the tundra. However, upon moving to Andryushkino she stopped doing that and switched to Russian for practical reasons. Only after her daughter had become proficient in the state language, would she resume teaching her TY, she said to me. The above-mentioned organizer of the Sunday school does not teach his child TY under the pretext of having to concentrate his efforts to care for the TY linguistic community as a whole. The most graphic example of the negative language attitude on personal level I could observe in a senior male Yukaghir, who gave his reasons why his granddaughter should learn Yakut and English. When I pointed out to him that younger Yukaghirs’ exclusive occupation with other languages will deprive TY of chances of survival, he just emphatically waved it away with his hand.

1.7 Methodology


‘If they are to be state-of-the-art, they focus on primary data without favoring particular genres or text types, have an explicit concern for both accountability and long-term preservation of the data, and are the product of interdisciplinary teams working in close cooperation with and direct involvement of the speech community.’
Zúñiga (2012:172) goes on to say that

‘By contrast, secondary data consist of material found in specialized studies and reference grammars. The current consensus in descriptive work is that such sources should not constitute the sole, or principal, foundation on which the description is based.’

On the following page Zúñiga (2012:173) comments that

‘Wälchli (2007) and Epps (2011) rightly point out that intralinguistic structural variation has tended to be underrepresented in traditional descriptions, which have favored normalized representations of typical patterns and neglected unsystematic or infrequent structures. […] Recent studies emphasize the need for less restrictive data collection techniques that allow “to support claimed generalizations with multiple empirical sources of converging evidence, including observations of ecologically natural language use” Bresnan (2007:302).’

Finally, it is stressed in the article that language description should be ‘typologically informed’. Zúñiga (2012:177) specifies referring to Epps (2011:648) that

‘the description must meet the dual challenge of enabling and facilitating crosslinguistic comparison while remaining “true to the languages themselves, without forcing them into ill-fitted predetermined categories”.’

I have striven, within the limits of my capacity, to highlight interesting typological facts in the grammar of TY. Upon reading the thesis the reader will make his own judgment whether the above recommendations have sufficiently been taken into consideration.

As far as the sources of linguistic data are concerned, the use of secondary sources was marginal. The few quoted examples were an inevitable measure in the absence of comparable examples from the available corpus. Earlier primary sources, e.g. Jochelson (1900) or those found in Jochelson ([1926] 2005), Krejnovič (1958, 1982), Maslova (2001) did not make part of the available corpus. They were excluded from it for the sake of originality of the present work and also because the thesis is a synchronic description of TY as it is spoken nowadays in Andryushkino and Cherski. A quick look into the TY texts published by Jochelson (1900, [1926] 2005) makes one realize how different that TY was from the modern idiom. The differences include lexical items, morphological devices and syntactic constructions. For instance, in the very first sentence of the first tale in Jochelson ([1926] 2005:383) the word lači ‘lived’ occurs, which is unattested in the modern TY. The equivalent modern verb forms are l’ej and sayanej. The second sentence of the same text, which expresses possession, contains the possessee in the instrumental:
Comparable sentences are formed today without such an adjunct:

(2b) *Tuŋ apanalaan’ej peldudie ki quod’eduo-n’e-l’el-ŋi.*

‘That old man and the old woman had two sons.’

In the textual material the nowadays obsolete accusative ending –γale is found, as well as a non attested converb form ireleŋ ‘having tied’ (Jochelson [1926] 2005:384). Already from these superficial observations it is obvious that either TY underwent a good deal of language change in the last hundred years – and diachronic phenomena do not necessarily fit into a synchronic grammar as this one – or another variety of TY is described, inexistent at present.

The major source of the primary data for this grammar were the transcripts of different audio recordings made by Cecilia Odé in 2009 and a book of memoirs of a senior female Yukaghir deceased in the 80’s of the past century, referred to as Kurilov and Odé (2012), and my own field notes. More than two thirds of the examples come from these three sources. The examples from the transcripts as well as field notes appear in the thesis without reference. The transcripts include monologues (tales, descriptions, and recollections), a long dialogue, short written pieces of autobiographical character, rich with discourse, and a telephone conversation. Around one quarter of the examples are taken from the second edition of Kurilov’s (2001) dictionary. I treat those as

This example demonstrates that in TY an intransitive verb can have both an S- and an O-argument, the latter even being formally marked as such with the accusative. It may be that the marking of O-arguments with the instrumental, still existing in KY, was applied also in TY at the time when Jochelson collected his materials. It is interesting to note in this connection that the instrumental case ending is –le in KY (Maslova 2003c:95). (2a) does not contain a transitive verb, which could have a direct object, but this is not an obstacle to consider *kin marqilek* ‘two daughters’ a direct object because semi-transitive clauses are rather widespread in TY (see 4.2.3.2 and 4.2.3.2.4). Particularly denominal verbs derived by the suffix –n’e, employed in (2a), can be predicates of semi-transitive clauses:

(3) *Tudel taŋ’ele viejuol morawn’ej.*

‘He must do it.’

This example demonstrates that in TY an intransitive verb can have both an S- and an O-argument, the latter even being formally marked as such with the accusative. It may be that the marking of O-arguments with the instrumental, still existing in KY, was applied also in TY at the time when Jochelson collected his materials. It is interesting to note in this connection that the instrumental case ending is –le in KY (Maslova 2003c:95). Alongside the ending –γane this is the accusative case ending in TY, which, thus, has multiple means for encoding O-arguments. Could it be that the modern TY accusative ending –le stems from the uses of the KY instrumental –le for object marking, accompanied by the narrowing of the functional load of the KY instrumental case ending –lek, presumably present in *marqilek* in (2a), to encoding instruments?

Examples of single words found as entries in Kurilov (1990, 2001) also lack references unless they are meant to provide contrast with the data from some other sources. In such a case the source of examples from transcripts and field notes is indicated too.

To facilitate the search of these examples in the dictionary not only the information about the page is provided by also about the entry under which the example sentence is given.
primary data because they are not analyzed apart from being provided with translations, part of speech labels, short comments on the meaning in case of modal particles and indications of the aspectual, voice etc. value of verb forms. Besides, entries no do not appear in the dictionary to illustrate a grammatical point. Therefore, the analysis of those examples is mainly mine and can be considered original. I would generally turn to Kurilov (2001) in the absence of comparable data in the major sources mentioned above. A noticeable number of sentences were taken from a book with children stories (Kurilov 1994). Occasionally I drew on the material contained in the volume on TY folklore consisting of tales and legends (Kurilov 2005) and from a similar but far less voluminous compilation published 15 years earlier (Kurilov 1991). Any other referred source was used only sparsely. I took the liberty to alter the translations of the original sources when it seemed appropriate to me, without explicitly signaling it in each case.

Alongside more or less natural speech, elicitation sessions have contributed essentially to figuring out the intricacies of the language use. The medium language during elicitation sessions was always Russian.

Principal informants were all above 65 years of age at the time of the completion of this thesis and in full command of TY as well as Russian. Female speakers were overrepresented, in the proportion 4:1.

1.8 A note on the spelling and glossing system adopted in this work

Words of foreign (with respect to English) origin, primarily geographic names in Russia, that are parts of the English text of this book are spelt according to the traditional use or the common English transliteration system, e.g. Yenisei, Yakutsk, Andryushkino etc. All examples given in languages other than English are italicized. Examples from languages with a well established writing system based on the Latin script are given in their original spelling. The same holds for examples from any language quoted from Anglophone sources.

Non-Yukaghir words and word segments occurring in Russian sources – in the Cyrillic-based script that is – are spelt according to the German scientific transliteration of the Cyrillic script, e.g. Joljune for Йолюйонэ, djuke for дюкэ, etc. Whenever this is insufficient, the IPA symbols are employed, e.g. etelat. In case one and the same word is not spelt identically in different sources, e.g. missing or present vowel length signs, the spelling of whichever source the word is taken from gets transliterated.

40 For one, having graduated at Mainz University, I was naturally more accustomed to using the German system when I began my work on the thesis and it would have been impractical to acquire another one. Secondly, German linguistic and philosophic thought influenced Russian academicians of the first half of the 20th century arguably more strongly than other European linguistic schools – after all an outstanding Russian linguist Trubetzkoy spent three years in Leipzig studying the work of Junggrammatiker and resided in Austria during his most productive years – which might be the reason why Russian-speaking linguists seem to prefer a transliteration system resembling the German one. Since I am a native Russian, it was a natural choice for me from this viewpoint too. Finally, the German scientific transliteration is almost identical with the transliteration system practiced in academic libraries in the Netherlands, the host country and facilitator of this project.

41 A divergence from the German scientific transliteration is the decision to use the regular Latin letter e instead of the symbol é employed to transliterate the Cyrillic э.
Yukaghir words are spelt following the conventions adopted in the existing Anglophone literature on the Yukaghir language, e.g. Maslova (2003c), the differences being the use of the Greek letter \( \gamma \) instead of \( h \) for the voiced uvular fricative [v], the letter \( c \) instead of the symbol \( t' \) for the affricate [tʃ] and double vowels instead of the macron symbol to represent long vowels\(^{42}\).

In this work the guidelines of the Leipzig glossing rules are followed as described at http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/LGR08.02.05.pdf (accessed on 24.03.2013). Whenever there are morphophonemic alternations in the target language resulting in segmentation difficulties or affecting the number of segments involved, a line with the underlying form is inserted between the surface form and the gloss, and it is in this line that words are broken down into morphemes. If segmentation does not pose a problem or, conversely, is not possible at all, the first line of the examples itself is parsed as far as possible and glossed. This inconsistence is justified by the desire to save space by omitting the additional line where clarity cannot be compromised by its absence. In the additional line with the underlying form the phonemic transcription is given, in its absence the transcription is, naturally, orthographic.

Finally, a remark on quotes from the Russian sources, which are numerous: they all are given in my own translation.

\(^{42}\) This particular point applies also for transliterating examples from other languages taken from Russian sources.
2. Phonology

2.1 Segments

The phonemes of TY are identified according to the standard procedure of establishing minimal pairs.

### minimal pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels</th>
<th>Phonemes distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>köde ‘man’ ~ köd’e ‘worm’</td>
<td>/e/ ≠ /ɛ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>law-43 ‘to drink’ ~ lew- ‘to eat’</td>
<td>/a/ ≠ /æ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mönde- ‘to flare’ ~ munđe- ‘to mumble’</td>
<td>/ö/ ≠ /u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iirē ‘kind of willow’ ~ aare ‘leather diaper’</td>
<td>/ii/ ≠ /aa/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para ‘basis’ ~ paraa ‘the sledge load just manageable for a pair of reindeer’</td>
<td>/aa/ ≠ /a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ool ‘ladling (out)’ ~ ol ‘opposite’</td>
<td>/ool ≠ /o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uuđl’ ‘law’ ~ uuļ’ ‘mischief’</td>
<td>/uu/ ≠ /u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ieruuče ‘hunter’ ~ ieriiče ‘herder’</td>
<td>/uu/ ≠ /i/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bibaya- ‘to flutter’ ~ čibaya- ‘squeak’</td>
<td>/b/ ≠ /ć/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waajl ‘keeping’ ~ n’aajl ‘son in law’</td>
<td>/w/ ≠ /n’/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wajčjuol- ‘to be looked for’ ~ wajčbuol- ‘to be inclined to beg’</td>
<td>/j/ ≠ /b/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puge- ‘to be hot’ ~ pude ‘outside’</td>
<td>/ɡ/ ≠ /d/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tojore- ‘to make (the reindeer milk) thick’</td>
<td>/ɔ/ ≠ /jɔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>titin’ 2PL.DAT ~ titin’ 3PL.DAT</td>
<td>/t/ ≠ /t’/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>met ‘1SG’ ~ tet ‘2SG’</td>
<td>/m/ ≠ /t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>köde ‘man’ ~ köd’e ‘worm’</td>
<td>/d/ ≠ /d’/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kedie- ‘to be stubborn (about a reindeer)’</td>
<td>/d/ ≠ /t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mirje ‘wife’ ~ kirje ‘name’</td>
<td>/m/ ≠ /k/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saal ‘wood’ ~ maal ‘waiting’</td>
<td>/s/ ≠ /m/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omo ‘tribe’ ~ ono ‘silhouette’</td>
<td>/m/ ≠ /n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>janil ‘crossbow’ ~ jan’il ‘track’</td>
<td>/n/ ≠ /n’/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anil ‘gift’ ~ an’il ‘evil’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tugul ‘covering’ ~ tugul’ ‘patch’</td>
<td>/l/ ≠ /l’/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luge- ‘to be older’ ~ puge- ‘to be hot’</td>
<td>/l/ ≠ /p/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qanil ‘shade’, ‘lee-side’ ~ janil ‘crossbow’</td>
<td>/q/ ≠ /l’/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

43 The hyphenised forms are stems. However, they can occur in the uninflected form in the context of a negation or, as intransitive verbs, in questions about peripheral constituents, e.g. el=law ‘[s/he] did not eat’, quodirı mumde ‘why did [s/he] mumble?’.
Phonemes distinguished on the basis of these minimal pairs are:

vowels: /i/, /e/, /ö/, /a/, /o/, /u/, /ii/, /aa/, /oo/, /uu/
consonants: /p/, /t/, /k/, /b/, /d/, /g/, /s/, /č/, /m/, /n/, /ŋ/, /l/, /r/, /γ/, /w/, /j/, /q/
palatalized consonants: /d'/, /l'/, /n'/
geminate consonants: (/tt/)44

It is noteworthy that TY does not follow the generalization that SOV languages have greater consonant/vowel ratios (Gil 1986:165). The average ratios for SOV and SVO languages are 4.09 and 3.52 respectively (Gil 1986:210). However, the TY ratio of 3.33 is not only lower than the average value for SOV languages but is even below the average ratio calculated for SVO languages (Gil 1986:206). Being an SOV language syntactically TY patterns phonologically as an SVO language.

These phonemes are represented according to their phonetic features in Table 2.1.1 (vowels) and Table 2.1.2 (consonants) below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the phonemic status of most of the vowels as well as their phonetic descriptions are quite uncontroversial, this cannot be said with respect to /ö/. The present thesis, in accordance with the author’s own subjective auditory perception, adopts the view expressed in Odé (2012:42) and supported by her experimental study that /ö/ is a ‘mid central rounded vowel with variable realizations’.

Apart from these monophthongs, there are also four rising opening diphthongs45: /uo/, /ie/, /ia/ and, supposedly, the centering diphthong /uö/. The diphthongal nature of the first two of them is confirmed by the fact that they select the allomorph mer= of the verbal focus proclitic, which is employed when the verbal stem begins with a vowel:

(4a) \[ \text{mer=aawej} \ ‘[s/he] sleeps’ \]
\[ \text{mer=ierem} \ ‘[s/he] guards’ \]
\[ \text{mer=uorpen’i} \ ‘[s/he] has children’ . \]

Verbs with a consonantal onset select the allomorph me= of that proclitic:

(4b) \[ \text{me=lewm} \ ‘[s/he] ate’ \]

44 The minimal pair provided in this description is probably the only one existing in TY for this pair of consonants. The existence of this phoneme was not reflected in previous studies of TY.
45 Diphthongs are defined here as long vowels having two different targets, whereas long vowels have two identical targets (see e.g. Ladefoged and Maddieson 1996:321).
This is how the clear distinction between the vowel glides /uo/ and /ie/ on the one hand and the combinations of approximant + vowel /wo/ and /je/ on the other hand is made when these sequences appear word-initially. In other positions other tests, e.g. vowel elision as in (8a), may apply. For the diphthong /uö/ no such evidence distinguishing it from the hypothetical sound sequence */wö/ can be provided because it is not found in the absolute onset. Another phonotactic rule confirms the diphthongal status of /uö/. Since it occurs only in the sequence <juö> and TY does not allow consonant clusters in the onset, the segment following the approximant /j/ can be interpreted only as a vowel. The diphthong /ia/ was not detected by previous scholars for its exceptional rarity. It is used literally in just a couple of lexemes, e.g. miara- ‘to whet’, niar ‘a bare spot on a skin’, tianu-46 ‘to jump pulling hind legs rather high’ (about a reindeer). Despite its rarity minimal pairs can be found: miaral ‘whetting’ ~ miral ‘walking’ and miaraanul ‘to whet.DUR.GER’ ~ maraanul ‘to dress.DUR.GER’.

Nikolaeva (2006:30) notes that no minimal pairs can be found that would discern the diphthongs /uo/, /ie/ and /uö/ from the corresponding long mid vowels, of which they are, according to her, ‘non-phonological variants’. However, for diphthong /uö/ a minimal pair involving the corresponding long mid vowel does exist, e.g. uo ‘child’ ~ oo ‘pants’, and variants like oorin’-e- ‘to cry’ (e.g. Kurilov 1990:206), as opposed to uorin’-e-(filed notes), should therefore be interpreted as instances of smoothing47. No such pairs can be found for the remaining diphthongs /ie/ and /uö/ for reasons not directly related to their assumed phonemic status. The diphthong /ie/ is left without one due to the assumption (Nikolaeva 2006:30) that it occurs in variation with /eel/, and there are no minimal pairs for the opposition /iel/ ~ /eel/. I argue against this reasoning by pointing out that in modern TY presented in this thesis neither does the diphthong [ie] show variance with [e:] being realized as a diphthong phonetically48, nor is there the phoneme /ee/. Krejnovič (1958:9 and 1968:436) states that vowels can be long but does not offer a single example of [e:]. Krejnovič (1982:10) remarks that [e:] occurred in his material only once, without giving the actual example. Interestingly, he refrains from explicitly assigning phonemic value to long vowels generally. Veenker (1987:83) treats only /ii/, //uu/, /oo/ and /aa/ as phonemes. Kurilov (2006) does not mention the phoneme /ee/ either. Maslova (2003c:3) and Nikolaeva (2006:29) do place /eel/ into their vowel inventories of TY.

Judging by the relative frequency of [e:] and [ie] the latter should be a far more probable and eligible candidate for obtaining phonemic status than the former. Indeed, as soon as one stops demanding that the crucial opposition be [ie] and [e:] a number of minimal pairs with the pattern lewde- ‘to eat’ ~ lewdie- ‘to begin to eat’ are, indeed, easily found, supporting decisively phonemic status of the vowel glide /ie/. On the other

---

46 It is quite possible, however, that the noun niar derives from the Even nilber ‘a bare skin’ and the verb tianu- is the altered Even loan tibaadaj ‘to gallop’.

47 The term ‘smoothing’ is used here after Ashby (2011:112) to designate the simplification of complex vowels.

48 This has been confirmed by a phonetic analysis (Odé, personal communication).
hand, there are only a handful of lexemes with [ε:]49. The only pair of words with an opposition between [ε:] and [ɛ] or [V: ] that comes close to a minimal pair is eenil ‘one year old female reindeer’ ~ enilee ‘MP’. Apart from this pair’s being segmentally inadequate for a true minimal pair, its first member is a loan from Even and the second member is an interjection-like item, which makes the pair even less suitable to establish a language specific semantic contrast. Generally, the few instances of long [ε:], apart from those mentioned in footnote 49, are limited to Even loans (another rare example is neenukee ‘riddle’ (Nikolaeva 2006:30)) and interjections. In interjections this kind of lengthening conveys attitudes and can produce pseudo-minimal pairs. For instance, lengthening of the vowel in the first syllable of the interjection keged’eej [kε:gedε:j] signals a negative attitude of the speaker toward an event while lengthening of the second syllable [kε:gedε:j] indicates the speaker’s positive attitude (Kurilova 2012:32). It is clear that one deals here with different realizations of one and the same word expressing different emotional states of the speaker, which, arguably, cannot be identified with meanings. Interjections as such have only quasi-lexical status as they do not name concepts but only evaluate them. Nor do they distinguish grammatical meanings. It is differentiation of meanings, conceptual or grammatical, that ascribes phonemic value to a sound. All these facts and considerations justify denying the vowel [ε:] the status of a phoneme.

The diphthong /uö/ does not have a minimal pair of the sort /uö/ ~ /öö/ because the long vowel /öö/ does not seem to exist50. The lack of /öö/ is essential, because the

49 In passive/resultative forms of verbal lexemes whose derivational bases end in <CVj> the vowel in this sequence, which is mostly [ɛ], undergoes lengthening: jonotejuol- < jonotej ‘to open’ ajayarejuol- < ajayare- ‘to skin’, waareejuol- < waarej- ‘to pull along’, jarayaajuol- < jaraj- ‘to turn white’, keweejuol- < kewej- ‘to leave’, kewrejuol- < kewrej- ‘to carry away’, juoyarejuol- < juoyarej- ‘to finish’ sisayarejuol- < sisayarej- ‘to tear’, pulgereejuol- < pulgerej- ‘to pull out’, köcegejuol- < köcegej- ‘to rush’, jedejjuol- < jedej- ‘to become visible’, januarejuol- < januarej- ‘to clean up’ etc. This is a regular vowel alternation with only a few exceptions. It is self-evident that these forms are not suitable to act as members of potential minimal pairs.

50 If the criterion of the existence of minimal pairs is to be applied rigidly, [a:] cannot be considered a TY phoneme, since none are found. Even as a phone it is an extremely rare variant on the short [a]. Odé (2012:37) states that in her materials this vowel is attested very sparsely. In fact, in the source Odé (2012) refers to, it occurs only in forms of the word köjle ‘piece’ and represents an idiolectal lengthening of the short [a]. The speaker does it also with other vowels. Examples of [ɛ:] in words belonging to various parts of speech and in different grammatical contexts follow: leweejl (Kurilov and Odé 2012:24), kewejl’en’ [he left.NVIS’ (ibid. 28), pulgereejlelek (ibid. 60) ‘having rushed out’, janaspeejrellek ‘having forgotten’ (ibid. 64), jedejlu [it] appeared SF (ibid. 32) etc. There are at least some inconsistent uses of [ɛ:] in that source, e.g. mε=pulgeejmund eli ‘we go out’ (ibid. 22) vs. pulgejnumi ‘[it] appears’ (ibid. 264).

This kind of lengthening is not an isolated phenomenon. In the recordings of another speaker there are forms like paajpe(n) ‘women’(s), keepeya ‘in young men’ and qomon’eajrukan ‘something blue’. These lexemes are listed in Kurilov (2001) as pajpe, keip and qomon’eajrukan. The speaker herself utters the two latter words in the same recording also with the short vowel. This indicates that one deals here for the most part with a non-phonemic realization, possibly emotionally colored, of short vowels. At least as many speakers avoid this practice. This kind of lengthening may have originated from the vowel alternation mentioned in footnote 49. The rule was apparently generalized to different degrees by some speakers of TY, which resulted in non-phonemic variants described above.
very similar diphthong /uo/ is definitely the alternate realization of /ool/, the respective long mid vowel (Nikolaeva 2002:4, Nikolaeva 2006:30), which, in addition, is regular only in stressed syllables (Maslova 2003c:3). Moreover, for Nikolaeva (2006:30) the diphthongs are only tendentially preferred under stress or in monosyllabic words. So, the existence of the corresponding long mid vowels is thought of as being primary, almost the prerequisite for the existence of the diphthongs. If the long vowel /öö/ is not there in TY, it is reasonable, on these grounds, not to expect the existence of diphthong /uö/.

The existence of diphthong /uö/ is suggested by the entry juö– ‘to see’ in Kurilov (2001:132) and assumed by Maslova (2003c:3). However, Kurilov (1990:80) spells the word as juo- and Krejnovič (1958, 1968, 1982) does not recognize this diphthong even phonetically. Neither does Kurilov (2006:36-37) in his overview of the vowel phonemes. Sentence examples in Kurilov (2001) demonstrating the use of the verb ‘to see’ are spelt with <ö> only in the nest of this verb itself. In other examples, scattered over the pages of the dictionary, the verb is written with <o>. Obvious cases of confusion of /o/ and /ö/ are present in Kurilov (2001) too. For instance, the word juondève ‘sinciput’ deriving from juo ‘head’ and ewče ‘top’ is erroneously spelt as juöndève (Kurilov 2001:133). There are more cases of confusion of these two vowels. Thus, one of the informants insisted that the word for ‘middle’ should be spelt as örd’e while in (Kurilov 2001:348) it is listed as ord’a. The spelling örd’e stands for ‘garbage’ according to Kurilov (2001:357). The adverb ‘far’ is spelt jöke in Kurilov (2001:127) and joko in Kurilov and Odé (2012). Easy confusion of /o/ and /ö/ may have been the reason why Krejnovič in all his works recognizes only two diphthongs: /ie/ and /uo/. Words that have the diphthong [uo] he presents as having the diphthong /uo/. Notably, apart from the obscure word juöldöjče ‘spear’, <uö> appears only in the nest of the verb juö– ‘to see’ in Kurilov’s (2001) dictionary. Somewhat simplified, this means that there is only one, at most two, words in TY with the sequence <uö>. The root juö– ‘to see’ serves together with juo ‘head’ as a member of the sole minimal pair distinguishing the diphthongs /uö/ and /uo/. Extreme scarcity of minimal pairs does not in itself preclude establishing the phoneme /uö/. However, in view of the additional evidence, that is, apparent confusion of the sounds [ö] and [e] in writing and the absence of long vowel /öö/, with which /uö/ could alternate in the same way the diphthong /uo/ alternates with /ool/, it is not unwarranted to question the validity of the minimal pair juo ‘head’ ~ juö– ‘to see’.

Nikolaeva (2006:30) notes that in transcripts of KY the verb ‘to see’ is recorded now as juo-, now as joo-. This possibly indicates that what is described in more recent works on TY as the diphthong /uö/ in fact is the diphthong /uo/ realized sometimes as the long vowel [oö]. This would make the members of the assumed minimal pair juo ‘head’ ~ juö– ‘to see’.

Krejnovič (1982:10) admits plainly that he had not come across [e]. Therefore, it is not clear why some scholars, e.g. Nikolaeva (2002:2, 2006:29), Maslova (2003c) assume its existence and even attribute to it the status of a phoneme.

51 Indeed, despite this tendency monosyllabic words with long [oo] exist, e.g. jooj– ‘to be ill’, oo– ‘to ladle (out)’.

52 ‘Nest’ (гнездо) is a common term in Russian lexicography roughly designating word entries that share a derivational base.

53 Its derivate surfaces in Kurilov (2001:133) as juöldewečen– ‘to have a spear’. At another place in the dictionary it appears with an <o> instead of <ö>: juöldöjčelek ‘spear.INS’ (Kurilov 2001:451, suuseej-).
juō- ‘to see’ homonyms, and the issue of the missing long vowel /öö/ would become irrelevant. Such interpretation of the present situation is also readily compatible with the above mentioned confusion of /ö/ and /o/. Systematic phonetic experiments would be necessary to unambiguously answer the question whether or not the assumed diphthong [ʊə] and, consequently, /uö/ exists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1.2</th>
<th>bilabial</th>
<th>coronal</th>
<th>palatal</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>uvular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>voiced</td>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>voiced</td>
<td>voiceless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plosive</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>/t/, /tt/</td>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>/d'/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>/n'/</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>/ŋ'/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trill</td>
<td></td>
<td>/r/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fricative</td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affricate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approximant</td>
<td>/w/</td>
<td>/j/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lateral</td>
<td></td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>/l'/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few remarks are appropriate here concerning pronunciation of certain consonants.

/d/, /l/ and /n/ in front of /i/ are hard to discern from their palatalized counterparts. /l/ can, but need not, also be difficult to distinguish from /l'/ in front of /e/.

/d'/ can surface almost as the affricate [dʒ], which may have been the default pronunciation at earlier stages of TY since /d'/ is regularly found when /č/ gets voiced: čuol’e d’ii < čuol’e ĉii ‘ancient people’.

/t/ in the coda of cliticizing words can be pronounced as an affricate in quick speech when followed by /ʃ/: met juo [męč(j)uə].

/č/ may be perceived as /h/ in front of the dental nasal /ŋ/: lejričnaal’elum [lejritna:ɬelum] ‘he recalled.NVIS’.

/q/ has two realizations, which seem to vary freely, namely the voiceless uvular plosive [q] and voiceless uvular fricative [χ].

/w/ can be more of a labiodental consonant, with the lips hardly protruded, possibly due to interference with Russian.

/γ/ has a positional variant, the voiced uvular plosive [ɡ], after /ŋ/: tidanja [tidanɡa] ‘last year’, idaranγa [idaraŋɡa] ‘next year’.

/n'/ can be realized as a retroflex after /ŋ/: jahre [jaŋre] ‘goose’.

/n'/ in word final position is regarded by some speakers of TY as /n/: nonolŋin’ [nɔnɔlŋin] ‘snare’, səaʃal’en’ [saʃaɬən] ‘s/he disappeared’.

2.2 Phonotactics

2.2.1 Positional restrictions

The least restricted are word-internal positions, since this is the least specific environment within a word. All phonemes can occupy it. It is the only environment in

---

54 In amutney ‘well’ < amuč ‘[it] is good’ + -nen ‘ADV’ it has even become the default pronunciation.
which voiced obstruents occur primarily. Word-finally voiced obstruents are absolutely prohibited. Word-initially the phonemes /g/, /d/ and /d'/ can occur only as the result of voicing of the underlying voiceless counterparts, e.g. čuol’e d’ii ‘ancient people’ < čuol’e čii (Kurilov 1991:30). Distribution of voiced obstruents is restricted also on the syllable level: they are limited to syllabic onsets after vowels, approximants, sonorants and /č/.

Other consonants can be encountered both in onsets and codas, but additional word-level restrictions apply. Thus from word-initial onsets the consonants /tt/, /ŋ/ and /r/ are banned. Word-finally, some consonants are possible only in very restricted grammatical context, e.g. /s/ can be found exclusively in 3SG of causative verbs under negation.

Among vowels the phoneme /uo/ is found very seldom word-initially. Word-finally vowel phoneme /õ/ occurs extremely seldom and /oo/ probably never. Other vowels are not restricted in either of these positions.

As far as word roots are concerned, irrespective of the part of speech their coda shows a high degree of sonority ending either in a vowel or a sonorant consonant, and only very seldom in /č/. Voiceless stops are disallowed in root final position. A possible exception are adverbs ending in /q/, e.g. jaqlaaq ‘beyond’.

2.2.2 Adjacency restrictions

Tautosyllabic consonant clusters are disallowed in the onset under all circumstances. Word-internally heterosyllabic consonant clusters of more than two consonants are prohibited. Consonant clusters, generally disallowed in the coda, do occur in the absolute coda, but may not exceed three segments. Below are the lists of the permissible consonant combinations ordered according to the decreasing sonority distance:

1. Glide or /l/, or /r/, or /m/, or /s/, or /č/ and /k/

(5) pulgejk ‘come out!’
lewk ‘eat!’
quduolk ‘lie!’
n’il’iwuolk ‘keep smiling!’
oll’elk ‘neither/nor’

---

55 For instance, in the expression mōčgurčii- ‘to go mad’ or in könn’ičhuol- ‘to be inclined to show family feelings’. This is a previously not noted position for voiced plosives.
56 There is an emphatic linguistic device yoll’elk, but since it behaves like a clitic, almost like a suffix actually, it can hardly be said to have an initial position. The same cannot be said as categorically about the copular verb yol- since a pause can be inserted in front of it.
57 For the diphthong /uwol/ quite a few entries in Kurilov (2001) can be found, where it occurs in inlaut, but all of those words derive from the noun uo ‘child’, the only exception being its homonym, the verb uo- ‘to roast’.
58 I am aware only of the following instances of these two phonemes word-finally: ðrkōbō ‘lynx’ and ōŋō ‘a small hill on a plain’, oo ‘pants’ and the homophonous verbal stem oo- ‘ladle (out)’.
59 /s/, being the causative suffix, is stem final.
60 It is quite possible that it is historically derived as the final –q seems to be some adverb deriving formative. Cf. jataq ‘straight’ ~ jatarqaj ‘to become straight’ ~ jatarqa ‘straight part of smth.’.
61 Sonority distance values are calculated on the basis of the sonority scale proposed in Gussenhoven and Jakob (2011:165): obstruents → nasals → liquids → glides → vowels.
From this list it follows that when the second consonant of the cluster is a plosive\(^{62}\), the sonority distance is not a restrictive factor, all possible values of the sonority distance are attested.

2. Glide and /l/, or /\l'/, or /\eta/, or /m/, /\v/ or /h/

(6)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{qoql} ‘God’
  \item \textit{naajl} ‘son-in-law’
  \item \textit{qajl} ‘stone’
  \item \textit{kwej\l} ‘leaving’
  \item \textit{\^carqatterej\j} ‘[I] twisted’
  \item \textit{lawn\j} ‘[I] drank’
  \item \textit{joom} ‘[s/he] is ill’
  \item \textit{qool\vem} ‘[s/he] did smb. in’
  \item \textit{jaraw\c/jaraj\c} ‘[it] lasts annoyingly long’
  \item \textit{qodej\c} ‘[it] is unpleasant’
  \item \textit{\vulyajt} ‘[I] will stab’
  \item \textit{el=\vajlerej\t} ‘[s/he] will not become sober’
\end{itemize}

When the first member of the two-consonant cluster is a glide, the sonority distance does not seem to play a role either, except that sonority distances <1 are not allowed. The conspicuous absence of the cluster */js\l/, hypothetically possible in 3SG of causatives under negation, e.g. *el=\textit{sal}\'\gammaarejs\l ‘[s/he] did no make [smb.] break [smth.]’, is an indication of disregard for the foot structure in TY (see 2.2.3 and 2.2.5 for discussion). The grammatically correct negative form is \textit{el=\textit{sal}\'\gammaarejse ‘[s/he] did not make [smb.] break [smth.]’, with a degenerate foot in word-final position in addition to the loose word-internal light syllable <\gammaa>. The hypothetical form would have only the latter. The reason for this foot-wise ‘inadequate’ form is probably a much stronger constraint on three-consonantal clusters, preventing the potential illicit cluster */jsk\l/: *\textit{Sal}\'\gammaarej\v/\textit{Sal}\'\gammaarej\v\k ‘Make [smb.] break [smth.]!’ or *\textit{Pomogerej\v/Pomogerej\v\k ‘Let [smb.] circumambulate!’\(^{63}\).

---

\(^{62}\) The designation ‘plosive’ here is by no means all-encompassing. Moreover, /k/ is the only plosive that enters such a broad variety of clusters. /k/ only instantiates plosives as a class in consonant clusters and individual restrictions on cluster formation apply for individual plosives.

\(^{63}\) TY has the so called ‘alternating suffixes’, or morphemes exhibiting the morphology Ce/C (Nikolaeva 1998:203). The Ce form is presumed to be the underlying one (Nikolaeva 1998:208). If the vowel of the causative suffix –se got deleted in the negated form of these verbs yielding the cluster */js\l/, the imperative of the resulting causatives would contain the illicit */jsk\l/ cluster. Theoretically this cluster could be resolved by the epenthetic vowel /u/ as */jsuk\l/. Practically, the imperative ending vehemently –k resists epenthesis, allowing it optionally, to my knowledge, only after the velar nasal, e.g. \~\textit{\textit{\v}u\textit{j}/u\textit{j} ‘Read!’.
As is clear from the examples the majority of the instances of consonant clustering are limited to a narrow grammatical context of several finite verb forms (singular imperative and 1SG, 3SG as well as 2PL indicative of the basic conjugation) as well as gerunds.

Clusters of three consonants are extremely rare and obtain only in 2PL indicative when the verb base ends with an approximant:

(7)  
\[sal\gamma arejmk^{64}\] ‘[you.PL] broke’ 
\[moomk\] ‘[you.PL] held’

Notable is the absence of clusters liquid + nasal while clusters liquid + obstruent or nasal + obstruent exist. Their lack is probably explained by the insufficient sonority distance between liquids and nasals, which are next to each other on the sonority scale. If one takes into consideration the preceding remarks, the conclusion may be drawn that cluster relevant sonority distance depends on the sonority class of consonants participating in a potential cluster and the direction of the sonority value. For glides or obstruents it can be as low as 1. For liquids it can be 1 up the sonority scale and must be > 1 down the sonority scale. For nasals the minimal sonority distance is 1 down the sonority scale and 2 up the sonority scale.

An immediate co-occurrence of two vowels not belonging to the same syllable, a hiatus, is forbidden in TY and is resolved either by vowel deletion or an insertion of an epenthetic consonant, /j/, /r/, /n/ or /ŋ/.

Heterosyllabic adjacency restrictions on consonants are summarized following Nikolaeva (2002:7). Generally, they are less numerous across morpheme boundaries. Prohibited are all clusters with a voiced obstruent as the first member, which automatically follows

\[\text{Heterosyllabic adjacency restrictions on consonants are summarized following Nikolaeva (2002:7). Generally, they are less numerous across morpheme boundaries. Prohibited are all clusters with a voiced obstruent as the first member, which automatically follows.}\]

\[\text{According to Krejnovič (1958:139) the form sal\gamma aremk would have to be expected since for another verb whose base ends with /Vj/ he gives the form susemk ‘[you.pl] threw’.}\]

\[\text{Except that clusters voiceless obstruent + voiced obstruent are recognized across morpheme boundary (see footnote 55 for examples).}\]
from the positional restriction limiting voiced obstruents to onsets, as well as clusters /Cj/ (except for /wj/, e.g. lawje ‘water’) and /ww/.

Inside a morpheme the following additional clusters are impossible: sonorant + /wl/, /r/ + voiced obstruent and sonorant (except r) + voiceless obstruent.

2.2.3 Syllable structure

Nikolaeva (2006) attributes an important role to the concept of ‘prosodic foot’ for explaining some of the phonotactic properties of TY. However, it is doubtful whether this language at all conforms with the Prosodic Hierarchy and the principle of Foot Binarity (McCarthy and Prince 1995:321), the two postulates that demand that the minimal prosodic word in a language be no shorter than a bimoraic foot, i.e. have at the very least the structure VC, V: or V₁V₂. Syllables with the structure CV are degenerate feet and cannot be complete words. From Nikolaeva’s (2006:74-75) analysis it follows that the minimality requirement in Yukaghir is imposed on the level of Lexical Word in terms of McCarthy and Prince (1995:323). Now the monosyllabic bare root of one of the copular verbs in TY with the structure CV can, apparently, occur as an independent prosodic word in negative context as long as its subject is 3SG:

(9) Tuustaaq-qa-t el=jöke l’e

66 Here and in the following, V = vowel, C = consonant, V: = long vowel, V₁V₂ = diphthong

67 I do not have a phonetic proof that l’e in this expression constitutes an independent stress assignment domain, just as I do not have phonetic evidence that it does not, cliticizing with el=joke. I based my claim solely on the fact that the copular verb l’e- per se does not belong to cliticizing elements in TY, unlike the negative clitic el=, which always needs to lean on something. Therefore I reason that if el= satisfies its need for leaning by some other host as in (9), there is no reason to expect the following l’e- to clitize. It is only the theoretical approach of McCarthy and Prince (1995) that demands it. However, even they admit that there could be languages without a foot. There are indeed languages in which more convincing examples than that in (9) can be found to illustrate a prosodic word consisting of a degenerate foot, e.g. su ‘water’ in Turkish. So, there is not need a priori to squeeze TY, or any language for that matter, into the formal framework developed by McCarthy and Prince (1995) and adopted by Nikolaeva (2006).

A problem with the analysis in (9) is that one cannot be sure that l’e- does not belong to the cliticizing units of TY. Normally, it occurs with at least one more segment, e.g l’ej ‘[it] is’, and meets the minimality requirement, at least as long as one agrees that also a word-final consonant provides a mora and regards TY glides as consonants in all positions, and I do. In the few grammatical contexts in which l’e- ‘to be’ occurs as a bare root, it cliticizes. This fact is not as unequivocal as it may seem at first, though. When l’e- clitisizes with el= in the negative copula ewl’e ‘there isn’t’, it can be analyzed as triggered by el=, it is more difficult to explain away in a similar way the form qoll’e ‘where is [it]?’, which probably derives from qadaa ‘where’ + l’e- ‘to be’. A way to do it would be to say that, since l’e- is specialized in expressing locations, the combination of these two words is extremely frequent. In Bybee (2011:11) one can read about how the usage frequency accelerates sound changes. In other words, the existence of the synthetic interrogative location copula qoll’e ‘where’ instead of the synonymous analytic expression qadaa l’e may be the result of frequent use and not l’e- having to clitize. Such an analysis is corroborated by the existence of lexicalized items like quodeban- ‘to be what kind’ < quode ‘how’ + pan- ‘to be’. In this word the copular verb pan- has also undergone a mutation which tells us that it forms one phonological word with quode. However, this compound, which certainly evolved due to the high frequency of use of these two words together, is not demanded by the word minimality requirement. This means that one cannot be entirely sure whether the word qoll’e ‘where is’ is. In this way, neither evol’e ‘there isn’t’ nor qoll’e are convincing proofs that l’e has to clitize. In the absence of such a proof I interpret the written corpus data to accommodate my claims. Until the alternative point of view has been supported by solid phonetic evidence, it cannot, I believe, be objectively preferred over mine.
This violates the principle of Foot Binarity and makes the existence of foot in TY questionable or, more dramatically, renders invalid the part of the Prosodic Hierarchy which postulates that a prosodic word must contain at least one foot. On the other hand, in absence of an adverbial with a spatial meaning the copular verb l’e- ‘to be’ fuses with the negative clitic el= to form the negative existential copula ewl’e ‘not to be there’. In questions focalizing a peripheral constituent, another context where intransitive verbs occur as bare roots in 3SG, the copular verb l’e- in my material is either omitted, e.g. qadaa tay ‘where [is] it?’, or appears in an interrogative location copula qoll’e ‘where is’. These facts do support the idea that a language strives to produce words not shorter than a bimoraic foot. It may also be objected that one cannot regard copular verbs as Lexical Words since copulas are semantically empty structural devices necessary to form nominal predicates. However, there are three copular verbs in TY, which show a strong tendency to a semantically conditioned complementary distribution. As for l’e- ‘to be’, it has existential and locative meaning. Therefore, it is not quite unwarranted to see them as lexical words with the meanings ‘to be X’ or ‘to be equal to X’, ‘to exist’ or ‘to be at/be situated in’ and, finally, ‘to be such’. More importantly, since the term Lexical Word is presented together with Root and Stem as one of MCats at which the minimality requirement is imposed (McCarthy and Prince 1995:323), it can be taken as a label for a morphological unit. Copular devices are, certainly, morphological units too. If TY copular verbs are accepted as Lexical Words, the following, and unfortunately rather rhetoric, question to pose would be whether the isolated example of a monosyllabic word with the structure CV in (9) is sufficient to make far-reaching typological conclusions about TY phonotactics.

There is one more ‘suspicious’ item, though, namely the word me, which is an invitation to take an object:

(10)  Ekoja me jolle-len keći-men!

older.sister take moss-FOC.ABS bring-TR.3SG.OF

‘Sister, take, I’ve brought moss.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:132)

There is more controversial evidence in TY as regards the existence and significance of foot in it (see 2.2.4 and 2.2.5), so at least it can be stated that the concept ‘foot’ is to be used with caution when trying to account for phonological phenomena in TY. Connected with the concept of ‘prosodic foot’ is the distinction of light vs. heavy syllables. If one accepts the validity of the Prosodic Hierarchy and the principle of Foot Binarity (McCarthy and Prince 1995:321) in TY, then one is compelled to conclude that

---

Another similar indication in favor of the assumption of a bimoraic foot in TY is the behavior of demonstrative pronouns. Krejnovič (1982) attests monosyllabic variants of the attributive, presumably cliticizing, forms of the demonstrative pronouns without the velar nasal in coda position, e.g. tu ‘this’ and ta ‘that’ instead of tuij and taj. Normally, these truncated CV-forms cannot be used as independent demonstrative pronouns, i.e. when they are to be prosodically self-sufficient, they must assume extended shapes, namely tujujtuji tuj(e(n)) ‘this one’ and tajutajitajn(e(n)) ‘that one’ respectively.

This is not a very strong point because this monosyllabic word could be interpreted as a lexically and modally specified particle. There is a parallel in Russian, the particle na with the same meaning.
the coda consonant, also word-finally, provides a mora in TY since this language has monosyllabic words of the structure (C)VC, e.g. al ‘under’, aq ‘constantly’, wal ‘beside’, ‘instead of’ and a number of intransitive verbs, such as mon- ‘to say’, jaw- ‘to ache’, n’ir- ‘to vomit’, peć- ‘to trot’, en- ‘to be alive’. These monosyllabic verbal roots will occur as prosodic words in 3SG in questions focusing on an adjunct. Several transitive verbs could be added to this list, which occur as roots under AF, e.g. löö- ‘to raise/to educate’, möö- ‘to sense’, men- ‘to take’, čaw- ‘to cut off’, čuŋ- ‘to read’ and a few more. A few examples illustrate their use:

(11a) Qadaa jaw?
    3SG why ache[3SG.ITR]
    ‘Where does it ache?’
(11b) Tudel quodii n’ir?
    3SG why vomit[3SG.ITR]
    ‘Why did s/he vomit?’
(11c) Tudel quodeŋ en’?
    3SG how be.alive[3SG.ITR]
    ‘How does s/he live?’
(11d) Kin par?
    who[FOC.ERG] dip[AF]
    ‘Who has put [it] to cook?’

On the other hand – and this is an interesting typological fact about TY syllable weight – monosyllabic nouns under no circumstances can have the structure CVC in TY (Nikolaeva 2006:41). They have to have two moras in the nucleus or be disyllabic, with the structure CV.CV. According to the existing views languages are divided in two groups depending on how they distinguish light syllables from heavy ones. The difference between the two groups lies in the treatment of the coda. A coda consonant either counts as a mora and, consequently, contributes to the syllable weight making a closed syllable with a short (or lax) vowel heavy or it does not, which leaves a closed syllable with a monomoraic nucleus light (Hyman 1984:5-6). Accepting the concept of word miniality conditioned by the principle of Foot Binarity, one has to draw the conclusion that TY shows a word class dependent pertinence to one of these typological groups of languages, treating the syllable CVC differently in (most) nouns on the one hand and other parts of speech on the other hand.

The list of monosyllabic words with the structure (C)VC given above is close to exhaustive. Monosyllabic prosodic words are generally rare in TY. Some instances of such words having the structure (C)V:C and (C)V1V2(C) are the following: oo ‘pants’, jaa ‘birch’, čuul ‘meat’, waaj ‘again’. uo ‘child’, čuo ‘iron’, wiem ‘[s/he] did’, čuor ‘whirlwind’ etc.

Far more common are oligosyllabic and polysyllabic (more than 3 syllables) words. In compounds the number of syllables can reach 6, e.g. ojenuberukun ‘daily clothes’, ugurčend’erukun ‘legged entity’. Complicated, and admittedly somewhat artificial but possible, verb forms can count up to 8 syllables, e.g. kudičisienunulbull’en ‘it appears that [s/he] always wanted to begin to make [smb.] put [smth.] repeatedly’.

Except for the lexemes al ‘under’ and wal ‘besides’ treated in this grammar owing to their function as postpositions, which for formal reasons would have to be recognized as nouns (see 3.8).
The following is an overview of the possible syllable types in TY:

- open syllables

1. \(V \rightarrow a.\eta a\) ‘mouth’
2. \(V: \rightarrow ii.die\) ‘aunt (elder brother’s wife)’
3. \(V_1V_2 \rightarrow uo\) ‘child’
4. \(CV \rightarrow wa.ya\) ‘face’
5. \(CV: \rightarrow jaa.die\) ‘aunt (mother’s younger sister)’
6. \(CV_1V_2 \rightarrow wie.d’ie\) ‘MP’

- closed syllables

7. \(VC \rightarrow an.min\) ‘MP’
8. \(V:C \rightarrow oon.d’ej\) ‘s/he informed’
9. \(V_1V_2C \rightarrow ien.d’e\) ‘excrements’
10. \(CVC \rightarrow qo.mo.n’ej\) ‘to be blue/green’
11. \(CV:C \rightarrow waaj\) ‘again’
12. \(C V_1V_2C \rightarrow \ddot{c}uor\) ‘whirlwind’

- closed syllable with consonant clusters

13. \(CVCC \rightarrow ke.wejk\) ‘leave!’
14. \(CV:CC \rightarrow moojk\) ‘hold!’
15. \(C V_1V_2CC \rightarrow n’iemk\) ‘you called’
16. \(CVCCC \rightarrow pul.gejmk\) ‘you came out’
17. \(CV:CCC \rightarrow paajmk\) ‘you hit’

All in all, TY has a fairly complex system of syllables for an OV language\(^{71}\) and a number of superheavy syllable types defined as comprising more than two moras (Hyman 1984:10). It is conspicuous that the system is almost symmetric in the sense that all possibilities of combining vowels and diphthongs with consonants and licit consonant clusters, except \(CV_1V_2CCC\), are attested, that is, in whichever syllable type a short vowel is found, a long vowel or diphthong is found too.

Syllable structure of TY is typologically remarkable in a few respects. Firstly, it is not possible to assess uncontroversially the syllable complexity in TY according to the classification criteria proposed in Maddieson (2005:54, 2006:109) because strictly speaking TY does not fall into any of the suggested classes. Thus, languages regarded as having ‘moderately complex syllable structure’ are such that allow qualitatively restricted onset clusters of no more than two consonants and disallow any in the coda. Languages with a ‘complex syllable structure’ have less restricted prevocalic consonant clusters and/or postvocalic consonant clusters. It appears that this typology expects a higher

---

\(^{71}\) There has been an opinion that the syllable structure tends to be simple in OV languages (Lehmann 1973:61, Gil 1986).

\(^{72}\) Abstract consonants are meant here as there are positional and adjacency restrictions on occurrences of certain classes of consonant sounds (see 2.2.1 and 2.2.2).
complexity of consonant clusters rather in the onset than in the coda. In TY the situation is the opposite: no consonant clusters are allowed in the onset but up to three consonants can occur in the coda. According to an alternative complexity scale (Maddieson 2010 cited by Tokizaki and Kuwana 2012:74), which takes into account the complexity of the nucleus and indexes precisely the coda complexity, TY would unambiguously occupy step 5 on a scale between 1 and 8.

Maddieson (2005:56) places TY among languages with a complex syllable structure despite the fact that the proposed criteria seem to be leading to controversial conclusions. Maddieson (2005:55) also notes a direct correlation between the size of the consonant inventory and the degree of syllable complexity. The average number of consonant phonemes correlating with simple, moderately complex and complex syllable structure is reported to be 19.1, 20.0 and 25.8. The number of consonant phonemes in TY equals 21, which means that the correlation is not strictly valid for TY.

TY has a rather complex syllable structure with up to 6 segments in it and shows a rich inventory of consonants that can occur in the coda (see 2.2.1), which undermines the absolute value of Hashimoto’s (1978 cited by Tokizaki and Kuwana 2012:78) observation that codas are simpler in northern Asia than in southern Asia. At the same time TY displays a nearly maximal degree of complement-head order along the scale devised by Tokizaki and Kuwana (2012:79). This, in turn, frustrates the inverse correlation between complement-head order and high syllable complexity and coda variety expected by Tokizaki and Kuwana (2012:80-81).

Resuming, a remarkably high degree of syllable complexity and coda variety for a predominantly head-final language, marked clustering position within the syllable and lack of a clear direct correlation between the size of the consonant inventory and syllable complexity make TY syllable structure typologically interesting.

2.2.4 Vowel harmony

There has been no unanimous opinion among scholars whether or not TY has vowel harmony. Veenker (1987:104) does not see a tendency for vowel harmony. Krejnovič (1982:20) avoids categorical statements in this respect and supposes on the basis of the available data, where /e/ co-occurs with /ö/ and /o/ with /a/, that backness harmony had existed in TY at some point for non-high vowels. Nikolaeva (2006:36), who attempts to describe vowel harmony in the Yukaghir languages in terms of foot structure, asserts vowel harmony along this parameter. She adds that within the first bimoraic foot there is also a limited roundness harmony, disallowing co-occurrence of /a/ and /o/.

Both types of harmony just mentioned are better described without resorting to the concept of ‘foot’ because, as is apparent from the relevant examples in Nikolaeva (2006:36-37), they are supposed to operate also beyond the foot boundary. A more

---

73 This is an interesting phonotactic parallel between TY and the extant Samoyedic languages, which also prohibit consonant clusters in the onset but permit (in Tundra Nenets) up to two consonants in the coda (Várnai 2012:132). The variety of nucleus types is also a common characteristic of TY and Samoyedic languages.

74 For comparison, in Manchu, a Tungusic language, only [n] and [ŋ] can be found in that position (Hashimoto 1978 cited by Tokizaki and Kuwana 2012:78).

75 This discrepancy arises from the fact that Nikolaeva (2006:41) regards word-final consonants as not contributing to syllable weight in Yukaghir, with which I disagree with respect to TY (see discussion in
accurate formulation would be to say that vowel harmony is effective within the first two syllables of a stem as long as this portion of a word has the syllabic structure (C)V.CV and (C)V.CVC(CC).

backness harmony backness and roundness harmony

(12) e.be.kie ‘dampness’
e.le.m.de- ‘to say trifles’
ö.ge.te- ‘to install’
ö.gejm [s/he] peeped in’
me.ge.če ‘mischievous person’
je.deč [it] appeared’
kö.če.ge- ‘to gallop’
mö.ner ‘thunder’

The remaining two short vowels, /i/ and /u/ are harmonically neutral and can occur with front and back vowels alike, either following them or preceding:

combinations with front vowels combinations with back vowel

(13) ö.či.die ‘uncle’
ö.d’il ‘nail’
e.nu ‘river’
e.gur ‘withers’
lö.gi.te- ‘to feed’
mö.rim [s/he] heard’
ke.lu.jen ‘we came’
le.gul ‘food’
pi.me ‘louse’
či.re.be ‘plummet’
lit.wem ‘[s/he] amused’
pu.de ‘outside’
pu.geč ‘[it] is hot’

ö.či.die ‘uncle’
ö.d’il ‘nail’
e.nu ‘river’
e.gur ‘withers’
lö.gi.te- ‘to feed’
mö.rim [s/he] heard’
ke.lu.jen ‘we came’
le.gul ‘food’
pi.me ‘louse’
či.re.be ‘plummet’
lit.wem ‘[s/he] amused’
pu.de ‘outside’
pu.geč ‘[it] is hot’

In stems with the first two syllables displaying a different structure vowel harmony can be violated:

(C)V.CV (C)V.CV

(14) an.me.l’e- ‘to be idle’
lan.le ‘side’, ‘one half of smth.’
an’.mej ‘to seat upon smth.’
pan.dem ‘s/he attached’

2.2.3). But even if one accepted that the word-final consonant in ’TY does not project a mora, one would still have to conclude that even verb stems with the structure (C)V.CV like tono- ‘to drive’ display vowel harmony that goes beyond the foot boundary. In the 2PL of such verbs, as long as they are transitive, there is the consonant cluster /mk/, e.g. tonomk ‘[you] have driven’. In these forms /m/, being non-final, does provide a mora also under Nikolaeva’s (2006:35) analysis. Therefore, the resulting word is parsed in the degenerate foot /to/ and a bimoraic foot /nomk/. The vowels of these syllables harmonize, thus, across the foot boundary.
Thus, backness and roundness harmony is observed for the above mentioned sets of vowels within the first two syllables of a stem when the first syllable is open. Actually, neither backness, nor roundness vowel harmony has absolute validity in TY. There is a strong tendency for them and exceptions are utterly infrequent but quite real, e.g. 

- 

\[ \text{čon.đe} \text{ ‘fat’} \]
\[ \text{pom.nej} \text{ ‘[it] is round’} \]
\[ \text{on.đem} \text{ ‘[s/he] moistened’} \]
\[ \text{qon.γač} \text{ ‘[s/he bowed down’} \]

Apart from this stem internal vowel harmony TY has optional pre-radical vowel harmony. It involves only verbal proclitics \text{mer=} ‘PF’, \text{at} ‘POT’ and \text{el} ‘NEG’. They are listed here in their relative position in the preverbal slot, \text{mer=} and \text{el=} being mutually exclusive. Pre-radical vowel harmony is basically vowel assimilation, which yields \text{mar=} and \text{al=}.

The assimilatory effect can come either from the potential clitic \text{at} or from the first vowel of the verb root, e.g. \text{me=}jam\text{d’ij} [majam\text{d’ij}] ‘[s/he] is ill’\textsuperscript{76}. An assimilation of \text{mer=} by the particle \text{anne} ‘just’ is lexicalized as \text{maranme}.

Some limited vowel harmony can be observed in the post-radical domain too. The suffix deriving nouns from qualitative verbs has two allomorphs (-rke/-rka) which harmonize with the stem along the parameter of backness.

\[ jöjerke \text{ ‘smth. ringing’ vs. jatarqa ‘straight part of smth.’} \]

The allomorphs of the inchoative suffix are said to show some harmonic distribution. The allomorph -\text{(n)aa} tends to follow bases containing /a(a)/ or /o(o)/ while in all other cases it is -\text{ie} (Krejnović 1982:121, Kurilov 2001:165):

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{sayanaa- ‘to sit down’ < sayane- ‘to sit’} \\
\text{tonaa- ‘to begin to drive’ < tono- ‘to drive’} \\
\text{moojnaa- ‘to begin to hold’ < mooj- ‘to hold’} \\
\text{iečie- ‘to begin to pierce’ < ieči- ‘to pierce’} \\
\text{pörindie- ‘to begin to kick’ < pörinde- ‘to kick’} \\
\text{mugie- ‘to begin to undress’ < muge- ‘to undress’}
\end{align*} \]

However, counterexamples, where the vowel harmony appears to be violated, are rather frequent. A regularity may be observed here that the violation is more often in favor of -\text{naa}, the allomorph normally employed for hiatus resolution after harmonically back bases ending in a long vowel or a diphthong.

\[ kuderienaa- ‘to begin to put’ < kudere- ‘to put’ \]

\[ \text{Krejnović (1958:147) provides an example of the harmonizing preconsonantal allomorph me=} \text{assimilated by a back vowel: momod’eŋ < me=} + \text{mod’eŋ ‘I said’. No instances of that are known to me from modern TY. Krejnović (1982:21) also reports an instance of regressive harmony involving the negative clitic el=, which is triggered by the first vowel of the root: alaruud’a ‘dumb person’ < el= ‘NEG’ + aruu ‘speech’ + d’aa ‘NMLZ’.} \]
wenaa- ‘to begin to do’ < wien- ‘to do’

More seldom is the use of the allomorph –ie when –aa is expected. It is found e.g. after the desiderative mood suffix –bun’:

\[19\] ayal’webun’ie- ‘to begin to want to laugh’ < ayal’we- + -bun’ ‘DES’ + -ie ‘INCH’

For some verbs alternative forms of the inchoative are attested. It appears that here too rather verbs with the expected suffix –ie can have the alternative allomorph, not the other way around. This can be seen as a tendency toward regularization of the inchoative suffix as –naa and the resulting loss of vowel harmony in this domain:

\[20\] uusaa- < uuse- ‘to carry away’ > uusie-

A seemingly exceptionless rule pertaining to vowel harmony in TY is that /ö/, unless it is the second half of a compound, can be preceded by no other vowel than /ö/, e.g. ögöjre ‘to peep in having suspended one’s body from above’.

A reflection of vowel harmony is the phenomenon of synharmonism observed in TY stems. Uvular consonants /q/ and /γ/ do not occur in stems with harmonically front vowels /e/ and /ö/ whereas velar plosives /k/ and /g/ are not found in stems with harmonically back vowels /a/ and /o/ (Nikolaeva 2006:40):

\[21\] pugelwe- ‘to warm oneself’ vs. ayal’we- ‘to laugh’
seruge- ‘to rattle’ vs. paduγa- ‘to flutter’
mörkie- ‘to resound.INCH’ vs. juoqaa- ‘to ache.INCH’

The validity of this rule appears unbroken only under Nikolaeva’s (2006:29) assumption that beyond the first bimoraic foot all short non-high vowels are neutral with respect to backness, being realized as a central vowel, which optionally partly harmonizes to a full vowel. If one does not assume that, exceptions are rather frequent as there are plenty of derivational suffixes involving vowel /el/, which are attached to harmonically back verbal roots rendering them disharmonic. In such disharmonic stems /g/, /q/ and /γ/ can occur:

\[22\] pomoge- ‘to turn around’
qandej- ‘to see off’
qalimd’e ‘coolness’
sal γarejse- ‘to break.CAUS’

Such combinations can be encountered even in words where /el/ is not outside the first bimoraic foot, e.g. qalel ‘drifting of the ice’.

Compound stems, naturally, also need not adhere to the rule of synaharmonism, e.g. möçgurčii- ‘to go mad’.

\[77\] ‘Derivational’ implies here non-paradigmatic.
2.2.5 Some remarks on the significance of ‘foot’ in TY

It was already shown (see 2.2.3 and 2.2.4) that the presumed importance of ‘foot’ may be overestimated when applied to phonotactics of TY. The concept of word-minimality based on Prosodic Hierarchy and Foot Binarity is valid not without reservations. Exceptionless vowel harmony obtains in the first bimoraic foot of non-derived nouns only. There are further indications of the foot structure being disregarded.

Certain aspectual forms are computed without consideration of the foot structure. For instance, the choice of allomorph –naa of the inchoative suffix in (20) could produce well formed words of the structure CVC|CV:C, a perfectly bimoraic structure in both feet. Instead, the allomorph –aa is selected and the result is the ‘imperfect’ foot structure CV|CVC of the non-derived verb.

(23)  joŋim ‘[s/he] took offence’ > joŋaam ‘[s/he] began to take offence’, *joŋnaam
      čoŋum ‘[s/he] defended’ > čoŋaam ‘[s/he] began to defend’, *čoŋnaam

It follows from (23) that if the foot structure is not completely irrelevant in suffixation, it is subject to higher constraints, e.g. prohibition of the use of the epenthetic /n/ unless it is necessary for hiatus resolution (see (28) in 2.3.1).

Another phonological process, vowel lengthening, also appears to contribute to the retention of the suboptimal foot structure. In the following example lengthening of the final vowel of the verb base makes the amelioration of the foot structure impossible, which would obtain in the hypothetical form without vowel lengthening⁷⁸.

(24)  keluunuj ‘[s/he] is coming’ (CV|CV:|CVC) < keluj ‘[s/he] came’ (CV|CVC)
      *kelunuj (CV.CV|CVC)

The choice of the ‘wrong’ allomorph, coupled with other processes, e.g. vowel shortening can even lead to distortion of the bimoraic foot structure of the original verb form. In (25) the transition is from CV:CC to CV|CV:C instead of the hypothetical CV:C|CV:C.

(25)  joojm ‘[s/he] is ill’ > jojaaj ‘[s/he] fell ill’, *joojnaaj ‘[s/he] fell ill’.

It is important to stress that there is no adjacency restriction on the combinations [ŋn] or [jn], cf. čuŋnaa- ‘to read.dur.’ < čuŋ- ‘to read’, joŋotejnaa- ‘to open.INCH’ < joŋotej- ‘to open’. From this it can be concluded that TY tolerates degenerate feet in word-initial position. A quick look into the dictionary tells one that feet with the structure CV are also allowed in word final position. This is in compliance with the assumption of McCarthy and Prince (1995:321) that unfootable light syllables will tend to be found at edges. Less expected are word internal degenerate feet. For KY Nikolaeva (2006:44) establishes a strong preference for CVC and CV: syllables facilitating a continuous parsing of words in bimoraic feet. In TY word-internal light syllables disrupting the optimal foot structure are not uncommon, especially in verbal forms, e.g. sal’γa|rejm ‘[s/he] broke’.

⁷⁸ This reasoning is, of course, only correct if one accepts that the word-final consonant projects a mora and regards glides in this position as approximants, i.e. consonants, which I do.
ker|dis|nu|num ‘[s/he] praised’, mon|te|jek ‘you will say’, pul|ge|čenj ‘[I] came out’ qadu|yu|denj ‘where’, law|re|lek ‘having drunk’ etc.

Maintenance of the optimal foot structure is supposed to be the functional reason behind the existence of alternating suffixes (see footnote 63) in TY. The alternative shapes of these suffixes allow creation of words, which are well-formed from the point of view of foot structure (Nikolaeva 2006:44). Indeed, very convincing examples of this can be found. Compare, for instance, the use of the alternating allomorphs of the acquisitional suffix –r/-re in uorej ‘[s/he] got a child’ vs. uor|pe.ri ‘[s/he got children]’. Mutual replacement of the allomorphs would produce words with suboptimal foot structure: *uo|ri and *uor|pe|rej. However, examples of ‘wrong’ allomorphs can be found, e.g. öl|kie|nul|l’el|ut ‘(how) [s/he] must have run’. Note the insertion of the epenthetic vowel /u/ to prevent an illicit consonant cluster. The epenthesis would not be necessary if the vocalized allomorph of the future tense suffix –t/-te were used: *öl|kie|nul|l’el|te. More importantly, the degenerate foot would find itself at a word edge, where theoretically there should be more tolerance toward light syllables (McCarthy and Prince 1995:321) and not word-internally as in the actual, grammatically correct form. Conversely, many causative stems have the vocalized allomorph of the causative suffix –s/se, e.g. po|no|sej|se ‘to separate.CAUS’. In 3SG under negation or in questions with the focus on the subject, bare stems of transitive verbs are used. It means that in causatives one ends up with a loose word-final degenerate foot, which would be well formed if the non-vocalized allomorph of the causative suffix was employed: *po|no|sejs. Apart from that, the choice of the causative allomorph in other grammatical contexts is irrelevant for the foot structure because in both cases the structure of the syllable where the /s/ of the causative suffix is the onset has the same structure. The nucleus of that syllable is represented either by the vowel /e/ of the causative suffix itself or by the epenthetic vowel /u/, e.g. čawsem ‘[s/he] made/let cut’ vs. čewnusum ‘[s/he] made sneeze’.

All this is to say that apart form the concerns of foot structure, which certainly play an important role in determining the shape of alternating suffixes, there are constraints in TY, which must be seen as ranking higher than the constraint aligning foot boundaries with syllable boundaries.

The first bimoraic foot is the only environment where short non-high vowels are fully articulated without being assimilated by another full vowel (Nikolaeva 2006:29). This is in contradiction with the fact that in verbal forms the first foot is represented by proclitics me(r)= and at=, which are subject to optional assimilation (see 2.2.4). Apart form that, variation can be observed in the realization of short non-high vowels in the first bimoraic foot of stems, e.g. čama ‘big’ ~ čamedenu Alasej ‘big river Alazeya’ ~ čamuney ‘to a great extent’ or luge- ‘to be older’ ~ luguje ‘to be older’. There is thus no principled way to distinguish variation in the realization of short non-high vowels within the first bimoraic foot and beyond, which undermines the significance of ‘foot’ as a concept facilitating the location of this variation. The term ‘(extra)-radical domain’ seems to capture the regularities pertaining to varying vowel realization better.

These observations coupled with the ones made in the preceding subsections of chapter 2 (violation of word-minimality requirement and vowel harmony operating beyond the foot
boundary) should make one cautious when trying to account for phonotactic phenomena in TY invoking the concept of ‘prosodic foot’.

2.3 Phonological alternations

A good criterion to distinguish phonological alternations from morphophonemic ones is the non-appliance of an alternation rule in a grammatical or lexical context different from the one in which the rule was first observed, while the phonological conditions for the rule to operate are met. In other words, if instances of a rule are encountered e.g. only in verbal forms, this per se does not make it morphophonemic. The reason for the confinement of a rule to one part of speech may lie in the circumstance that in other parts of speech the necessary phonological environment simply does not obtain, making it impossible to test the consistency of the rule. Therefore, the default interpretation of all detected alternations should be to regard them phonological, until and unless it is demonstrated that the attested rule does not operate in the same phonological and different morpho-syntactic or lexical environment. This also entails that idiolectally conditioned instances of non-appliance of a rule in an identical grammatical or lexical context do not lead to the reassessment of a rule as morphophonemic; instead such a phonological rule would get the label ‘variable’, which could be applied to morphophonemic rules too. This would be an ideal approach, which might be not feasible in certain academic undertakings, though, since it presupposes a lot of checking of the primary data and, possibly some extensive eliciting. Writing of a grammar in a limited period of time is such an undertaking. Therefore, in order to be practical, a compromise was made in this work: whenever a rule shows a rather restricted distribution in the part of speech system or otherwise, it is taken to be morpho-phonemic.

Hence, ‘phonological’ implies here sound alternations independent of parts of speech or morphemic context. Some phonological alternations follow from phonotactic restrictions. These are resolution of hiatus and illicit consonant clusters as well as sonorization of voiced obstruents. Other processes are assimilatory.

2.3.1 Hiatus resolution

Hiatus resolution is achieved either by vowel elision or consonantal epenthesis. For illustration see (8a-8e).

1. hiatus resolution rule: \( V \rightarrow \emptyset / _-V \)

   It is always the vowel of the first syllable that gets elided.

2. hiatus resolution rule: \( \emptyset \rightarrow C / V._-V \)

   The epenthetic consonant becomes the onset of the second syllable.

The universal nature of the hiatus resolution rules is relative in two ways: the choice of the rule and epenthetic consonant are conditioned by the morpho-syntactic context. Thus
the first rule is applicable when the passive/resultative suffix –uol\(^79\) (see (8a)) or the inchoative suffixes –aa or –ie are attached:

(26) \(\text{čoŋa}-\) ‘to defend.INCH’ < \(\text{čoŋu}-\) ‘to defend’
    \(\text{lewdje}-\) ‘to eat.INCH’ < \(\text{lewdje}-\) ‘to eat’
    \(\text{lewdienaa}-\) ‘to eat.DUR.INCH’ < \(\text{lewdienu}-\) ‘to eat.DUR’

The epenthetic consonants /j/ and /r/ are used word internally in verbs. The former is inserted in front of the passive/resultative suffix –uol. The latter is employed in the verbal proclitic me(r)-. The epenthetic /h/ occurs in different parts of speech but only in the reciprocal context:

(27) \(n’iŋ=\text{akaajil}’ ‘brothers’ < n’i- ‘RECP’ + \text{akaajil}’ ‘brothers’
    \(n’iŋ=\text{amud’iinaa}-\) ‘to fall in love mutually’ < n’i- ‘RECP’ + \text{amud’iinaa}- ‘to fall in love’
    \(n’iŋ=\text{id’ie ‘equally’, ‘together’ < n’i- ‘RECP’ + id’ie ‘self’}

The consonant /n/ is used only in front of the inchoative suffix –aa when the verb base ends with a segment specified by the feature combination [-consonantal\(^80\), + long]:

(28) \(\text{maliinaa}-\) ‘to observe curiously.INCH’ < \(\text{maalii}-\) ‘to surprise’
    \(\text{kerienaa}-\) ‘to fall down.INCH’ < \(\text{kerie}-\) ‘to fall down’
    \(\text{sisayajnaa}-\) ‘to tear.INCH’ < \(\text{sisayaj}-\) ‘to tear’

The epenthetic consonant /d/ is reserved for hiatus resolution at word boundaries, in compounds. The rule is thus slightly modified.

/l-/epenthesis rule: \(\emptyset \rightarrow d / V\#_\#V\)

(29a) \(\text{čama-d-od’e}
    \text{big-0-meat.juce}
    ‘meat of the tendon along the spinal chord’
    (Kurilov 2001:542, \(\text{čamadod’e}\))

(29b) \(\text{al’ya-d-eluoji-nube}
    \text{fish-0-carry-OP}
    ‘a sack for carrying fish’
    (Kurilov 1994:9)

(29c) \(\text{čajledenmunn} ‘every day’ < \text{čajle ‘day’ + enmunn ‘every’}

The epenthesis of /d/ has an extension not serving for hiatus resolution. Nevertheless it seems practical to present it here since it takes place in a very similar context. Insertion of /d/ between two members of a nominal compound takes place whenever the second

\(^79\) During passivization both rules can be applied: \(\text{ögetuol-ögetejuol-} ‘to be installed’ < \text{ögete-} ‘to install’

\(^80\) The feature [-consonantal] implies that there is no major restriction in the oral cavity (Odden 2005:139) and groups together, as far as it is relevant for TY, vowels and glides, or approximants in phonetic terms.
member of the resulting compound begins with a vowel, so the rule must be reformulated as follows: \( \emptyset \rightarrow d / ^{#_#}V \)

(30a) \( N^{id}erpe-j-d-enu \)
be.new-PTCP-0-river
‘River Malaya Kuropatochya’ (literally “New River”)

(30b) \( sukud ayil \)
\( sukun-n-d ayil \)
dress-GEN-0 edge
‘the edge of a/the dress’

The epenthetic /d/ very often occurs in the context of possessive constructions as in (30b) and ousts the genitive case ending, which is additionally exemplified in (33a-d). As was observed already by Krejnovič (1958:63), the genitive case ending itself ousts the word-final sonorant:

(31) \( saan nime \)
\( saal-n nime \)
wood-GEN house
‘wooden house’

For this reason Krejnovič (1958:64) assumed two allomorphs of the genitive case ending: -n in preconsonantal and -d in prevocalic context. However, /d/ must be epenthetic in all circumstances since it can co-occur with /n/ in genitival expressions:

(32) \( \check{c}awundawur ‘quiver’ < \check{c}awur ‘arrow’ + -n ‘GEN’ + -d ‘0’ + awur ‘container’ \)
\( juondew\check{c}e ‘crown’ < juo ‘head’ + -n ‘GEN’ + -d ‘0’ + ew\check{c}e ‘top’ \)

Ousting of the genitive case ending by the epenthetic /d/ creates surface structures which suggest a resolved hiatus (see (33a-d)) and cannot be discerned from genuine hiatuses as in (29a and 29b) but are secondary, resulting from the morphophonemic rule applicable in certain grammatical contexts: [+sonorant, +consonantal] \( \rightarrow \emptyset / _d \)

(33a) \( wadul / erpejed / waawe\check{c}ed \)
\( wadul-n-d / erpeje-n-d / waawe\check{c}e-n-d \)
aruu-lek
Yukaghir-GEN-0 / Even-GEN-0 / Russian-GEN-0 language-INS
‘in Tundra Yukaghir / Even / Russian language’

(33b) \( jaly\check{d}ayil ‘shore of a lake’ < jalgil ‘lake’ + -n ‘GEN’ + -d ‘0’ + ayil ‘shore’ \)

(33c) \( \check{c}umudörd’e ‘the middle part of a hill’ < \check{c}umur ‘hill’ + -n ‘GEN’ + -d ‘0’ + örd’e ‘middle’ \)

(33d) \( joqodile ‘horse < joqol ‘Yakut’ + -n ‘GEN’ + -d ‘0’ + ile ‘reindeer’ \)

This extension of the /d/-epenthesis rule is optional because some speakers find the following expressions equally felicitous:
Similar examples can be found in the secondary literature on TY:

(35a) *qangajipun ed’ilek*

\[\text{qangaji-pul-n} \quad \text{ed’il-ek}\]

Khangay-PL-GEN life-COP

‘[it is] the life of Khangays’  (Kreinović 1958: 64)

(35b) *Tuŋ ilen emmur me čamuon’.*

\[\text{tuŋ} \quad \text{ile-n} \quad \text{emmur} \quad \text{me=čama-ŋol-j}\]

ADL DEM reindeer-GEN antlers PF=big-be-INTR.3SG

‘This reindeer’s antlers are big.’  (Kurilov 2006:124)

In Kurilov (2006) the following triplet involving the word *čumur* ‘hill’ functioning as the dependent member of the compound is encountered:

(36a) *čumud örd’e* ‘the middle part of a hill’
(36b) *čumun ussuu* ‘abrupt lowering of a long hill’
(36c) *čumundewče* ‘the crest of a hill’

It is not clear what determines these idiosyncratic patterns while the functional and phonological context are very similar, if not identical.

2.3.2. Prevention of illicit consonant clusters

Prevention of illicit consonant clusters is always realized by vocalic epenthesis. The main locus for the epenthesis is the right edge area of a word, between the stem and the inflectional suffixes. The three epenthetic vowels are listed here in the order of decreasing frequency: /u/, /i/ and /e/. Nikolaeva (2002:9) observes that /i/ is used mainly after palatals while /e/ shows very specific distribution, e.g. in front of the focus marker –k or after verb bases ending in /l/ (except those ending with the non-visual suffix –l’el):

(37a) *med’im* ‘[s/he] took’ < *men* ‘to take’ + -m ‘TR.3SG’

\[\text{ed’il ‘life’ < en’- ‘to exist’ + -l ‘GER’}\]

\[\text{pun’imk ‘[you] killed’ < pun’- ‘to kill’ + -mk ‘TR.2PL’}\]

\[\text{kuril’ičiŋ ‘[I] asked’ < kuril’ič- ‘to ask’ + -ŋ ‘1SG.TR’}\]

\[\text{mörwolel ‘being recognized’ < mörwoł- ‘to be recognized’ + -l ‘GER’}\]

\[\text{pojwolel ‘being numerous’ < pojwoł- ‘to be numerous’ + -l ‘GER’}\]

\[\text{jalaklaľel ‘being four’ < jalaklaľ- ‘to be four’ + -el ‘GER’}\]

\[\text{ikl’alel ‘being hard’ < ikl’al- ‘to be hard’ + -l ‘GER’}\]

\[\text{pojwolel ‘in great number’ < pojwoł- ‘to be numerous’ + -r ‘CIRC’}\]

\[\text{mitin ‘1PL.DAT’ < mit ‘1PL’ + -n’ ‘DAT’}\]

\[\text{mitek ‘who’ < mit ‘1PL’ + -k ‘SF’}\]

The epenthetic /u/ is employed in other contexts:
With the exception of the permitted consonant clusters (see 2.2.2) the rule for preventing them can be formulated as follows: $\emptyset \rightarrow V / \_ CC$

### 2.3.3 Onset-coda alternation of voiced obstruents

Maslova (2003c:4) and Nikolaeva\(^{81}\) (2006:47) describe an important alternation, which takes root in the positional restriction on voiced obstruents disallowing these in the coda. There are several series of consonants alternating in the onset (also across word boundaries) vs. coda position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Onset</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>/m/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mobil’e-</em> ‘to crumple’</td>
<td><em>momdil’e-</em> ‘to crumple’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>/n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qadilwe-</em> ‘to cool down’</td>
<td>*qand’e ‘cold’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*köde ‘person’</td>
<td>*könpe ‘persons’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/d’/</td>
<td>/n’/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sukid’ewrej ‘roaming’</td>
<td>*sukin’ ‘wilderness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pandid’i-</em> ‘to cook’</td>
<td>*pandintejli(^{82}) ‘[we] will cook’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>/w/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*legul ‘food’</td>
<td>*lewde- ‘to eat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/γ/</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*qoγi- ‘to dig’</td>
<td>*qoŋne- ‘to be hollow’, ‘to have a dent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/γ’/</td>
<td>/w/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*čayum/čoγum ‘[s/he] cut off’</td>
<td>*el=čaw ‘[s/he] did not cut off’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{81}\) Nikolaeva (2006:47) lists also the alternation /r/ ~ /n/ as the TY correspondence of the KY alternation /ʒ/ ~ /n/, e.g. *mőri- ‘to hear’ ~ *mõnd’e- ‘to be capable of hearing’ It is clear that the TY pair is not a comparable alternation. Since /r/ is allowed in the coda, ‘exceptions’ exist, e.g. *mõrd’e ‘news’.

\(^{82}\) The underlying /n’/ is realized as /n/ here because the rule of assimilative depalatalization (see below) applies after the alternation.
2.3.4 Voicing

Word-initial voiceless obstruents usually undergo voicing when they follow words or clitics ending in a vowel or sonorant.

(39)  köde dite ‘like a man’ < köde tite
      el=bun’ mey [I / you] did not kill.OF’ < el=pun’ mey (Krejnović 1958: 140)
      keluje d’ii ‘people that have come’ < keluje čii (Kurilov 2005:126)
      el=d’aŋut < el=čaŋut ‘not quite well’ (Kurilov 2001:586, edie-)
      čuondoliigi ‘[his] iron staff’ < čuon + toliigi
      tuŋ gólle ‘this man’ < tuŋ + kólle
      taŋ d’iiŋin’ ‘to those people’ < taŋ čiŋin’ (Kurilov 2001:264, mòrdie-)

However, this voicing, except in compounds, is optional:

(40)  n’oril’ tite ‘like a pool’
      el=čuŋd’e ‘not reading’
      mer=ičuom punnų įudayane ‘[he] saw how the were killing’ (Kurilov 2005:126)

2.3.5 Devoicing

The attachment of a suffix to a base ending with a segment with the feature [-voiced] is accompanied by devoicing of the onset consonant of the suffix.

Devoicing rule: voiced obstruent → voiceless obstruent / voiceless obstruent + _

(41a)  jalþil-γa ‘lake-LOC’, enu-γa ‘river-LOC’ vs. met-qa ‘1SG-LOC’, tet-qa ‘2SG-LOC’

(41b)  aduo-gi ‘son-PERT’ vs. čajnik-ki ‘tea.pot(Russ)-PERT’

(41c)  nime-die ‘house-DIM’ vs. al’γap-tie ‘fish.PL-DIM’

(41d)  mon-relek ‘say-ANT’ vs. keris-telek ‘take.off-ANT’
       aŋuol-renoŋ ‘stand-SIM’ VS. siiges-teŋ ‘drip.CAUS-SIM’

Devoicing in (41d) requires some explanation. /t/ would normally be considered the devoiced counterpart of /d/, and not of /t/. There are allomorphs of the converb suffixes with initial /d/: -delek ‘ANT’ and –deŋ ‘SIM’. However, these allomorphs probably cannot be the underlying forms, to which the rule of devoicing could be applied. The reason for this conclusion is the fact that the allomorph triads –rX ~ -dX ~ -tX exist only in converbs where there is some material X after the first segment of a converb suffix. If the suffix is just –r, which is the case in the circumstantial converb, the ending is invariant. The potential illicit consonant cluster is resolved in circumstantial converbs by means of an epenthetic vowel, e.g. mon-ur ‘say-CIRC’. To my mind, the converbal suffixes -renoŋ ‘SIM’, -relek ‘ANT’, -r ‘CIRC’ are ontologically related. It would be illogical, therefore, to
posit the allomorph with /d/ as underlying if it does not occur in circumstantial converbs: -deŋ ‘SIM’, -delek ‘ANT’, -url*/-(u)d ‘CIRC’.

Since /d/-allomorphs of converbs cannot be the targets for the devoicing rule, it has to be concluded that the alternation is /r/ > /t/. The result of devoicing in converb suffixes is not random; /r/ shares with /d/ the place of articulation, so the most natural devoicing of /r/ would result in /t/, in which the devoicing of /d/ would too. This rather unusual devoicing could be triggered by the phonological constraint prohibiting the sequence /sr/. Of course, one could object against this reasoning by asking why TY speakers don’t resort to vocalic epenthesis and say something like n’aačesurelek ‘having sharpened’ instead? Or yet better, why don’t they simply use the vocalized allomorph of the causative suffix: -se? In an attempt to counter this objection one may postulate a hierarchy of constraints whereby vowel epenthesis or vocalized allomorphs of alternating suffixes would be employed only to resolve potential illicit consonant clusters (see 2.2.2) as in monur/*monr ‘say.CIRC’. The handling of adjacency restrictions such as */sr/ would be dependent on this higher constraint. Since in n’aačestelek ‘having sharpened’ no illicit consonant clusters arise, epenthesis or vocalized causative allomorph, which would prevent /s/ and /r/ from coming together, cannot be employed. Another strategy has to be found to prevent /sr/. It is not possible to delete either of the segments since they are the crucial elements of the morphemes involved, so one of them undergoes a mutation which appears least arbitrary.

2.4 Morphophonemic alternations

The following overview makes no claim to be exhaustive. Morphophonemic alternations are held apart from the phonological ones because their application in an environment phonologically definable in terms of natural classes based on (sets) of phonological features is restricted by parts of speech, by the morpho-syntactic context or lexically. Alternations non-definable phonologically are morphophonemic per definition.

2.4.1 Vowels

Diphthongization:

During suffixation the base-final /e/ can be diphthongized to /ie/ if the base is harmonically non-back:

(42) nimien’ ‘house.DAT’ < nime + -n’
lewdnienu ‘eat.DUR’ < lewde- + -nu
edienun- ‘to burn.HAB’ < edu- + -nun
čugirienu- ‘to whistle.DUR’ < čugire- + -nu

Some examples of non appliance of this rule is the attachment of the verbalizing comitative suffix –n’(e) and the causative suffix –s(e):

(43) nimen’e- ‘to have a house’ < nime + -n’e
aawes- ‘sleep.CAUS’ < aawe- + -s
The vowel of the copular verb *gol-* serving as the passive suffix is diphthongized to /uo/:

(44) \( qajruol\) ‘to be bent’ < \( *qajr\) + *gol- ‘to be’

De-diphthongization:

In rare, probably, lexically determined cases, the root diphthong can undergo a simplification during suffixation. In the following example de-diphthongization is triggered by the attachment of the inchoative suffix.

(45) \( egurie\) ‘to walk.INCH’ < \( eguore\) ‘to tread (upon) smth.’

Vowel lengthening:

In the event of the attachment of a number of aspectual suffixes the base-final vowel /u/ is lengthened if the base is harmonically front whereas the vowels /o/ and /e/ are lengthened to /oo/ and /aa/ respectively if the base is harmonically back:

(46) \( keluunuj\) ‘to come.DUR.INTR.3SG’ < \( keluj\- + -nu\)
    \( sayanaamu\) ‘to sit.DUR’ < \( sayane\- + -nu\)
    \( tonaanu\) ‘to drive.DUR’ < \( tono\- + -nu\)
    \( jaqtaanun\) ‘to sing.HAB’ < \( jaqte\- + -nu\)

The vowel /i/ generally remains unaffected during this kind of suffixation:

(47) \( čuginu\) ‘to make a sound to prompt a child to urinate’ < \( čugi\- + -nu\)
    \( tadinu\) ‘to give.DUR’ < \( tadi\- + -nu\)
    \( wančinun\) ‘to search.HAB’ < \( wanči\- + -nun\)
    \( mörinun\) ‘to hear.HAB’ < \( mőri\- + -nun\)
    \( kečil’el\) ‘to bring.NVIS’ < \( keči\- + -l’el\)
    \( kečinun\) ‘to bring.HAB’ < \( keči\- + -nun\)

Diphthongization and lengthening of the base-final vowel in verbs is triggered by the same set of suffixes. Apart from the durative aspect suffix and the related habitual aspect suffix –nun, the suffixes expressing the following grammemes cause these alternations: the itive –će, the diminutive –čii, the non-visual –l’el, the commiserative –ködi:

(48) \( jaqtaače\) ‘to sing.ITV’ < \( jaqte\- + -će\)
    \( kuderieče\) ‘to put.ITV’ < \( kudere\- + -će\)
    \( sayanaačii\) ‘to sit down.DIM’ < \( sayane\- + -čii\)
    \( qočoraal’el\) ‘to howl.NVIS’ < \( qočore\- + -l’el\)
    \( aawaaködi\) ‘to sleep.CMSR’ < \( aawe\- ‘to sleep’

Apart from the above mentioned verbalizer –n’e and the causative –s(e), the attachment of the following suffixes does not lead to either diphthongization of lengthening of base-
final vowels in verbs: passive suffix –(j)uol, the inclinative suffix –buol, desiderative suffix –bun’, the augmentative suffix –tke, the transitivizer –ri, the future tense suffix -te:

(49)  ayal’wejuol- ‘to be laughed at’ < ayal’we- + -juol
      ayal’webuol- ‘to be risible’
      ayal’webun’- ‘to want to laugh’
      ayal’wetke- ‘to laugh vigorously’
      ayal’weri- ‘to deride’
      kuderete- ‘to put,FUT’

Vowel shortening:

Affixing can lead in verbs with the root structure CV:C to the shortening of the root vowel:

(50)  paaj- ‘to hit’ vs. pajdu- ‘to beat’ or turpaj- ‘to hit oneself’
      jooj- ‘to be ill’ vs. jojaa- ‘to fall ill’
      jaan ‘three’ vs. jaluol- ‘to be three’

An instance of vowel shortening accompanied by a quality change is the /uu/ ~ /i/ alternation. In qualitative verbs the stem-final /uu/ turns into /i/ when the inflectional ending is attached (see (63) for more examples):

(51)  mörč ‘[it] is audible’ < mörüu- + j
      qalč ‘[it] is frightful’ < qaluu- + j
      amalč ‘[it] is embarrassing/indecent’ < amaluu- + j

Vowel deletion:

Suffixation can in rare cases cause a deletion of the root-final vowel instead of its lengthening:

(52)  čonju- ‘to defend,DUR’ < čonju- + -nu

Long vowels and diphthongs can be deleted too:

(53)  qan’qaa- ‘to get cold’ < qad’u- ‘to be cold’ + -qaa ‘INCH’
      maaluod’ėŋ ‘[I] was surprised’ < maalii- ‘to surprise’ + yol-‘to be’
      maruoji- ‘to dress,ITR’ < maraa- + -uojii
      weludu- ‘to hang,ITR’ < welie- + -udu

Assimilation:

In verbal stems and nominalized oblique participles the /u/ of a suffix can exercise regressive assimilation upon the vowel of the preceding syllable, whereby the latter acquires a more back and, if applicable, high quality, accompanied by rounding:
(54)  

kurul’uol- ‘to be visible’ < kuril’ii- ‘to know’ + -uol < yol- ‘to be’

tojudu- ‘to chase. itr’ < tojore- + -du

al’yamalmu- ‘to become fewer’ < al’yamlal- + -mu

qomorojnube ‘season when plants become green’ < qomorej- ‘to become green’

The assimilation coming from –mu seems to be lexically determined since it does not occur always:

(55)  

werwemu- ‘to become strong’ < werwe- + -mu

pugočamu- ‘to become light’ < pugočal- ‘to be light’

The iterative suffix –ji assimilates the base-final /el/:

(56)  

aawiji- ‘to sleep. itr’ < aawe-
köjlji- ‘to break. itr’ < köjle-

Dissimilation:

The semelfactive suffix –j causes dissimilation of word-final /i/:

(57)  

nerej- ‘to bite. sem’ < neri- ‘to bite’

anγej- ‘to scrub off. sem’ < anγi- ‘to scrub off’

2.4.2 Consonants

2.4.2.1 /y/-related alternations

Some of the most frequent consonant alternations concern the approximant /y/. This is natural as it is the first segment of most of the personal endings of intransitive verbs as well as 1PL.TR and at the same time the consonant which is subject to the most number of adjacency restrictions. Therefore, when it attaches to verb bases ending in a sonorant or /j/, it must alternate in order that an illicit cluster is prevented. The most widespread strategy for this is coalescence of /y/ and the base-final consonant. The concrete rules differ:

[+sonorant, +consonantal] + /y/ → /d’/

(58)  

quduod’ey ‘[I] lie’ < quduol- ‘to lie’ + -jeγ ‘intr. 1SG’

mod’ek ‘you said’ < mon- ‘to say’ + -jek ‘intr. 2SG’

-bud’eli ‘we want’ < -bun ‘des’ + -jeli ‘intr. 1PL’

There are numerous exceptions from this rule, but they are in themselves quite regular and can be stated as a rule:

j → d’ / [+sonorant, +consonantal] _
(59)  \textit{el=bun’deŋ} ’[I] did not kill’ < \textit{el=pun’} - ‘NEG=to kill’ + \textit{-jəŋ} ‘INTR.1SG’  
\textit{köl’d emut} ‘you(PL) came’ < \textit{köl}- ‘to come’ + \textit{-jemut} ‘INTR.2PL’  
\textit{n’id’aŋajl’eld’e} ‘to complete.PTCP’ < \textit{n’id’aŋajl’el-} ‘to finish.NVIS’ + \textit{-je} ‘PTCP’  
\textit{eguonund’eli} ‘[we] get up’ < \textit{eguonun-} ‘to get up.HAB’ + \textit{-jeli} ‘INTR.1PL’  
\textit{n’amučend’e} ‘to be red.PTCP’ < \textit{n’amučen-} ‘to be red’ + \textit{-je} ‘PTCP’  

An exception from this rule is the combination of the non-visual mood suffix and the personal ending of 1PL.TR:

(60)  \textit{paajl’eluj} ‘[we] hit’ < \textit{paajl’el-} ‘to hit.NVIS’ + \textit{-j} ‘1PL.TR’

It has to be noted that in 3SG ending of intransitive verbs /j/ is in complementary distribution with /l/, which is attached to verb bases ending with /n/, /n’, /d’, /l/, /l/ or /č/:

(61)  \textit{moni} ‘[s/he] said’  
\textit{muoqan’i} ‘[it] has broad white fish’  
\textit{ed’i} ‘[it] exists’  
\textit{činičeri} ‘[it] gets dark’  
\textit{čaaqici} ‘[s/he] freezes constantly’

This /l/ is realized as /n’/ coalescing with the base-final /l/:

(62)  \textit{čuguon’} ‘[s/he] is quick’ < \textit{čuguol-} + \textit{-i}  
\textit{čuguoll’en’} ‘[s/he] is quick.NVIS’ < \textit{čuguoll’el-} + \textit{-i}

One may inquire into the motivation for this unusual alternation. A potential explanation can be formulated as follows. It can be observed that the realization of verb final /l/ as /n’/ in 3SG of intransitive verbs produces a pattern reminiscent of the onset-coda alternation of voiced obstruents (2.3.3). Compare the following pairs:

(63)  \textit{sukid’ewrej} ‘roaming’ ~ \textit{sukin’} ‘wilderness’  
\textit{pujuod’e} ‘to rejoice.PTCP’ ~ \textit{pujuon’} ‘[s/he] rejoiced’ < \textit{puuguol-} ‘to rejoice’

In the first pair, which is an instance of the onset-coda alternation of voiced obstruents, two segments alternate: /d’/ and /n’/. In the second pair the same two segments alternate\textsuperscript{83}. The apparent surface similarity with the onset-coda alternation of voiced obstruents could be taken to explain the alternation /l/ + /l/ → /n’, but it is not clear why this alternation should be restricted to this sequence of segments, disallowing pairs like \textit{mod’əŋ} ‘[I] said’ ~ *\textit{mon’} ‘[s/he] said’ etc.

Coalescence often leads to affrication: /l/ or /l/, or /uul/ + /l/ → /č/:

(64)  \textit{čaaqarečen’} ‘[I] froze’ < \textit{čaaqarej-} + \textit{-jəŋ}

\textsuperscript{83} This alternation is, of course, only on the surface. Underlyingly, the alternation is /l/ ~ /l/.
uučić ‘[s/he] passed’ $< $ uučić- + -j
sal’γareč ‘[we] broke’ $< $ sal’γarej- + j
suseč ‘[we] threw’ (Krejnovič 1958:139)
n’anič ‘[it] is sinful’ $< $ n’an’uu- + -j
čejlič ‘[it] is far’ $< $ čejluu- ‘to be far’ + -j
mörčič ‘[it] is audible’ $< $ möruu- ‘to be audible’ + -j

The stems ending in vowels as in (64) do not pose an adjacency restriction on the following /j/ as such constellations are attested, e.g. aawej ‘[s/he] slept’, ayal’wejčiij ‘[s/he] smiled slightly’.

Coalescence of a suffix-initial /j/ with the root final palatal approximant of a monosyllabic verb with a heavy nucleus results in a simplification of the sequence:

\[ j \rightarrow \emptyset / j+_\]

\[ (65) \]
\[ jooj-göde \ ‘sick person’ \ < \ jooj- ‘to be ill’ + -je ‘PTCP’ \]
\[ paaj ‘[we] hit’ < paaj- ‘to hit’ + -j 1PL.TR’ \]
\[ \text{but:} \quad pajič ‘[we] hit’ (Krejnovič 1958:75) \]

Sometimes there is no coalescence of two adjoining approximants; instead only the rule of affrication applies: \[ j \rightarrow ĉ / [+\text{sonorant}, -\text{consonantal}] + _ \]

\[ (66a) \]
\[ jarajč ‘it lasts annoyingly long’ < jaraj- ‘to last for a very long time’ + -j \]

\[ (66b) \]
\[ jarawč ‘it lasts annoyingly long’ < jaraw- ‘to last for a very long time’ + -j \]

Alternatively, /w/ alternates additionally with /j/:

\[ (66c) \]
\[ l’arajč ‘it lasts annoyingly long’ < l’araw- + -j \]
\[ qodejč ‘[it] is unpleasant’ < qodew- + -j \]

In individual verbs the affrication is not motivated by anything synchronically:

\[ (67) \]
\[ pugeč ‘[it] is hot’ < puge- + -j \]

2.4.2.2 Other alternations

Deletion:

\[ [+\text{sonorant}, +\text{consonantal}] \rightarrow \emptyset / [+\text{sonorant}, +\text{consonantal}] + _ \]

This alternation is typical for the /l/-initial nominal suffixes and the aspectual suffixes beginning with /n/.

\[ (68) \]
\[ sukune ‘thing.ACC’ < sukun + -le \]
\[ amunenj ‘bone.FOC’ < amun + -lenj \]
There are lexically determined exceptions such as *leguolnu-* `<*leguol-* `to be killed', *ed’uolnu-* `<*ed’uol- `to be fearful'. Sometimes the /n/ of an aspectual marker is reinstated in a derive form of a verb, e.g. *puŋuoluččii* - `to rejoice.DUR.DIM'.

The direction of this process is reverse when the attached morpheme is the genitive case ending as in (31) and (33b-d). The rule is therefore as follows:

\+[sonorant, +consonantal] → Ø / _+\+[sonorant, +consonantal]

(69) lewejmeney `<lewejl + -mej `ADV' `in summer'

but not in: *čiŋičelmeney* `<čiŋičel `night' + -mej `ADV'

jaloumū- `<jaloul- `to be three' + -mu `INCH'

čiŋičer- `<čiŋičel `darkness' + -r `VBLZ'

ŋorii- `<ŋol- `to be' + -rii `CAUS'

ančjeļmeney `<ančjeļ `anxiety' + -nej `ADV'

This latter rule is also active at word boundaries, thus:

\+[sonorant, +consonantal] → Ø / _\+[sonorant, +consonantal]

(70) saa laŋudey `<saal `wood' + laŋudey `toward'

Neither of these rules applies when the non-visual mood suffix is attached:

(71) l’ukuoll’en `<l’ukuol- + -l’el `as it seems, [s/he] was small'

Stem final /l/ is also ousted by certain verbal suffixes:

(72) puŋuosey `[I] gladdened’ `<puŋuol- `to rejoice' + -se `CAUS'

n’umuos- `<n’umuol- `to suffer' + -s `CAUS'

el=ą’uot `[s/he] won’t survive’ `<ąyol- `to stand' + -t `FUT'

 jaluoččii- `<jaloul- `to be three' + -ččii `DIM'

The velar nasal of the copular verb *ŋol-* is deleted when the verb serves as the passive voice marker:

(73) tadijuol- `<tadi- `to give' + ŋol- `to be'
Assimilation:

\[ n \rightarrow l / _{+\text{lateral}} \]

(74) \( t\)aqull\(e\)k ‘thereby’ \( < \) ta\(j\)un ‘INVS.DEM’ \( + \)lek ‘INS’
\( o\)niejull\(el\)- ‘to wear.HAB.NVIS’ \( < \) oni\(e\)nun- \( + \)\(-l\)el
\( m\)oll’\(-l\)- ‘to say.NVIS’ \( < \) mon- \( < \)\(-l\)el
\( i\)lell’ebul ‘reindeer pasture’ \( < \) ile‘n ‘reindeer.GEN’ \( + \)l’e- ‘to be’

Some speakers in whom the assimilation of /n/ in this context is observed, allow the form
\( m\)onl’en ‘[s/he] said.NVIS’, therefore this is a morpho-phonemic rule.

\[ n’ \rightarrow n / _{\text{non-palatal (depalatalization)}} \]

(75) en\(n\)uj ‘[s/he] lives.DUR’ \( < \) en’- \( + \)nu
pandin\(n\)ur ‘to cook.DUR.CIRC’ \( < \) pandin’- \( + \)nu
nimelen\(n\)nu- < (*nimelen’\(n\)u-) ‘to write.DUR’ \( \sim \) nimeled’i- ‘to write’
mente\(y\)anek ‘hold!’ \( < \) men’- ‘to hold’ \( + \)te\(y\)anek ‘FUT.IMP’
punde\(l\)ek ‘to kill.ANT’ \( < \) pun’- ‘to kill’ \( + \)de\(l\)ek < -relek ‘ANT’
pandin\(k\) ‘to cook.IMP.SG’ \( < \) pandin’- ‘to cook’ \( + \)\(-k \)IMP.SG’

Exceptions from this rule in the same phonological context are so frequent that it should
be considered a partly (the rule seems to be consistent for /n/ as a trigger) variable one:

(76) pu\(n\)’temek ‘[you] will kill’ \( < \) pu\(n\’- ‘to kill’ \( + \)\(-te \)FUT’ (Kurilov 2001:398, pu\(n\’-)
pu\(n\’)de\(l\)ek ‘to kill.ANT’ \( < \) pu\(n\’- \( + \)de\(l\)ek < -relek ‘ANT’
me\(n\’)de\(l\)ek ‘to take.ANT’ \( < \) me\(n\’- ‘to take’ \( + \)de\(l\)ek < -relek ‘ANT’
me\(n\’)te\(j\) ‘[we] will take’ \( < \) me\(n\’- \( + \)\(-te \)FUT’ (Kurilov 2001:275, me\(n\’-)
me\(n\’)k ‘to take.IMP.SG’ \( < \) me\(n\’- \( + \)\(-k \)IMP.SG’

There are also non-palatal sounds which regularly fail to trigger this alternation, e.g. en’\(\gamma\)i ‘they live’ \( < \) en’- ‘to be alive’ \( + \)\(-\gamma\)i ‘3PL.INTR’.

Finally, a very common process is a sonorization of the initial /s/ of the second member
of a nominal compound is observed when the first member of the compound ends in a
vowel or a sonorant: \( s \rightarrow r / [+\text{sonorant}]/_# \#

(77) end’erukun ‘a living entity’ \( < \) end’e ‘living’ \( + \)sukun ‘thing’
ann’ejrukun ‘a speaking entity’ \( < \) ann’ej ‘speaking’ \( + \)sukun ‘thing’
n’oronruske ‘pool’ \( < \) n’oron ‘hill.GEN’ \( + \)suske ‘cup’

Dissimilation:

\[ r \rightarrow d / [+\text{sonorant}, -\text{syllabic}]+_\text{#} \text{(restricted to converses)} \]

(78) mon\(d\)ele\(k\) ‘say.ANT’ \( < \) mon- \( + \)relek
The velar nasal does not trigger this alternation, e.g. čugrelek ‘to read.ANT’.
Approximants are ambivalent triggers:

(79) tolejdenj ‘support.SML.SIM’ vs. moojrey ‘hold.SIM’

This rule does not apply for –r, the suffix of the circumstantial converb, which is separated from the verb root by an epenthetic consonant, e.g. monur ‘say.CIRC’.

n’ → n / _ palatal (depalatalization)^84:

(80) pandinl’en’ ‘[s/he] cooked.NVIS’ < pandin’- + -l’el (Kurilov 2001:366, pandin’-)
menl’elga ‘[they] took.NVIS.’ < men’- + -l’el (Kurilov 2005:126)
punl’elga ‘[they] killed.NVIS’ < pun’- + -l’el (Kurilov 2005:126)
ilenbund’e ‘reindeer slaughter’ < ile + -n ‘GEN’ + pun’- ‘to kill’ + -d’e ‘NMLZ’
l’erkejend’e ‘shamanic praying’ < l’erkejen’- ‘to engage in shamanic praying’ + -d’e ‘NMLZ’
menče- ‘to fetch’ < men’- ‘to take’ + -če ‘ITV’

l → j / _ l (in emphatic forms of personal pronouns)

(81) tudejlede ‘s/he.EMPH’ < tudel + -lede
tittejlek ‘they.EMPH’ < titel + -lek

n’ → j / _ n (characteristic of manner adverbs)

(82) maaruojney ‘happily’ < maaruon’ ‘[s/he] is happy’ + -ney ‘ADV’
poujojnen ‘much’ < pojuon’ + -ney
čuguojney ‘quickly’ < čuguon’ + -ney

2.5 Rule ordering

Some alternations are in a sequential relation with some other alternations. The passive suffix –(j)uol derives from the copular verb ŋol-. This entails that before the epenthesis rule for hiatus resolution during passivization applies, a deletion of the velar nasal and diphthongization of /o/ take place.

For the obvious reason of the linear order of the segments, ousting of the genitive case in the event of /d/-epenthesis as in (33a-d) takes place after the genitive case ending ousts the word-final sonorant if there is one.

^84 The forms resulting from the contact with the following /l/ are in contrast with what Maslova (2003c:4) reports. According to her, the resulting stems should be mell’el- and pull’el-, which reflects a completely different rule. In my corpus there is only one isolated instance of an elicited verb form displaying the kind of assimilation Maslova (2003c:4) describes.
Depalatalization, assimilative and dissimilative alike, follows other processes, such as the dissimilative desonorization (83a), a /j/ alternation (83b) or the onset-coda alternation of voiced obstruents (83c):

(83a)  *pundelek ‘to kill’ < *pun’delek < pun’- ‘to kill’ + -relek ‘ANT’
(83b)  *n’amučend’e ‘to be red’ < *n’amučen’d’e ‘to be red’ + -je ‘PTCP’
(83c)  *nimelen’nu- > nimelennu- ‘to write’
      *nimelendi- ‘to write’ vs. *nimelendi- ‘to write’
      pandi- ‘to cook’ vs. *pandin’tejli > pandintejli ‘[we] will cook’

The onset-coda alternation follows vowel deletion:

(84)  *qan’qa- ‘to get cold’ vs. qad’uu- ‘to be cold’

2.6 Suprasegmentals

2.6.1 Stress

TY has non-phonemic free stress, that is, stress is not fixed on one syllable for each word, and there are no minimal word pairs on the basis of stress position. In languages with lexical word stress, stressed syllables are perceived as more prominent than their surrounding syllables and can be described in terms of phonetic correlates such as pitch, vowel quality, length and intensity. However, for TY no such regularities have been experimentally verified yet, which is reflected in the diverging conclusions scholars have drawn while studying this issue, as is presented below.

Krejnovič (1968:437) is very brief, stating that stress is free in TY and can lie on the first or second syllable. Krejnovič (1982:19) modifies his view by saying that any syllable can be stressed and adds that inflectional suffixes attract stress.

Kurilov (2006:38) reports what the previous scholars had said and expresses preference for Jochelson’s (1905) views\(^\text{85}\).

Nikolaeva (2002:11) provides a concise description of stress assignment rules for TY. She establishes the following stress attracting hierarchy: rightmost V\(_1\)V\(_2\)/V: > rightmost CVC > rightmost CEC\(^\text{86}\) > rightmost open syllable. An important stipulation is that syllable with the structure CE cannot bear stress.

Odé (personal communication) reports that speakers of TY have different opinions regarding the existence of lexical stress and its assignment rules. A detailed experimental-phonetic study of stress (Odé, in preparation) is necessary to ascertain the regularities in its application.

---

\(^{85}\) It needs to be said that Jochelson’s (1905: 374:375) observations pertain to the stress pattern in KY, the closest relative of TY. They need not coincide with those of TY and therefore are not reported here.

\(^{86}\) Nikolaeva (2002:4) postulates a reduction of short non-high vowels in the syllables following the first bimoraic foot in non-compounding words, which leads to the loss of opposition between such vowels. ‘E’ is the label for this reduced vowel whereas ‘V’ stands for any vowel but ‘E’.
2.6.2 Intonation

Two basic intonation patterns are presented here: interrogative polarity questions and declaratives under verb and argument focus.

The intonation of a polarity question, whether positive or negative, is realized with a salient pitch rise in the penultimate syllable of the predicate, followed by a half fall in the last syllable:

(85) \textit{Me \text{\`o}ri\c{c}?}
\[ \text{me=m\text{o}ruu-j} \]
\[ \text{PF=be.audible-INTR.3SG} \]
‘Is [it] audible?’

Figure 1. Oscillogram and Fundamental Frequency contour of the question \textit{Me \text{\`o}ri\c{c}} pronounced by a native male speaker. The typical TY polarity intonation can be observed: a rise in \text{\`o}ri\c{c}- followed by a half fall.

(86) \textit{Lasu el=\text{\`a}yad’e?}
\[ \text{Lasu NEG=work.[3SG.ITERG]} \]
‘Didn’t Lasu work?’
The intonation of a declarative sentence with focus on the predicate is realized with low pitch in the penultimate syllable of the verb. The pitch movement is not as significant as in polarity questions:

(87) \textit{Lasu el=čayad’e.}
Lasu NEG=work.[3SG]
‘Lasu didn’t work’
Polarity questions and declarative clauses under verb focus differ formally only in their intonation pattern.

Intonation patterns in TY clauses with focalized arguments and focalized peripheral constituents have been elucidated in Odé (2011) as well as in Matić and Odé (forthcoming). The main finding is that the focalized constituent is marked morphologically as well as by a prominent falling pitch followed by low level pitch.

2.7 Orthography

The orthography for TY was developed by native speaker and linguist Kurilov (1987) on the basis of the Russian Cyrillic alphabet, with the addition of some letters from the official Yakut alphabet for those sounds that are missing in Russian. The relatively late arrival of an orthography for TY is partly responsible for its inconsistent use by different speakers, who are nevertheless rather proficient in writing. One of the major inconsistencies concerns phoneme /a/, which is realized in certain environments as a more central vowel. Some speakers prefer then to use grapheme <a> while some other favor <e>. Sometimes one and the same speaker makes alternative choices. Another divergence, probably reflecting individual pronunciation, is e.g. the non-phonological lengthening of vowels as mentioned in 2.1.

On several occasions, Kurilov noted at least one of the potential inadequacies of the orthography devised by him. In his view, rendering voiced bilabial approximant /w/ by Cyrillic <в> promotes the wrong pronunciation of this phoneme as the voiced labiodental fricative since this is the way this grapheme is pronounced in Russian, the language of the Yukaghir youth. The identical grapheme for /ö/ in TY in Yakut, namely <ө>, may have influenced the acquisition of this sound as a more closed and fronted vowel, characteristic for Yakut, in the speech of some TY speakers, especially those who communicate primarily in Yakut (Odé 2012:35, 37).

Despite potential shortcomings of the existing orthography, it was decided to apply it systematically in the present thesis, which meant editing of the original spelling of the primary data in many cases. This was done for several reasons. First of all, it makes examples with diverging original orthography comparable for the reader. It was important to standardize the orthography of the primary data also for theoretical reasons. For instance, in one of the primary sources the scribe applied a spelling system that led to the blurring of the boundaries between phonemes /n/ and /n'/. Standardization of the spelling is essential if compiling a normative learner’s grammar for TY in the future, to which this thesis may contribute. Another important consideration for standardization is the existence of the largest to date Yukaghir-Russian dictionary (Kurilov 1990, 2001) written in the officially acknowledged orthography of Kurilov. It goes without saying that that dictionary will form the lexical basis for TY speakers and acquirers for decades to come. How the Cyrillic orthography of TY is transliterated in this thesis is explained in 1.8.
3. Morphology

3.1 Basic morphological profile of TY

3.1.1 Typological characteristics of TY morphology

By the criteria established in e.g. Comrie (1981:40), TY is to a considerable degree an agglutinating language. The concatenations of morphemes, impossible or rare in isolating languages, are not only frequent in TY but can correspond to whole phrases or even clauses. 

(88a) nime-pe-da-γa
     house-PL-PERT-LOC
     ‘in their house’

(88b) kewej’elŋudaγa
     kewej-l’el-ŋu-l-daγa
     leave-NVIS-PL-GER-3.DS
     ‘after they have apparently gone’

The segmentability of TY words, i.e. the identification of morpheme boundaries, is relatively easy in many cases. Apart from that, an individual morpheme usually has ‘a reasonably invariant shape’ (Comrie 1989:40), or, put in Greenberg’s (1960:185) terms, is predominantly ‘automatic’. Despite this, TY is hardly a ‘prototypical’ agglutinating language for several reasons, which are presented in the following.

Starting with the criterion of invariance, if one compares (88a) and (88c), it becomes obvious that there are morphemes in TY which are not automatic.

(88c) nime-pe-gi
     house-PL-PERT
     ‘their house’

The pertensive suffix has two allomorphs: -gi and –da. Whichever of these alternants is postulated to be the base form, the respectively other one cannot be derived from it by phonological rules. Its phonetic shape is totally unpredictable. There are, thus, instances of violation of the ‘one meaning one form’ principle in TY. There are further instances of employment of different formatives to encode the same meaning: two nominal focus markers –leŋ and –(e)k, two dative endings –n’ and –ŋin’, seven suffixes (Kurilov 2001:166) expressing iteration. Sometimes the allomorphs themselves are rather similar

---

87 To be more precise, the number of morphemes per word is a value of another parameter, whose extremes are isolation and polysynthesis, as opposed to the parameter of morpheme segmentability, or the degree of fusion (Comrie 1981:43). Note the terminological difference concerning the use of the label ‘polysynthetic’. In FGD (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008:301) it stands for the possibility of combining lexical morphemes in one word, for which the term ‘incorporation’ is reserved by Comrie (1981:42). Thus TY is moderately polysynthetic in terms of Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008:301) and moderately incorporating according to Comrie (1981:42) as it allows compounding.

88 This term is borrowed from Aikhenvald (2013:7). It implies being possessed.
but the precise relation between them unveils the non-automatic status of the morpheme they constitute. For instance, some converb endings are represented by triads of the type \(-rX/-dX/-tX\). The base form is taken to be that with the trill. The second of the allomorphs is employed when the verb stem ends with a sonorant (see (78)). While the third alternant can be seen as derived from the first one by the rule of devoicing (see 2.3.5), the rule \(r \rightarrow d / \text{sonorant}+_+\) yielding the second alternant is not phonological, but morphophonemic. In some other grammatical contexts, e.g. (88b) or (30b), (31) and (33a-d) in 2.3.1, the resulting combination sonorant + /d/ is prevented. Since variation between the three morphs is not fully automatic, neither is the morpheme as a whole. Therefore, in calculating the index of agglutination proposed by Greenberg (1960:185), which is the ratio of agglutinative junctures to morpheme junctures, the juncture between verbal stems and converb endings of this type would not count as agglutinative and would diminish the ratio, making TY a relatively less agglutinating language.

Morphophonemic alternations are generally frequent at morpheme boundaries in TY and can affect lexical morphemes, i.e. roots, too. Some of these alternations are relatively sophisticated:

\[(89a)\] n’aarčitnεnε ‘badly’ \(<\) n’aarčiun-j-neq
be.bad-INTR.3SG-ADV
‘[it] is bad’
(derivational analysis from Kreinovič 1958: 202)

\[(89b)\] med’uol- ‘to be born’ \(<\) men’- ‘to take + ηol- ‘to be’

\[(89c)\] saγaα- ‘to disappear’ \(>\) saγuse- ‘to lose’ vs. soŋ-dič- ‘to lose-ITR’

\[(89d)\] iletej- ‘to push.SEM-’ vs. ildič- ‘to push.ITER’

\[(89e)\] jaluol- ‘to be three’ vs. jaan ‘three’

Segmentability also can be problematic in TY. In some instances, albeit restricted to a few grammatical and morphophonemic contexts, TY violates also the principle ‘one form one meaning’, as coalescence of morphemes occurs in the language (see 2.4.2). An example of complete fusion is embodied in the surface ending \(-n’\) of intransitive verbs, which is the result of coalescence of the base final /l/ and the 3SG ending \(-i\), whereby the ending merges with the stem and cannot be segmented any longer, e.g. aγuon’ ‘[s/he] stands’ < aγuol- ‘to stand’ + -i ‘INTR.3SG’.

Apart from going against the principle ‘one form one meaning’ characteristic of strongly agglutinating languages, TY has a remarkable number of homophonous morphemes. For instance, the ending \(-m\) can be TR.3SG and 1SG.ITERG, the suffix \(-n’\) can

\[^{89}\] Agglutinative junctures are, as defined by Greenberg (1960:185), junctures between automatic morphemes.

\[^{90}\] This is, however, less diagnostic since morphological homonyms can be found even in languages that are used as prime examples of agglutinating languages in academic teaching and in linguistic literature. In Turkish, one of such favorites, some functionally different morphemes are represented by identical allomorphs in post-consonantal position: –I (accusative case ending or the pertensive suffix with the possessor in 3SG), -Im (the pertensive suffix indicating the possessor in 1SG or the present tense form of the
stand for dative and comitative, the suffix –n is the genitive and prolate case ending, the suffix -t is ablative case ending in nouns and one of the allomorphs of the future tense suffix. The high degree of syncretism in TY is also manifested in that such a homophonous morpheme can be both derivational and inflectional as e.g. the suffix –f, which can both encode INTR.3SG and derive verbs with semelfactive meaning. Some segmentable morphemes can combine to produce a grammatical meaning, which is not a mere sum of the meanings of the single morphemes involved. One of such combinations is the suffix –daya signaling switch-reference as in (88b), which is materially identical with the combination of the pertensive suffix and the locative case ending present in (88a). Another such combination is that of the non-visual suffix –l’el and the future tense suffix –te used to express conjectures about actions in the past.

A further fact that could be interpreted as an indication of TY not being a ‘prototypical’ agglutinating language are asymmetries in derivational properties. One of them is the missing nominalizer suffix -l in verbs whose bases end with /l/ (Kurilov 2006:103-105), which is obligatory in gerunds derived from other bases. Compare the following pairs of words in (90a) and (90b).

(90a) čamuol- ‘to be big’ ~ čamuol ‘size’, ‘big stature’
čuguol- ‘to be quick’ ~ čuguol ‘quickness’, ‘speed’
jaqteyol ‘to be sung’ ~ jaqteyol ‘being sung’
kijuol- ‘to be two’ ~ kijuol ‘two’
ikl’al- ‘to be hard/firm’ ~ ikl’al ‘firmness’

(90b) werwe- ‘to be strong’ ~ werwel ‘to be strong.GER’
aawe- ‘to sleep’ ~ aawel ‘sleeping’
ieruu- ‘to hunt’ ~ ieruul ‘hunt(ing)’
mon- ‘to say’ ~ monul ‘to say.GER’

This discrepancy is even more striking in the light of the following facts. Gerunds of intransitive action verbs (see 3.4.1.1) like aawe- ‘to sleep’ can express subject focus. Gerunds of qualitative verbs whose bases end with /l/ cannot. In order to express SF they do require suffixation of –l aided by vocalic epenthesis:

(90c) čamuol-el ‘to be big-GER.SF’
čuguol-el ‘to be quick-GER.SF’.

This means that there is no phonological restriction on the attachment of the suffix –l to stems ending in /l/. Nonetheless it is not attached during gerund derivation as in (90a). To assume a coalescence of two /l/ in (90a) is not reasonable (unless one poses an idiosyncratic morphophonemic alternation) because they co-occur in (90c), being separated from each other by en epenthetic /e/. If /l/ were in the underlying structure of the nouns in (90a), it would be expected to surface as it does in (90c). Therefore this is an instance of a genuine derivational asymmetry: stem conversion vs. suffixation.

verb imek ‘to be’ in 1SG), –In (the pertensive suffix indicating the possessor in 2SG or the genitive case ending), -Inlz (the pertensive of 2PL and the plural form of the imperative mood). This is not the full inventory of morphological homonymy in Turkish.
In the morphological word structure the following units can be identified: root, stem, derivational affixes, inflectional affixes. Lexemes of TY can be divided into basic, historically derived and synchronically derived. Basic lexemes cannot be shown to have an internal morpheme boundary. Synchronously derived lexemes clearly possess at least one internal morpheme boundary and at least two morphemes are easily identifiable and belong to the lexicon of TY. Historically derived lexemes are those which due to some morphological regularities can be assumed to have been derived in the past, but not all their formatives can be identified as parts of the lexicon at present. Thus, adverbs like orýi ‘almost’ or waaj ‘again/also’ are most probably basic. The adverb n’id’erpejney is clearly synchronically derived as it is easily parsed into the stem n’id’erpej ‘it is new’ and the derivational adverbial suffix –ney. On the other hand adverbs like iitney would have to be regarded as historically derived as the display the regularity of having the common derivational suffix of manner adverbs but the segment <iit> serving as the derivational base cannot be identified as a part of the present day TY lexicon.

3.1.2 Marking of relations

Refining Maslova’s (2003c:6) statement that ‘[i]n many respects, Tundra Yukaghir fits the … profile of head-final dependent marking language’, it can be stated that TY is to a considerable degree a head-marking language.

As far as the possessive construction is concerned, both types of marking are available: the pertensive suffix on the head (91a) and the genitive case ending on the dependent (91b):

(91a) mid’erpe-ju uraritče uo-gi
be.new-PTCP teacher child-PERT
‘the new teacher’s child’

(91b) tuo uo-n jaqte
ADL.PROX child-GEN song
‘the song of the child’  (Kurilov 2001:138, juönd’ad’uu)

The relationship between the head and a dependent in an NP can remain morphologically unmarked:

(91c) uraritče uo
teacher child
‘teacher’s child’

Since TY has a case system, it is obviously dependent-marking at the level of the clause:

(92) Ieruuče lalime-le me=köjle-s-um.
hunter sledge-ACC PF=break-CAUS-TR.3SG
‘The hunter broke the sledge.’
The distinctive morphological marking of the dependent will lack altogether if the object is a 3rd person while the subject is one of the interlocutors:

\[(93) \quad \text{Met lalime } m\text{e=köjie-s-uŋ.} \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
1\text{SG sledge[ACC]} & \text{PF=break-CAUS-1SG.TR} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I broke the sledge.’

However, head-marking in a clause is present not only inasmuch as person and number of the subject are indicated in the predicate but also the number of the core arguments are, as transitive and intransitive verbs have their own distinct inflectional paradigms.

3.1.3 Morphological processes

Suffixedation is absolutely predominant in TY. Suffixation in the verbal domain is illustrated in (94) and (95).

- inflectional suffixation:

\[(94) \quad a\text{yal’we- ‘to laugh} + -j ‘\text{INTR.3SG} > ay\text{al’wej ‘[s/he] laughed’} \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
akal’we + -aa ‘\text{INCH} > ayal’wa- ‘to burst out laughing’ \\
akal’we + -j ‘SEM’ > ayal’wej- ‘to smile’ \\
akal’we + -ji ‘\text{ITR} > ayal’wiji- ‘keep smiling’
\end{array}
\]

- derivational suffixation:

\[(95) \quad a\text{yal’we- + ri ‘\text{TRZ} > ayal’weri- ‘to mock’} \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
ayal’we + -s ‘\text{CAUS} > ayal’wes- ‘to make [smb.] laugh’ \\
ayal’we + -tki ‘\text{AUG} > ayal’weti- ‘to laugh loudly’
\end{array}
\]

Depending on whether one is inclined to see the respective formatives as prefixes or clitics, prefixation in TY is marginal to nonexistent. There are five items that occupy pre-radical positions in a word. These are the reciprocal \(n’i(ŋ)=\), the potential at=, the negative el=, the verbal focus marker me(r)= and the semi-productive reflexive tur=. If one applies the criterion of host faithfulness, the morphemes el=, me(r)=, n’i(ŋ)= and tur= should be considered clitics since they are compatible with different parts of speech. The marker of potential is a purely verbal morpheme and could be regarded as a prefix. This is, however, in conflict with its relative position in the preverbal slot, namely between the verbal focus marker and the negator, which are clearly clitics. Therefore, at= is regarded here as a clitic too\(^{91}\).

One formative in TY could be regarded as a circumfix: \(n’i(ŋ) … jil’ \sim jil\). It occurs exclusively in kin terms as exemplified in (96) and expresses plural.

\[(96) \quad n’i\text{yakaajil’ ‘brothers’ < n’i- ‘RECP’ + akaa ‘brother’ + -jil’ ‘PL’} \]

\(^{91}\) Apart from these five proclitics, there is the enclictic =dayi, which expresses assumption. Kurilov (2008:84) derives it from the independent invisible demonstrative toyi.
n’in’and’ijil ‘relatives addressing one another in the third person’ < n’andii- ‘to overcome oneself’

n’in’aaajgönmiijil’ ‘wives of brothers in relation to one another’ < n’aail ‘in-law’ + könme ‘partner’

Instances of root/stem modification\(^{92}\) can be found (see also (89a-e)):

(97) ökuol- ‘to have holes’ ~ ökte- ‘to pierce’
    lew- ‘to eat’ ~ lógie- ‘to eat.INCH’
    iire- ‘to tie’ ~ ikći ‘to tie.1TR’

In noun formation compounding is widespread:

(98) awunsaal ‘cradle’ < awur ‘container’ + -n ‘GEN’ + saal ‘wood’
    joyonduuul ‘grouch’ < joyo ‘anger’ + -n ‘GEN’ + tuul ‘contents’

Grammatical morphemes can be reduplicated without a difference of meaning in the resulting word as compared to non-reduplicated forms. Such alternative forms are especially frequent with causatives\(^{93}\):

(99a) wieses- ‘to make/let [smb.] do [smth.]’ < wie- ‘to do’ + -se ‘CAUS’ + -s ‘CAUS’
    wel’iises- ‘to make/let [smb.] lift [smth.]’ < wel’ii- ‘to lift’ + -se ‘CAUS’ + -s ‘CAUS’
    n’imieses- ‘to let extinguish’ < n’imie- ‘to go out’ + -se ‘CAUS’ + -s ‘CAUS’

In (99b) it is the suffix -(j)uol, the integrated copular verb ñol-, that is reduplicated. The forms with reduplication (on the left) are opposed to functionally identical stems without reduplication (on the right).

(99b) med’uoluol ‘birth’ (‘to take.be.be[GER]’) vs. qoyijuol ‘to dug out.be[GER]’
    istuol aŋuoluol ‘the place where a table stood’ vs. lačidayuol ‘fireplace’

The conditions under which this kind of reduplication can take place are unclear.

As a substitute\(^{94}\) for morphological processes suppletion may occur:

(100) köde ‘man’ vs. čii ‘people’
    maarquon’ ‘one’ vs. el’ill’e ‘first’
    kijuon’ ‘two’ vs. könmegisçe ‘second’

---

\(^{92}\) I prefer this more neutral term instead of the more common term ‘stem alternation’ because the latter is normally understood as vowel alternation in strong verbs encountered in Indo-European languages, which is not applicable to TY.

\(^{93}\) Note that this double marking is different from the phenomenon of double causation (see 3.4.3.1.3).

\(^{94}\) Suppletion is not regarded as a morphological process here since it is lexical in nature.
3.2 Parts of speech

Theoretically, one could classify the lexemes of a given language strictly according to their semantics, which is a very straightforward, transparent and, possibly, universally applicable approach. Any lexical item describing e.g. properties in any single language could be designated ‘adjective’ irrespective of its morpho-syntactic behaviour. Since properties are, presumably, a universal concept, all languages would have adjectives and nobody would wonder “Where have all the adjectives gone?” It is clear, however, that the English adjective ‘tall’ would then still have to be considered something different from its Yorùbá counterpart ga. In terms of Croft’s (2003:184) propositional acts and semantic classes, in English a head of an NP can be modified by an unmarked adjective such as ‘tall’ but the assistance of a copula is required for ‘tall’ to function as a predicate, whereas in Yorùbá the word ga as it is can be a predicate but cannot modify the head of an NP in this unmarked form having to undergo partial reduplication first:

(101a) Igi yií ga.
    I  this be.tall
 ‘This tree is tall.’

(101b) igi yií gíga.
    I  this tall
 ‘this tall tree’

(Awobuluyi 1978:56)

In a given language, lexical items designating properties whose behaviour resembles that of the adjective ‘tall’ of the English language could be called e.g. ‘adjectives proper’. Yorùbá does not have adjectives proper in this sense. At best, there are a limited number of lexical items denoting properties, mainly colours, which can be used without alternation in both above-mentioned syntactic functions:

(102a) Aṣọ náà dúdú.
    cloth DET be.red
 ‘The cloth is red.’

(102b) aṣọ dúdú
    cloth red
 ‘red cloth’

(Awobuluyi 1978:56)

Lexemes displaying the morpho-syntactic behaviour of dúdú ‘red’ could be then labelled e.g. ‘pro-predicational adjectives’, meaning that these are adjectives with potentially verbal morphosyntactic behaviour, specifically with the ability to encode predication. The Yorùbá adjectives in (102a) and (102b) could be called ‘predicational’ and ‘derived’, or, specifically, ‘de-predicational’, respectively. ‘Predicational adjectives’ could be

---

95 This contradicts Croft’s (2003:186) prediction that typologically unmarked combinations of propositional acts and semantic classes will never be more marked then typologically marked combinations of those.

96 To be quite correct, there are at least two basic attributive adjectives in Yorùbá, namely ńlá ‘big’ and rere ‘good’. However, they cannot be called ‘adjective proper’ in the sense e.g. English adjectives can, because they are deficient; they cannot be used predicatively, with or without a copula, and therefore could be labeled ‘extreme adjectives’. Fully functional roots with the same meanings are the qualitative verbs tòbi ‘to be big’ and dàra ‘to be good/lovely’. The attributive form of the former is derived from it in a regular way: títòbi ‘big’. That of the latter is derived by a total reduplication of the derivational base: dàradára ‘good, lovely’.

97 Similarly, the designation ‘pro-referential adjective’ could be employed to refer to semantic adjectives converted to express reference if this constellation were attested in a given language.
defined then as mimicking unmarked verbs, or morphologically underived lexemes denoting action and encoding predication. ‘Derived adjectives’ would stem from their morphologically unmarked semantic equivalents encoding a propositional act function other than modification. Since in case of Yorùbá it is predication, one could speak of ‘de-predicational adjectives’ when referring to words like gíga ‘tall’. In this way Yorùbá would not have ‘qualitative verbs’, the term which can be found in linguistic literature to refer to words like dúdú ‘to be red’ or ga ‘to be tall’, but two classes of adjectives: pre-predicative and predicational. The label involving the prefix pro- would always imply the formal identity of a lexeme in a typologically unmarked combination of a semantic class and propositional act, e.g. property + modification, and its marked instantiation(s) from the same point of view, e.g. property + predication. On the other hand, when the label ‘(de)-predicational’, ‘(de)-modificational’, ‘(de)-referential’ was applied to a lexeme, it would entail the heteromorphy of the single instantiations of the concept under scrutiny depending on the combination of propositional act function it fulfils and the semantic class it belongs to. Another implication is that the typologically unmarked combination is represented by a morphologically marked shape of the lexeme, its derived form. Just to give one more hypothetic example for the sake of clarity, a ‘modificational verb’ would be a lexeme designating an action and functioning as an attribute without further morphological adjustment, in its basic form. A derivational process would have to be applied to make it possible for such a verb to be used predicatively. This derived word would belong to the class of ‘de-modificational verbs’. De-modificational verb as well as de-modificational nouns presumably do no exist. At the same time pro-modificational nouns and pro-modificational verbs are quite common.

This purely semantic approach for identifying parts of speech in a language has objective shortcomings. Probably the most important and basic of them is the impossibility to determine a universally valid division of lexemes in conceptual semantic classes. While the concepts and semantic classes themselves are there, the distribution of single words among the semantic classes obviously differs from language to language. It appears that Yorùbá speakers indeed associate the concept ‘red’ more closely with words denoting actions and not properties, and Swahili speakers would wonder why a word like ‘darkness’ should primarily be perceived as a property; for them the word giza may refer to an abstract entity, with ‘dark’ as a secondary concept to it.

One could think of many other impediments, mainly of a technical nature, if one started to think of a practical implementation of this certainly tempting idea of dividing the world of words on the basis of their meaning alone. Would, for instance, the expression –a kupendeza ‘lovely’ < kupendeza ‘to please’ be a de-referential or a de-predicational adjective? Kupendeza ‘to please’ is an infinitive, whose inflected forms are basic as in e.g. Mwana apendeza mama wake ‘The child pleases (is lovely for) his/her mother’. Therefore the expression under scrutiny would have to be labelled a de-predicational adjective. On the other hand, infinitives can function as gerunds in

---

98 Here again, a semantic adjective functioning in its basic form to denote reference would be designated as ‘referential adjective’ and its derived semantic equivalent used attributively would be labeled ‘de-referential’. Such ‘de-referential adjectives’ abound in another African language, namely Kiswahili. Just to give a few examples: -al/-enyé giza ‘dark’ < giza ‘darkness’, -a nguvu ‘strong’ < nguvu ‘strenght’, -a moto ‘hot’ < moto ‘fire’.

99 This is reflected also in the fact that attributive forms of action verbs are derived in Yorùbá in the same way as those of qualitative verbs (Schleicher 2008:101). The same holds for TY.
Kiswahili, as nouns, that is. Besides, the expression –a kupendeza ‘lovely’ has a template identical with that of the expression –a giza ‘dark’, which is clearly a de-referential adjective.

I would like to premise the actual discussion of the parts of speech system in TY with two symptomatic quotes.

The analysis of linguistic data does not always lead to clear-cut results. Criteria used to distinguish between word classes, for example, do not always give unequivocal classifications when applied to the forms found in a particular language; and the data drawn from corpus analysis will often show statistical (>0% and <100%) rather than categorical (0% or 100%) distributions.

(Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008:9)

The problem of the parts of speech in the Yukaghir language requires a special study. There are no adjectives in this language. Their meanings are expressed with the help of qualitative verbs. Numerals are not singled out as a separate part of speech either. Their separate treatment in this article is done for convenience.

(Krejnovič 1968:437)

Below is an overview of the two systems of parts of speech posited for TY.


Maslova (2003:61-72) proposed for the closely related Kolyma Yukaghir the following division: nouns, verbs, adverbs, pronouns and related proforms, numerals, postpositions, particles and interjections.

Division of the lexicon of a language into categories will depend on what defining criteria are chosen and/or which of those are regarded as crucial. If the meaning of words is considered to be a criterion, then the existence of adjectives must be recognized in TY. The same conclusion would have to be drawn if distributional criteria are to play any role since heads of NPs can be modified by syntactic attributes in TY as, probably, in all other languages. If, however, structural properties are assigned the status of the dominant criterion, the assumption of the existence of adjectives as a distinct open morphological class of words would be precluded as there are only two underived words in TY designating properties. These adjectives are, in accordance with the typological tendency observed by Dixon (1982), the words belonging to the semantic type DIMENSION, namely those with the meaning ‘big’ and ‘small’:

(103a) čama solyid’e-γa
    big gathering-LOC ‘at a big reunion’

(103b) juku jalya
    small lake ‘a small lake’
The fact that there are no adjectives from other three major semantic types – AGE, VALUE and COLOUR – goes, however, against Dixon’s (1982:46) prediction that these ‘are likely to belong to the adjective class, however small it is’ in a given language and makes TY quite remarkable in this respect.

If the syntactic behaviour is viewed as relevant for singling out lexical categories, then the existence of a subclass of ‘denominal verbs’ would have to be accepted since nouns can function as predicates displaying verbal inflectional endings. Here, one has to differentiate between two cases: derivation of verbs from nouns by means of verbalizing suffixes and copula aided predications. The former are true verbs and attach personal endings directly to their stem:

(104a) *Nime-re-j*  
house-VBLZ-INTR.3SG  
‘[S/he] acquired a house.’

(104b) *Nime-te-m*  
house-VBLZ-TR.3SG  
‘[S/he] endowed [smb.] with a house.’

When a noun requires a copula or a copular verb in order to function as a predicate, it is more reasonable not to regard it as a verb:

(105a) *Ten nime-ley.*  
DEIC house-COP  
‘This is a house.’

(105b) *Tugi nime ŋotej.*  
ADL.PROX house be-FUT-INTR.3SG  
‘This will be a house.’

In (105a) the predicatively used noun does not exhibit any verbal morphology and in (105b) the verbal morphology is associated with the copular verb ŋol- ‘to be’. This is where morphological criteria kick in and help to draw a more differentiated and precise picture.

If this morphological criterion is adopted and applied consequently, it would have to be admitted that a considerable portion of the so called qualitative verbs and some of the quantitative verbs, distinguished by Krejnovič (1958, 1982) as subclasses of the word class ‘verb’, must be deprived of their verbal status because their forms capable of being conjugated also involve the same copular verb ŋol-:

(106) *qajruol-* ‘to be bent’ < *qajra- + ŋol- ‘to be’  
*maarquol-* ‘to be one’ < *maarqa- + ŋol- ‘to be’  
*jaluol-* ‘to be three’ < *jaal- + ŋol- ‘to be’  
(Kurilov 2006:63)

But the legitimate question is then, which part of speech those lexemes should be assigned to. In fact, there are reasons not to apply the criterion of the presence of a copular verb to the qualitative and quantitative verbs. Firstly, in the perception of native speakers of TY the copular verb ŋol- appears to be more tightly integrated into the stem of qualitative or quantitative verbs than, if at all, into that of nouns. This is reflected in the spelling of the respective forms. Nominal predicates tend to be written separately

\[\]  
\[\text{An attempt to classify parts of speech on the basis of syntactic criteria alone is e.g. Awobuluyi (1978).}\]
from the conjugated copular verb\textsuperscript{101}, while it is exceptionless that the copular verb $\eta ol$-
and the semantically qualitative or numeric base it accompanies are merged in writing. Note also, – and this is even more telling – that the signs of incepting fusion on the boundary between the roots of qualitative or quantitative verbs and the copular verb as in
(106) are missing altogether in the case of nominal predicates:

\begin{equation}
\text{(107a) Levejl } \eta ol\text{\textquoteright}en'.
\text{levejl } \eta ol-l\text{\textquoteright}el-i
\text{summer be-NVIS-INTR.3SG}
\text{\textquoteright}It was summer.'\text{ (Kurilov 2005:126)}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{(107b) Met tetqa olyin' el jaadie } \eta ol\text{\textquoteright}ej.
\text{met tet-ga olyin' el jaadie } \eta ol\text{\textquoteright}ej
\text{1SG 2SG-LOC completely NEG aunt be-INTR.1SG}
\text{\textquoteright}I am not at all your aunt.'
\end{equation}

Secondly, there are a considerable number of qualitative verbs and a few quantitative verbs inflected without the involvement of a copular verb. The former are derived with the help of different suffixes: the comitative suffix $-n\text{\textquoteleft}e$ to form color terms e.g. $qomon\text{\textquoteleft}e$-
‘to be blue/green’, the formant $-we$ whose sole function seems to be the derivation of qualitative verbs e.g. $werwe$-
‘to be strong’ $<$ $war$-
‘to be firm’$^{102}$. The latter do not seem to be derived at all, e.g. $jalaklal$-
‘to be four’, $imdald\text{\textquoteleft}al$-
‘to be five’, $maalajlal$-
‘to be six’. It would be illogical to group lexemes like $qajruol$-
‘to be bent’ separately from lexemes like $qomon\text{\textquoteleft}e$-
‘to be blue/green’ or $werwe$-
‘to be strong’ since all of them express properties. A similar relation between words like $jalaklal$-
‘to be four’ and $maarquol$-
‘to be one’ makes it reasonable to regard them as representatives of one subclass within the word class ‘verb’ too.

There is also a strong syntactic consideration to treat nominal and adjectival predicates differently. With nominal predicates the verbal focus proclitic $me(r)$= can be inserted between the predicate noun and the copular verb:

\begin{equation}
\text{(108) Ten nime me } \eta otej?\quad \text{Me } \eta otej.
\text{ten nime me}=\eta ote-j \quad me=\eta ote-j
\text{DEIC house PF=be-FUT-INTR.3SG PF=be-FUT-INTR.3SG}
\text{‘Is this going to become a house?’ ‘[Yes], it is.’}
\end{equation}

This is impossible with either qualitative or quantitative verbs.

As for the quantitative verbs, probably the strongest argument to count them among verbs is the fact that for counting – the most prototypical function of numerals – their conjugated forms are used:

\textsuperscript{101} One of the few exceptions is the verb $mirijepol$-
‘to roam’, whose spelling as one word is possibly meant to differentiate it from the expression $mirije \eta ol$-
‘to be a wife’ ($mirije$ means ‘wife’).
\textsuperscript{102} Note, however, that the derivational base is itself a qualitative verb, a basic one. This derivation isn’t thus necessary to enable a word with an ‘adjectival’ meaning to function as a predicate.
The verbal identity of the lexemes expressing numbers is additionally confirmed by the fact that ordinal numbers, except for the word ‘first’, end – just as many qualitative verbs do when used attributively – with a regular participle ending –če: könmegišče ‘second’, jalmascče,103 ‘third’, jeklesčče ‘fourth’ etc.

Apart from that quantitative verbs can occur as converses:

(109a) maarquon’
maarqa-ŋol-i
one-be-INTR.3SG
‘one’

(109b) jalaklan’
jalaklal-i
be.four-INTR.3SG
‘four’

The verbal identity of the lexemes expressing numbers is additionally confirmed by the fact that ordinal numbers, except for the word ‘first’, end – just as many qualitative verbs do when used attributively – with a regular participle ending –če: könmegišče ‘second’, jalmascče,103 ‘third’, jeklesčče ‘fourth’ etc.

Apart from that quantitative verbs can occur as converses:

(110) Mit jalaklalar ten’it me tonaaj, tittel jaluoler tadaa maaŋa.
mit jalaklal-ar ten’i-t me=tono-aa-j
1PL be.four-CIRC here-ABL PF=drive-INCH-1PL.TR

‘The four of us have begun to drive [the geese] from here and the three of them are waiting there.’

(Kurilov 2001:110, jalaklal)

All this clearly places quantitative verbs in the vicinity of action verbs. Thus it becomes clear why Krejnović (1968:437), with an Indo-European mind, speaks of mere convenience as a reason for mentioning a lexical class of numerals in TY.

When functioning as predicates the qualitative and quantitative verbs behave as regular intransitive verbs:

(111a) Mit jalaklad’eli.
mit jalaklal-jeli
1PL be.four-INTR.1PL
‘We are four’

(Kurilov 2001:110, jalaklal)

(111b) An me l’ukuod’eli.
an me=l’uku-ŋol-j’eli
DM be.small-INTR.1PL
‘We were small’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:22)

(111c) Lawjedekuŋa juuraanund’eli.
lawje-n-ekuŋ-ya juora(aa)-nun-jeli
water-GEN-hole-LOC play-INCH-HAB-INTR.1PL
‘We used to play near an ice-hole.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:20)

Actually, the very fact that a considerable number of qualitative verbs and all quantitative verbs need the copular verb ŋol- in order to function as predicates, speaks, surprisingly at first sight, in favor of regarding them as verbs. The point is that unlike simple nouns neither of these two groups of lexemes possesses a root that could function as a nominal. Quite a few qualitative verbs such as maaruol- ‘to be happy’ can be turned by means of conversion into nouns (maaruol ‘happiness’) but something like *maara is inexistent.

---

103 Note the loss of the integrated copular verb as compared to jaluol- ‘to be three’.
104 Krejnović (1958:192) erroneously, as it seems to me, treated the forms of the circumstantial converb (see 3.4.2.7) of quantitative verbs as nominals.
This is a situation in which the verbal status is so to speak imposed onto a lexeme since there is no other part of speech it could ontologically lean on. Whatever choice one may eventually favor in classifying words in TY on the basis of, for instance, their capability to function as predicates without a copular verb, it is obvious that one would have to make more or less arbitrary decisions, which, as admitted in the introductory quote by Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008:9), will necessarily yield equivocal classifications. What becomes obvious from the above elaboration is that morphology is indispensable when one attempts to sort the TY lexicon. Therefore, for the purpose of establishing parts of speech of TY in this dissertation, semantics and syntactic properties of a given lexeme will be consulted for the initial orientation. Its morphological behaviour will help to make the final judgement about its classification as a member of one of the word classes.

Morphology is also reliable and useful for working out a fine graded classification within single parts of speech, which is necessary in TY (see also 3.5.1). Thus, the qualitative and quantitative verbs, which are subsumed under the word class ‘verb’ are regarded as subclasses. Dividing up the part of speech ‘verb’ into subclasses in TY is grounded not only on the specific non-actional semantics of the qualitative and quantitative verbs but on a number of morphological limitations and peculiarities these subclasses have. Verbs belonging to them do not have e.g. iterative forms. They exhibit specialized suffixes, e.g. –mu for the inchoative or –muol for diminutive (in qualitative verbs only). Apart from that, the exact mechanism of adverb derivation from qualitative and action verbs seems to differ. While in manner adverbs stemming from action verbs the root serves as the derivational base attaching the adverbial derivational suffix –neŋ, e.g. ayineŋ ‘secretely’ < ayite- ‘to hide’, the derivational base in qualitative verbs is the finite form of 3SG.105

(112) Idaraŋŋa tuŋ çajlaŋa giin’uo maaruojneŋ peld’iyan.

next.year ADL.PROX day-LOC till
maaruol-i-neŋ pel-d’ii-ŋan
be.happy-INTR.3SG-ADV remain.alive-CAUS-JUSS

‘May he let [us] live till this day next year.’ (Kurilov 2001:234, maaruojneŋ)

The roots of quantitative verbs can display a purely nominal property: in order to function as attributes in NPs they do no attach the corresponding participial suffix106 but the genitive case ending –n107, which is otherwise used to form nominal compounds:

(113) Taat maaruol-neŋ ewl’ikie-j ...
so be.happy-ADV disappear-INTR.3SG
‘So, he died happily.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:140)

105 This statement should, apparently, be taken less categorically as there are instances of –neŋ being attached directly to the stem of qualitative verbs to derive manner adverbs:

106 Isolated participial forms of the numerals ‘one’ and ‘two’ are either lexicalized as the noun kijuod’e ‘twins’ or have a special connotation as maarqad’e ‘the only’ (see (65b) in Maslova (2003c:28)). Krejnovič (1958:189) reports that in TY the verb ‘to be nine’ has a participle, which is used attributively.

107 The same phenomenon is observed in e.g. Japanese (Kolesnikov 1993:49):
(114) *saan nime* ‘a wooden house’ < *saal* ‘wood’ + *n* ‘GEN’ + *nime* ‘house’

*jaan nime* ‘three houses’ < *jaluo*- ‘to be three’ + *n* ‘GEN’ + *nime* ‘house’

Numeric bases can even attach case endings, e.g. *kunil-*γ*a*-t ‘ten-LOC-ABL’.
These can be seen as sufficient reasons not to lump ‘true’ verbs with qualitative and quantitative verbs in one word class but posit three separate subclasses with similar but not identical structural properties.

Even closed lexical classes of TY can pose an interpretational problem. The class of words that are traditionally called postpositions for the syntactic function they fulfil, is actually a subclass of nouns having meanings like ‘the upper side’, ‘the lower side’, ‘the front side’, ‘the back side’ etc. and capable to attach spatial case suffixes as well as the pertensive suffix. Moreover, they can occur on their own, which goes against the very meaning of the term adposition:

(115) *Ičuo-k, aduŋ čoγoje!.. Oryi pure-da-γa uučii-ček!*

look-IMP.SG  ADA.PROX  knife

*orγi  pure-da-γa-n  uučii-jek*

almost upper.side-PERT-LOC-PROL  pass-INTR.2SG

‘Watch out, that knife!.. You have almost trodden on it!’

(Kurilov 2001:404, pure)

However, it would seem much too unorthodox to say that in TY there are no adpositions and treat the lexemes fulfilling the function of postpositions under nouns. Therefore, after having pointed out this peculiarity of the words like *pure*, following the convention, I will nevertheless call them postpositions and comment on their nominal characteristics in the corresponding section.

Resuming, a combination of criteria will be used in this work to determine the single parts of speech of TY. These diagnostic factors will be mentioned in the beginning of every section dedicated to the word class under scrutiny.

One more general remark must be made with respect to the parts of speech of TY. It can be observed that the borders between the single parts of speech are often fuzzy. Thus, adverbal clauses can be formed with the help of the combination of nominal inflectional morphemes –*da* ‘PERT’ and –*γa* ‘LOC’, which are attached to verbal bases. The verbal status of the bases is confirmed by the presence of the verbal plural marker –*ŋu* when the subject is in plural. Certainly, the bases undergo nominalization before the subordinating complex suffix –*daya* is attached to them. Yet, the nominalization itself is not detectable in the surface form and has to be postulated. These apparent ‘hybrid’ forms can be followed by postpositions, which normally act as heads of nominal phrases. The following example illustrates the coexistence of verbal and nominal morphology in one verb form.

(116) *futatsu no ringo*  

two GEN apple  

‘two apples’
The nominal root čuŋre- in this example is verbalized by the suffix –r expressing acquisition. This form has the verbal plurality marker, suffix –ŋu, which is on the surface followed successively by the possession and locative suffixes, whose combination functions in a verb form as the device signaling the switch in the reference. The whole expression is accompanied by a postposition. Symbolically the sequence of the overt morphemes can be represented as follows: N+V+N+N+V+N+V, where N stands for morphemes typically associated with nouns and V for those found in verbs.

The gerund can display in TY verbal syntactic properties. For instance, it can be modified by an adverb.

Conversely, verbs can be modified by participles:

Conversely, verbs can be modified by participles:

In this the TY gerund resembles e.g. the Latin gerund.
The comitative ending is used in the predicate, as follows from (121), to encode possession. The expression is formed, however not with the help of a copular verb, but with a regular verbal inflectional ending, further washing away the border between noun and verb in TY.

The prefix $n'i(ŋ)$ is the productive marker of the reciprocal voice but it can be employed in nouns as well: $n'i=gedel$ ‘each other’, $n'iŋ=akaajil$ ‘brothers’ etc. The privative suffix –čuon together with the negative clitic el= marks the negative converb when attached to the bases of action verbs. At the same time, it can be suffixed directly to nominal roots and corresponds semantically to the preposition ‘without’.

\[(122)\quad el=molčuon \text{ ‘without staying overnight’} < mol- \text{ ‘to stay overnight’}\]
\[el=nimečuon \text{ ‘without a house/homeless’} < nime \text{ ‘house’}\]

The delimitative postposition gitn’er ‘till’, ‘as far as’ can have a converb as a dependent:

\[(123)\quad \text{lugumu-r gitn’er} \quad \text{get.old-CIRC till}\]

‘till old age’

In face of these facts it is appropriate to continue the above quote by Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008:9):

This has led a number of current grammatical approaches to promote the notion of gradience, the position that boundaries between categories are fluid and that categorization should be based upon prototypes rather than on inviolable criteria […]

All lexemes which behave in a non-prototypical way can be assessed on the basis of their resemblance to one or the other word class as instantiated by prototypically behaving lexemes. Whichever word class behaviourally ambivalent lexemes resemble most, to that word class they are assigned to.

I distinguish the following parts of speech in my description of TY: noun (including the gerund, or nomen actionis), pronoun, verb (action, qualitative, quantitative, denominal and deictic verbs), adjective (a closed class), adverbs, postpositions, conjunctions, particles (deictic, modal and emphatic particles, discourse markers, interjections).

To conclude, below is the list of the main characteristics (except for the semantic ones, which are self-evident) on the basis of which single parts of speech are distinguished:

- nouns: capacity to inflect for case and number
- pronouns: capacity to substitute for NPs or their nominal modifiers (adjectives and participles)
- verbs: semantically non-empty items capable of being inflected for person
- adjectives: capacity of being non-verbal adnominal attributes incapable of being heads of NPs.
- adverbs: non-verbal forms modifying verbs or, less prototypically, other adverbs
- postpositions: capacity to determine the syntactic relations between their dependents and the predicate
- conjunctions: capacity to link clauses or coordinate NPs
- particles: capacity to enrich the bare semantics of utterances with certain pragmatic meanings.

3.3 Noun morphology

3.3.1 Noun inflection

Nouns in TY are inflected for case and number, and can carry the pertensive suffix.

3.3.1.1 Cases

Eleven cases can be distinguished in TY: nominative, accusative, ergative, absolutive, genitive, dative, instrumental, locative, ablative, prolative and comitative.

One of the conspicuous features of TY grammar is the presence of split ergativity. In other words, four cases are necessary to encode core arguments. Since the split is conditioned by the focal status of the core arguments (see for more detail 4.2.2), it is possible to have nominative and absolutive or ergative and accusative in one clause. Since nominative and ergative show complementary distribution, the fact that they occupy the same functional slot and both have zero marking does not pose a problem.

3.3.1.1.1 Nominative

The nominative case encodes subjects of intransitive and transitive verbs. It occurs in clauses with any information structure except for those with SF and AF. It has zero marking.

(124) Sal’il nime-γa sayane-j.
mouse house-LOC sit-INTR.3SG
‘The mouse lived in a house.’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

(125) Pajpen mayil’ jaan sawayat wiejuolnuni.
pajpe-n mayil’ jaa-n sawa-γa-t wie-ŋol-nun-i
woman-GEN coat three-GEN skin-LOC-ABL do-be-HAB-INTR.3SG
‘Women’s coat is sewn from three skins.’

(126) met wal’be Köndie me=mente-te-m
1SG friend Kyondie PF=fetch-FUT-3SG.TR
‘My friend Köndie will pick [me] up’ (Kurilov 1994:7)

3.3.1.1.2 Accusative

The accusative case marks direct objects. It occurs in clauses with any information structure except those displaying OF, where the O-argument is encoded with the
absolutive case ending. It has the ending –le or –γane as in (127-133c), if the subject is in the 3rd person, otherwise it is zero-marked as in (134) and (135). The ending –γane is used with proper nouns (130), relational nouns (kinship terms (131a, 131b), body parts (132a, 132b) and nouns modified by possessive pronouns (133a-133c):

(127) Sal’ile paajl’elum!

sal’i-le paajl-l’el-um
mouse-ACC hit-NVIS-TR.3SG
‘[He] hit the mouse!’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

(128) Maarqad’eŋ Qaalid’e tolon ilele pundelek keči’elum.

maarqad’eŋ Qaalid’e tolon.ile-le pun’-relek keči-l’el-um
once Wolf wild.reindeer-ACC kill-ANT bring-NVIS-TR.3SG
‘Once the Wolf brought a wild reindeer after having killed it.’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

(129) Taatl’er tuŋ saalŋin’ uurelek saale iitney ičuorelek tuŋ tude n’umud’iilek saale pajl’elmele.

Taatl’er tuŋ saal-ŋin’ uu-relek saal-le iitney ičuo-relek
therefore ADL.PROX tree-DAT go-ANT tree-ACC long.time look-ANT
tuŋ tude n’umud’i-i-lek saal-le paaj-l’el-mele
DM 3SG.POSS axe-INS tree-FOC.ABS hit-NVIS-TR.3SG.OF
‘Therefore he came up to the tree, gazed at it for a long time and hit the tree with his axe.’

(130) Qal’arqaa-γane quolemde-köde-k mooj-te-l?109

Qal’arqaa-ACC what.kind man-FOC.ABS hold-FUT-GER.SF
‘Which man will hold [in his hands the girl named] Khalyarkhaa?’ (Kurilov 2001:505, qalarqaa)

(131a) Taŋnigi maarquon’titte n’aajl-γane juö-ŋa.

then only 3PL.POSS daughter.in.law-ACC see-3PL.TR
‘Only then they see their daughter-in-law.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:42)

(131b) Taŋ sayanereŋ tude enieγane jaqtaam.

taŋ sayane-ren’ tude enie-γane jaqte-aa-m
DM sit-SIM 3SG.POSS mother-ACC sing-INCH-TR.3SG
‘And she sat and sang about her mother.’

(132a) Lačil pomniir ile-n wanar-γane mörelwej-γan mon-ur me=kudič-im.

fire around reindeer-GEN.tongue-ACC soften-JUSS say-CIRC PF=put.TR.TR.3SG
‘He put reindeer tongues around the fire in order that they melt a bit.’

(Kurilov 2001:255, monur)

109 This sentence is an illustration of how AF can be encoded as SF, a strategy not uncommon in TY, but not reported in previous descriptions.
‘(She recalled …) [her] mother’s long, thick hair’

‘[He] stopped his dogs.’

‘Luckily [he] calmed us (our eyes)!’ (Kurilov and O dé 2012:52)

‘[He] began to sing his song.’

As long as the subject is not in the 3rd person, the O-argument is not marked overtly:

‘Good that we did not loose the fathers’ stone plummets!’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

The accusative case ending may also be absent when the O-argument is dominated by a non-finite verb form (see also (128)):

‘“O-o-oh!” the Wolf howled having grabbed the table.’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

3.3.1.3 Ergative

Both ergative and absolutive cases are primarily focus markers, which also identify NPs as A, S or O-arguments. The ergative case encodes A-arguments of transitive verbs in sentences with AF. It remains unmarked, which along with an overtly marked absolutive (see below) yields a typologically remarkable constellation. Cross-linguistically, nominative and absolutive tend to be formally less marked than accusative and ergative (Comrie 1981:119). Typological literature gives the impression that this tendency is stronger for the pair absolutive-ergative than for the pair nominative-accusative. A number of languages have been identified where the accusative has zero realization and the nominative carries an overt case ending. However, instances of an unmarked

Among these are e.g. Mojave (Munro 1976:18) and to a limited extent Berber (in prefixless nouns (Penchoen 1973: 12-13, 19-20)) and Somali (in feminine nouns ending in a consonant and in adjectives (Saeed 1999: 64, 108)). Oromo dialects, e.g. Harar Oromo (Owens 1985:98 ff.), can be counted among such languages too if one does not treat word-final gender distinguishing vowels as suffixes.
ergative coexisting with the non-zero absolutive were until recently believed to be
unknown (Dixon 1994: 11).

The ergative case is employed very sparsely in the textual material, therefore it is
easier to elicit its use with the help of question-answer pairs:

(136) *Kin ögete tuŋ nime-le? — Met amaa ögete.*
who[FOC.ERG] install[AF] ADL.PROX house-ACC 1SG father[FOC.ERG] install[AF]
‘Who built this house?’  ‘My father did.’

3.3.1.1.4 Absolutive

The absolutive case encodes subjects of intransitive verbs and O-arguments. It occurs in
sentences having SF or OF. It’s endings are –le(n) in non-modified nouns (137) and –(e)k
in nouns modified lexically (138a-138c) or by a derivational morpheme (139a, 139b).
Nouns carrying the possessive suffix –gi/-da (140) and those accompanied by possessive
pronouns cannot have the absolutive ending.

(137) *Amun-pe-leŋ maarquon’ pon’aa-ŋu-l.*
bone-PL-FOC.ABS only remain-PL-GER.SF
‘Only the bones are left.’  (Kurilov 1994:8)

(138a) *Taat mon-delek qad’ir iitneŋ ayuol-denŋ içu-o-nu-l-daya keje-da-ŋa*
so say-ANT DM long.time stand-SIM look-DUR-GER-3SG.DS front.side-PERT-LOC
čama lukunburebe ord’e-da-ŋa maarqa-n saal-ek ayuol-l’el-ul.
big surface middle-PERT-LOC one-GEN tree-FOC.ABS stand-NVIS-GER.SF
‘Having said that [he] stood for a long time, looked [around and saw] that in the
middle of a wide surface there stood one tree.’

(138b) *Tidaa tidaa apanalaan’e-j peldudiek sayanaal’elŋul.*
tidaa tidaa apanalaan-’e-j peldudie-k sayane-l’el-ŋu-l
long.ago long.ago old.woman-VBLZ-PTCP old.man-FOC.ABS live-NVIS-PL-GER.SF
‘Long ago an old man and an old woman lived.’

(138c) *Lewejeŋy jayden wal’d’id’e-k mennull’elŋumle.*
lewej-ŋey jayde-n wal’d’id’e-k men’-nun-l’el-ŋu-mle
sumer-ADV goose-GEN liver-FOC.ABS take-HAB-NVIS-PL-TR.3SG.OF
‘In summer one takes geese liver.’

(139a) *Tienaayar jalyil-die-k l’e-l.*
over.there lake-DIM-FOC.ABS be-GER.SF
‘There is a small lake over there.’  (Kurilov and Odé 2012:86)

(139b) *Taŋ-ut jugullaayare-ŋa Joyul-tege-k ibal-tege-k l’e-l.*
INVS.DEM-ABL right.side-LOC Nose-AUG-FOC.ABS hill-AUG-FOC.ABS be-GER.SF
‘On the right of it there is a tall hill, Big Nose.’  (Kurilov and Odé 2012:175)
The degree of markedness of S/O-arguments in relation to that of A-arguments is typologically highly unusual. The situation is so rare, in fact, that for a long time it was supposed to be unattested. According to Greenberg’s (1966: 95) Universal 38, ‘Where there is a case system, the only case which ever has only zero allomorphs is the one which includes among its meanings that of the subject of the intransitive verb.’ Even toward the end of the 20th century it was assumed that according to the available cross-linguistic data the absolutive is formally always unmarked with respect to the ergative (Dixon 1994:58). I am aware of only very few languages apart from TY where A-arguments have less morphological marking than S/O-arguments. Those are a dialect of Dogon (Sumbatova 1999:528-529) and Nias (Brown 2001 cited by Dryer 2007:252).

3.3.1.1.5 Genitive

The genitive case, whose ending is –n or zero, indicates a possessor or a relational adjective. In compound nouns it marks the first member (see 3.3.2.3). The very existence of genitive has been a controversial issue among the scholars of TY. Some of them, e.g. Maslova (2003c), do not recognize this grammatical case. Others, like Krejnovič (1958, 1968) and Kurilov (2006), do list the genitive as one of the cases in the declensional paradigm of nouns. The reason why there is no unanimous opinion about genitive lies probably in the difficulty of unambiguously ascertaining which of the functions is fulfilled by nouns carrying the suffix –n, that is, whether those nouns are referential (possessive constructions) or non-referential (relational adjectives and compounds). According to Kurilov (2006:90) the word ilen in (141) can have both referential and non-referential reading.

(141) ile-n jawul
reindeer-GEN track
‘a track of a/the reindeer’ or ‘a reindeer track’

On the other hand, as observed by Maslova (2003c:49), certain phonological phenomena on the boundary between the modifier and the head in such potentially possessive constructions suggest that compounding is the only possible interpretation. In (142a, b) a voiced plosive occurs word-finally, which violates a positional restriction of voiced plosives (see 2.2.1), from which one has to conclude that the expressions in (142a, b) are single words, compounds, that is.

111 Note, however, that compounding does not necessarily entail the loss of referentiality, as is exemplified in (142a). Even relational adjectives can remain referential, in fact. Consider the Russian expression učitel’skij stol ‘the teacher’s table’, where the denominal adjective učitel’skij ‘of the teacher (*teacherly)’ refers not to the class of humans which happen to be teachers but to a particular teacher in a particular classroom, at least during a given class.
In (143a) and (143b) voicing of the initial consonant of the head occurs.

(143a) *ilenbund’e
ilen-pun’-d’e
reindeer-GEN-kill-NMLZ
‘reindeer slaughter’

(143b) ilend’uul
ile-n-čuul
reindeer-GEN-meat
‘reindeer meat’

Voicing as in (143a, b) can take place in phrases too (see 2.3.4). Since there are certain restrictions regarding the parts of speech which may engage in compounding, phrases with voicing can be told apart from compounds. Voicing is obligatory in compounds whereas it is optional across word boundaries. Both these processes indicate that the expressions in (142a, b) and (143a, b) are phonological words and not phrases.

The strongest proof of the compound nature of such expressions is the impossibility of insertion of another word between the modifier and the head\textsuperscript{112} in (144a) as opposed to (144b) (Kurilov 2006:74):

(144a) *ilen čuol’e jawul
reindeer old track
‘old track of a reindeer/old reindeer track’ (Kurilov 2006:73)

(144b) ile čuol’e jawul
reindeer old track
‘old track of a reindeer/old reindeer track’ (Kurilov 2006:73)

If the genitive case ending marks a relation between two nouns, the suffix –n in modifiers in (142), (143a,b) and (144a) cannot be the genitive case ending, because, the expressions in these examples being compounds, the question of a relation between two nouns does not even arise.

Despite these facts, examples can be found where the interpretation of the modifier as a non-referential noun intuitively does not appear plausible:

(145a) aruu-n tudul
word-GEN contents
‘the meaning of a/the word’

Although (145a) is not a classical example of a possessive relation, it does express a possessive relation between two independent nouns, if only metaphorically. The expression in (145a) is certainly not a compound because the phonological rule of voicing, typical for compounds (see 2.3.4) and exemplified in (143a, b) does not apply here. The relational adjective reading of aruum ‘of the word’ does not seem natural.

\textsuperscript{112} The validity of this test is undermined by the fact that some speakers would accept (144a).
(‘wordly’). In the phrase in (145a) ‘contents’ is not specified as characteristic of words as a class of objects, as compared to e.g. *‘baggy contents’ or *‘pockety contents’ but is rather associated with a concrete word, which makes the word aruu ‘word’ here a referential noun. Similar examples can be found, albeit very infrequently, with animate possessors:

(145b) Tideoŋ pajpen kewejuolŋan ičuonaal’elum.

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{ANPH} & \text{pajpe-n} & \text{kewe-jol-ya-n} & \text{ičuo-naa-l’el-um} \\
\text{woman-GEN} & \text{leave-BE[GER]-LOC-PROL} & \text{look-INGCH-NVIS-TR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘He began to examine [the hole in the tree] through which the woman disappeared.’

There is more phonological evidence that the constructions under scrutiny need not be compounds. Compare (146a) and (146b).

(146a) jaa-n čaj-n suske

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{three-GEN} & \text{tea-GEN} & \text{cup} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘three tea cups’

(146b) n’oronruske

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{n’oro-n-suske} \\
\text{hill-GEN-cup} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘pool’

Although the English translation of (146a) and (146b) suggests compounding in both examples, the lack of the morphophonemic alternation in (146a), which does take place in (146b), indicates that čajn and suske are two phonological words in (146a). However, (146a) does not prove the existence of a genitive case, because the ending –n in it obviously creates a relational adjectives out of the noun čaj ‘tea’. For the word ‘tea’ to be a noun the example has to be altered:

(147) Jaa-n suske čaaaj-ek law-meŋ.

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{three-GEN} & \text{cup} & \text{tea-FOC.ABS} & \text{drink-TR.1/2.SG.OF} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I have drunk three cups of tea.’

The decisive proof that nouns with the suffix –n can be referential is the possibility to modify them by pronouns:

(148a) Tuŋ jawul tidaal’e tideoŋ ile-n jawul-ek.

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{ADL.DEML} & \text{track} & \text{old} & \text{ANPH} & \text{reindeer-GEN} & \text{track-COP} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘This track of that reindeer is old.’

(148b) Tideoŋ ile-n jawul-gi met awjaa juoŋ-p.

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{ANPH} & \text{reindeer-GEN} & \text{track-PERT} & \text{1SG} & \text{yesterday} & \text{see-1SG.TR} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘This track of that reindeer I found yesterday.’

(148c) tuŋ met ile-n jawul

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{ADL.DEML} & \text{1SG} & \text{reindeer-GEN} & \text{track} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘this track of my reindeer’
The necessarily referential status of a noun with the genitive case ending can follow from the semantics of its host in a given morpho-syntactic context. In the following examples with embedded possessive construction the nouns in genitive are referential because they have the pertensive suffix, which singles them out from the multitude of potential referents of the same class and individuates them through association with one particular possessor:

\[(149a)\] sugud'e-gi-n tibege-l
heart-PERT-GEN beat-GER
‘[her] heartbeat’

\[(149b)\] Omčukur ekye-gi-n uo
Omchukur elder.sister-PERT-GEN child
‘the child of Omchukur’s elder sister’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:242)

Possessive relation between two nouns can also be expressed in TY by their juxtaposition. This is the zero-realization of the genitive:

\[(150a)\] ile jawul
reindeer track
‘a track of a/the reindeer’
(Kurilov 2006:73)

\[(150b)\] pajpe suske
woman cup
‘a cup of a/the woman’
(Kurilov 1977:59)

The difference of the construction in (150a, b) from that in (141) is that the word ile ‘reindeer’ in the former has only referential interpretation. This is not always the case; there are compound nouns without the genitive case marking as in (151a). However, such a zero-marked compound can, even if its formation does not create an environment for a phonological mutation, easily be distinguished from the homonymous phrase as in (151b), because the meaning of a compound often cannot be derived from the meaning of its members:

\[(151a)\] öjege-laqil
hare-tail
‘constellation’
(Kurilov 1977:60)

\[(151b)\] öjege laqil
hare tail
‘a tail of a/the hare’
(Kurilov 1977:60)

While zero-marked possessors are more easily distinguished form compounds, they still can be confused with NPs in which the modifier functions as a relational adjective:

\[(152)\] qajl’ čirebe
stone plummet
‘a stone plummet’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

Impressionistically, however, marked nominal modifiers serve much more frequently as relational adjectives than zero-marked ones, therefore the danger of mixing up a possessor and a relational adjective in zero-marked forms is not substantial.
On the basis of these facts it can be supposed that at a certain point in history TY had only the construction as in (141) to express the possessive relation. /n/-marking of the possessor is widely attested roughly in the part of Eurasia where TY is spoken, e.g. in Finno-Ugric, Turkic, Mongolic languages as well as in Ket (Krejnovič 1958:6-7), but also in Japanese (Kolesnikov 1993:23), possibly Korean (Cholodovič 2010:59) and, marginally, in Manchu (Avrorin 2000:75). Initially being just the genitive case ending –n began to be used in compounds, which is a widely attested cross-linguistic phenomenon (Hengeveld, personal communication), and to derive relational adjectives from nouns. To disambiguate these uses, the speakers might have started to employ unmarked constructions for purely genitival functions. It is noteworthy in this context that the zero-marking is strongly preferred with animate possessors, that is, with prototypical possessors. With time, this strategy began to lose its absolute nature too, which made it necessary to introduce another one. The most effective way to solve this recurring problem once and for all would be to mark the possessive relation on the head instead of the dependent. This is exactly what the pertensive suffix (see 3.3.1.3) does in a totally unambiguous way.

Resuming, the suffix –n can occur in referential nouns, in phrases and sometimes in compounds. In this environment it functions as the genitive case ending marking the possessor, if only metaphorically as hardly ever a possessor represented by an animate relational noun takes this ending. The use of –n as a case ending should be differentiated from its occurrences in non-referential nouns: first members of compounds or attributively used nouns in phrases.

3.3.1.1.6 Dative

The dative case, whose endings are –n’ and –ŋin’, prototypically encodes a recipient (153). Apart from that it designates a goal, as a location (154a, 154b) and as an object to acquire (155). It also expresses similarity (Kurilov 2006:84-85) as in (156).

According to Krejnovič (1958:61) the reduced ending is attached to proper nouns and nouns modified by possessive pronouns. My data do not support that. Kurilov (2006:84-85) sees the choice as dependent on the phonological properties of nouns. Those terminating in a vowel or the glide /j/ can take the reduced ending. Note the non-obligatory nature of that reduction.

(153) Tindaa met ċiŋin’ qad’ir me=nemele kečinunŋa qad’ir puŋuoldeŋ menunŋa. tindaa met ċiŋin’ qad’ir me=neme-le keči-nunŋa
previously 1SG people-DAT DM IND=what-ACC bring-HAB.3PL.TR
qad’ir puŋuol-reŋ men’-nunŋa
DM rejoice-SIM take-HAB-3PL.TR
‘In previous times, when [one] brought something to my parents, they used to take [it] with joy.’


113 The use of the genitive case ending for the marking of possessors and for the derivation of relational adjectives is known for Manchu (Avrorin 2000:96).
‘Where did he go?’

‘To Yakutsk.’

(154b) Tude n’umudiyane n’aacêstelek qad’ir tidaŋ tude saalın’ kewejl’en’.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tude} & \quad \text{n’umudit-γane} & \quad \text{n’aacê-s-relek qad’ir tidaŋ} \\
3\text{SG.POSS} & \quad \text{axe-ACC} & \quad \text{face-CAUS-ANT \ DM \ ANPH} \\
\text{tude} & \quad \text{saal-γın’} & \quad \text{kewej-l’el-j} \\
3\text{SG.POSS} & \quad \text{tree-DAT} & \quad \text{leave-NVIS-INTR.3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Having sharpened well his axe, he went to that tree of his.’

(155) Met amaa tit qajčie labunme-γın’ nonolpe ičuonureγ ewlikiel’en’.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{met} & \quad \text{amaa} & \quad \text{tit} & \quad \text{qajčie} & \quad \text{labunme-γın’} & \quad \text{nonol-pe} & \quad \text{ičuonureγ} \\
1\text{SG} & \quad \text{father} & \quad 2\text{PL} & \quad \text{grand.father} & \quad \text{ptarmigan-DAT} & \quad \text{snare-PL} & \quad \text{look-DUR-SIM}
\end{align*}
\]

‘My father, your grand-father died when he was checking snares for ptarmigans.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:84)

(156) Obez’jana n’aacê-lek köde-γın’ ban-i.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Obez’jana} & \quad \text{n’aacê-lek} & \quad \text{köde-γın’} & \quad \text{ban-i}.
\end{align*}
\]

‘Monkey’s face resembles that of a human.’ (Kurilov 2006:84)

Sometimes one and the same word can have alternative dative forms. In such cases the following regularity can be observed in some idiolects: the reduced allomorph of the dative case ending shows a strong tendency to be used whenever its host is modified by a possessive pronoun:

(157a) Qad’ir met maalek eguojie met nimien’ kewejmorijenγ

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Qad’ir} & \quad \text{met} & \quad \text{maalek} & \quad \text{eguojie} & \quad \text{met} & \quad \text{nimien’} & \quad \text{kewejmorijenγ} \\
\text{DM} & \quad \text{1SG} & \quad \text{MP} & \quad \text{tomorrow} & \quad 1\text{SG} & \quad \text{house-DAT} & \quad \text{leave-PRSP-INTR.1SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘It looks like I will have to go home tomorrow.’

(157b) Tadaat taat mon-relek ičie ayuoldelek tude nimien’ me kewejl’en’.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tadaat} & \quad \text{taat} & \quad \text{mon-relek} & \quad \text{ičie} & \quad \text{ayuol-relek} \\
\text{then} & \quad \text{so} & \quad \text{say-ANT} & \quad \text{long.time} & \quad \text{stand-ANT} \\
\text{tude} & \quad \text{nime-n’} & \quad \text{me=kewej-l’el-i} \\
3\text{SG.POSS} & \quad \text{house-DAT} & \quad \text{PF=leave-NVIS-INTR.3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Then, having said that, he stood for a long time and went to his house.’

If the noun in the dative is not accompanied by a possessive pronoun, the full allomorph is employed:

(158a) Tadaat qad’ir wie-l’el-daya nime-γın’ uu-se-γį-k!

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tadaat} & \quad \text{qad’ir} & \quad \text{wie-l’el-daya} & \quad \text{nime-γın’} & \quad \text{uu-se-γį-k!} \\
\text{then} & \quad \text{DM} & \quad \text{do-NVIS[GER]-3SG.DS} & \quad \text{house-DAT} & \quad \text{go-CAUS-PL-IMP}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Then, when he did [it], bring him home.’
(158b) **Tuŋ körel akaad'e-γane tuŋ wadun nime laŋudeŋ nimeinquin' sewriel'elum.**

*ADL.PROX devil elder.brother-ACC ADL.PROX Yukaghir-GEN house towards*

`nime-ŋin'` *sewre-l’el-um*

`house-DAT bring.in-NVIS-TR.3SG`

'The devil grabbed the elder brother and pulled him toward that Yukaghir tent, inside the house.'

Other speakers do not follow this usage:

(159) **Tude nimeinquin' penjeinaadayā ilwiimureŋ mod’eq ...**

*3SG.POSS house-DAT return-INCH-GER-3SG.DS graze-DUR-SIM say-INTR.1SG*

`As he started toward home I told him while grazing …’

3.3.1.1.7 Instrumental

The instrumental case, denoted by the ending –lek, describes, as the name tells, the instrument (in the broadest sense) of an action it is performed with (160a, 160b). It also serves to indicate professional occupations (161)

114. Apart from that it names a material something is made of (162) and the source of one’s subsistence (163).

(160a) **Ten met-ul tet čojoje-lek čul-d’i-mek.**

*DM 1SG-ACC 2SG knife-INS poke-ITR-TR.2SG*

‘You had been poking me with your knife.’

(160b) **Met čuudewče-pe ile-lek lögite-ŋ mon-i Sal’il-die.**

*1SG relative-PL reindeer-INS feed-1SG.TR say-INTR-3.SG mouse-DIM*

‘ “I fed the relatives with the [meat of] reindeer,” said the little Mouse.’

(Kurilov 1994:8)

(161) **Kulup-qa qudruuk-lek čayad’e-jeŋ.**

*club-LOC coach-INS work-INTR.1SG*

‘I worked as a coach in the club.’

(162) **Taat wie-nu-l’el-ŋa aq jewlid’e-n sawa-lek.**

*so do-DUR-NVIS-3PL.TR only reindeer.calf-GEN skin-INS*

‘One made it like that only out of reindeer calf skin.’

(163) **Taŋnigine labunmelek legulnienunŋi.**

*then ptarmigan-INS food-VBLZ-HAB-3PL.INTR*

114 This is most probably a recent grammatical borrowing from Russian. Considering the potential Uralic link, it is noteworthy that in this TY is like e.g. Komi-Permyak and Udmurt and different from e.g. Hungarian and Finnish. The latter employ in this function a special case, the essive, whose lack in TY and some other Uralic languages may be caused by the influence of Russian (de Groot:2012).
‘In previous times one subsided on ptarmigan [meat].’

3.3.1.1.8 Locative

The locative case denotes a place (164a, 164b) and a time (165) at which an action is carried out. The locative can also indicate the goal of a motion verb (166) and competes thus with the dative. The locative can have delimitative meaning, often in combination with *kitn’er* ‘up to’ (167a, b, c). Its ending has two allomorphs: *-γa* and *–qa*.

(164a) *Tuŋ uŋŋ ileγa l’iel’en*.

\begin{Verbatim}
Tuŋ uŋŋ ileγa l’iel’en.
\end{Verbatim}

ADL.PROX child reindeer-LOC be-NVIS-INTR.3SG

‘The child was in the reindeer herd.’ (Kurilov 2005:126)

(164b) *Maarqa-n n’unun’al-γa garandaas-len pon’aal-el-ul*

\begin{Verbatim}
Maarqa-n n’unun’al-γa garandaas-len pon’aal-el-ul
\end{Verbatim}

one.GEN former.nomad.camp-LOC pencil(Russ)-FOC.ABS remain-NVIS-GER.SF

‘In a deserted nomad camp, a pencil was left behind.’ (Kurilov 1994:7)

(165) *Apanalaa-gi uuči-l sukunmol’γa Čieriskej-γa ewl’ikie-j.*

\begin{Verbatim}
Apanalaa-gi uuči-l sukunmol’γa Čieriskej-γa ewl’ikie-j.
\end{Verbatim}

old.woman-PERT pass-PTCP year-LOC Cherski-LOC disappear-INTR.3SG

‘His old wife died last year in Cherski.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:242)

(166) *Sal’il Ṋodoyane lukunsisayuyuγa tubegejl’en*.

\begin{Verbatim}
Sal’il Ṋodoyane lukunsisayuyuγa tubegejl’en.
\end{Verbatim}

mouse top.cntr earth-GEN-crack-LOC rush.in-NVIS-INTR.3SG

‘But the mouse whisked into a hole.’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

(167a) *Nime-γa kőtkej-relek sespe-γa kőtkej-relek qad’ir*

\begin{Verbatim}
Nime-γa kőtkej-relek sespe-γa kőtkej-relek qad’ir
\end{Verbatim}

house-LOC reach-ANT door-LOC reach-ANT DM

‘When he reached the house, when he came up to the door, he took off all his clothes.’

(167b) *Taŋ ayuodayane tideŋ saale pajuoldayat maarqan pajpe tude sisidamunya gitn’er pulgejl’en*.

\begin{Verbatim}
Taŋ ayuodayane tideŋ saale pajuoldayat maarqan pajpe tude sisidamunya gitn’er pulgejl’en.
\end{Verbatim}

DM stand[GER]-3SG.DS ANPH tree-acc hit-be[GER]-PERT-LOC-ABL one-GEN

woman 3SG.POSS breastbone-LOC up.to come.out-CAUS-NVIS-TR.3SG

‘While he was standing, from the place where he hit the tree, a woman came out up to her breasts.’

(167c) *Tadaa jayil ord’edaya loqöyanudayu anme sayaaaj.*

\begin{Verbatim}
Tadaa jayil ord’edaya loqöyanudayu anme sayaaaj.
\end{Verbatim}

then lake middle-PERT-LOC swing-DUR-GER-3SG.DS simply get.lost-INTR.3SG

‘Then, up to the middle of the lake it was swinging and suddenly disappeared.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:170)
3.3.1.9 Ablative

Both ablative and prolative case endings are attached not directly to the stem, but to the locative case endings. The ablative case ending –t indicates the source of an action (168) as well as a material (169). It also marks the reason for an action (170). It is used in comparative expressions (171).

(168) *Aduŋ met n’aajl tude čii-γa-t al’γa-p-tie-le keči-nun-um.*
DM 1SG son-in-law 3SG.POSS people-LOC-ABL fish-PL-DIM-ACC bring-HAB-TR.3SG
‘Well, my son-in-law used to bring fish from his parents.’

(169) *Pajpeja jaan sawayat wiejuolnuni.*
*Pajpe-γa jaa-n sawa-γa-t wie-ŋol-nun-i*
woman-LOC three-GEN skin-LOC-ABL do-be-HAB-INTR.3SG
‘[That] of women are made of three skins.’

(170) *Tuŋ Ukul’e juödiiyät aawai me čantajrem.*
*tuŋ Ukul’e juödii-γa-t aawa-l-le me=čantajre-m*
ADL DEM Akulina eyes-LOC-ABL sleep-GER ACC PF=not.be.able-TR.3SG
‘This Akulina cannot sleep because of [her] eyes.’

(171) *Pon’aa-l’el-d’e d’ii kewej-l’el-d’e köde-γa-t engene*
*Pon’aa-l’el-d’e d’ii kewej-l’el-d’e köde-γa-t engene*
remain-NVIS-PTCP people leave-NVIS-PTCP person-LOC-ABL very
*puŋuol-deŋ pon’aa-nun-i*
rejoice-SIM remain-hab-INTR.3SG
‘People that remain feel happier than a person that has left.’

3.3.1.10 Prolative

The prolative case ending –n designates the place through or along which a movement takes place (172a, 172b), a period of time over which an action extends (173).

(172a) *Tet uraanulγa aqćeyuol erimeyan ölkenuni.*
*tet uraa-nu-lγa aqćeyuol erime-γa-n ölke-nun-i*
2SG learn-DUR-1/2SG.DS barefoot snow-LOC-PROL run-HAB-INTR.3SG
‘When you went to school, [he] used to run barefoot over snow.’

(172b) *Tite ekuu-da-γa-n iću-o-l’el-um.*
*Tite ekuu-da-γa-n iću-o-l’el-um.*
so hole-PERT-LOC-PROL look-NVIS-TR.3SG
‘He looked into [its] the hole.’

(173) *Tuŋ tude nimie-n’ kewej-relek iiñeŋ jaa-n čajle-γa-n*
*DM 3SG.POSS house-DAT leave-ANT long.time three-GEN day-LOC-PROL*
*Tuŋ tude n’umudii-γane n’aaye-s-l’el-um.*
3SG.POSS axe-ACC face-CAUS-NVIS-TR.3SG
‘After he had left, he sharpened his axe for a long time, for three days.’
3.3.1.1.11 Comitative

The comitative case denotes a person partaking in the action of another person and is encoded with the ending –n’ẹŋ.

(174) Qarandaas met čii-ẹŋ ewri ejen monur puŋuölur mer ayal’waaj me mönd’ẹč!
qarandaas met čii-ẹŋ ewre-nu-jen mon-ur
pencil 1SG people-COM walk-DUR-INTR.1SG say-CIRC
puŋuöl-nu-r mer=ayal’we-aa-j me=mönd’ẹj-j
rejoice-DUR-CIRC PF=laugh-INCH-INTR.3SG PF=wake.up-INTR.3sg
‘The pencil, thinking that he was with his people, rejoiced and woke up.’
(Kurilov 1994:7)

3.3.1.1.12 Purposive

The purposive expresses the idea ‘to act/to serve as’. The purposive suffix is represented by the copular verb ṣol-, which can still be used in this function analytically, as in (175b). For this reason, it might be more appropriate to call this device quasi-suffix:

(175a) Maarqall’e tet mirijuol, könmegi metl’uol.
maarqa-ll’e tet mirije-pol könmegi met-l’e-uol
one-RLN 2SG wife-be another.one 1SG-RLN-PURP
‘One of them will be the wife for you, and the other one for me.’
(Kurilov 2001:160, könmegi)

(175b) Malaa kin nidet mit margil’ kirijeyane taŋut tudeyane men’tem könme ṣol
malaa kin nide-t mit margil’ kirije-γane
MP who[FOC.ERG] name-FUT[AF] 1SG daughter name-ACC
taŋu-t tudel-γane men’te-m könme ṣol
INVS.DEM-FOC.ABS 3SG-ACC take-FUT-TR.3SG partner be
‘Come on, the one who names my daughter’s name, will marry her.’
(Kurilov 2001:151, kin)

115 The same meaning can be expressed by the word moraw approximately meaning ‘duty’, which is treated in this grammar as the obligatory mood marker (3.4.2.4). When used to express purpose, it is often preceded by the genitive case suffix. This indicates that it functions as the head of a possessive construction and is not a nominal suffix, as Krejnovič (1958:66) believed:

(176) Qaaliče uon morawk.
qaaluu-je uo-n moraw-k
be.strong-PTCP child-GEN PURP-COP
‘This child is meant to become strong.’ (Kurilov 2001:259, moraw)

116 Note the discrepancy between the focal status of taŋut ‘that one’ and the focus pattern encoded in its predicate.
3.3.1.2 Number

In TY singular and plural can be distinguished. The former is unmarked, the latter is formed with the help of the suffixes –p(e(ŋ) and –pel which immediately follow the base. A number of nouns have suppletive plurals, e.g. köde ‘man’ vs. či ‘people’. A limited number of irregular formations are attested as well: uor-pe ‘children’ < uo ‘child’.

It is important to note that the notion of plurality can be conveyed in TY without formally marking the noun as plural form. Such collective nouns functioning as the subjects of sentences can be combined with predicates in plural:

(177) Ileŋ lewejme pulgid’ilele lewnunjumle qand’eme n’ord’ele lewnunj19

ileŋ lewej-m ele pulgid’ile-le lewnun–nu-m ele
reindeer summer-NMLZ flower-ACC eat-HAB-PL-TR.3.OF
qand’e-m ele n’ord’e-le lewnun–ya
cold-NMLZ reindeer.moss-ACC eat-HAB-3PL-TR

‘In summer reindeer graze green plants and in winter reindeer moss.’

Subjects represented by the word ile ‘reindeer’ – nowadays the most important domesticated animal alongside the dog for Yukaghirs, which is kept in herds, i.e. naturally existing as a multitude in TY culture – are especially prone to surface without an overt plural marking. In other words, as Maslova (2003c:48) puts it, ‘the morphological marking of plurality is possible only if the NP has specific reference’, generic uses remaining unmarked for number. This view requires revision, though. Nouns denoting paired body parts can, despite being normally specific, have both singular and plural reading without a formal change: ugurče ‘leg(s)’, juödii ‘eyes’:

(178) Araj tite ičuo-l-daya maarqa-n n’awn’ilkie-die tude

so look-GER-3SG.DS one-GEN polar.fox-DIM 3SG.POSS
juödii pilie-nu-l’el-mele
eye wipe-DUR-NVIS-TR.3SG.OF

‘And then [he] looked and saw how a little polar-fox was rubbing his eyes.’

Krejnović (1958:70) claims that the suffix –p is selected when it is followed by other markers, otherwise the two other forms are used. However, even in his own presentation he gives counterexamples, in which the suffix –pe is followed by the focus markers –leŋ or –k and the suffix –pel attaches the possession marker –gi, and even states these phenomena explicitly (Krejnović 1958:71). It is true, on the other hand, that in most cases the suffix –p cannot be used in word-final position.120

117 The suffix –pel is a rare idiolectal variant of -pul.
118 This word has, probably, the highest number of plural forms. Apart from this one there is the irregular plural form könpe and the regular form in the accusative ködepeyan (Kurilov 2001:255, monur). See also the redundantly marked form in (186).
119 Note the lack of the OF pattern in the second clause, where the BC pattern is employed instead. The contrastive meaning implied by the translation would actually make one expect OF in the second clause too.120 Krejnović (1982:43) notes, that the plural suffix –p is found in word-final position in kinship terms, e.g. očidiep ‘father’s younger brother’, gawd’diep ‘mother’s younger brother’ and so on, where it does not express plurality but has an honorific meaning. In Kurilov (2001:143, jewluge) one also comes across the form jewlugep ‘poor creatures’.
In his later work Krejnovič (1982:40-41) sees the choice of the plural suffixes as dependent on the type of noun stem and the stress pattern. His analysis is, however, not quite convincing. He distinguishes two types of stems: those ending in a or e/o < a (class II in his description) and all others (class I in his description). He proceeds to say that the suffix –pe is used with class I nouns while class II nouns attach the suffixes –pul and –p. However, there counterexamples or alternative forms of the plural for one and the same noun can be found. Krejnovič (1982:42) himself recognizes this fact, explaining it by the development of the focus system in TY and the incompatibility of the suffix –pul with the function of focus (Krejnovič 1958:71). Though it may tendentially be true that –pul does not occur in focalized arguments, such sentences are not ungrammatical, as the elicitation below shows.

(179) N’etlepuleŋ keluŋul.

n’ete-pul-leg keļu-ŋu-l

fox-PL-FOC.ABS come-PL-GER.SF

‘It were foxes that came.’

Apart from that, the other allomorph selected by class II stems, the suffix –p, is compatible with the focus suffix –leŋ and could facilitate the assignment of focus function even if –pul could not:

(180) Tadaa čupče-p-leŋ l’e-ŋu-l.

there chukchi-PL-FOC.ABS be-PL-GER.SF

‘Chikchis lived there.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:24)

According to Krejnovič (1982:38-41) participles belong to class II stems and should not attach the suffix –pe. Nevertheless forms like ilwičeppe ‘herders’, where ilwič is a nominalized participle (see 3.3.2.1), are readily found.

Nikolaeva (2002:14), too, attributes the choice of the plural suffix to the nature of the stem. She differentiates among stems ending in the central vowel [ə], which normally take the suffix –pul and all other stems that attach –pe. She admits that ‘deviations from this distribution are attested.’ Nikolaeva (2002:14) groups the suffix –pul with the suffix –p and says that it assumes the shape of the latter ‘when followed by a l-initial case suffix’. Actually, while the sequence <pe-lek> ‘PL-INS’ is indeed extremely rare, the sequences <pe-leŋ> ‘PL-FOC.ABS’ and <pe-le> ‘PL-ACC’ are quite common, including environments (to the right of the first bimoraic foot) in which Nikolaeva (2006:29) would expect [ə] and, consequently, –pul/-p, e.g. qajčie-tege-pe-le ‘bears (grandfather-AUG-PL-ACC)’ or n’etle-pe-leŋ ‘fox-PL-FOC.ABS’. On the other hand, the sequence <p-le> ‘PL-ACC’, taken by Nikolaeva to be the contracted form of <pul-le>, can be found in

---

121 Note that in this approach the suffix –p is associated with –pul, whereas in Krejnovič (1958:71) it seemed to be grouped with –pe on the basis of the compatibility with the focus marker, not inherent to –pul.

122 It has to be admitted though that stems ending in consonants (class I) do seem to attach primarily suffix –pe.

123 In my corpus it is instantiated only once, in the Russian word for ‘tea-pot’ čajnikpelek ‘tea-pot.PL.INS’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:180). However, the instrumentals with –p are almost equally rare, with only two tokens, one of them being a Yakut loan.
environments in which the suffix -pul would not be expected, e.g. jelid’e-p-le ‘reindeer calf-PL-ACC’.

I believe that the choice of allomorphs –p and –pe in a non-terminal position is conditioned by syllable structure of a given word form and adjacency restrictions. The exact rules are unclear. A good illustration of the potential significance of syllable structure for the choice of the plural suffix allomorph is the parallel existence of the same words with both allomorphs. The word laame ‘dog’, which Krejnovič regards as a class II stem (e < a) e.g. displays the following plural forms:

- pe  - p

(181) laame-pe ‘dog-PL’ laame-p-le ‘dog-PL-ACC’
laamepe-γane ‘dog-PL-ACC’ laame-p-tie ‘dog-PL-DIM’
laame-pe-gi ‘dog-PL-PERT’ laameptiek ‘dog-PL-DIM-ABS’

In the first column the form laamepe is conditioned by the word-final position of the plural suffix. The other two forms are most probably computed on the basis of the adjacency restriction voiceless obstruent + voiced obstruent. It is not an absolute restriction but it is violated in my data only when the first segment of the cluster is /č/. See footnote 55 in 2.2.2 for examples. The forms in the left column are a good example of how the stem rule postulated by Krejnovič (1982:40f.) is overridden by other constraints and therefore cannot be universally applicable. The forms in the right column cannot be explained by adjacency restrictions. I speculate that it is the features of syllabic structure (heavy vs. light syllables, open vs. closed syllables, possibly diphthongs vs. simple vowels and the exact order of the syllables of different types) that determine these forms. Just how exactly still needs to be investigated. It cannot be excluded that despite all efforts some variation may remain unaccounted for, among other things due to idiolectal differences. For instance, the form waaweče-p-len ‘Russian-PL-FOC.ABS’ attested in Kurilov (1994:9) was rejected by a competent informant as ungrammatical, in favor of the synonymous form waawečepeleŋ. However, waawečepeleŋ probably cannot be a misprint, as one might suppose under these circumstances, because one finds the same pattern in e.g. čupče-p-len ‘Chukchi-PL-FOC.ABS’ in Kurilov (2001:396, pulgejre-), qaalid’e-p-le ‘wolf-PL-ACC’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:106).

As far as the distribution of the suffix –pul is concerned, I adopt Kurilov’s (2006:69) view, according to which the suffix –pul is used when the speaker regards the denotates as a homogenous whole without singling out any of them:

(182a) Ile-pe me=kelu-ŋi.
reindeer-PL PF=come-3PL.INTR
‘Several tens of reindeer came.’

---

124 The vowel in the suffix –d’e is realized as an [e] and not as an [ə].
125 The first form in the right column could theoretically be explained, in Nikolaeva’s vein, as having the short allomorph of –pul in front of a /l/-initial suffix, if the generalization made in that approach had not been demonstrated above as untenable. Besides, there exist forms like n’etlepuleŋ ‘fox-PL.ABS.FOC’, which indicate that the suffix –pul does not even have to be contracted to –p in front of /l/-initial suffixes.
(182b) *Ile-pul me=kelu-ŋ*  
reindeer-PL PF=come-3PL.INTR  
‘A reindeer herd came.’ (Kurilov 2006:69)

The forms with –*pul* are, thus, similar in their meaning to the unmarked plural of collective nouns used generically. Therefore this allomorph is especially frequently used with ethnonyms since these are often non-referential:

(183) *Jojopelya sayanejli.*  
*joqol-pul-ya sayane-jli*  
Yakut-PL-LOC sit-INTR.1PL  
‘We lived among Yakuts.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:58)

However, referentiality is not a crucial criterion for the choice between –*pe* and –*pul*. The subject in the following example is clearly referential since it is specified as the speaker’s parents:

(184) *Tadaa met čii-pul¹²⁶ l’e-ŋi.*  
there 1SG people-PL be-3PL.INTR  
‘My parents were there.’

Examples can be found where nouns with the plural suffix –*pul* are not only undoubtedly referential but are individuated in an absolute way by being named¹²⁷:

(185) *Ten’i klimat quode-ban-ul-gi Severnej Ledovitej tadaat*  
here climat how-be-GER-PERT North(Russ) Icy(Russ) and  
*Tichij okean-pul-γa-t para-n’e-j.*  
Pacific ocean(Russ)-PL-LOC-ABL basis-VBLZ-INTR.3SG  
‘The climate here is determined by the North Polar Sea and Pacific Ocean.’

The obvious conclusion that can be draw from (184) and (185) is that the suffix –*pul* is employed when the speaker wants to present the denotates, whether referential or not, as a unit.

Some words allow a double plural marking, e.g. čii-pe-*ley* ‘people-PL-COP’ (suppletive plural stem), *uorpe-pul-γi* ‘children-PL-PERT’.

(186) *Ed’ilwej el’niimije čii-pe-da-γane köde-pul me=pun-l’e-ŋa.*  
Edilwey orphan people-PL-PERT-ACC man-PL PF=kill-NVIS-3PL-TR  
‘Edilwey is an orphan, [some] people killed his parents.’ (Kurilov 2005:126)

¹²⁶ Note that this form is also in conflict with the phonological explanations cited above: the word čii ‘parents’ belongs to class I and it’s stem does not end in [ɔ].

¹²⁷ It may be interesting for the reader that during an elicitation session I witnessed a disagreement among two competent speakers on whether the expression ‘оленья упряжка’ should be rendered into Yukaghir by *ilepe* or *ilepul*. By de-individuating the reindeer in this expression I expected to get *ilepul* as the valid translation but it was suitable only for the one of the speakers, while the other one preferred *ilepe*. 
TY has something what could be labeled as reciprocal plural, expressed by the circumfix \( n'i(ŋ) \) ... \( jil' \sim jil \). It is only applicable to kinship terms:

(187) \( n'in'ugeejil' \) ‘cousins’ < \( n'i- \) ‘RECP’ + \( n'ugel \) ‘cousin’ + \( -jil' \) ‘PL’

See more examples in (96).

Kurilov (2006:69) notes the existence of an associative use of the plural with proper nouns in TY. The exact scope of the plural suffix in such usages is determined by the context:

(188a) \( Kolja-\text{pe} \) \text{me}=\text{kelu-}\text{ŋ}. \hspace{1cm} \text{Kolya-PL PF=come-3PL.INTR}

‘Kolya and his family members have come.’ (Kurilov 2006:69)

(188b) \( Petja-\text{pe} \) \text{mer}=\text{uraa-nu-}\text{ŋ}. \hspace{1cm} \text{Petya-PL PF=learn-DUR-3PL.INTR}

‘Petya and his classmates/friends are learning.’ (Kurilov 2006:69)

(188c) \( Qad'ir \text{ta} \text{m}i\text{g}i \) Daurov Vasja-\text{pe} ile \text{dite} \text{č}ama \text{laame}-\text{n'-}\text{ŋ}. \hspace{1cm} \text{DM then Daurov Vasya-PL reindeer like big dog-VBLZ-INTR.3PL}

‘And at that time the family of Vasja Daurov kept a big dog of a size of a reindeer.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:52)

(188d) \( \text{Tittel an Kurilew-}\text{pe-le} \text{ŋ}. \hspace{1cm} \text{3PL DEIC Kurilov-PL-COP}

‘They are Kurilovs.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:62)

The plural suffix occasionally, even in the same idiolect, ousts the word-final sonorant:

(189) \( \text{lačilpe} \sim \text{lačipe} \) ‘fires’
\( \text{joqopul} \sim \text{joqol} \) ‘Yakut’ + \( -\text{pul} \) ‘PL’ \sim \( \text{wadul-pul} \) ‘Yukaghir-PL’

3.3.1.3 Pertensive

The possessum can be marked in TY with the pertensive suffix –\( gi \) as long as the possessor is a 3\text{rd} person:

(190) \( \text{Met l'ukuoler} \text{čamija}a \text{Löti}i \text{könmegi}n'e\text{ŋ}, \text{Tretyakov Aleksej Semjonovič, ilwiiče} \text{ŋ}oler \text{ewrej}e\text{ŋ}. \hspace{1cm} \text{met l'uku-}\text{yol-er} \text{čamija}a \text{Löti}i \text{könme-gi-n'}e\text{ŋ} \text{Tretyakov}
\hspace{1cm} \text{1SG small-BE-CIRC aunt Lyotee husband-PERT-COM Tretyakov}
\hspace{1cm} \text{Aleksej Semjonovič ilwii-če} \text{ŋ}oler \text{ewre-j}e\text{ŋ}
\hspace{1cm} \text{Aleksey Semyonovich herd-NMLZ be-CIRC go-INTR.1SG}

‘When I was small, I worked as a herder together with my aunt Lyotee’s husband, Alexeys Semyonovich Tretyakov.’
If the locative case suffix follows, the pertensive suffix turns into –da:

(191a) ile jawul-gi
reindeer track-PERT
‘a track of a reindeer’
(191b) ile jawul-da-γa-n
reindeer track-PERT-LOC-PROL
‘along a track of a reindeer’

The pertensive suffix remains unchanged when followed by the genitive case ending. The possessor the pertensive suffix refers to is often omitted when understood:

(192) uo-d-uorpe-gi-n juödii-pe-gi
child-0-children-PERT-GEN eye-PL-PERT
‘[her] grandchildren’s eyes’

The pertensive suffix blocks the attachment of the nominal focus marker and the homophonous copula.

### 3.3.2 Noun formation

A detailed analysis of noun formation can be found in Kurilov (1977, 1994, 2003). Nouns are either derived by suffixes or formed via the process of compounding. Conversion of verbal stems is also a limited source of noun formation.

#### 3.3.2.1 Suffixal derivation

Kurilov (2006:91-92) estimates the number of suffixes deriving nouns at about 30. Only around one third of them are productive. These include –je, -če, -(n)d’e, -l, -jaal-jie, -čaal-čee, -d’aal-d’ie, -(d)ii, -uu, -bel-bul, -me, -rgal-rke, -diel-tie and -(t)tegel-tke. They are presented in the following according to the meanings they convey.

Before proceeding with the actual presentation, a few words must be said about the first three suffixes in the list, which express a number of meanings. They are identical with the participle suffixes that form a series of allomorphs and thus the nouns formed with their help should be viewed as nominalized participles. However, they are not dealt with as instances of conversion because nouns derived with their help are not always homophonous with the corresponding participles. This is to say that the allomorph of the participial suffix selected by a given stem need not coincide with the suffix deriving nouns. In other word, the derivational suffix can be another allomorph of the participle suffix. Sometimes these differences are systematic. A good illustration of that is derivation of nouns with abstract meaning. When such nouns are derived from qualitative verbs, whose attributive forms carry the participial suffix –če, the derivational ending is invariantly –d’e. This clearly sets the attributively used verbal forms off deverbal nouns:

(193) amud’e ‘the good’ vs. amuče ‘good’ < amuo- ‘to be good’
qaalid’e ‘smth. frightful’ vs. qaaliče ‘frightful’ < qaaluu- ‘to be frightful’

Except in abstracta, whose stems end in vowels, the suffix –d’e appears almost exclusively after stems ending in sonorants. The suffix –če, except in abstracta, usually
occurs after stems which end in a long vowel and approximant as well as /č/. The suffix –je normally follows stems ending in a short vowel or a diphthong. To meet this selecting criterion, a long stem-final vowel is shortened or undergoes a diphthongization when the suffix –je is attached. Aberrations from this scheme exist. Most of the examples below are taken from Kurilov (1994, 2006:92-96).

a) Nomina agentis can be derived from verbs with the help of the suffixes –je, –če, –ďe, –jaal/-jie:

(194) l’iteged’ие ‘blacksmith’ < l’iteged’ie ‘to forge’
    ilwičе ‘herdsman’ < ilwi– ‘to pasture’
    amalad’aače ‘doctor’ < amalad’aa– ‘to treat medically’
    moojče ‘chief’ < mooj– ‘to hold’
    lajnid’aače ‘soldier’ < lajnid’aa– ‘to be a professional soldier’
    löl’d’e ‘step father’, ‘educator’ < löl– ‘to bring up’

There are also derivationally unclear cases, such as moojdiе ‘obstacle’ (presumably deriving from mooj– ‘to hold’), where the sequence <di> is of an obscure origin.

The suffix –jaal/-jie expresses an augmentation of this meaning: (‘the one who exercises the action expressed by the underlying verb to a greater degree’ or ‘the one who is skillful at carrying out the action expressed by the underlying verb’):

(195) jaqtijaa ‘singer’ < jaqte– ‘to sing’
    ann’ijaa ‘orator’ < ann’e– ‘to speak’
    lawníjaа ‘drunkard’ < lawnu– ‘to drink’ (durative form)
    ölkijie ‘runner’ < ölke– ‘to run’
    čungdijie ‘wiseman’ < čungde– ‘to think’
    werwijie ‘hercules’ < werwe– ‘to be strong’

b) Semantically related to the suffix -jaal/-jie is the suffix –čaa/-če, which derives nouns from other nouns, with the meaning ‘area abounding in smth.’:

(196) n’ord’ečaa ‘a place abounding in reindeer lichen’ < n’ord’e ‘reindeer lichen’
    morqčaa ‘a place where many dwarf birches grow’ < morqe ‘dwarf birch’
    čičee ‘a place full of people’ < čii ‘people’
    čuučee ‘a place of the reindeer body with a lot of meat’ < čuu ‘meat’
    amuncčaa ‘a bony portion (of a fish)’ < amun ‘bone’
    n’anmečaa ‘rose willow bushes’ < n’anme ‘rose willow’
    lačínčaa ‘a place abounding in firewood’ < lačil ‘fire(wood)’

---

128 Not any obstacle can be referred to as moojdiе. Words like ‘rope’ or ‘darkness’ can. Words like ‘river’ or ‘wall’ cannot.
129 The suffix –jaal/-jie derives nouns with this meaning only very seldom. The instances are mainly restricted to toponyms, e.g. N’uorqijaa (name of a lake) < n’uorqa ‘horse-tail’ (a lake at whose shores horse-tail abounds).
The nominal character of these derivates is confirmed by their capability to attach inflectional endings:

(197) Čii-čaa-γa / Čii-čaa-pul laayar sayane-jli.
people-NMLZ-LOC / people-NMLZ-PL area sit-INTR.HORT
‘Let’s live there where people are.’

c) Denominal nouns denoting a person or object characterized in some way by the derivational base are derived by the suffix pair –d’aa/-d’ie:

(198) laamed’aa ‘one who is transported by dogs’ < laame ‘dog’
aariid’aa ‘a person with a rifle’ < aarii ‘rifle’
lalimed’aa ‘one who rides on a sledge (and not e.g. on a rein-deer’s back)’ < lalime ‘sledge’
el=gi tiết’ie ‘ring finger’ < el= ‘NEG’ + kirije ‘name’
el=mirije’ie ‘bachelor’ < el= ‘NEG’ + mirije ‘wife’

It appears that the suffix series –je, -če, -d’e is related materially and semantically with the series –jaa/-jie, -čaa/čee and –d’aal/-d’ie.

d) Nouns designating instruments facilitating the action expressed by the derivational verbal base are formed with the help of the suffixes –je,-če, -(d)ii:

(199) čoγoje ‘knife’ < čoγu- ~ čaw- ‘cut (off)’
igije ‘belt’ < ige- ‘to be tied’,
n’i=muoje ‘strait’ < mooj- ‘to hold’
amaličče ‘medicine’ < amaleč- ‘to treat medically.’ITR’ < amaler- ‘to cure’
wel’iće ‘rucksack’ < wel’ii- ‘to lug’
miarii ‘file’ < miara- ‘to whet’
tolii ‘staff’ < toli- ‘to prop up’
lewdeii ‘fork’ < lewde- ‘to eat’
loyorii ‘sponge’ < loyor- ‘to wash’
juödii ‘eye’ < juö- ‘to see’
čulyadii ‘ice-pick’ < čulya- ‘poke’

The outcome of the derivation with the suffix –ii can be semantically less straightforward:

(200) sal’yarii ‘teeth’ < sal’yarej- ‘to break’
aawii ‘blanket’ < aawe ‘to sleep’

It is not possible to predict that the noun designating an instrument derived from the verb ‘to break’ would be ‘teeth’ and not, for instance, ‘stick’, or ‘hammer’, or anything that could be used for demolishing things. The same holds for the word pair ‘to sleep’ and ‘blanket’.
e) Nomina facta denoting the result of an action or its undergoer are derived with the help of the suffixes –je, -će, -(n)d’e and -uu:

(201) siigije ‘creek’ < siige- ‘to drip’  
    al’uojje ‘ice-hole’ < al’uol- ‘to thawed’  
    uraričče ‘tamed reindeer’ < urarič- ‘to teach’ (might be an underlying –je that’s experienced a complete assimilation)  
    moldend’e ‘soaked skin meant for shammy’ < molde- ‘to rot’  
    köjluu ‘hole’ < köjle ‘to tear’  
    sisayuu ‘crack’ < sisayaj ‘to break’  
    n’uoruu ‘tress’ < n’uore- ‘to plait’  
    lugul’uu ‘old creature’ (about reindeer, dogs, etc.) < luge- ‘to be older’

f) Nomina actionis are derived by the suffixes –je, -će, -(n)d’e and –l:

(202) wajajije ‘current, flow’ < wajaja- ‘to flow away’  
    lajniće ‘war’ < lajnu- ‘to fight’  
    juoriće ‘festival’ < juora- ‘to play’  
    lögirind’e ‘wedding’ < lögirič- ‘to feed’ITR’  
    l’erkejend’e ‘shamanic praying’ < l’erkejen’- ‘to engage in shamanic praying’  
    wel’il ‘bag’ < wel’ii- ‘to lug’  
    örül ‘cry’ < örn’e- ‘to shout’  
    legul ‘food’ < lew- ‘to eat ~ lögite- ‘to feed’  
    kičil ‘end’ < kici- ‘to restrict’  
    ed’il ‘life’ < en’- ‘to live’  
    anil ‘gift’ < ani- ‘to present’

Some nouns derived with the help of the suffix –je cannot be easily identified as belonging to one of the above listed semantic groups:

(203) watnije ‘(a kind of) trap’ < watnii- ‘to keep smth. open’

With qualitative verbs, derivations with different members of the series –je, -će, -d’e are sometimes possible. Thus, in (12) the suffix –d’e derives, as expected, an abstract noun (nomen qualitatis) while the suffix –će derives a noun with the meaning of an instrument.

(204) pugud’e ‘warmth’ < puguol- ‘to be warm’ > puguće ‘wool’

g) Gerunds are derived by means of the suffix –l and by stem conversion if a stem ends in /l/ (Kurilov 2006:103-105), which is most typically the case when the copular verb yol- attaches to a verb stem or in quantitative verbs. Suffixation derives gerunds with an active meaning (205), while conversion leads to a formation of gerunds with a passive meaning from transitive verbs (206) and with a resultative meaning from intransitive verbs (207):
‘She cried while putting on her clothes, so much was she disinclined to leave.’

(Kurilov 2001:517, qodej-)

‘When he hit, at the place where he hit with his axe a moan resounded.’

‘Make [him] clean up his spew.’ (Kurilov 2001:321, adaateŋ)

‘One day the old woman saw that in the direction they were to go there was something like a black cloud.’  
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:182)

‘His strong side is that he tends to reindeer.’

According to Kurilov (2006:106) the instrumental of gerunds functions as an adverbial expression of manner modifying the predicate of the clause, as in (209), but in some contexts it appears to have a temporal meaning, resembling the anteriority converb in –relek:
(210) **Tuŋ quod’eduγane jukuolel taŋunγane waaj taŋ nime lanjudeŋ uuselek me sewrej’elum.**

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{tuŋ} & \text{kuod’eduγane} & \text{juku-ŋol-el} \\
\text{ADL.PROX} & \text{boy-ACC} & \text{small-be-PTCP} \\
\text{taŋ} & \text{nime} & \text{lanjudeŋ} \\
\text{INVS.DEM} & \text{house} & \text{toward} \\
\text{waaj} & \text{uus-se-l-lek} & \text{me=sew-re-j-l’el-um} \\
\text{also} & \text{PF=enter-CAUS-SEM-NVIS-TR.3G} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘He carried also this son, the young one, to the house and pulled him inside.’

The dative of the gerund is used to encode predicates of final clauses under coreferentiality of the subjects in the main and dependent clause (see 4.3.2.2.5).

The essential difference of the gerund from sometimes homonymous nomina actionis is that gerunds being nouns still have some verbal properties. The most important of them is the retention of the argument structure (see discussion in 3.9.2.1).

Gerunds play a very important role in TY syntax, facilitating formation of adverbial clauses (see 4.3.2), encoding predicates under SF (see 5.2), functioning as attributive verb forms (see 4.3.3). When gerunds encode predicates of e.g. temporal clauses in sentences with disjoint subject reference, they combine with the locative case ending, followed in the 3rd person by the pertensive suffix, and form a quasi-verbal paradigm presented below. The forms translate as ‘when I/you etc. sing’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 jaqte-l-γa</td>
<td>jaqte-l-aqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 jaqte-l-γa</td>
<td>jaqte-l-aqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 jaqte-daγa</td>
<td>jaqte=daγa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the surface the 3rd person forms lack the gerund suffix –l, which is a result of the morphophonemic process of deletion (see 2.3.1). That the gerund ending is present, at least in the underlying form, in all slots of the paradigm is indirectly confirmed by the following example:

(211) ölked amud’egi

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{ölke-l-d} & \text{amuo-d’e-gi} & \\
\text{run-GER-0} & \text{be-good-NMLZ-PERT} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘his best time as a runner’ (Kurilov 2006:107)

In (211), the gerund suffix –l is absent under the same phonological condition as in the switch-reference forms in the 3rd person above, namely in front of /d/. A similar example follows:

(212) Eu ejk ewri eguojie al’γaŋ ejuud’γane tel’iedal’γa mer=at=wie-j.

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{eu} & \text{ejk} & \text{ewri} \\
\text{ITJ} & \text{if} & \text{if} \\
\text{eguojie} & \text{tomorrow} & \text{fish} \\
\text{al’γaŋ} & \text{get.caught-3SG.DS} & \\
\text{ejuu-daγane} & \text{PF=POT=make-1PL.TR} & \\
\text{tel’ie-l-d-al’γa} & \text{mer=at=wie-j.} \\
\text{dry-GER-0-fish} & & \\
\end{array}
\]
‘Oh, if only fish got caught tomorrow, we would make yukola.’

(Kurilov 2001:589, efk ewri)

Conversely, in the 3PL the gerund suffix is present in the surface structure of predicates under SF because no suffix with /d/ in the initial position follows: tittel jaqteŋul ‘[It is] they [who] sang’.

Stems of qualitative verbs ending with /l/ can function as gerunds without a formal nominalization, presenting thus a case of stem conversion. This stem-final /l/ is not deleted in the 3SG of the discussed switch-reference forms, e.g. pajuol-daya ‘to be numerous[GER]-3SG.DS’. In the 3PL of such verbs the presence of the nominalizing suffix –l has to be posited in the underlying structure to reconcile the adjacency of the purely verbal plurality suffix –ŋu and the switch-reference marker, which is built up of nominal inflectional endings: the pertensive suffix and the locative case ending:

(213) jukuolŋudaya
      jukuol-ŋu-l-daya
    be.small-PL-GER-3.DS
‘when [they] were small’

As already observed by Krejnovič (1982:170) there is an alternative paradigm of switch-reference forms with disjoint subject reference. The gerund suffix lacks in it altogether. Unlike Krejnovič, who regarded these alternative forms of suffixes as expressing some kind of emphasis, I believe that they are simply a variation in usus without semantic differences. In Kurilov (2000:152, kinek, 598, endii-) one can find the same sentence. In one instance of it the predicate of the dependent clause is written with the gerund suffix, in the other instance without it.

(214a) Tet kewejlyane kinek endiit tittelŋane.
      tet kewej-l-ŋane kin-ek en’-ii-t tittel-ŋane
    2SG leave-GER-1/2SG.DS who-FOC.ABS be.alive-CAUS-FUT[AF] 3PL-ACC
‘If you leave, who will provide for them?’

(214b) Tet kewejqane kinek tittel endiitel tittelŋane.

h) Nouns designating a location at which an action is (supposed to be) carried out are formed with the suffixes –be, -bul. The resulting derivates are actually the nominalized forms of the oblique participle (see 3.4.2.6), which also has the more or less pronounced meaning of a ‘participium necessitatis’.

(215) sayanebul ‘bench’ (‘a place where one sits’) < sayane- ‘to sit’
      moojnube ‘handle’ (‘a place at which one holds’) < moojnu- ‘to hold.DUR’
      wel’ibe ‘saddle’ (‘a place for luggage’) < wel’ii- ‘to lug’
      ilell’ebul ‘reindeer pasture’ (‘a place to be at’) < ilen ‘reindeer.GEN’ + l’e- ‘to be’

130 This term is enclosed in quotation marks because in Latin grammar, where it is borrowed from, the corresponding forms are exclusively passive. In TY it is only the modal meaning that’s shared with Latin participial necessitates, and not the voice value.
The suffixes –be and –bul are ambivalent as far as the part of speech of the derivational base is concerned:

(216)  

\textit{purebe} ‘surface’ < \textit{pure} ‘on’ (literally ‘upper part’)

A suitable paraphrase for \textit{purebe} is ‘a place where the upper part is’, ‘a place at which the upper part is supposed to be’.

Consider also the following formations:

(217)  

\textit{wal’be} ‘friend’ < \textit{wal} ‘near’
\textit{čirebe} ‘plummet’ < \textit{čirej} ‘to sink’
\textit{monnube} ‘smth. to be said’ < \textit{monnu-} ‘to say.DUR’

In these examples the notion of locus is lost. Instead, these nominalization can be seen as expressing the modal meaning, inherent to some extent to the suffix –be of the oblique participle. Therefore one could paraphrase the derivate in (217) as ‘the one to be near’, ‘something meant to sink’ and ‘something meant to be said’.

i) Time periods are encoded with the help of the suffix –me:

(218)  

\textit{qand’eme} ‘winter’ < \textit{qand’e} ‘cold’
\textit{pugud’eme} ‘early spring’ < \textit{pugud’e} ‘warmth’
\textit{čajleme} ‘daytime’ < \textit{čajle} ‘light’

These derivate occupy an intermediate position between nouns and adverbs. Kurilov (2001) is inconsistent in assigning a lexical status to this class of words, treating the two first words in (218) as nouns while the last one is entered into the dictionary as an adverb. If one tries to test the part of speech of derivate with –me by checking if they can trigger agreement, one arrives at controversial results:

(219a) \textit{Tidaŋγa amdur cùoγajme ηol-aa-j.}
\textit{last.year haste-CIRC spring be-inch-INTR.3SG}
‘Last year the spring arrived earlier.’

(219b) *\textit{Tidaŋγa cùoγajme amdu-r kelu-j.}
\textit{last.year spring haste-CIRC come-INTR.3SG}
‘Last year the spring arrived early.’

In (219a), where the predicate is non-verbal, \textit{cùoγajme} ‘spring’ is formally the subject since it makes the copular verb ηol- agree with it. In (219b), with a verbal predicate, the same sentence is regarded by speakers as ungrammatical. Whether or not this is conditioned by the different predicate types, a word with the suffix –me shows ambivalent syntactic behavior, now qualifying to be a noun, now not.

The relational adjective \textit{cùoγajl’e} ‘spring(like)’ is derived not from the stem \textit{cùoγajme} ‘spring’, as one might me expect, but from the stem *\textit{cùoγaj}, which does not
occur on its own. Some season names have alternative forms, e.g. *qand’e* and *qand’eme* ‘winter’. The corresponding relational adjective can be derived from both of these stems: *qand’el’e* and *qand’emel’e* ‘wintry’. Many examples can be found where words with the suffix –*me* function as temporal adverbs. In the following example the word *lawjejme* must be an adverbial expression since the subject is human.

(220)  
\textbf{Lawjeme surun’e-j ličuorke-k pun’-ŋu-mle.  }  
\textit{late.autumn.ADV fat-PTCP femail.reindeer-ABS.FOC kill-PL-TR.3.OF}  
‘In late autumn one would slaughter a fat female reindeer.’  
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:176)

On the other hand, there are specialized adverbial forms, such as *čuøyajmede* ‘in spring’. Despite the fact that words carrying the suffix –*me* can function as adverbs, they should, after all, be regarded as nouns, because apart from some limited capability to trigger agreement they can attach the nominal copula:

(221)  
\textbf{Čuøyajme-ley.}  
\textit{spring-COP}  
‘[It] is spring.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:84)

j) Designations of objects or concepts characterized by the qualitative meaning of their derivational bases (nomina qualitatis) can be formed by the means of the suffix –*rqa/-rke*:

(222)  
\textbf{čeupurqa} ‘point’ < *čuøyaj*- ‘to become pointed’  
\textbf{jatarqa} ‘smth. straight’ < *jatajaj*- ‘to become straight’  
\textbf{lasurqa} ‘smth. bushy’ < *lasune*- ‘to be bushy, thick’  
\textbf{pömörke} ‘circle’, ‘ring’ < *pönme*- ‘to be round’  
\textbf{čičirke} ‘length’ < *čičigej*- ‘to become long’

k) Nouns with diminutive-affective meaning are derived by the suffix –*(d)ie/-tie*:

(223)  
\textbf{nimated ‘small house’}  
\textit{al’γaptie} ‘small fishes’  
\textbf{puŋpie} ‘little soup’ < *puŋe* ‘soup’  
\textbf{iraŋalie} ‘reindeer with a light brown fell.DIM’ < *iraŋal* ‘reindeer with a light brown fell’  
\textbf{indelie} ‘floor.DIM’ < *indele/indule* ‘floor’

l) Augmentatives are signaled by the suffix -(t)tege/-tke. Krejnovič (1982:36) believes that the choice of the two augmentative allomorphs is determined by the stem class a given noun belongs to. However, this assumption is refuted by the existence of alternative augmentative:

(224)  
\textbf{nime(t)tegel/nimetke} ‘big house’  
\textbf{laame(t)tegel/laametke} ‘big dog’  
\textbf{al’γa(t)tegel/āyatke} ‘big fish’
The suffix variant \(-ttege\) imparts the connotation of dislike. Therefore expressions like \(notinej nimettege\) ‘an attractive big house’ are infelicitous. The suffix \(-tegie\) expresses affection, e.g. \(met akaategie\) ‘my dear elder brother’

3.3.2.2 Conversion

Some nomina actionis are the product of conversion of the corresponding verbal stems.

\[(225)\]
\(juora\) ‘game’ < \(juora-\) ‘to play’
\(jaqte\) ‘song’ < \(jaqte-\) ‘to sing’
\(ayare\) ‘breath’ ~ \(ayare-\) ‘to breath’
\(lajse\) ‘barking’ ~ \(lajse-\) ‘to bark’

The formation of gerunds, otherwise derived by the suffix \(-l\), is achieved by conversion as long as the verb stem terminates with an /l/:

\[(226)\]
\(čamuol\) ‘size’, ‘big stature’ < \(čamuol-\) ‘to be big’
\(čuguol\) ‘quickness’, ‘speed’ < \(čuguol-\) ‘to be quick’
\(iral’al\) ‘heaviness’, ‘difficulty’ < \(iral’al-\) ‘to be heavy’
\(ikl’al\) ‘firmness’ < \(ikl’al-\) ‘be hard/firm’
\(maarquol\) ‘one’ < \(maarquol-\) ‘to be one’
\(imdal’al\) ‘five’ (e.g. persons) < \(imdal’d’al\) ‘to be five’

3.3.2.3 Compounding

Compound nouns are numerous in TY. Basic as well as derived stems can be parts of compounds. There are two basic schemes for nominal compounding:

stem + stem:

\[(227)\]
\(nonyalawje\) ‘pipe’ < \(nonya\) ‘tobacco’ + \(lawje\) ‘water’, liquid
\(aylačil\) ‘an eloquent person’ < \(aja\) ‘mouth’ + \(lačil\) ‘fire’
\(samnaldajn’e\) ‘mushroom’ < \(sannel\) ‘to be fl. GER’ + \(tajn’e\) ‘INVS.DEM’
\(jukurugud’e\) ‘puls’ < \(juku\) ‘small’ + \(sugud’e\) ‘heart’

stem + genitive case ending + stem

\[(228)\]
\(n’oronburie\) ‘cloudberry’ < \(n’oro\) ‘hill’ + -\(n\) ‘GEN’ \(purie\) ‘berry’
\(jaljind’øjurqa\) ‘a thin strip of land between two lakes’ < \(jaljil’\) ‘lake’ + -\(n\) ‘gen’ + \(čųyurqa\) ‘smth.thin’

stem + epenthetic /\(d/\) + stem

\[(229)\]
\(čiidoŋojdeŋ\) ‘pocket’ < \(čii\) ‘people’ + \(d ‘0’\) + \(ŋoj\) ‘bag’
\(qayimeduon’ebul\) ‘crows’ nesting site’ < \(qayime\) ‘crow’ + -\(d \’0’\) + \(uo\) ‘child’ + -\(n’e\) ‘COM’ + -\(bul\) ‘NMLZ’
\(čųŋdedamud’a\) < ‘good-natured person’ < \(čųŋde\) ‘mind’ + -\(d \’0’\) + \(amuď’e\) ‘the
good’ + -\(d'\)aa ‘NMLZ’

Very common are compounds whose second member is the word sukun ‘thing’:

(230)  \(ujen'ejr\)ukun ‘bird’ < \(u\)je ‘wing’ + -\(n'\)e ‘VBLZ’ + -\(j\) ‘PTCP’ + sukun ‘thing’  
\(mumnejrukun\) ‘retard’ < munne- ‘to be incomplete’ + -\(j\) ‘PTCP’ + sukun ‘thing’  
\(ijuunjrukun\) ‘smth. groaning’ < ijuu- ‘to groan’ + -\(nu\) ‘DUR’ + -\(j\) ‘PTCP’ + sukun ‘thing’

Though rarely, nominal compounds consisting of three bases can be found:

(231)  \(la\'cin\) wie\(\'e\) \(\acute{c}uotege\) ‘poker’ < \(la\'c\)il ‘fire’ + -\(n\) ‘GEN’ + wie\(\'e\) ‘to do. NMLZ’ + \(\acute{c}uotege\) ‘iron. AUG’

From the examples it follows that the second stem can be represented by an underived noun, derived noun and a demonstrative pronoun. A basic noun, gerund, participle and adjective can act as the first stem.

Some compounds involve words from other languages:

(232)  \(ju\'ond\)adu\'u ‘echo’ < \(ju\'ond\)'e ‘mirage’ + ad'uu ‘voice’ (KY) ~ aruu ‘TY’  
qaldawa ‘scales’ < kala ‘fish’ (Finnish) + sawa ‘skin’  
\(qonmeraw\) ‘skin from reindeer’s legs’ < qonme ‘leg’ (Omok) + sawa ‘skin’

The TY word waawe\(\'e\) ‘Russian’, which historically is a participle, is found in several recent compounds owing their existence to the cultural contact between Yukaghir and Russians. The compound nouns involving this etnonym must have once been NPs in which the word waawe\(\'e\) ‘Russian’ turned into a relational quasi-adjective by dropping the final /e/ of its originally participial ending –\(\acute{e}\). Later on, due to extensive use the corresponding NPs with a lexically modified head acquired a character of a fixed construction and eventually of a single word:

(233)  waawe\(\'e\) legul ‘Russian kitchen’ vs. waawe\(\'e\) legul ‘food of a (certain) Russian’  
waa\(\'\)we\(\'e\) laame ‘sheep-dog’ vs. waawe\(\'e\) laame ‘the dog of a (certain) Russian’  
waa\(\'\)we\(\'e\) \(\acute{c}\)\(\'\)yoje ‘table knife’ (‘Russian knife’)  
waa\(\'\)we\(\'e\) pime ‘bed-bug’

3.4 Verb morphology

Verbal roots in the majority of cases end in a vowel, to which then the inflectional endings are added. All verbs in TY are divided into intransitive and transitive. This division is not only lexically determined but is also reflected morphologically in most verbal forms, that is, the (in)transitivity suffix constitutes an integral part of inflectional endings in most slots of the so called basic conjugation paradigm, or BC (see below). A variety of derivational suffixes can occur in front of the (in)transitivity suffix.
When the verb base terminates in a consonant, an epenthetic vowel is required to attach the inflectional ending. The epenthetic vowels are /u/, /e/ and /i/. The factors determining the choice of an epenthetic vowel are mentioned in 2.3.2.

For different theoretical purposes it may be necessary to establish what the base of the given verb form is. The pure base of any verb form is manifest in 3SG under negation as shown in the following example, in which el= is the negative proclitic:

(234)  
el=war ‘[it] is not solid’
   el=men ‘[s/he] did not take’
   el=kelu ‘[s/he] did not come’
   el=ćayad’aanu ‘[s/he] is not working’
   el=jawtanaa ‘[s/he] did not begin to sing’
   el=juoraanu ‘[s/he] did not use to play’
   el=ayal’wes ‘[s/he] did not make laugh’
   el=sigerejse ‘[s/he] did not let drop’
   el=nimen’e ‘[s/he] does not have a house’
   el=lalimen ‘[s/he] does not have a sledge’
   el=nimere ‘[s/he] did not acquire a house’
   el=lalimer ‘[s/he] did not acquire a sledge’

In 3SG the base of an intransitive verb can be additionally identified in interrogative sentences with adjunct focus and that of a transitive verb in clauses with AF:

(235)  \[\text{Kin-in’ mon?} \]
   \[\text{who-DAT say} \]
   ‘Whom did [he] tell [this].’

(236)  \[\text{Kin nide-t?} \]
   \[\text{who[FOC.ERG] name-FUT[AF]} \]
   ‘Who will name?’

The pure base is normally segmentable also in affirmative as well as in negative forms of 3PL:

(237)  \[\text{el=amuo ‘[it] is not good’ vs. e.g. mer=amuć ‘[it] is good} \]
   \[\text{mer=amuoji ‘[they] are good’/el=amuoju ‘[they] are not good} \]

3.4.1 Verb subclasses

Verbs in TY can be divided into subclasses according to their lexical meaning and the details of their morpho-syntactic behaviour. The following subclasses can be singled out: action verbs, qualitative verbs, quantitative verbs, denominal verbs and the deictic verb.
3.4.1.1 Action verbs

Action verbs are defined here negatively, as not belonging to any other verb subclass. Whenever a verb does not express a property, a numeric concept, have a deictic meaning or derive from a noun, it is labeled ‘action verb’. Within the subclass of action verbs I do not further distinguish between dynamic and stative verbs. This means that verbs like ‘hit’ and ‘sleep’ are treated here as action verbs.

Action verbs display the full range of inflectional and derivational properties and can be primarily transitive, i.e. without a transitivizing suffix. According to the details of the morphological build-up of their minimal stems, most of the action verbs can be subdivided into groups.

a) Some action verbs are underived, i.e. their roots can accept inflectional endings directly. With all certainty the underived character can be claimed for monosyllabic verbs. The following list is nearly exhaustive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jaw</em> - ‘to ache’</td>
<td><em>maa</em> - ‘to wait’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>en</em> - ‘be alive’</td>
<td><em>wie</em> - ‘to do’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>n’ir</em> - ‘to vomit’</td>
<td><em>paaj</em> - ‘to hit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pec</em> - ‘to trot’</td>
<td><em>mooaj</em> - ‘to hold’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>law</em> - ‘to drink’</td>
<td><em>lew</em> - ‘to eat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lew</em> - ‘to eat’</td>
<td><em>čaw</em> - ‘to cut off’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>čuŋ</em> - ‘to count’, ‘to read’</td>
<td><em>čuŋ</em> - ‘to count’, ‘to read’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pun</em> - ‘to kill’</td>
<td><em>pun</em> - ‘to kill’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>men</em> - ‘to take’</td>
<td><em>men</em> - ‘to take’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>par</em> - ‘to submerge’, ‘to cook’</td>
<td><em>par</em> - ‘to submerge’, ‘to cook’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mör</em> - ‘to sense’</td>
<td><em>mör</em> - ‘to sense’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mon</em> - ‘to say’</td>
<td><em>mon</em> - ‘to say’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mol</em> - ‘to stay overnight’</td>
<td><em>mol</em> - ‘to stay overnight’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>löl</em> - ‘to raise’, ‘to educate’</td>
<td><em>löl</em> - ‘to raise’, ‘to educate’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also disyllabic action verbs which are potentially basic:

---

131 Some of these verbs possibly consist of more than one morpheme. For instance, the string <wii> in *ilwii* - ‘to herd’ can be found in other transitive verbs, e.g. *labwii* - ‘to press’. This sequence is formally similar to some of the causative suffixes with the generalized structure –Cii (see 3.4.3.1.3). Considering that causative and transitivizer suffixes can overlap functionally, it would not be unreasonable to assume that –wii is an unproductive transitivizer suffix. However, according to the classification adopted here, even if this assumption was correct, it would not be possible to place this verb into group b (see below), because the presumed suffix –wii is not simply a stem forming one but has a grammatical meaning. These are different kinds of derivation in terms of the adopted analysis. It would have to be regarded as belonging to group c (see below).
intransitive     transitive

(239a) juora- ‘to play’    (239b) ieruu- ‘to hunt’
kerie- ‘to fall’            ilwii- ‘to herd’
elej- ‘to set down’ (about the sun) welie- ‘to hang’
iimu- ‘to be drunk’         aji- ‘to shoot’

welie- ‘to hang’

b) A great proportion of action verbs consist of a root and a suffix with the generalized structure $-CVj$\(^{132}\). The suffixes can be isolated since they recur in a certain position in different verbal lexemes and are replaced by the iterative suffix in some cases (see 3.4.2.3.5). At the same time they represent an indispensible part of the verb stem, without which the roots of the verbs belonging to this group cannot take inflectional endings. Being purely base forming suffixes, they do not contribute to the lexical or grammatical meaning of a verb\(^{133}\), except combinatorially in some cases. The suffixes $-we$, $-ge(j)$, $-ya(j)$ are clearly restricted to intransitive\(^{134}\) verbs, while the suffix $-te$ is found only in transitive verbs. Only the most productive suffixes are included in the overview below\(^{135}\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>intransitive</th>
<th>transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(240a) aa-we- ‘to sleep’</td>
<td>(240b) ök-te- ‘to pierce’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayal’-we- ‘to laugh’</td>
<td>öge-te- ‘to install’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa-rej- ‘to stop’</td>
<td>ele-rej- ‘to swallow’(^{136})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čugi-re- ‘to whistle’</td>
<td>iime-rej- ‘to confirm’, ‘to respond’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>möm-de- ‘to burn’</td>
<td>en-de- ‘to burn’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juö-dej- ‘to glance’</td>
<td>juö-dej- ‘to glance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quu-dej- ‘to clime’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sii-ge- ‘to drip’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pul-gej- ‘to come out’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pod’a-γa- ‘to glitter’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porča-γa- ‘to splash’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) In the verbs belonging to this group the derivational morphemes are also stem forming but are grammatically non-empty, e.g. lögite- ‘to feed’ $< *lōgi- + -te ‘CAUS’.$

\(^{132}\) The glide is in all instances the semelfactive aspect suffix, which is with some verbs an integral part of the minimal stem, e.g. aarej-/*aare- ‘to stop’.

\(^{133}\) This is in contrast to some homophonouse suffixes. For instance, the suffix $-de$ is a detranzitivizer: lewde- ‘to eat’ (vi) $< $lew- ‘to eat’ (vt). The suffix $-re$ is a tranzitivizer or causativizer: porčayarej- ‘to sprinkle.SEM’ $< $porčayaj- ‘to splash.SEM’, sewre- ‘to bring in’ $< $sew- ‘to enter’.

\(^{134}\) Primary intransitivity is meant here. Intransitive verbs containing these suffixes can be tranzitivized, of course.

\(^{135}\) Most of the examples are from Kurilov (2003:71-96).

\(^{136}\) The sequence <re> in this verb and the following one is historically, most probably, a tranzitivizer suffix, as it is in most of its occurrences in transitive verbs. No intransitive counterpart could be identified in the contemporary TY.
Instances of stem forming inflection could also be counted among the members of this group, e.g. *aarej- ‘to stop’ < *aare- + -j ‘SEM’.

d) A few action verbs designating postures have integrated in their minimal stems the copular verb *ŋol-, e.g. ayuol- ‘to stand’, quduol- ‘to lie’, eguo- ‘to stand up’.

3.4.1.2 Qualitative verbs

Qualitative verbs designate properties, e.g. dimension (‘tall’), shape (‘thick’, ‘round’), colour (‘red’) etc. They too can be divided up in a similar way as action verbs. Basic qualitative verbs are rather rare, e.g. war- ‘to be firm’.

Derived qualitative verbs can be grouped according to how gerunds are derived from them. Suffixal derivation is characteristic of qualitative verbs whose stems contain the suffixes –ne, –uu, -n’e, –ge and –we. Derivation by conversion is typical for those ending in /l/. The major part of the latter group is made up of verbs with the integrated copular verb *ŋol-. A few examples follow.

(241a) köti-ne- ‘to be thick’
  pom-ne- ‘to be round’
  n’arč-uu- ‘to be bad’
  wald’uu- ‘to be sour’
  toro-n’e- ‘to be sour’
  qomo-n’e- ‘to be blue/green’
  lu-ge- ‘to be older’
  pu-ge- ‘to be hot’
  wer-we- ‘to be strong’
  n’aa-we- ‘to be white’

(241b) čamuol- ‘to be big’
  maaruo- ‘to be happy’
  čuguo- ‘to be quick’
  iral’al- ‘to be heavy’
  ikl’al- ‘to be hard’

3.4.1.3 Quantitative verbs

Quantitative verbs denote absolute quantity of the subject referents. All of them are derived. Their morphological structure is the same as that of the qualitative verbs of the second group. The following list is from Vyrdylina (2011:38-40).

(242) maarquol- ‘to be one’
  kijuol- ‘to be two’
  jaluol- ‘to be three’
  jalaklal- ‘to be four’
  imdald’al- ‘to be five’
  maalajlal- ‘to be six’

137 Membership of verbs derived with the suffix –n’e among qualitative verbs is based on purely semantic grounds because this suffix is actually a verbalizer deriving denominal verbs (see 3.4.1.4). Therefore, qualitative stems derived with its help are, morphologically viewed, denominal. In some instances the corresponding noun exists, even if only as a nominalized participle, e.g. n’amučen- ‘to be red’ ~ n’amuče ‘redness’. The nominal character of the derivational bases of these verbs is further corroborated by their accepting other verbalizing suffixes, just as other nouns do, e.g. n’amučer- ‘to become red’, derived by the verbalizing suffix –r, which expresses acquisition, thus ‘to acquire redness’.
puskijal- ‘to be seven’
maalajlakal- ‘to be eight’
kunil’al- ‘to be ten’
kunil’ kijuol- ‘to be twelve’
jaan kunil’ kijuol- ‘to be thirty two’

3.4.1.4 Denominal verbs

Denominal verbs are derived with the help of three verbalizers, expressing possession, acquisition and endowment, respectively: -n’(e), -r(e) and –te/-s. The suffix -n’(e) is homophonous with that of the comitative case. The suffix –te/-s serves in action verbs as a causative marker.

(243a) aawiin’e- ‘to have a blanket’
aawiire- ‘to acquire a blanket’
aawiite- ‘to provide with a blanket’

(243b) lalimen’- ‘to have a sledge’
lalimer- ‘to acquire a sledge’
lalimes- ‘to provide with a sledge’

The choice of one of the series of these suffixes depends on the class membership of the noun serving as the derivational base. According to Krejnovič (1982:50 ff.), the vocalized suffixes, i.e. -n’e, -re and -te attach to class I nominal stems, while consonantal allomorphs are selected by class II nouns (but see the discussion in 3.4.2.1, including the criteria for a noun to classify as belonging to class I or II).

Possession and acquisition denominal verbs take intransitive personal endings, while endowment denominal verbs are transitive.

3.4.1.5 The deictic verb

The deictic verb constitutes a subgroup of intransitive verbs. It is derived from the proximal deictic particle ten by means of the verbalizing suffix –n’e and serves to single out the subject referent from a number of other potential referents:

(244a) Juoyaj-relek amaaj tude jerkeje mooj-rej mon-i
finish-ANT father 3SG.POSS drum hold-SIM say-INTR.3SG
Ilya ten’i me=l’e-jek? Tadaa Lanya amaaj cii
Ilya here PF=be-INTR.3SG then Lankha father people
tuduruu sayane-rej ten-n’e-jen.
inner.part sit-SIM DEIC-VBLZ-INTR.3SG

138 In my material only the form tenn’e- ‘to be here’ is present. However, it could be expected that the forms ann’e- and/or tiginn’e-, with distal meaning, exist too.
‘As he finished the ritual, your father said while holding the drum, “Ilya, are you present here?” Than father Lankha, who was sitting among the people, said, “Here I am.”’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:46)


maarquon’ apanalaal-eŋ kewrej-te-ŋeq. qoll’e aduog-i?
only old.woman-ABS FOC carry.away-1/2SG.OF where.be son-PERT

köde tuduruuy-t maarqan adileek pulgejl mon-redq. ten-n’eqeq
man inner.part-ABL one-GEN lad-ABS FOC come.out-GER.SF say-SIM DEIC-VBLZ-INTR.1SG

‘I will take with me only the old woman. Where is her son?’ A young man stepped forward and said, “Here am I.”’ (Kurilov 2005:158)

As is obvious from the examples, the deictic verb tenn’e- is intransitive. It is compatible with SF:

(245) Ten-n’eqeq-l met monoŋ.
deic-VBLZ-GER.SF 1SG cap

‘It is my cap that is here.’

3.4.2 Inflection

Finite verbs in TY are inflected for person, number, (in)transitivity, tense, aspect, mood, information structure and display partly diverging paradigms depending on the sentence type (affirmative vs. negative vs. interrogative). They distinguish three persons (1st, 2nd and 3rd), two numbers (singular and plural), five focus types (S-focus, A-focus, O-focus, predicate focus and adjunct focus), two tenses (non-future, future), eight aspects (inchoative, durative, habitual, semelfactive, iterative, resultative, proximative and periphrastic perfective) and ten moods (indicative, potential, imperative, jussive, hortative, desiderative, inclinative, prospective, obligative and non-visual).

There are two non-finite verb forms in TY: participle and converb. Participles can carry the markers of different aspects, the marker of the future tense and at least one mood marker (non-visual), which acquires temporal meaning in them. Apart from that, the voice can be expressed in a participle but since this grammatical category is considered derivational it is not discussed here. Converbs can express relative tenses but are otherwise truly non-finite. Some attributive verb forms distinguish the grammatical category of person, which is a remarkable feature that makes their participial status questionable.

3.4.2.1 Person, number, (in)transitivity and focus type

It is reasonable to consider the paradigmatic changes according to person and number together with those conditioned by focus type and sentence type as the former categories are encoded together with the latter ones in portmanteau-morphemes or zero-morphemes. In the indicative mood there are seven distinct conjugational paradigms: five affirmative ones, a negative and an interrogative one.
There are five focus types in TY: S-focus (the subject of an intransitive verb is focalized), A-focus (the subject, or the most agent-like argument, of a transitive verb is focalized), O-focus (a direct object, or the least agent-like argument, is focalized), predicate focus and adjunct focus. Only the first three have their own paradigms while the last two share one and the same paradigm referred to as the ‘basic conjugation’ in this work. Predicate and adjunct focus types formally differ from each other in that under predicate focus the predicate is accompanied by the proclitic $me(r)\,=\,$. The clitic itself does not, strictly speaking, constitute a part of the conjugational paradigm. This yields five distinct paradigms for affirmative clauses. The respective affirmative verbal paradigms are adapted from Krejnović (1958:131-140, 146-155), Maslova (2003c:17-21) and Kurilov (2006:154).

intransitive (*jaqte-* ‘to sing’):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG1</td>
<td><em>jaqte-jej</em></td>
<td><em>jaqte-l</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>jaqte-jek</em></td>
<td>2 <em>jaqte-l</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>jaqte-j</em></td>
<td>3 <em>jaqte-l</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td><em>jaqte-jli</em></td>
<td>PL1 <em>jaqte-l</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>jaqte-jmut</em></td>
<td>2 <em>jaqte-l</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>jaqte-ji</em></td>
<td>3 <em>jaqte-ju-l</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

transitive (*aji-* ‘to shoot’):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>OF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG1</td>
<td><em>aji-ŋ</em>(^{139})</td>
<td>SG1 <em>aji</em></td>
<td>SG1 <em>aji-meŋ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>aji-mek</em></td>
<td>2 <em>aji</em></td>
<td>2 <em>aji-mey</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>aji-ŋ</em></td>
<td>3 <em>aji</em></td>
<td>3 <em>aji-mele</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td><em>aji-ŋ</em></td>
<td>PL1 <em>aji</em></td>
<td>PL1 <em>aji-l</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>aji-mk</em></td>
<td>2 <em>aji</em></td>
<td>2 <em>aji-mk</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>aji-ŋa</em></td>
<td>3 <em>aji-ŋu</em></td>
<td>3 <em>aji-ŋumle</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is evident from the paradigms, most of the intransitive forms of the BC carry the sequence $\langle je\rangle$. At the same time, the BC of transitive verbs and the OF paradigm contain forms with the sequence $\langle me\rangle$. Naturally, they should be regarded as intransitivity and transitivity markers respectively. Morphological marking of (in)transitivity coupled with the existence of the distinct sets of personal endings depending on this parameter is a non-trivial phenomenon in verbal inflection cross-linguistically. It is conspicuous that these morphemes are not found in all slots of the corresponding paradigms. The ending of 3SG in intransitive verbs is $\langle i\rangle$ if the base-final consonant is $/n/, /n'/, /h/, /č/, /\ddot{d}/$ or $/l/$. Given the heterogeneous nature of these segments, it is more reasonable to consider the allomorph $\langle i\rangle$ the underlying form of 3SG ending in intransitive verbs. This

\(^{139}\) The velar nasal is absent in the future tense form of 1SG.
choice is also preferable because it is easy to predict the 3SG forms of bases ending in short vowels if one departs from forms like *mon- 'say-3SG', but not vice versa: jaqte- 'sing-3SG' ~ *monej/*monuj/*monij. A base taking in 3SG the allomorph –j is nevertheless chosen here for illustration because such bases are more frequent than those selecting –i. Besides, with verb bases requiring the ending –i in 3SG, the first segment of the endings in all slots of the paradigm except 3PL undergo morphophonemic alternations (see 2.4.2.1), which obscure the shape of the ending. Some bases selecting the allomorph –j trigger morphophonemic changes too, which are also presented in 2.4.2.1. This concerns the 1PL.TR ending –j as well.

In the same line of reasoning the interpretation of the ending –ŋi ‘PL.INTR’ would be a combination of –yu ‘PL’, identifiable in its pure form in e.g. the AF or negative paradigm below, and the ending –i, which would have to be interpreted here as intransitivity marker alone. This analysis is supported by the data from KY, where the 3PL ending of transitive verbs is –gum (Krejnovič 1958:132)\(^{140}\), indicating that in plural forms the plural suffix is followed by the (in)transitivity marker. The ending –jumle ‘PL.TR.3.OF’ is the only ending where the exponent of the grammatical category of number is a clearly segmentable morpheme. Everywhere else the endings should be thought of as portmanteau-morphemes in which number is encoded along with the person, if only the latter is represented by a zero-morpheme as in ‘3PL.AF’, for instance.

The endings –jli, -jmut have disyllabic variants –jeli and –jemut. The same alternation, affecting the vowel of the transitivity marker, is observed in the suffix –m(e)le. On the other hand, 3PL ending in transitive verbs is always –jumle, never *-jumele. Kurilov’s (2006:149) presentation suggests that the choice of a variant is, at least with some verbs, free. Indeed, in the corpus both bi- and monosyllabic variants of the INTR.1PL suffix of the verb kelu- ‘to come’ is found. This alternation happens in the speech of the same speaker and within the same discourse:

(246a) Tan ten migideŋ keluunuŋeŋ, amutneŋ kelujli.  
Tan ten migideŋ kelu-nu-reŋ amuč-neŋ kelu-jli  
AND DM here,ADV come-DUR-SIM be.good.3SG-ADV come-INTR.1PL

‘When we were coming here, we rode well.’

(246b) Taat tigin Sapokylaq-qa-t migideŋ anaan amutneŋ kelu-jeli.  
so DEIC Sapokylaq-LOC-ABL here,ADV very be.good,ADV come-INTR.1PL

‘Later on, from [the] lake Sapokylaqat we rode very well.’

It is difficult to explain the regularities of this kind of alternation. Maslova (2003c:5) adopts Krejnovič’s (1982:36 ff.) view that the choice of an allomorph of a given alternating suffix depends on the stem-final segment. TY roots historically fall into two groups. Those ending in /al/ \(< /a/\) belong to class II and take monosyllabic

---

\(^{140}\) Nowadays, the transitivity marker in 3PL is lost in KY too (Maslova 2003a:5), which gave rise to a compensatory lengthening –ŋaa. Such forms with a long /aa/ can be encountered also in TY but at least as frequent are those with a short /a/, another indication that transitivity marker was dropped in 3PL in TY earlier than in KY.

\(^{141}\) This notation means that some instances of the modern word-final /el/ and /ol/, in Krejnovič’s (1982:38) view, diacronically derive from /a/. It is on those historical forms that the class assignment of nominal stems is based.
allomorphs of alternating suffixes. All other stems as well as those ending with a stressed /a/ constitute class I and attach disyllabic allomorphs (Krejnovič 1982:41). In 3PL under OF the stem, or the base to be more precise, always ends with /u/, the vowel of the plural marker, and is thus expected to suffix –mele, which is in conflict with the data. It is also impossible to explain the ungrammaticality of *-ŋumele ‘PL.TR.3.OF’ by resorting to the rule of concatenated alternating suffixes, whereby vocalized suffixes alternate with non-vocalized ones: C-Ce-C or Ce-C-Ce (Maslova 2003c:5). To be quite correct, the concatenation rule, a useful descriptive approach elsewhere, would explain the ungrammaticality of *-ŋumele ‘PL.TR.3.OF’ per se, but fails to do it in the context of the grammaticality of the ending –mele ‘TR.3SG.OF’ alongside its monosyllabic allomorph -mle.

Trying to explain these regularities in terms of foot structure does not provide a universally applicable solution either. While aji|mele ‘shoot.TR.3SG.OF’ is certainly better formed than *a|jim|le from the point of view of foot structure, this cannot be asserted with respect to keč|jum|le ‘bring.PL.TR.3.OF’ as compared with grammatically equivalent hypothetic *keč|jum|le. The principle of foot structure well formedness cannot predict the parallel forms like kelu|jeli ~ ke|luj|li ‘come.INTR.1PL’. The latter form with its two dangling light syllables on the edges is so badly formed that it should not exist.

All approaches proposed in the literature on TY grammar so far attempting to explain the distribution of allomorphs of alternating suffixes do cover some of instances, but none of them is universally sufficient. Intuitively, I tend to think that the distribution of these allomorphs is determined by syllable structure of the base. Precise rules, if there are universally valid rules at all, are yet to be discovered.

The distinct negative paradigm, introduced by the negative proclitic el=, is the counterpart of the PF conjugational pattern\(^{142}\). The (in)transitivity does not play any role in it as both transitive and intransitive verbs follow the same conjugational pattern. The negative paradigm differs from the affirmative intransitive paradigm only in the 3rd person, which is zero marked in the singular\(^{143}\) and has only the ending indicating number in the plural.

aji- ‘to shoot’ (a transitive verb)

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{SG} & \text{PL} \\
1 & el=aji-je& y \quad el=aji-jeli \\
2 & el=aji-je& k \quad el=aji-jemut \\
3 & el=aji & el=aji-ju
\end{array}
\]

The detransitivization under negation does not take place in clauses with OF (see 5.2.6). Generally, SF and OF in negative clauses is expressed with the same set of endings as in the SF and OF affirmative paradigms.

\(^{142}\) Just as the focus proclitic me(r)=, el= is not considered a part of the paradigm. It only triggers the negative conjugation, charcterized, as all other conjugations by verbal endings.

\(^{143}\) One speaker told me that in 3SG the BC form is equally acceptable in negative sentences. This is probably a rare aberration from the common usus.
As for interrogative sentences, one has to differentiate between polarity questions, questions with argument focus and those with adjunct focus. In polarity questions verbs follow the corresponding (intransitive or transitive) BC. When a core argument is in the focus of a question, the SF, AF, or OF conjugational pattern is employed. It is only in questions about peripheral constituents that a paradigm obtains which diverges from BC. Here, intransitive and transitive verbs behave differently. In most cases transitive verbs are conjugated according to the BC. Intransitive verbs form a paradigm of their own.

Below is the paradigm of the verb *ennu*- ‘to live.DUR’ in the interrogative sentence ‘What do I/you etc. live for?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>ennu</em>-ŋ</td>
<td><em>ennu</em>-juok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>ennu</em>-k</td>
<td><em>ennu</em>-mut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>ennu</em></td>
<td><em>ennu</em>-ŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this paradigm it appears that there is only one dedicated interrogative ending, namely that of 1PL: -juok (-uok after stems ending in a consonant). 1SG receives the BC ending of transitive verbs. The second person is characterized by the absence of the intransitivity marker. The third person displays identical marking as in the negative paradigm.

There is a subtype of questions focusing a peripheral constituent, which in many instances can be labeled as rhetoric. They are normally limited to verbs marked as having future tense reference – in the 1SG exclusively so – even though the actual reference may be to the past. In such questions both intransitive and transitive verbs receive the ending –*m in 1SG and –(j)uok in 1PL (see 4.2.4.2 for more examples):

(247a) *Nemuol qodejtem? Qata me puŋuotejŋ.*

_nemuol  qodej-te-m?  qata   me=puŋuol-te-jeŋ_

_why  decline-FUT-1SG.ITRG  MP(Yak)  PF=rejoice-FUT-INTR.1SG_

‘Why would I be against? I will be glad.’ (Kurilov 2005:158)

For 1SG of transitive verbs the choice of this ending is optional:

(247b) *Nemepol uusienut?*

_nemepol  uu-se-nu-t_

_why  go-CAUS-DUR-FUT[1SG.TR]_

‘Why should [I] be bringing?’

---

144 As Maslova (2003a:21) notes, the intransitivity marker can be retained. Informants may give different assessments of the grammaticality of such forms. On one occasion an informant rejected the forms with the intransitivity marker and told me that only people who do not quite master the language use them in this type of questions. On another occasion she accepted questions of this type with the intransitivity marker in the predicates. Another informant accepted such forms for the 3rd person, tolerated them in the 2nd person and rejected them in the 1st person. It has to be noted that in their spontaneous translations informants always employ the forms without the intransitivity marker, and use it only when prompted, as long as it seems acceptable for them.
3.4.2.2 Tense

There is only one marker that can unequivocally be associated with a tense: the suffix –t, which encodes future. Verb forms without this suffix must be considered as referring to non-future activities. An epenthetic vowel is frequently inserted after the future tense suffix and in rare cases in front of it. The rules for epenthesis can be summarized and illustrated as follows. When the future tense suffix occurs in word-final position, 1SG of the BC of transitive verbs (248a), in the 3rd person of the negative (248b) and interrogative paradigm (248c) as well as from the whole AF paradigm, there is never epenthesis:

(248a) Aγan fuō-se-t.
   MP see-CAS-FUT[1SG.TR]
   ‘I will definitely show.’

(248b) Uogi el aγuot monur maarqan wolmek menčiel’eljumle.
   uo-gi el=aγuol-t mon-ur
   child-PERT el=take-3SG FUT[3SG]
   ‘Since it was feared that her children will not survive, one brought a shaman.’
   (Kurilov 2001:29, aγuol-)

(248c) El lačidauγolčuon quodeŋ en’ŋut.
   el=lačil-d-aγuol-čuon quodeŋ en’ŋut
   NEG=fire-0-stand-PRIV how bealive-FUT[3.ITRG]
   ‘How will they live without fire?’

The requirement, that no vowel may follow the future tense suffix when it occupies the word-final position, ranks over the prevention of illicit consonant clusters. In the following example the absence of an epethetic /e/ in the future tense suffix makes a vocalic epenthesis necessary to resolve the resulting illicit cluster:

(249) … uogi molid’ee el med’uoldaya quodeŋ tudel tuŋ ilepe dite puŋuolenŋ ölkiennull’elut.
   uo-gi molid’ee el=men’-ŋol-daŋa quodeŋ tudel tuŋ ile-pe tite
   child-PERT slightly NEG=take-be-3SG.DS how 3SG ADL.PROX reindeer-PL like
   puŋuol-renŋ ölke-nun-l’el-ut
   (She recalled) ‘how she must have run overjoyed, just like these (other) reindeer do, when her cub was almost born.’

As for non-final positions, there are only a few possibilities to be distinguished, since the future tense marker can be followed only by personal endings, except for the plural marker. The future tense suffix is used without epenthesis in front of the suffix –uok of the interrogative paradigm:
The future tense suffix is regularly followed by the epenthetic /e/ when a prohibited sequence would otherwise obtain. This is always the case when the personal ending does not contain vowels, creating a forbidden tautosyllabic consonant cluster, or contains the intransitivity marker, disallowed after /t/ by the adjacency restrictions on /j/ as the second member (see 2.2.2):

(250)  \textit{Qadaa-t n’ijuo-nu-t-uok}  \\
where-ABL compete-DUR-FUT-1PL.ITRG  \\
‘Where shall we be competing from?’

In quick speech the epenthetic vowel accompanying the future tense suffix in intransitive verbs is lost if the suffix is attached to a verb stem ending in a vowel, which produces an assimilation of /j/ of the personal ending resulting in the affricate /č/, which, in turn assimilates /t/ of the future tense suffix:

(252)  \textit{jaqte-te-jeŋ ‘to sing-FUT-INTR.1SG’ > *jaqtetjeŋ > jaqtetčeŋ > jaqtcčeŋ}

When the future tense suffix is followed by the vocalized transitivity marker, which does not fall under an adjacency restriction, epenthesis takes place according to some other considerations, whose nature is not quite clear yet (see the related discussion in 3.4.2.1).

(253a)  \textit{Neme-le pundu-t-meŋ qad’ir?}  \\
what-FOC.ABS tell-FUT-TR.3SG.OF DM  \\
‘Well, what’s new?’

(254b)  \textit{Ise tideŋ pajpe jawul-gi nuu-te-meŋ.}  \\
MP ANPH woman trace-PERT find-FUT-TR.1/2SG.OF  \\
‘Maybe I will find that woman’ footprints.’

Apart from identifying an action as unfolding after the moment of speech, the future tense can be employed to lend a more lively character to a narration making it more accessible to the listener. This use could be labeled, in analogy to a comparable use of present tense in Latin, futurum historicum:

\[\text{Note the presence of an SF verbal ending in a transitive verb.}\]
‘When they enter, they bow down at the entrance.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:40)

The future tense suffix can express the meaning comparable with that of the irrealis mood:

(Ekye) Tuopuu-ŋa-t jaadie Anna-die-ŋa-t-ŋe me=lude-te-j.

‘She would have been older than sister Topu and aunt Anna.’ (about a person, who died young) (Kurilov and Odé 2012:82)

It is interesting to inquire into the origin of the future tense suffix. If one accepts the Uralic membership of TY, then it is reasonable to compare the situation in TY with other Uralic languages. In is a well-known fact to linguists that in Finno-Ugric languages it is not uncommon not to have a synthetic future tense. In Finnish, for instance, the meaning of the future tense is conveyed by present tense forms or personal forms of the verb *tulla* ‘to come’ followed by the third infinitive illative (Karlsson 1999:191-192). In Hungarian the future tense is expresses by coverbs or the auxiliary *fog* (Rounds 2001:15). However, if one moves to Eastern Europe, one finds Finno-Ugric languages with a synthetic future tense, e.g. Udmurt, where the future tense is expressed by the suffix –(l)o (Perevoščikov *et al.* 1962:200), possibly deriving from the verb *luyny* ‘to become’, whose 1SG future tense form is *luo* (Alatyrev 1983:580). In Nenets, a Samoyedic language, the future tense suffix is normally –ŋgu but with hes ‘to leave’, *tos* ‘to come’ and *tas* ‘to give’ the suffix is –ta (Almazova 1961:60). In Kurilov (2001:72, worpe-) one can find the future tense suffix of this shape: *worpe-ŋi-tayanŋe* ‘to be careful-PL-FUT.IMP’. The striking material similarity is additionally enhanced by the overall typological similarity of the tempus system in TY and Nenets. The non-future tenses in Nenets are represented by a so called indefinite tense (Almazova 1961:6f.), which can be used for both present and past, and by the past tense (Amazova 1961:54ff.), which is used to refer to activities specifically in the remote past. In TY the unmarked verb form could be compared to the indefinite tense of Nenets. The past tense of Nenets is paralleled to some extent in the TY non-visual mood suffix, which can, apart from its modal meaning, express past reference.

Kreinovič (1958: 124) saw a connection between the suffix –nu and the expression of the present tense, but it has proven to be incorrect. First of all, it is not obligatory in sentences with an unambiguous present tense reference. In the following example the converb expressing a simultaneous action and the finite verb lack the durative suffix –nu, although it would be expected here as the speaker says that while being filmed:

(257) Met mit sukun oŋie-ŋe ten kerie-ŋe.

‘Being dressed in our clothes I am being recorded.’

---

146 1SG present tense form of this verb is *lue* (ibid.), which is phonetically close to the TY copular verb *l’e-*.
147 I was present at the moment of the utterance and actually saw the woman who said that dressing herself in the traditional Yukaghir garments, therefore the present tense reference of the utterance is undoubted.
Second of all, this suffix can occur with a clear past tense reference and thus serves simply as an indicator of the durative aspect.

(258) Awjaa waaj tittel keluŋudaya mit me čayad’aanujli.
    awjaa   waaj   tittel   keluŋu-l-daya   mit   me=čayad’e-nu-jli
    yesterday also 3PL come-PL-GER-3SG.DS 1PL PF=work-DUR-INTR.1PL

‘Yesterday too, when they came, we worked.’

3.4.2.3 Aspect

Accounts vary regarding the question how many aspects there are in TY. Eight aspects are distinguished here: inchoative, durative, habitual, semelfactive, iterative, resultative, proximative and periphrastic perfective. Some verb examples in the following presentation are taken from Kurilov (2003:70ff.).

3.4.2.3.1 Inchoative

The inchoative indicates the beginning of an action. It has several exponents depending on the verb subclass. In action verbs the harmonically selected suffixes –(n)aa and –ie are employed. According to Kurilov (2006: 165) the first suffixes appears in verbs whose stems contain the vowels a or o, in all other cases the ending –ie tends to be used, although the correlation is not strict (see (16-19)). The suffixation is accompanied by the elision of the final short vowel of the stem. If the stem ends with a long vowel, diphthong or a glide, the epenthetic /n/ is used between the base and the inchoative suffix. The following examples illustrate these points:

(259) čoŋja- ‘to defend.INCH’ < čoŋuj-
    joŋon'aa- ‘to be angry.INCH’ < joŋon’e-
    jaqtaa- ‘to sing.INCH’ < jaqt-
    čagad’esaa- ‘to work.CAUS.INCH’ < čayad’es-
    öl’kie- ‘to run.INCH’ < ölke-
    lölie- ‘to educate.INCH’ < löl-
    nerie- ‘to gnaw.INCH’ < neri-
    kepčie- ‘to carry away.ITR.INCH’ < kepči-
    uunaa- ‘to go.INCH’ < uu-
    čambiinaa- ‘to help.INCH’ < čambii-
    kerienaa- ‘to fall.INCH’ < kerie-
    sisayajnaa- ‘to tear.SEM.INCH’ < sisayaj-
    kewrejnaa- ‘to carry away.INCH’ < kewrej-

After sonorant consonants both –aa and –naa can be found:

(230) ηolaa- ‘to become’ < ηol- ‘to be’
    čuŋnaa- ‘to read.inch’ < čuŋ- ‘to read’

There are exceptions, though, e.g. ijerie- ‘to look down at smb.INCH’ < ijerii-
(231a) Taat čuɗegudienureŋ mer aawaaj.
   taat čuɗe-kudie-nu-ŋeŋ mer=aawe-aa-j
   so thought-keep-DUR-SIM PF=sleep-INCH-INTR.3G
   ‘Contemplating like that, he fell asleep.’ (Kurilov 1994:7)

(231b) Pandink mondelek waaj mer ölkiej.
   pandin’-k mon-relek waaj mer=ölke-ie-j
   cook-IMP.SG say-ANT again PF=run-INCH-INTR.3.SG
   ‘Having said, “Cook!” he ran again.’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

(231c) Tadaa wie-naa-jelì.
   then do-INCH-INTR.1PL
   ‘Then we began to repair.’

There can be two alternative inchoative forms of the same verb:

(232) uusaa- < uuse- ‘to carry away’ > uusie-
   lewnaa- < lew- ‘to eat’ < lögie-

In qualitative and some action verbs the inchoative is marked by the suffix pair –kie/-qaa selected according to vowel harmony and synharmonism principles. In bases with qualitative semantics it expresses the idea that the state denoted by the base has been achieved

(233) pugekie- ‘to become hot’ < puge- ‘to be hot’
   qan’qaa- ‘to become cold’ < qad’uu- ‘to be cold’
   juoqaa- ‘to ache.INCH’ ~ jooj- ‘to be ill’
   mörkie- ‘to resound.INCH’ < möruu- ‘to be audible’

(234a) Tan quodiir tittel čama-neŋ qan’qaa-l-daya el=kewej-ŋu
   and why 3PL big-ADV get.cold-GER-3SG.DS NEG=leave-PL-3
   ‘And why don’t they leave [only] when it gets very cold?’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

(234b) El itčie l’ellek tibegeleŋ mörkiel.
   el=itčie l’e-relek tibege-l-lenŋ mörüu-kie-l
   NEG-long.time be-ANT tramp-GER-FOC.ABS be.audible-INCH-GER.SF
   ‘After some time a tramp became audible.’ (Kurilov 2001:265, mörkie-)

For this function also the suffix –mu is available, restricted to qualitative and quantitative verbs\(^{149}\):

(235) lugumu- ‘to become old’ < luge- ‘to be older’
   werwemu- ‘to become strong’ < werwe- ‘to be strong’
   pojumu- ‘to become numerous’ < pojuol- ‘to be numerous’

\(^{149}\) The inchoative form čuol’emu- ‘to get old’ lacks the integrated copular verb gol- of the underlying verb čuol’uol- ‘to be old’.
jaluomu- ‘to become three’ < jaluo- ‘to be three’
kuruluomu- ‘to become visible’ < kuril’uol- ‘to be visible’
arinn’em- ‘to become deft’ < arinn’e- ‘to be deft’

(236a) Qad’ir me=čamu-mu-j.
DM PF=big-INCH-INTR.3SG
‘And so he grew up.’

(236b) Id’ie wadud aruulek ann’ej köde mer alyamnumuj.
now Tundra.Yukaghir-GEN language-INS speak-PTCP person PF=be.few-INCH-INTR.3SG
‘Nowadays, there is hardly anyone speaking Tundru Yukaghir.’

(236c) Tet uo qamlamu id’ie? — Jaluomuj.
tet uo qamlal-mu id’ie? jaluo-mu-j.
2SG child be.how.many-INCH[3SG.ITRG] now be.three-INCH-INTR.3SG
‘How many children do you have now?’ — ‘Three.’
(Kurilov 2001:109, jaluomu-)

In qualitative verbs derived by the comitative suffix –n’e and denominal verbs denoting atmospheric phenomena the inchoative meaning is rendered by the combination of the acquisitional suffix –re, which alternates with –n’e, and the semelfactive suffix –j:

(237) tororej- ‘to become black’ ~ toron’e- ‘to be black’
n’amućerej ‘to become red’ ~ n’amućen’- ‘to be red’
erirej- ‘to have thawed’ (result) ~ erin’e- ‘to thaw’ (process)
tiwerej- ‘to begin to rain’ ~ tiwen’e- ‘to rain’ < tiwe ‘rain’
erimerej- to become covered with snow’ ~ erimen’- ‘to be covered by snow’

(238) Qand’eme puguod’e ilije Tihij okean laayarut čawul’yan keluununi, taŋun lajaat mer erimerejnuni.
qand’e-me puguol-je ilije Tichij okean laayar-ut čawul-ya-n
winter-ADV be.warm-PTCP wind Pacific ocean side-ABL sea-LOC-PROL
kelu-nun-i taŋun laja-a-t mer=erime-re-j-nun-i
come-HAB-INTR.3SG INVS.DEM back.part-ABL PF=snow-VBLZ-SEM-HAB-INTR-3SG
‘In winter warm wind comes over the sea from the Pacific Ocean, after that it snows usually.’

In some instances the synchronically underived form of a verb resembles strongly an inchoative form:

(239) papaa- ‘to urinate’/*papa-/∗papepegie- ‘to follow’/*pege- sayaa- ‘to get lost’/*saya-/*saye-köngie- ‘to rip up’/*könge-kudie- ‘to keep’/*kude-pilie- ‘to wipe’/*pile-
Sometimes, an inchoative is aspectually neutral, e.g. *tuŋie*-tuŋu- ‘to shield’, ‘to forbid’. It can have an aspectual value different from the inception of an action. For instance, in the following example it has rather a perfective or resultative mening:

(240)  
edie- ‘to burn up’ < *edu* - ‘to burn’.  
čantajraa- ‘to have failed’ < čantajre- ‘to fail’

The attachment of the inchoative suffix can lead to some typologically highly curious phenomena. For instance, a reverse of the semantic role of the subject from the stimulus to perceiver can happen:

(241)  
maalinaa- ‘to observe curiously’ < *maalii- ‘to surprise’

In some instances the sole function of inchoative forms is to reduce the argument structure:

(242)  
jojaaj ‘to fall ill.INTR.3SG’ < joojm ‘to be ill.TR.3SG’  
pon’aaj ‘to remain.INTR.3SG’ < pon’im ‘to leave.TR.3SG’

   mōrdiej ‘to inform.INTR.3SG’ < mōrd’iim ‘to inform.TR.3SG’  
   nugiej ‘to be found.INTR.3SG’ < nugum ‘to find.TR.3SG’

The inchoative meaning of the transitive verb can then be expressed by the phonologically non-motivated allomorph –naa:

(243)  
pon’inaa - ‘to leave.DUR.INCH’ < *pon’inu-

Instances of the reverse can be found too:

(244)  
ediem ‘to burn.TR.3SG’ < *edu ‘to burn.INTR.3SG’

   igiem ‘to tie.TR.3SG’ < igej ‘to tie.INTR.3SG’

3.4.2.3.2 Durative

The uniform durative suffix –nu indicates that an action is ongoing and extends over a period of time. Claims (Kreinovič 1958:124, Kurilov 2006:165) that this suffix simultaneously expresses the present tense do not hold against the empirical data (but see (286b) in 3.4.2.3.7). In 3.4.2.2 it was already demonstrated that durative forms are compatible with adverbial forms having past time reference. Here is one more example of this sort. The past time reference is established not lexically but by the preceding context:

(245)  
… mer ičuom punnuŋudaŋane.  
               mer=ičuom pun’-nu-ŋu-l-dayane
PF=look-TR.3SG   kill-DUR-PL-GER-3DS

   (A protagonist’s parents had been killed by some people) ‘…, he saw how they were killing.’

   (Kurilov 2005:126)
As with the inchoative, in some verbs the durative form seems to be the basic one, e.g. čewnu-/*čew- ‘to sneeze’ as opposed to e.g. lajnu-‘Dur’ < lajnu- ‘to fight’.

Elicitations show that the employment of the durative suffix is often perceived by the speaker as optional, at least for verbs with an inherently continuous internal structure. The following sentences are assessed by informants as semantically equivalent:

(246a) Met mer ennujeŋ.  
met mer=en’-nu-jeŋ
1SG PF=be.alive-DUR-INTR.1SG
‘I live.’

(246b) Met mer end’ey.  
met mer=en’-jeŋ
1SG PF=be.alive-INTR.1SG
‘I live.’

This is also reflected in inconsistent marking of the predicates in related clauses:

(247) Tan ten migideŋ keluuńure amuć-neŋ kelujeli.  
tan ten migideŋ kelu-nu-re amuć-neŋ kelu-jeli
and DM here.ADV come.DUR-SIM be.good.INTR.3SG-ADV come-INTR.1PL
‘And when we were coming here, we were coming well.’

The inchoative suffix –aa can combine with the durative suffix, irrespective of the phonological characteristics of the stem. This suffix sequence has the function of amplification of intensity or amount of an ongoing action that began or expresses the thoroughness or an excessive duration of the commenced action (Kurilov 2006:165), being thus some kind of verbal augmentative.

(248a) jaqte- ‘to sing’ > jaqtaa- ‘to start singing’ > jaqtaanu- ‘to start singing for a while’ > jaqtaanaa- ‘to start singing a lot for a while’

(248b) lewde- ‘to eat’ > lewdie- ‘to start eating’ > lewdienu- ‘to start eating for a while’ > lewdienaa- ‘to start eating thoroughly for a while’

(248a) Čayad’aanare titte maŋila iirienunŋa.  
čayad’e-nu-aa-re titte maŋila iir-i-unga
work-DUR-INCH-CIRC 3PL.POSScoat-LOC bind-HAB-3PL.TR
‘When they begin to work hard, they sew [the mittens] to the coat.’

(248b) Maarqad’ey id’igojgir laamepegi lajsaanaal’elŋi!  
maarqad’ey id’igojgir laame-pee-ge lajse-nu-aa-l’el-ŋi
once morning dog-PL-PERT bark-DUR-INCH-NVIS-3PL.INTR
‘Once morning his dogs began to bark, never to stop!’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:166)

The durative aspect suffix can also have a distributive meaning. Speaking of, for instance, fish size, one may use the durative suffix as in (249a). This would imply that the speaker characterizes each fish separately as small. Without the durative suffix a general assessment is made, without referring to each individual fish (249b).
Some durative forms cannot be reduced to a root:

(250) petnu- ‘to crawl on one’s knees’
čewnu- ‘to sneeze’

3.4.2.3.3 Habitual

The habitual suffix –nun testifies of the regular repetition of an action or its periodic nature as well as depicts a customary activity. It is reasonable to think of it as of a product of partial reduplication of the durative aspect suffix.

(251) Čuol’uolγan n’id’erpeγan jawnuo lawnuuŋγ.
čuol’-ŋolγan n’id’erpeγan jawnuol law-nun-ŋγ
old-be-JUSS be.new-JUSS all.DO drink-HAB-1SG.TR
‘Be it something old or new, I drink everything.’
(Kurilov 2001:314, n’id’erpeγ)

In denominal verbs, habitual expresses the persistent nature of a state:

(252) Taat sayanereγ qad’ir waaj sayanaanureγ tuγ paiqpeγ el uon’ienull’en’.
taat saγane-reγ qad’ir waaj saγane-nu-reγ tuγ paiqpeγ
so sit-SIM DM again sit-DUR-SIM ADL.PROX woman
el=uo-n’e-nun-l’el-i
NEG=child-VBLZ-HAB-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘And so that woman’s life went on and she remained without children.’

Sometimes the use of the habitual suffix in this function appears to be optional. Consider the nearly identical sentences from the tale about Edilwey uttered by two different speakers:

(253a) Taññigi nimepegi jukuruskun yoll’en’.
taññigi nime-pe-gi juku-sukun yoll-el-i
then house-PL-PERT small-thing be-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘At that time their house was small.’

(253b) Taññigi nimepegi jukuruskun yollnull’en’, lewejn nimek.
taññigi nime-pe-gi juku-sukun yoll-nun-l’el-i lewejl-n nime-k
then house-PL-PERT small-thing be-HAB-NVIS-INTR.3SG summer-GEN house-COP
‘At that time their house was small; it was a summer hut.’ (Kurilov 1991:42)

The suffix –nun also encodes a recurrent action viewed as one event. It is thus the repetitive marker too:
In ancient times a girl lost her way while eating berries. She looked around several times. She realized to her surprise that she was standing in the midst of a great plain, whose limits were not visible and which was red from cloudberries.

(Kurilov 2005:278)

We kissed the iron staff … [he] sprinkled us with holy water.

(Kurilov 2001:385, porčatterej-)

3.4.2.3.4 Semelfactive

The semelfactive suffix –j describes an action that takes place only once. This suffix immediately follows the root:

(255) tiwayaj- ‘to wink.SEM’ < tiwaya- ‘to wink’
siigej- ‘to drop.SEM’ < siige- ‘to drop’
örtej- ‘to shout.SEM’ < örν’e- ‘to shout’
mönd’ej- ‘to wake up’ < mönd’e- ‘to stay awake’

Maslova (2003c:12) suggested that this suffix functions as a perfective aspect marker. Indeed, some verbs appear to be in such relation to each other:

(256) pugelwej- ‘to warm oneself up’ < pugelwe- ‘to be warming oneself up’

The perfective meaning is natural for semelfactive as the latter can be regarded as a subtype of the perfective.

(257) Taŋ uktej-relek čamanęŋ čamanęŋ mer örtejl’en’.

‘He became tired and shouted very loudly.’
The semlfactive can simply express a short duration of an action, functioning as some kind of diminutive:

\[(258)\quad \text{ise me silyal’esej} \text{tem, maarquon’ me čingičernaaj.} \]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ise me=silyal’e-se-j-ŋu-te-m maarquon’ me=čingičel-r-nu-aa-j} \\
\text{MP PF=dry-CAUS-SEM-PL-FUT-TR.3SG only PF=darkness-VBLZ-DUR-INCH-INTR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘Maybe they’ll dry it just a bit, but the problem is that it is getting dark.’

(Kurilov 2001:434, silyal’esej-)

3.4.2.3.5 Iterative

The following presentation of the morphological properties of the iterative aspect is adapted from Kurilov (2006:166-168). Verbs can be divided in eight groups according to how they form the iterative depending on the morpho-phonological properties of the verb root:

Group I

From bases ending in high vowels, the form of the iterative is usually derived by the suffix –ji:

\[(259)\quad \text{aawiji- ‘to sleep.ITR’ < aawe-}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{köjliji- ‘to break.ITR’ < köjle-}
\end{array}
\]

Group II

Verb bases ending with the glide /j/ or a long /aa/ acquire the suffix –uuji or –uoji. The latter usually attaches to verb roots terminating in long /aa/. The suffix ousts the final vowel or diphthong:

\[(260)\quad \text{ayuuji- ‘to touch’.ITR < ayaj-}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ponduuji-/ponruuji- ‘to separate/to break off.itr’ < pondej-/ponrej-}
\text{maruojji- ‘to dress.ITR’ < maraa-}
\end{array}
\]

Group III

In verb bases with the final syllable ge(j) or γa(j) the syllable is replaced by the suffix –d’i:

\[(261)\quad \text{siid’i- ‘to drop.ITR’ < siige-}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{sisad’i- ‘to tear.ITR’ < sisayaj-}
\end{array}
\]

Group IV

In verb bases with the final syllable re(j) the syllable is replaced by the suffixes –ći or
–nd’i. When the suffix –či is attached, further phonological changes take place in the root, which are difficult to systematize:

(262) čugind’i- ‘to whistle.İTR’ < čugire-
pukind’i- ‘to jump/run/fly out.İTR’ < pukirej-
kudiči- ‘to put.İTR’ < kudere-
kepči- ‘to carry away.İTR’ < kewrej-
ıkči- ‘to tie.İTR’ < idire-
sökči- ‘to bring in.İTR’ < sewre-
pomoreči- ‘to roll.İTR’ < pomore-
jojoči- ‘to become angry.İTR’ < jojon’aa-

Group V

The final syllable te(j) or se in verb bases is replaced by the suffix –rič/-dič. The root may experience vowel deletion or vowel alternation:

(263) wierič- ‘to untie.İTR’ < wiete-
ayirči- ‘to hide.İTR’ < aithe-
weldič- ‘to hang.İTR’ < welte-
jojdiči- ‘to open.İTR’ < jojotej-
sındiči- ‘to lose.İTR’ < sayuse-

Group VI

Verb bases ending in <γarej>/<gerej> have the final syllable rej replaced by the suffix -s.

(264) sal’yas- ‘to break.İTR’ < sal’yarej-
sisayas- ‘to tear.İTR’ < sisayarej-
silγyas- ‘to dry very quickly.İTR’ < silγagyarej-
pulges- ‘to take/pull/let out.İTR’ < pulgerej-

Group VII

A number of verbs form the iterative form with the help of the suffix -(u)du, which generally replaces the last syllable. The short penultimate vowel of the verb root is elided, as in group V. Unlike group V, the open penultimate syllable of the derivational base remains open thanks to the attachment of the extended allomorph –udu, which seems to be selected after short root-final vowels and consonants:

(265) aadu- ‘to stop.İTR’ < aarej-
tanudu- ‘to chase.İTR’ < tojore-
weludu- ‘to hang.İTR’< welie-

In some instance the phonological shape of the resulting form cannot be fully predicted. In the following example the motivation for /γ/ in the iterative form is unclear.
Group VIII

With a few verbs, possibly only those whose stems end with the syllable sej, the indicator of the iterative aspect is suffix –diį. It is difficult to describe the morpho-phonological changes accompanying the attachment of this suffix. Too few examples are known. On the basis of available data it seems that, along with the syllable sej, the immediately preceding syllable is replaced by the iterative suffix and a nasal is inserted between the iterative suffix and whatever is left from the root.

If the preceding syllable contains a long vowel, the syllable is not replaced but the vowel undergoes shortening. Comparing the two examples provided it can be concluded that the choice of the nasal is determined by the place of articulation of the preceding vowel.

A text example illustrates the use of the iterative:

Tidaa mitt et lukunburebeγya l’elaqane tet mitul oqol’ tanjuddunmek.

‘Earlier, when we were on your land, you used to chase us.’

An important phenomenon concerning the formal opposition of aspectually unmarked verb forms, those marked for semelfactive and those identifiable as iterative ones is that such triads are not available for all verbs. An example of a complete verb in this sense would be the following:

čulγaj- ‘to poke.SEM’ < čulγa- ‘to poke’ > čulďi- ‘to poke.ITER’

tiwaγaj- ‘to wink.SEM’ < tiwaγa- ‘to wink’ > tiwaďi- ‘to wink.ITER’

Incompleteness is manifest in the absence of one of the members of the triad:

pulγeį- ‘to get out.SEM’ < *pulγe- > pulďi- ‘to get out.ITER’

lieįaj- ‘to rush.SEM’ < lieięa- ‘to run about’ > *liedįi- ‘to rush/run about.ITER’

*aaweį- ‘to sleep.SEM’ < aawe- ‘to sleep’ > aawuji- ‘to sleep.ITER’

It is difficult to find a satisfactory explanation for this aspectual deficiency. Krejnovič (1982:124) attempts to account for it in term of telicity and phasal structure. Maslova (2003c:11ff.) follows in the same vein applying Vendler’s (1967) aspectual typology to TY. Kurilov (2003:71) also attributes these gaps to the inherent aspectual semantics of
the verb root. In my opinion, this approach can work for some verbs but not for all of them. It would fallaciously predict that the telic verbs lieγa- ‘to run about’ and aawe-γa ‘to sleep’ would behave in the same way, which they don’t. It is equally impossible to explain why the telic verbs ‘to poke’ and ‘to get out’ should differ in TY with respect to the aspectually unmarked form. There is another area of TY grammar in which the theoretical concept of telicity can be misleading. Thus Maslova (2003c:11), having embraced Vendler’s (1967) typology, makes a wrong prediction with respect to telic verbs in TY by saying that ‘the absence of Progressive marking [‘durative’ in my terminology] indicates that the inherent endpoint has been achieved by the time of reference’, while non-achievement of such an endpoint ‘must be signaled by the Progressive suffix’. In the majority of cases it may be correct. However, in (247) the aspectually unmarked form of the verb kelu- ‘to come’, of an arguably telic verb, that is, does not imply an arrival, refuting Maslova’s assumption based on Vendler’s (1967) aspect typology. Another theoretical misconception leading to a wrong prediction is that so called perfective verbs, which Maslova (2003c:12) identifies with Vendler’s (1967) ‘achivements’, depict events ‘that cannot be construed as ongoing at the time of reference’, which is reflected in their incompatibility with the durative aspect suffix. Consider the following examples.

(272) Oktjabr’ el’i ćajlepedaγa jalyipul, enupul ma ćaaqarnunμi. Tadaat ijun’ ćajlepedaγa mer al’aa-nunμi. Ćama jalyipul čawlaayar l’e jisik’il’uod’e jalyipul tuγ kind’e n’i’d’aγajnudayμa mirin al’aa-nunμi.
Oktjabr’ el’i ćajle-pe-daγa jalyi-pul enu-pul me=ćaaqar-nun-ŋi.
October(Russ) first day-PL-PERT-LOC lake-PL river-PL PF=freeze-HAB-3PL_INTR

Tadaat ijun’ ćajle-pe-da-γa mer=al’aa-nun-ŋi. Ćama jalyi-pul
then June(Russ) day-PL-PERT-LOC PF=thaw-HAB-3PL_INTR big lake-PL
čawul-laayar l’e-j isik’il’uol-je jalyi-pul tuγ kind’e
sea-side be-INTR.3SG be.deep-PTCP lake-PL ADL.PROX month
n’i’d’aγa-j-nu-l-daya mirin’ al’aa-nun-ŋi
end-SEM-DUR-GER-3SG.DS only.then thaw-HAB-3PL_INTR

‘In the first day of October, lakes and rivers freeze. Then, in the beginning of June they thaw. Big lakes and deep lakes along the ocean shore thaw only in the end of this month (July).’

150 This may be conditioned by something different than TY not complying with Vendler’s typology, though. In TY, an identical aspectual value is sometimes not expressed in a successive clause. Here is a similar example:

(273) Amaa, tigin jaŋde-pe quodirir čuŋγajme keluununμu tadaat gomdeme lajyudeŋ pengejnuŋμi?
Amaa tigin jaŋde-pe quodirir čuŋγajme kelu-nun-ŋu
father DEIC goose-PL why spring come-HAB-PL[3.ITER]
Tadaat gomdeme lajyudeŋ pengej-nu-ŋi
and autumn back return-DUR-3PL_INTR

‘Father, why ever do geese come in spring and return in autumn?’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

However it may be, a formal contradiction between Maslova’s (2003c:11) assumption made on the basis of Vendler’s (1967) aspectual typology and TY data remains.
From these examples it is clear that the combination of the semelfactive and durative is not only possible but has a function, namely to indicate the inception of an action normally thought of as having no duration.\(^\text{151}\)

Example: Mit abučie jarqa me=čayad’e-j-nu-j.
1PL grandmother ice P=move-SEM-DUR-INTR.3SG
‘The ice on our river is gradually beginning to move.’
(Kurilov 2001:536, čayad’ej-)

3.4.2.3.6 Resultative

A combination of an intransitive stem with the copular verb \(ŋ\)ol- expresses the resulting state of an action:

(276) Lalime me köjluon’.
lalime me=köjle-ŋol-i sledge P=break-be-INTR.3SG
‘The sledge is broken.’

(277) Taŋ n’amuče’drukungi ord’adaγa el kötkuolnun.
taŋ n’amuče’-je-sukan-gi ord’a-da-γa el=kötkej-ŋol-nun INVS.DEM redness-VBLZ-PTCP-thing-PERT middle-PERT-LOC NEG=reach-be-HAB[3SG]
‘That red part [of the fir wood] does not reach the middle.’
(Kurilov 2001:164, kötkuol-)

In many intransitive verbs the resultative suffix is not a voice marker but rather a base forming morpheme, an integral, inseparable part of the stem. In most cases it can be seen as a copular device allowing verbal lexemes with qualitative semantics to act as predicates:

(278) My celye sutki dobiralis’ do Andrjuškino.
1PL whole day.night reach.IPF.PAST.1PL as.far.as Andrjuškino
‘Reaching Andryushkino took us a whole day.’

\(\text{151}\) Similar examples can be given from Russian, where the action denoted by a typical punctual verb ‘to reach’ can be presented as extended in time, something unthinkable in English via aspectual markers, unless an iterative meaning is intended (Comrie 1976:43):
(279) pojuol- ‘to be numerous’ ~ *po-
čuguol- ‘to be quick’ ~ *čugV-/čuwC
maaruol- ‘to be happy’ ~ *maar
pujuol- ‘to rejoice’ ~ *puŋ-
ayuol- ‘to stand’ ~ *ayV-/*ayC
quduol- ‘to lie’ ~ *qudV-/*quC

The resultative meaning can be expressed by apparently underived verb forms:

(280) pujʊ- ‘to be cooked’
ige- ‘to be tied’

Very frequent are nominalized forms of the resultative, especially functioning as attributive verb forms:

(281) Met keluŋol laamepul me lewbun’ŋi.

met keluŋol laame-pul me=lew-l-bun’ŋi
1SG come-be[GER] dog-PL PF=eat-GER-DES-3PL.INTR

‘The dogs on which I have arrived are hungry.’

This usage is characteristic of gerunds of transitive verbs too:

(282) Lasu moŋole tadiŋol paad’edu met emd’e.

Lasu moŋo-le tadi-ŋol paad’edu met emd’e
Lasu cap-ACC give-be[GER] girl 1SG younger.sister

‘The girl to whom Lasu presented a cap is my younger sister.’

3.4.2.3.7 Proximative

The proximative is regarded by Krejnovič (1982:149), who first recognized this grammeme in TY, as a mood. He elaborates this topic primarily using the data from Kolyma Yukaghir. Examples from TY are scarce and they suggest that shades of modality can be expressed by the proximative. The proximative is a periphrastic construction: gerund in dative + auxiliary to be:

(283) Met kelu-lŋin’ l’e-jey.

1SG come-GER-DAT be-INTR.1SG

‘I wanted/was about to come’ (Krejnovič 1982:148)

According to Krejnovič’s informants the sentence above implies that the speaker has promised to go, while in the following sentence (in the desiderative mood) the driving force is his own desire.

(284) Met kelulbud’ey.

met kelu-l-bun’-jey
1SG come-GER-DES-INTR.1SG

‘I wanted to come’ (Krejnovič 1982:149)
Modern TY data confirms that the proximative can have a modal meaning:

\[(285)\] Taŋ körel mit paad’eduoγane med’ilŋin’ l’ienuj.

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{taŋ} & \text{körel} & \text{mit} \\
\text{INVS.DEM} & \text{devil} & 1\text{PL} \\
\text{paad’eduo-γane} & \text{girl-ACC} & \text{take-GER-DAT} \\
\text{men’-il-ŋin’} & \text{be-DUR-INTR.3SG} & \\
\text{l’e-nu-j} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘That devil wants to marry our daughter.’

One of my informants pointed it out to me that the combination of proximative with the durative aspect suffix transposes the action to be carried out into a more distant future and makes a past tense reference impossible, whereas the ‘unmarked’ proximative implies imminence and can refer to past activities:

\[(286a)\] Met kelu-l-ŋin’ le’-jeŋ.

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
1\text{SG} & \text{come-GER-DAT} & \text{be-INTR.1SG} \\
\text{kelu-l-ŋin’} & \text{be-DUR-INTR.1SG} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I am/was going/about to come.’

\[(286b)\] Met keluŋin’ l’ienujeŋ.

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
1\text{SG} & \text{come-GER-DAT} & \text{be-DUR-INTR.1SG} \\
\text{keluŋin’} & \text{be-DUR-INTR.1SG} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I am/#was going to come (later on).’

3.4.2.3.8 Periphrastic perfective

There is a periphrastic verb form involving the auxiliary juoyaj- ‘to finish’ that expresses the completion of an action. It follows the circumstantial adverb carrying the lexical content of the expression:

\[(287)\] Lewder juoyaceli.

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{lewd} & \text{er} & \text{juoyaj-jeli} \\
\text{eat-CIRC} & \text{finish-INTR.1PL} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘We finished eating.’

\[(288)\] Jaqte-r juoyaj-relek pure-n laŋudeŋ onidigil’ laŋudeŋ juoćčii-m.

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{sing-CIRC} & \text{finish-ANT} & \text{upper.side-GEN} & \text{toward} & \text{roof.opening} & \text{toward} & \text{see-DIM-TR.3SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Having finished singing she glanced up toward the roof opening [of the hut].’

3.4.2.4 Mood

3.4.2.4.1 Indicative

TY has a rich system of moods. The indicative is a default mood and is unmarked. It is represented by the paradigmatic forms in 3.4.2.1.

3.4.2.4.2 Potential

The potential mood indicates a conditionally possible action or state of affairs. It typically marks the apodosis in conditional sentences (see 4.4.2.2). The formal expression of the potential is the verbal proclitic at=, whose relative position is behind the marker of predicate focus mer= and in front of the verbal negator, proclitic el=, which, in turn, immediately precedes the verb:
(289)  

*Ejk quruulat keriel’elγan met juo pure erimeley at l’el, tan lukulyat pulgejl’elγan met juo pure lukuleγ at l’el moll’en*.

‘If I had fallen from the sky, I would have snow on my head, and if I had come out from the ground, I would have soil on my head,” he said.

(290)  

*Sukunn’iel’eldayane köden kid’e at čuŋrej.*

‘If he had clothes, one could have alternative assumptions. (i.e. one could hope that the person, who lost his way, is still alive)’ (Kurilov 2001:447, *sukunn’e-*)

The potential can express a shade of deontic modality:

(291)  

(A)  

*Tuŋ čajle-γat mer=at=wie-ŋa.*

‘They are supposed to repair [it] today.’

(B)  

*Quode wie-l’el-ŋu-te-m qad’ir iimu-nu-j-sukun-pe?*

‘How would they manage if they are drunk?’

3.4.2.4.3 Imperative

The imperative mood has two endings: -k in singular and -ŋik in plural as long as the sentence is affirmative. It is curious that the plural suffix of the 3rd person, -ŋi (see 3.4.2.1), is employed in the imperative, that is, in the 2nd person. It is also conspicuous that it does not differ depending on the (in)transitivity of the verb. In negative sentences the verb in the imperative mood receives the negative proclitic el= of declarative sentences. Apart from that negation is marked by the prohibitive suffix –l’ek in singular and –l’eŋik in plural, the prohibitive suffix being split by the plurality marker. Again, it is unexpected that the plurality marker –ŋi does not surface as –ŋu, the corresponding marker in the negative paradigm.

(292a)  

*Tapi taat kuril’ii-k!*

‘Know that [to be] so!’

(292b)  

*Sal’ildie, nimedie ögetek!*

‘Little mouse, build a little house!’ (Kurilov 1994:8)
(292c) Mal tet kejen ajik moll’en’ Edilwey!

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mal} & \quad \text{tet} & \quad \text{kejen} & \quad \text{ajik} & \quad \text{moll’en’} & \quad \text{Edilwey}. \\
\text{MP} & \quad 2\text{SG} & \quad \text{earlier} & \quad \text{shoot-IMP SG} & \quad \text{say-NVIS-INTR 3SG} & \quad \text{Edilwey}.
\end{align*}
\]

‘“Come, be the first to shoot!” Edilwey said.’

(292d) Tit saaband’e tit nonol ieruu-l čajleŋ emmun juö-nun-ŋi-k.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tit} & \quad \text{saaband’e} & \quad \text{tit} & \quad \text{nonol} & \quad \text{ieruu-l} & \quad \text{čajleŋ} & \quad \text{emmun} & \quad \text{juö-nun-ŋi-k}. \\
\text{2PL} & \quad \text{net} & \quad 2\text{PL} & \quad \text{snare} & \quad \text{hunt-GER day} & \quad \text{every} & \quad \text{see-HAB-PL-IMP}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Check your nets, snares and your catch every day.’

(293a) Met-ul el=urari-č’ek!

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{1SG-ACC} & \quad \text{NEG=teach-PROH.SG}.
\end{align*}
\]

‘Don’t teach me!’

(293b) Qajčie, Lačin Meruuŋin’ čyojo ewe če el uusieull’eŋik! N’anič.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qajčie} & \quad \text{lačil-n} & \quad \text{meruuŋin’} & \quad \text{čyojo} & \quad \text{ewe} & \quad \text{el=uu-se-nun-l’eŋi-k}!. \\
\text{grandfather} & \quad \text{fire-GEN} & \quad \text{fire-DAT} & \quad \text{knife} & \quad \text{edge} & \quad \text{NEG=go-CAUS-HAB-PROH-PL-PROH}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Grandfather, do not direct the edge of a knife toward a fire, it is a sin.’

The imperative is compatible with the future tense marker and has as its exponent the suffix –γaneŋ/-γanek then, which is insensitive to number. The sequence <γan> of the suffix materially coincides with the jussive mood suffix (see below). The presence of le/ between this suffix and the singular form of the imperative is unexpected here as it is not required phonologically. The combination of the future tense suffix and the imperative suffix implies that the order does not need to be carried out at once:

(294a) Worpe-te-γanek.

\[
\text{be.cautious-FUT-IMP}.
\]

‘Be cautious.’ (Kurilov 2005:160)

(294b) Čaj lawk lewdek me qan’qaatej tadaat ladineŋ niediteγanęŋ

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{čaj} & \quad \text{law-k} & \quad \text{lewde-k} & \quad \text{me=qad’uu-qaa-te-j} \\
\text{tea} & \quad \text{drink-IMP.SG} & \quad \text{eat-IMP.SG} & \quad \text{PF=be.cold-INCH-FUT-INTR 3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tadaat} & \quad \text{ladineŋ} & \quad \text{niedi-te-γanęŋ}. \\
\text{then} & \quad \text{peacefully} & \quad \text{narrate-FUT-IMP}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Drink tea, eat! It will get cold, and then tell without haste.’

3.4.2.4.4 Jussive

The ending –γan encodes the jussive mood:

(295a) Qojl amuoriiγan!

Qojl amuo-rii-γan

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{God} & \quad \text{be.good-CAUS-JUSS SG}.
\end{align*}
\]

‘May God bless!’
The meaning of the jussive mood can be enhanced by the modal particle köčejk ‘may …’/‘let …’:

(296)  

Ee köčejk men’-yan.  

ITJ  MP take-JUSS.SG  

‘Well, let him take.’ (Kurilov 2001:167, köčejk)

3.4.2.4.5 Hortative

The hortative mood is signaled in intransitive verbs and in the singular of transitive verbs by the respective BC endings, these hortative forms thus being non-different from their indicative counterparts. A dedicated hortative ending, namely –γa, exists therefore only in the plural of transitive verbs:

(297a)  

Ekya sespe lalwii-γa!  

elder.sister door press-HORT.PL  

‘Sister, let’s block the door!’  

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:100)  

(297b)  

Čoγul-gi law-γa!  

bone.marrow-PERT eat-HORT.PL  

‘Let’s eat its bone marrow.’  

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:154)

3.4.2.4.6 Desiderative

The desiderative mood is indicated by the suffix –bun’ attached to the gerund. It expresses the desire to carry out an action. Transitive verbs display ambivalent morphological behavior when used in the desiderative mood. The intransitive paradigm is used with the desiderative forms of transitive verbs when no object is explicitly or implicitly intended; otherwise a verb in the desiderative mood follows the transitive conjugation:

(298a)  

Tittel me=law-l-bun’-ηi.  

3PL PF=drink-GER-DES-3PL.INTR  

‘They are thirsty.’

(298b)  

Tittel n’aarčeu je lawje le me=law-l-bun’-ηa  

3PL be.bad-PTCP water-ACC PF=drink-GER-DES-3PL.TR  

‘They want to drink vodka.’

Some speakers accept intransitive forms even in the presence of an overt object:

---

152 Kurilov (personal communication) believes that the transitivity of the verb must be retained under all circumstances but does detransitivize verbs in spontaneous speech.
Referentiality does not play a role in determining according to which paradigm a verb marked for the desiderative is to be conjugated:

(300a) Met al’γa-leγ lew-l-bun’-mey.
1SG fish-FOC.ABS eat-GER-TR.1/2SG.OF
‘I want to eat fish.’ (as opposed to e.g. pine-apples)

(300b) Met tuŋ al’γa-k lew-l-bun’-mey.
1SG ADL.PROX fish-FOC.ABS eat-GER-TR.1/2SG.OF
‘I want to eat this fish.’ (as opposed to some other fish)

(300c) Met tuŋ čajleγa tet ejitejuol al’γak lewlbun’mey.
Met tuŋ čajleγa tet ejuu-teŋ ol al’γa-k lew-l-bun’-mey.
1SG ADL.PROX day-LOC 2SG get.caught-CASUS be fish-FOC.ABS eat-GER-TR.1/2SG.OF
‘I want to eat the fish that you have caught today.’

Under object focus the transitive paradigm is obligatory in the desiderative:

(301a) Neme-le wie-l-bun’-mey?
what-FOC.ABS do-GER-TR.1/2SG.OF
‘What do you want to do?’

(301b) Tadaat juorqa pulgejrere čupčepleŋ pelulbunnunŋumle čieme pun’uod’edile med’iljn’.
Tadaat juorqa pulgejr-re-re čupče-p-leŋ pel-ul-bun’-nun-ŋu-mle
then woodless.area come.out-TRVZ-SIM Chukchi-PL-FOC.ABS catch.up-GER-DES-HAB-PL-TR.3.OF
čieme pun’-ŋol-je-d-ile men’-il-ŋin’
blood kill-be-PTCP-0-reindeer take-GER-DAT
‘When they came out of the forest to the tundra, they tried to catch up with the Chukchis to take blood and the reindeer carcasses.’ (Kurilov 2001:396, pulgejre-)

3.4.2.4.7 Inclinative

The combination of the truncated desiderative suffix –bu and the copular verb ŋol- marks the inclinative, the mood which expresses a propensity on the part of the subject referent, an inclination to the activity encoded by the verb. Unlike in the desiderative, the reduced desiderative suffix –bu attaches in the inclinative directly to the verbal stem.

(302a) Tudel amutneŋ juorpejbuon’.

‘He was fond of pulling one’s leg.’
(302b) \(Ta\text{n}gigl’ed\ uorpe\ alyad’aa\ me\ m\text{\-}ribuöl\text{-}ŋi.\)
\(ta\text{n}gigl’-e-d\ uorpe\ alyad’aa\ me=m\text{\-}r\text{\-}bi\text{\-}ŋi\)
then-RLN-0 children extremely PF=obey-DES-be-3PL..INTR
‘Children were very obedient back then.’

(302c) \(Köde\ uktejnubuoll’en’.\)
\(köde\ uttej-nu-bu-ŋol-l’el-i\)
person get.tired-DUR-DES-be-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘One gets tired quickly.’

3.4.2.4.8 Prospective

The prospective mood, encoded by the suffix \(-mor\), has, as Kurilov (2006:162) puts it, ‘a very wide array of meanings from to be able to to have to’. This is illustrated in the following example, which can be translated in various ways depending on the context.

(303) \(Me=kudere-mori.\)
\(PF=put-PRSP[INTR.3SG]\)
‘He can put it.’
‘He will have to put [it].’
‘He undertook/committed himself to put [it].’
‘He will certainly/definitely/doubtlessly put [it].’

Maslova (2003c:26) defines this mood as presenting ‘a future situation as a consequence of a present state of affairs’. A common semantic feature of its uses is a high probability of the activity being actually carried out in the future. Therefore Krejnović (1958:126) called it ‘certain/obvious mood’. Since it captures the most essential notion expressed by this mood, the label ‘prospective’, introduced for this grammeme by Krejnović (1982:144) and adopted by Maslova (2003c:26) seems most adequate. It is noteworthy that it expresses a higher degree of certainty that an action will take place than the obligative mood (see below).

According to some informants the suffix \(-mor\) cannot co-occur with the future tense suffix \(-te\). This along with its incompatibility with the non-future tense characterizes the prospective as standing somewhere between temporal and mood suffixes. Therefore, it could alternatively be analyzed as a modally tinged future tense suffix.

The introductory example (77) makes one believe that verbs in the prospective mood are always conjugated according to the intransitive paradigm. However, instances of transitive conjugation are also found, which may be a reflection of idiolectal peculiarities:

\[^{153}\] An interesting counterexample can be found in the corpus, in which the prospective suffix coexists not only with the future tense suffix but with the imperative mood:

(306) \(Ilijerejdaya\ quodeden\ tet\ ile\ solyanii\text{-}moriteyanek.\)
\(ilije-re-j-l\text{-}da\ quodeden\ tet\ ile\ solya\text{-}aj-nii-mori-te\text{-}yanek\)
wind-VBLZ-SEM-GER-3SG.DS somehow 2SG reindeer gather-CAUS-PRSP-FUT-IMP
‘When the weather worsens, try to keep the herd close together.’
While in (305) the transitive OF paradigm is employed because of the focus on the direct object, which is a very strong conditioning factor overriding even the obligatory detransitivization in negative clauses, the use of the transitive BC form in (304) can be triggered only by the transitivity of the verb itself, being in clear contrast to (303). Negation in the absence of object focus regularly detransitivizes verbs in the prospective as it does elsewhere:

(307)  \[\text{El=mæa-mori-jeli.}\]  
\[\text{NEG=wait-PRSP-INTR.1PL}\]  
\[\text{‘We will not be able to wait.’}\]

3.4.2.4.9 Obligative

The obligative mood expresses, naturally, an obligation on the part of the subject referent to conduct an action. Its marker is the word moraw. It has to be noted that this linguistic device is treated under verbal moods only due to the tradition to regard obligative as a verbal grammeme. In fact it is a nominal, roughly translating as ‘duty’ or ‘obligation’, which can also be attached to primarily nominal bases (see Krejnović 1982:145). Besides, the suffix moraw can be followed by case endings. A verb must undergo nominalization before it can take the obligative suffix. The nominizer is the verb øl- ‘to be’. In the following example it functions as the head of a matrix possessive construction, demonstrating that it is a free nominal morpheme and not a bound verbal suffix.

(308)  \[\text{Tudel keluqoł moraw çajlek.}\]  
\[\text{tudel kelu-øl moraw çajle-k}\]  
\[\text{3SG come-be[GER] OBLG day-COP}\]  
\[\text{‘It is the day on which he must come.’}\]
References to persons other than 3SG are made by simply alternating the forms of personal pronouns:

(309)  
\[ \text{Ten'i tet neme\-gol tet wie\-gol moraw el\-le}. \]
\[ \text{here 2SG what-be-FOC 2SG do-be[GER]-OBLG NEG-be} \]

‘You’ve got no business here.’

In order for moraw to refer to persons it has to be verbalized by means of the comitative suffix:

(310)  
\[ \text{Met tu\-j kinige ču\-gol moraw\-n\-e\-je\-n.} \]
\[ \text{met tu\-j kinige ču\-gol moraw-n\-e-je\-n} \]

‘I must read this book.’

The instrumental case of the obligative encodes negative final clauses (see 4.4.2.2.6).

3.4.2.4.10 Non-visual

The non-visual mood is a formalized expression of evidential modality. The verb containing the non-visual suffix –l’el, which is homophonous with the gerund of the verb l’e- ‘to be,’ describes an activity the speaker did not witness himself:

(311)  
\[ \text{Qad’ir tu\-j sajrepul jawner n\-a-aal’el\-jud\-a\-j tu\-j k\-o\-rel waaj tide\-n n’i\-nakaajilpul\-yane me tojorange\-l\-e\-l\-um}. \]
\[ \text{qad’ir tu\-j sajre-pul jawner n\-a\-al\-el\-jud\-a\-j tu\-j k\-o\-rel waaj tide\-n n’i\-n=akaajil-pul\-yane me=tojore-aa\-l\-el\-um} \]

‘And when all peregrins fell down, that devil again began to chase the brothers.’

The functional scope of the non-visual is, however, broader than reporting states of affair one has not witnessed oneself. The following examples show that it is employed for unconscious actions or actions carried out absent-mindedly:

(312a)  
\[ \text{Jeguor waaj met waaj kiile\-j taat janduul’eld\-eli}. \]
\[ \text{Yegor also 1SG also both so fall.asleep-NVIS-INTR.1PL} \]

‘Both I and Yegor fell asleep like that, as it turned out.’ (Kurilov 2001:56, waaj)

(312b)  
\[ \text{Met jugullaayande ugu\-r\-e-\-y\-a jawlaayande ugu\-r\-ed\-uul o\-nu\-l\-u}. \]
\[ \text{1SG right.side.ATTR foot-LOC left.side.ATTR shoe put.on-NVIS-1SG.TR} \]

‘It turns out that I have put the left shoe on my right foot.’

The non-visual suffix –l’el can apparently have purely temporal meaning indicating the past tense in participles, which is in an interesting contrast with the finite verb, which
does not differentiate that tense. The (remote) past tense connotation can, however, be associated with this suffix in finite verb forms, according to some informants\footnote{This is an interesting parallel to Turkish (Hengeveld, personal communication).}.

The combination of the suffix \(-l’el\) and the future tense suffix expresses an assumption with the non-future tense reference. Corresponding verb forms are labeled ‘assumptive mood’ (Kurilov 2006:162) and ‘hypothetical’ (Maslova 2003c:27):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(313a)] \textit{Agun lačil wier neme čambii-nu-l’el-ŋu-te-m.} ‘I guess, they at least helped to lay in firewood, or something.’
\item[(313b)] \textit{Metqat lugiel’eltej lem ilelek kelu taqniigi?} ‘He must be older than me, or else why would he come riding reindeer?!’
\end{enumerate}

Interestingly, this combination is attested in interrogative sentences too:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(314)] \textit{Taŋ ciile waaj lögitenul’elgte-mle?} ‘Did one feed also those people?’
\end{enumerate}

Considering that the non-visual suffix can have past tense value, its combination with the future tense marker reminds the situation in Romance and some Germanic languages, where future perfective verb forms also express assumptions about past actions. Compare the following sentence with its translation into Italian and German.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(315a)] \textit{Taŋ ciii talaw-le pojuol pun’-l’el-ŋu-te-m.} ‘Those people must have killed many wild reindeer.’
\item[(315b)] Questa gente avrà ucciso molte renne.
\item[(315c)] Diese Leute werden viele Rentiere getötet haben.
\end{enumerate}

\subsection*{3.4.2.5 Modal verbs}

Generally, TY is characterized by a poverty of modal verbs. Instead modal meanings are expressed in verbal suffixes, e.g. the desiderative mood (3.4.2.4.6) for volitive modality, the non-visual mood (3.4.2.4.10) for evidential and epistemic modality and the prospective mood (3.4.2.4.8) for several modal meanings. This entails that many modal values cannot be expressed without explicitly mentioning an action. Expressions like ‘Yes, I want’ are virtually impossible in TY. To express e.g. a desire for an object without naming an action, one has to resort to indirect means, namely, the verb ‘to like’:
There are a number of ways to express deontic modality. The potential mood is used to render various shades of it:

(317)  *Mer=at=lewdejen.*  
PF=POT=eat-INTR.2SG.INTR  
‘I must/need to eat.’

(318)  *Tet tuden’en mer at n’ied’ujek.*  
2SG 3SG-COM PF=POT=tell-INTR.2SG  
‘You should speak with him.’

Deontic modality can be additionally indicated by the obligative mood:

(319)  *Taŋuden tet at uujuol moraw el’e.*  
INVS.DEM-ADV 2SG POT=go-be[GER] OBLG NEG=be  
‘You don’t need to go there.’

The future tense can also express deontic modality.

(320)  *Met ten’i me sayanččen?*  
1SG here PF=sit-FUT-INTR.1SG  
‘May I sit here?’

Evaluative expressions serve the same purpose:

(321)  *El amuod’e pajpepol nonyaalawlpegi me ɳ’arčič.*  
NEG=be.good-PTCP woman-PL tobacco-drink-GER-PL-PERT PF=be.bad-INTR.3SG  
‘Pregnant women should not smoke.’

Finally, a loan from Russian expresses necessity:

(322)  *Pojuod’e lačilek naduolel l’ie taŋ.*  
be.numerous-PTCP fire.wood be.necessary-GER.SF MP DM  
‘A lot of fire wood is necessary.’

---

155 The presence of the proclitic *mer=* indicates a categorical obligation. In its absence the sentence has a value of an advice.
A peculiar feature of the TY modal verbs system is that there are two genuine TY modal verbs, but they have negative polarity. They express facultative, in terms of Hengeveld (2004), (323) as well as volitive (324) and (325) modality:

(323) *Qad’ir tuŋ sespegi joŋotejl čantajraŋ.*

\[ qad’ir tuŋ \quad \text{sespe-gi} \quad \text{joŋotej-l} \quad \text{čantajre-ŋ} \]

\[ \text{MP} \quad \text{ADL.PROX} \quad \text{door-PERT} \quad \text{open-GER} \quad \text{fail-1SG.TR} \]

‘I did not manage to open his door.’ (Kurilov 2001:547, čantajraa-)

(324) *Peldudie qodej-naa-re ömge-le meranme me=čaw-te-m.*

\[ \text{old.man} \quad \text{be.reluctant-INCH-COND} \quad \text{skin.strip-ACC} \quad \text{simply} \quad \text{PF=cut.off-FUT-TR.3SG} \]

‘When the old man has had enough of the work, he simply cuts (anywhere) the skin stripes (meant for making ropes).’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:124)

(325) *Oorin’ereŋ tude sukunyane oŋum. Taat qodejm kewejle.*

\[ \text{oorin’e-řeŋ} \quad \text{tude} \quad \text{sukun-γane} \quad \text{ŋu-m.} \]

\[ \text{cry-SIM} \quad \text{3SG.POSS} \quad \text{clouthes-ACC} \quad \text{put.on-TR.3SG} \]

\[ \text{taat} \quad \text{qodej-m} \quad \text{kewej-l-le} \quad \text{so be.reluctant.TR.3SG} \quad \text{leave-GER-ACC} \]

‘She cried while putting on her clothes, so much was she disinclined to leave.’

(Kurilov 2001:517, qodej-)

3.4.2.6 Participles

Participles are formed in TY with the help of the following suffixes: \(-j(e), -če, -d’e, -me\) and \(-be^{156}\). The first three suffixes are allomorphs. The glide is used after short vowels, the suffix \(-če\) coalesces with base final /j/, /i/, /u/ and occurs in causatives after /s/. The suffix \(-d’e\) is the result of coalescence of the underlying /j/ of the suffix and the preceding sonorant of a verb base\(^{157}\). The participial endings follow tense, aspect, mood and voice markers.

(326) *čitnej ‘long’ < čitne- ‘to be long’*

\[ \text{qaliče ‘strong’ < qaaluu-} \]

\[ \text{n’amučend’e ‘red’ < n’amučen’- ‘to be red’} \]

\[ \text{jadarqand’e ‘with pearls’ < jadarqan’- ‘to have pearls’} \]

The suffix \(-me\) is used only with transitive verbs turning them into passive forms. The suffix \(-be\) is the marker of oblique participles. Participles, apart from nominalized ones, as in (327), do not have a plural form.

(327) *pude l’ej qaalid’epe*

\[ \text{pude} \quad \text{l’e-j} \quad \text{qaaluu-je-pe} \]

\[ \text{outside} \quad \text{be-PTCP} \quad \text{be.frightful-NMLZ-PL} \]

\(^{156}\) The attributive form of the verb čuol’uol- ‘to be old’, namely čuol’e, is irregular in not being a participle.

\(^{157}\) Sometimes there is no coalescence (see 2.4.2.1 for details).
creatures of the wilderness

While –me and –be participles are inherently patient and adjunct oriented respectively, the participles having the other endings can in transitive verbs be both agent and patient oriented depending on whether or not the verb is conjoined with the copular verb ĭöl-, which creates passive forms of verbs (see more on orientation of participles in 4.3.3):

(328a) ögöte-je köde
install-PTCP person
‘the person who installs’

(328b) ögöte-îöl-je nime
install-be-PTCP house
‘the house that was built’

Krejnovič (1958:144-145) and Maslova (2003c:24) report personal participial forms. These forms are finite because they agree with the underlying subject of the action expressed by the participle. This formal property, strictly speaking, disallows to regard them as participles. They are homonymous with the singular forms of the OF conjugational paradigm. Maslova (2003c:24) claims that the plural forms of the 3rd person are possible as well but does not give a textual example in the corresponding section. Sentence examples of these forms are given in Krejnovič (1958:144-145):

(329) tuŋ jawnuo mooj-mele rukun amuṭney mooje gödek.
ADL.PROX everything.DO hold-REL.TR.3SG thing be.good.INTR.3SG.-ADV hold-PTCP man-FOC.ABS
‘the man who nicely keeps all these household belongings (all these kept things)’
(adapted from Krejnovič 1958:144-145)

I was unable to detect such participial forms in my corpus.

Participial forms of quantitative verbs, which function as equivalents of ordinal numbers, could be analyzed as those of the causative. Since their bases slightly differ from the respective verbal bases (3.4.1.3), the forms for the first ten, taken from Vyrdylina (2011:41) are listed here:

(330) könmegišče ‘second’
jalmasič ‘third’
jeleklisč ‘fourth’
imdal’siče ‘fifth’
maalajlisče ‘sixth’
puskijisč ‘seventh’

158 It may be interesting for the reader that in North-Eastern Asia personal participial forms, which in itself are a striking phenomenon since per commonly accepted definition participles are non-finite verb forms, exist in Siberian Eskimo (Menovščikov 1967:179).
159 The attributive forms of the quantitative verb for ‘one’ is not a participle: el’ill’e ‘first’ < el’i ‘first’ + -ll’e ‘RLN’.
160 This form, obviously, cannot be regarded as causative since it carries the pertensive suffix, indicating being possessed in nouns. Perhaps the form könmegišče ‘second’ could be explained in terms of paradigm pressure.
maalajlaklisče ‘eighth’
wal’yaramkurisče ‘ninth’
kunil’isče ‘tenth’

Doublets exist for some forms, e.g. jalmisče/jalmasče ‘third’. A textual example follows:

(331) Maarqad’ey met čamuolel uo Ganja, tajnigi jalmesče klasqa uraanuj, puŋuoldeŋ nimeŋya tubegeč. maarqa-d’ey met čamaŋol-el uo Ganja tajnigi jalmesče

one-ADV 1SG big-be-GER child Ganya then three.PTCP

klasŋya uraa-nu-j puŋuol-reŋ nimeŋya tubegej-j.

form-LOC learn-DUR-PTCP rejoice-SIM house-LOC rush.in-INTR.3SG

‘Once, my elder son Ganya, who went to the third form at that time, rushed into the house in a joyful mood.’

Temporal distinctions in participles can be expressed by the future tense suffix (332) as well as the non-visual aspect suffix (333), indicating past tense reference. The unmarked form (334a) or the durative form (334v) has the present tense reference\(^{161}\).

(332) Lugu-mu-r gitn’er at=en’-te-j apanalaa-γane uorpe-gi

be.old-INCH-CIRC till POT=be.alive-FUT-PTCP old.woman-ACC children-PERT

taat ewlikie-seŋa.

so disappear-CAUS-TR.3SG

‘The children killed in this way their old mother who would have lived till very old age.’

(333) Motineŋ puŋieł’eld’ed al’ya pôd’el met joyulŋya mörćiic.
motineŋ puŋie-l’el’d-e-d al’ya pôd’el met joyul-γya mörćiic-ŋ

already be.cooked-NVIS-PTCP-0 fish smell 1SG nose-LOC spread-INTR.3SG

‘I have already sensed the smell of cooked fish.’

(334a) jawmnuo kuril’iibud’e Apuodie

jawnnuo kuril’ii-l-bun’-je Apuodie

everything.DO know-GER-DES-PTCP Apuodie

‘little Apuodie, who wanted to know everything’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

(334b) Poyode met mennube kōde waduleŋ.
poyode met men’-nu-be kōde waduleŋ

money 1SG take-DUR-OP person Yukaghir-COP

‘The person I get money from is Yukaghir.’

\(^{161}\) This yields an exceptional situation in which a non-finite verb form is temporally more differentiated than finite verb forms, which distinguish only non-future and future. In a balanced sample of 30 languages studied by Schmalz (2008) 19 were recognized to have participles, but in none of them did participles exhibit a higher degree of temporal differentiation than finite verb forms.
3.4.2.7 Converbs

There are potentially six converbs in TY. Kreinovič (1958:198-201) lists only four converbs and diverges from Kurilov (2006:190-193) as far as the function of one of them is concerned. The verb ending in –ren/-den/-te describes an action simultaneous with the action of the main clause.

The converb ending in –ren/-den/-te describes an action simultaneous with the action of the main clause.

(335a) *Taŋnigi qaaliče ieruučεγεγεnε leml’ε ditel’uo ičuonunγa. Ieruučε ködek mondeγ
tudeγεnε tajudununγa.*

*then* strong-PTCP *hunter-ACC* *chief* *like* look-HAB-3PL.TR

*ieruučε köde-k mon-γεnε tudeγεnε tajudununγa*

*hunter* *man-COP* *say-SIM* *3SG-LOC* follow-ITR-HAB-3PL.TR

‘In those times a skillful hunter was looked upon as a chief. Naming a person a hunter one followed him.’ (Kurilov 2005:158)

(335b) *Imdal’d’an köde ńolden maačelek suuseejreγ el ejiyetunγa.*

*five.GEN* *man* *be-SIM* *lasso-INS* *throw-SIM* *NEG=catch-HAB-3PL.TR*

‘Five reindeer herders had thrown their lassos [but] could not catch [it].’ (about a reindeer that did not allow itself to be caught.) (Kurilov and Odé 2012:104)

The converb formed with the suffix –relk,(-llek)162/-delek/-telek describes an action that took place before the action of the main clause:

(336a) *Eguo-relk neme-le wie-nun-ul?*

*get.up-ANT* *what-FOC.ABS* *do-HAB-GER*

‘What do we do, after we have got up?’

(336b) *Id’ie ewrellek tudel me juötεm.*

*now* go-ANT *3SG* PF=see-FUT-TR.3SG

‘Now he will go and see.’

According to Kreinovič (1958:199), in whose account this converb is not present, this function is fulfilled by the converb with the ending –relde/-delde. According to Kurilov (2006:192), on the other hand, this latter converb has conditional meaning. In my material converbs ending in –relde/-delde are not attested.

The verb ending in –rel/-del/-te has conditional meaning:

(337) *Tagi l’ie naadii-re men’-γi-k.*

*INVS.DEM* *MP* *need-COND* *take-PL-IMP*

‘If you need [it], take [it]’

---

162 This is a reduced form or -relk, which often obtains after bases ending in a vowel (Kurilov 2006:191).
The functional description of the converb ending in –r poses certain difficulties. Both Kreinovič (1958:198) and Kurilov (2001:190) labeled it as describing a ‘fused’ action giving the following characterizations, ‘The converb of the fused action is inseparable from the action, expressed by the verb of the predicate. Both actions take place simultaneously and parallel to one another. The action encoded in the converb presents a circumstance, in which the action expressed by the predicate is carried out.’ (Kreinovič 1958:198). Kurilov (2006:190) is more concise, ‘It [the converb] designates a side-action, which takes place simultaneously with the action of the predicate.’ Both quotes prompt the question, how this converb differs from the simultaneous action converb ending in –reg/-den. On the other hand, the following example is a very clear instantiation of the non-‘fused’ use of this converb.

(338) Elen’mirin’tetmaalayur’ćald’esal’γas-urpon’ite-mek.
NEG only 2SG bothhandbreack-CIRCleave-FUT-TR.2SG
‘No, only when you have broken [your] both arms, will you leave [it].’  
(Kurilov 2001:426, sal’γas-)

Apart from the actions of the dependent and main clause being clearly successive, the converb seems to describe the condition for the action expressed in the main clause.

For the most part the clauses with the ‘fused’ action converb make an impression of conveying the reason for the action or state expressed by the predicate of the main clause:

(339) Aqorn’ertenmegimerumdīći’ll’en’.
constantlyshout-CIRCthroattargetPF=cover.ITR-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘Shouting incessantly, he lost his voice.’  
(Kurilov 2006:190)

The idea that one deals here with a causal converb is graphically substantiated by the existence of the subordinating conjunction taatl’er ‘therefore’ which is used to initiate consecutive clauses. The conjunction is formally the converb under scrutiny, derived from the verb l’e- ‘to be’ attached to the pronoun taat ‘so’. It thus can be literally translated as ‘[it] being so’. Following immediately the main clause, it functions as if resuming it as the reason, or the cause, for the following subordinate cause which expresses the consequence of the action named in the main clause (see 3.9.2.4).

However, it is not quite clear if one can safely call the converb in –r causal, since Kurilov (2006:191) claims that it can have final meaning, describing the goal of the action encoded in the predicate of the main clause, and exemplifies his claim with the following sentence.

(340) Ilewaŋčićeørsaalaŋudeŋkewejñi.
reindeersearch-ITV-CIRCwood-towardleave-3PL.INTR
‘They went toward the forest, searching for the reindeer.’  
(Kurilov 2006:191)
In the light of the presented facts a reconciling solution for labeling this converb could be the broad term ‘circumstantial’. In the following example this temporally or modally unspecified meaning of the circumstantial adverb is particularly obvious:

(341)  
\[
jawner \ldots tindaa jukuoler \ldots aq piečien’e monnnund’eli. \\
\text{jawner tindaa juku-uol-er aq piečien’e mon-nun-jeli} \\
\text{all previously small-be-CIRC constantly biscuit(Russ) say-HAB-INTR.1PL} \\
‘… all of us, as children, kept calling [those] biscuits.’
\]

The circumstantial converb of quantitative verbs expresses how many persons carry out an action:

(342)  
\[
\text{Id’ie taŋ stada-γa puskijal-er čayad’e-nu-ŋi} \\
\text{now INVS.DEM herd-LOC be.seven-CIRC work-DUR-3PL_INTR} \\
‘Now seven people work in that herd’ (Kurilov 2001:405, puskijalar)
\]

Finally, the negative converb is marked by the privative suffix –čuon:

(343a)  
\[
\text{Tindaa mit čii neme l’edayane taat qad’ir el tijniičuon jawnuo l’ie n’ikedeljın’taat l’ienunýa.} \\
\text{tindaa mit čii neme l’e-l-dayane taat qad’ir el=tijnii-čuon} \\
\text{previously 1PL people what be-GER-3SG.DS so MP NEG=stint-PRIV} \\
\text{jawnuo l’ie n’i=kedel-ŋin’taat l’e-ie-nun-ŋa.} \\
\text{everything.DO MP RECP-body-DAT so be-INCH-HAB-3PL.TR} \\
‘Previously, our people, if they had anything (lit.: if there was anything), used to do everything for each other just like that, without stinting [anything].’
\]

(343b)  
\[
\text{N’ied’il čuŋrelek el ičuočuon n’ied’iŋik.} \\
\text{n’ied’i-l čuŋ-relek el=ičuo-čuon n’ied’i-ŋi-k} \\
\text{narrate-GER read-ANT NEG=look-PRIV narrate-PL-IMP} \\
‘Having read the narration, tell [it] without a second thought.’ (Kurilov 1994:10)
\]

Marking with –čuon is not absolute:

(344)  
\[
\text{An qad’ir kōden aruu el mōrir mitqane uudek me n’aarčaqaasum.} \\
\text{an qad’ir kōde-n aruu el=mōri-r mit-γane uudek} \\
\text{DM MP person-GEN speech NEG=hear-CIRC 1PL-ACC EMPH} \\
\text{mm=e=n’aarčuu-qaa-su-m.} \\
\text{PF=be.bad-INCH-CAUS-TR.3SG} \\
‘And what do you think, she doesn’t understand human speech and has dragged us into disaster.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:58)
3.4.3 Verb formation

3.4.3.1 Voice

TY has five voices: active, passive, causative, reflexive and reciprocal.

3.4.3.1.1 Active voice

The active voice is the default voice, which remains unmarked.

3.4.3.1.2 Passive

The name of this voice is meant to accommodate the fact of TY grammar that the linguistic device, the copular verb ŋol- assuming the shape of the suffix –(j)uol, which is used to form the passive voice of transitive verbs, can be attached to intransitive verbs\(^{163}\), as in (4a, b), and indicate the resulting state of the subject referent. Transitive verbs undergo detransitivization in the passive. The resultative, as opposed to the dynamic meaning of the passive voice is characteristic for transitive verbs too. In fact, the resultative reading of transitive passives is far more common and is possibly even the only one genuinely Yukaghir. The dynamic use of the passive voice with transitive verbs is avoided in TY and normally can be elicited only after prompting speakers accordingly.

To denote activities TY strongly prefers the active voice.

The dynamic meaning of the passive voice of a transitive verb obtains most obviously when the logical subject or the instrument of the action is mentioned:

(345a) Nimelesiičelek n’iedileŋ nimelesuolel.

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{nimelesič-} & \text{n’iedil-} & \text{ŋol-}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{writer-INS}^{164} & \text{story-FOC.ABS} & \text{write-be-GER.SF}
\end{array} \]

‘A story was written by the writer.’

(345b) Lalime n’imud’iilek köjlesuon’.

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
lalime & n’imud’ii- & köjle-s-ŋol-i
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{sledge} & \text{axe-INS} & \text{break-CAUS-be-INTR.3SG}
\end{array} \]

‘The sledge was broken by an axe.’

It has to be stressed that animate agents are not possible in all lexical contexts. For instance, substituting the instrumental of the word nimelesič ‘writer’ for n’umud’iilek ‘by an axe’ in (345b) is rejected by speakers of TY because the sentence is understood in such a way that the person behind the word ‘writer’ was used as an instrument. From this one can conclude that in passive clauses the noun in the instrumental is identified with the agent only if there is a strong semantic link between its referent and the performed action.

\(^{163}\) A typological parallel can be found in colloquial varieties of European languages, such as Croatian, where an intransitive verb can have what formally is a passive participle, e.g. naspavan ‘one who has slept one’s fill’ < \textit{spavati} ‘to sleep’, \textit{naježen} ‘bristly’ < \textit{naježiti se} ‘to get goose pimples’, \textit{otkačen} ‘freakish’ < \textit{otkačiti} ‘to become an oddball’ etc.

\(^{164}\) Note the use of the instrumental case to encode the agent. This clearly parallels the situation in Russian and is most probably a direct grammatical borrowing from it.
Since writers customarily engage in writing, *nimelesiičelek* ‘writer.INS’ is readily associated with the doer in (1a). There is no such link between writers and the action of breaking. Therefore the word ‘writer’ is not apt to denote the logical subject of (1b). Nouns in the instrumental are permissible for denoting animate agents in passive clauses also if the action reflects a cognitive ability and at the same time excludes the semantic role of instrument:

(346) (A) *Kinek uraričičelek leitejuolel?*  
*kin-ek*  
*teacher-INS*  
*recognize-be.GER.SF*  
‘Who was recognized by the teacher?’

(B) *Uraričičelek uŋodo’e ieruučepek leitejuolŋul.*  
*teacher-INS*  
*child-be-PTCP*  
*hunter-PL-FOC.ABS*  
*recognize-be-PL.SF*  
‘(The) young hunters were recognized by the teacher.’

As noted above, it is much more common and natural for the passive voice to denote resulting states. If a transitive verb is used in the passive without a mention of the agent or the instrument of the action, the sentence receives an exclusively resultative reading (see also 3.4.2.3.6).

(347a) *N’iedil nimelesuon’.*  
*n’iedil*  
*story write-be.INTR.3SG*  
‘A story is written.’

(347b) *Lalime köjle-s-uon’.*  
*lalime*  
*sledge break-CAUS-be.INTR.3SG*  
‘The sledge is broken.’

A verb can have alternative passive forms, e.g. ‘to be beaten (up)’ can be expressed by *l’iteguol-* and *l’itegesuol-*, the latter clearly deriving from the causative *l’iteges-* ‘to beat (up)’ related, in turn, with *l’itegen’- ‘to engage in forging’.

The formation of the passives is sometimes coupled with stem modification. Compare the form in the following example with its active voice counterpart *ökte- ‘to pierce’*:

(348) *Pajpell’e ten’in ökuolnuni.*  
*pajpe-ll’e*  
*here-PROL*  
*pierce-be.HAB-INTR.3SG*  
‘Women’s [garments] have holes here.’

3.4.3.1.3 Causative

The causative voice serves to imply that the grammatical subject and the logical subject are not identical. Unlike in the passive voice, where this is achieved by assigning the syntactic function of the grammatical subject to the logical object, in the causative voice a logical object, if there is one, maintains its syntactic function as a grammatical object, instead the logical subject is transformed into a(nother) grammatical object when the
position of the grammatical subject gets occupied by a new participant: \( S_i \) makes \( S_j \rightarrow O_j \) do \( P \) (to \( O_k \)).

In TY a multiple/indirect causative is possible: \( S_i \) via \( S_j \) makes \( S_k \rightarrow O_k \) do \( P \) (to \( O_l \)), as in (12). Its indirectness is reflected in the fact that the intermediate causer can be omitted and thus be inferred. The causative voice is encoded by a number of suffixes in TY. According to Kurilov (2006:172-173) their choice depends on whether the causative is direct or indirect. In the former case the suffixes employed are \(-s\), \(-se\), \(-te\) and, less frequently, \(-jii\) and \(-d'ii\). The indirect causative is encoded either by the suffix \(-ščii\) or by the combination of suffixes \(-d'ii\) and \(-se\). The functional load of the suffix \(-ii(f)l'e\) is unclear.

As far as the choice of a causative suffix is concerned, the following can be said. Verb bases ending in a glide always select the allomorph \(-se\) over the competing allomorph \(-s\). A glide in the base-final position does not always lead to the use of \(-se\), though. If a stem modification occurs, a completely different causative suffix may be employed as in e.g. \( \text{law-} \) ‘to drink’ ~ \( \text{lawite-} \) ‘to drink.CAU$$. Even without a stem alternation an alternative suffix may be used, e.g. \( \text{čawse-} \sim \text{čawii-} \) ‘to cut.CAU$$. The suffix \(-d'ii\) is employed after bases terminating in a sonorant consonant. The suffix \(-te\) normally occurs with a class of denominal verbs. The respectively other class of denominal verbs takes the suffix \(-s\). The suffix \(-jii\) seems to be acceptable after long vowels and glides. Apart from that no predictive statements can be made. The choice of the suffixes signaling multiple/indirect causation can be computed from the above regularities.

(349a) \( \text{pon’aas-} \) ‘to remain.CAU$$. \langle \text{pon’a} \) ‘to remain’
\( \text{maraas-} \) ‘to provide with material for clothing’ \langle \text{maraa-} \) ‘to dress’, ‘to acquire material for clothing’ (vi)
\( \text{čayaaas-} \) ‘to bring over a river’ \langle \text{čayaaa-} \) ‘to cross over a river’

(349b) \( \text{papaase-} \) ‘to urinate.CAU$$. \langle \text{papaa-} \) ‘to urinate’
\( \text{maase-} \) ‘to wait.CAU$$. \langle \text{maa-} \) ‘to wait’
\( \text{wel’iise-} \) ‘to lift.CAU$$. \langle \text{wel’ii-} \) ‘to lift’
\( \text{tonose-} \) ‘to drive.CAU$$. \langle \text{tono-} \) ‘to drive’
\( \text{čawse-} \) ‘to cut.CAU$$. \langle \text{čaw-} \) ‘to cut (off)’
\( \text{köčegejse-} \) ‘to rush.CAU$$. \langle \text{köčegej-} \) ‘to rush’
\( \text{čawse-} \) ‘to cut.CAU$$. \langle \text{čaw-} \) ‘to cut (off)’

(349c) \( \text{mugete-} \) ‘to undress.CAU$$. \langle \text{muge-} \) ‘to undress’ (vi)
\( \text{pegite-} \) ‘to steal’ \langle \text{pegie-} \) ‘to follow’
\( \text{ejite-} \) ‘to catch (with a net)’ \langle \text{ejuu-} \) ‘to get caught’
\( \text{lógite-} \) ‘to feed’ \langle \text{lög-} \) ‘to eat.INCH’ \langle \text{lew-} \) ‘to eat’
\( \text{warite-} \) ‘to strengthen’ \langle \text{war-} \) ‘to be solid’
\( \text{ökte-} \) ‘to pierce’ \langle \text{okuol-} \) ‘to have a hole’

\(^{165}\) ‘P’ stands for predication.

\(^{166}\) I regard this sequence as a single suffix because \( <čii> \) never expresses the causative meaning on its own.
(349d) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-'ii</td>
<td>'to cook.CAUS' &lt; par- 'to cook'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-'rii</td>
<td>'to read.CAUS' &lt; čųŋ- 'to read'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-'nii</td>
<td>'to stay overnight.CAUS' &lt; mol- 'to stay overnight'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-'ii</td>
<td>'to take.CAUS' &lt; men- 'to take'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-'ii</td>
<td>'to read.CAUS' &lt; čųŋ- 'to read'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-'ii</td>
<td>'to stay overnight.CAUS' &lt; mol- 'to stay overnight'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-'ii</td>
<td>'to take.CAUS' &lt; men- 'to take'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-'ii</td>
<td>'to wait.CAUS' &lt; maa- 'to wait'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-'ii</td>
<td>'to cut.CAUS' &lt; čaw- 'to cut (off)'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are further suffixes with apparently causative meaning that are not mentioned by Kurilov (2006:172-173). The suffixes –ii, –rii and –nii could be taken as related to the above mentioned suffix -jii, whereas the suffix –re often functions as a transitivizer\(^{167}\) (see 3.4.3.2.1):

(350) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aγal’wii-</td>
<td>'to make laugh’ &lt; aγal’we- 'to laugh'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aawii-</td>
<td>'to put to sleep’ &lt; aawe- 'to sleep’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joŋorii-</td>
<td>'to infuriate’~ joŋi- 'to take offence/to be angry’ &lt; joŋo 'anger'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyorii-</td>
<td>'to make’ &lt; yol- 'to be’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amuorii-</td>
<td>'to grant well-being’ &lt; amuo- 'to be well’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loqniit-</td>
<td>'to lift’, ‘to keep lifted’ ~ loqnej 'to pile.INTR.3SG’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solyanii-</td>
<td>'to keep close together’ ~ solyacać ‘to gether.INTR.3SG’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewre-</td>
<td>'to bring in’, ‘to let in’ &lt; sew- 'to enter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wel’ire-</td>
<td>'to load’ &lt; wel’ii- 'to lift’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mojayarej-</td>
<td>'to make soft’ &lt; mojayaj- 'to get soft’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These forms can coexist with the ‘regular’ causative: sewre-/sewse-, aγal’wii-/aγal’wes-, joŋorii- ~ joŋon’aase-.

While causatives with –s, -se and –te are very frequent, those marked by –d’ii are phonologically restricted but have their fixed share in the language, the causative with the suffix –jii is not present in my material. The ending –iil’e is encountered in my primary data just once:

(351) Maarquon’ kil’il laame me nughuili’etem, n’aw n’ikliele.  

Maarquon’ kil’il laame me=nughu-te-iil’e-te-m n’aw n’iklie-le  

only kilyil dog PF=find-CAUS-CAUS-FUT.TR.3SG polar.fox-ACC  

‘Only the dog specially trained for polar fox hunting help find the polar fox.’  

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:115)

There can be double causative marking suggesting multiple causation, but at the same time an intermediate causer cannot be identified, as in the preceding example. The following two sentences are from two successive entries in Kurilov (2001). Apparently they represent two successive sentences in a narration and are thus very suitable to illustrate the point made here:

\(^{167}\) A formal overlap of transitivizers and causativizers is not uncommon in the languages of the world, it is present in e.g. such a completely unrelated language as Nepali (Korolev 1965:96).
Lewejméde čuule el pard’iinun, aq al’γałyəŋ. Taayanek me quode gurčiir maaqadeŋ me pard’iišem čuule.

In summer, he did not allow to cook meat, but only fish. Yet, once he requested (me) to cook meat.’ (Kurilov 2001:370, pard’ii-, pard’iise-)

Examples of a seemingly unwarranted use of the suffix –scii, which is regarded functionally identical with the combination of –d’ii and –se (Kurilov 2006:173), can be found even within one and the same sentence with a verb marked by a single causative suffix:

Maarqad’eŋ ten Palaša mit-qane mōrej-se-r anaan čewnu-scii-m.

‘Once Palasha gave us to smell something and made us sneeze heavily.’ (Kurilov 2001:574, čewnusčii-168)

Examples like (352) and (353) confirm Maslova’s (2003c:30) observation that multiple causatives do not necessarily imply that there are actually intermediate causers. Instead, multiple causative suffixes can simply indicate the indirect nature of causation as in (354) or permission as in (355). However, there is no strict correlation: permissions, as in the first sentence of (352), need not trigger the use of the exponents of a multiple/indirect causation.

It is so good that God made that wolf pass us and come to a place where there were many people.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:52)

‘We roasted thrice, and during that period it did not allow itself to be caught.’ (about a reindeer) (Kurilov and Odé 2012:104)

On the other hand, multiple causation indeed can indicate the presence of an intermediate causer, graphically demonstrated in (356), where the participants hold one another by their hands and the action is physically transmitted from one to another. Still, the exact number of the causative suffixes does not coincide with the number of causers.

---

168 The translation by Kurilov (2001:574) of the verb čewnus-, that is, of the form with a single causative suffix, does not suggest that it means anything different from čewnusčii-.
‘Holding you in [my] arms, I started to walk towards the door holding Dasha and Varvara one behind the other.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:56)

There are, however, some, possibly lexically determined, instances of a clear correlation of the number of causative suffixes and the number of causers. The correlation seems to be facilitated when the single causative is a transitivizer as in (15):

(357)  
qabugurie- ‘to be offended’ > qabuguriese- ‘to offend’ > qabuguriesesčii- ‘to make/let smb. offend.’

In some instances, the multiple causation appears simply to indicate that the object of the action expressed by the verb in the causative is associated with an animate noun:

(358)  
čaw- ‘to cut (off)’  
čawse- ‘to cut.CAUS’  
čawsesčii- ‘to cut.CAUS.CAUS smb’s hair’  
čawjiise- ‘to cut.CAUS.CAUS smb’s smth.’

The suffix –sčii, when employed in denominal verbs, signals the actual causative voice, while a simple causative suffix serves only to derive a verb from a noun (see 3.4.1.4):

(359a) jolle ‘moss’  
jolles- ‘to put moss into a diaper’  
jollesčii- ‘to use moss in a diaper.CAUS’

(359b) ugurče ‘foot’, ‘leg’, ‘shoe(s)’  
ugurčes- ‘to provide with shoes’  
ugurčesčii- ‘to attach a leg.CAUS’

There are lexicalized verb forms that once must have been causative forms: l’iteges- ‘to beat’ ~ l’itegen’- ‘to engage in forging’.

The causee can be marked not only by the dative case, as Maslova (2003c:29) reports, but also by the accusative:

(360)  
Tudel metqane čuulej lewsemle.  
tudel met-γane čuul-ley lew-se-mle
3SG 1SG-ACC meat-FOC.ABS eat-CAUS-TR.3SG-OF
‘He made me eat meat.’
3.4.3.1.4 Reflexive

The reflexive voice makes it possible to combine the functions of the logical subject and the logical object in one argument: \( S_i \) does \( P \) to \( S_i \). There are two strategies for deriving the reflexive voice: a synthetic and an analytical one. The synthetic strategy makes use of the proclitic \( tūr= \) (360), the analytical one is realized by inserting into the object slot a possessive NP with the word \( kedel \) ‘body, ‘self’ functioning as the possessum and the corresponding personal pronoun as the possessor (361):

(360)  
\[ Quodeŋ turliwienunmek? \]
\[ quodeŋ tur-liwe-n-mek \]
\[ why \] REFL-entertain-HAB-TR.2SG
‘How do you usually entertain yourself?’

(361)  
\[ Qad’ir tideŋ mit laame-pul waaj papaarelek qaqarelek erime-ɣa titte kedelyane loyoryaanaaɣa ɣanamaaɣ qduolaaŋį. \]
\[ qad’ir tideŋ mit laame-pul waaj papaarelek qaqarelek erime-ɣa \]
DM ANPH 1PL dog-PL again urinate-ANT pass.stool-ANT snow-LOC
titte kedel-ɣane loyore-νu-aa-ɣa ɣanamaaɣ qduol-aa-ɣi
3SG.POSS body-ACC wash-DUR-INCH-3PL-TR on.ones.back lie-INCH-3PL.INTR
‘And so, our dogs had again passed stool and urinated, after which they began to wash themselves in snow, to lie down on their backs.’

Deliberate actions are not distinguished form involuntary ones. Note that the reflexive verb forms do not become intransitive.

The formation of the reflexive voice by prefixing/incorporating the personal pronouns to the verb root observed by Krejnovič (1958:120) and confirmed by Kurilov (2006:173) is not accepted by my informants. An informant supposed that it was the influence of Chukchi, known for its capacity for incorporation. There is only one lexical item which shows this kind of pronoun incorporation, the verb \( tiltolöl- \) ‘to maintain oneself’ < \( titte \) ‘3PL.POSS’ + \( löl- \) ‘to raise’. It always has multiple referents:

(362)  
\[ Tidane met amaa čii aq aariiŋ joyulek tiltolölnull’elŋi. \]
\[ tidaanemet aamačii aq aarii-l joyul-lek tiltolöl-nun-l’el-ɣi \]
formerly 1SG father people only rifle-GEN nose-INS maintain.REFL-HAB-NVIS-3PL.INTR
‘Formerly, my father’s family used to provide for themselves only by hunting.’

(Kurilov 2001:467, \( tittelöl- \))

3.4.3.1.5 Reciprocal

Reciprocal verb forms presuppose at least two semantic subjects and just as many semantic objects referred to either collectively by one and the same syntactic argument in plural or individually. Unlike with reflexive verb forms, these subjects act not upon themselves but upon one another: \([S_i-O_i]\) mutually does \( P \) to \([S_{\text{non-i}}-O_{\text{non-i}}]\).

The reciprocal voice is formed by the proclitic \( n’i(ŋ)- \), the allomorph with the velar nasal attaching to verb roots beginning with a vowel. According to Krejnovič
(1958:120) and Maslova (2003c:31-32) all verbs in the reciprocal voice have intransitive endings:

(363) *Qajćietege n’awn’iklie-n’eŋ me=n’i-nuu-ŋi.*

bear arctic.fox-COM PF=RECP-find-3PL.INTR

‘A bear and a polar fox met.’ (Kurilov 2005:240)

Actually, transitive endings can be found with the reciprocal too.

(364) *Me=n’i=jewligi-ŋa.*

PF=RECP-love-3PL.TR

‘They love each other.’ (Kurilov 2001:315, n’ijewligi-)

From the contemporary material it appears that the intransitive paradigm is employed only when the subjects are presented in a comitative phrase, as in (363). In all other instances the verb is conjugated according to the transitive paradigm, even in the sentences with a comitative phrase as long as the verb contains the causative suffix:

(365) *Tet amaa amaa aq joqoln’e n’aya n’iwal’biinunum*169.

*tet amaa amaa aq joqol-n’e n’aya n’i=wal’be-ii-nun-um*

2SG father father only Yakut-COM together RECP=friend-CAUS-HAB-TR.3SG

‘Your father’s father made friends only with Yakuts.’

(Kurilov 2001:311, n’iwal’bii-)

Earlier data make the picture fuzzy. In the following example the predicate has an intransitive ending although there is no comitative phrase:

(366) *Čawurek n’iŋajinaaŋi.*

čawur-lek n’iŋ=aji=nu-aa-ŋi

arrow-INS RECP=shoot-DUR-INCH-3PL.INTR

‘They began to shoot arrows at each other.’ (Krejnović 1958:121)

Sometimes, verb forms externally suggesting reciprocity do not really express it. In the following example the verb does not, and cannot, have a reciprocal meaning. However, formally it is a reciprocal form because it clearly derives from *čaŋaj- ‘to disappear.*SEM’.

(367) *Ten metqa me juoč met čieme me n’idayajnuj.*

ten met-ya me=jaw-j met čieme me=n’idayaj-nu-j

DM 1SG-LOC PF=ache-INTR.3SG 1SG blood PF=end.SEM-DUR-INTR.3SG

‘I am in pain, I am bleeding.’

Alternatively, the reciprocal meaning can be encoded with the help of the pronoun *n’igedel ‘each other/one another’ < n’i= ‘RECP’ + kedel ‘body’. The grammatical subject and its predicate assume the singular form:

169 Note that the predicate exhibits a singular agreement ending.
Apart form that, a quasi-reciprocal pronoun can be employed:

(369) **Qad’ir n’itittekedelγane ičuonaal’elña.**

Qad’ir n’i=titte-kedel-yane iču-o-nu-aa-l’el-ña

DM RECP=3PL.POSS-body-ACC look-DUR-INCH-NVIS-3PL.TR

‘Now they began to look at each other.’

Kurilov (2001:26)

### 3.4.3.2 (In)transitivity

Generally, verbs in TY are either transitive or intransitive. A limited number of verbs are, however, labile and can occur as both. Thus, e.g. the verb **qusad’i-** ‘to jump.**ITR**’ is listed in Kurilov (2001:526) as an intransitive one. But in the dictionary example it has a transitive inflectional ending and a direct object:

(370) **Tadaat arinn’e-j d’ii enu-lenγqusad’i-ŋu-te-mle.**

then be.deft-PTCP people river-FOC.ABS jump.**ITR**-PL-FUT-TR.3SG.OF

‘Then deft people will jump over the river.’

Kurilov (2001:26)

In another example this verb is non-finite but clearly transitive since it has direct objects marked as such by the accusative ending.

(380) **Ed’ilwej el miraanun, aq ölkereŋ enupele, juku jalγapele qusad’ireŋ ewrienuni.**

Ed’ilwej el=mira-nun aq ölke-reŋ enu-pe-le juku

Edilwey NEG=walk-hab[3SG] only run-SIM river-PL-ACC small

jalγa-pe-le qusad’i-reŋ ewre-nun-i

lake-PL-ACC jump-SIM go-HAB-INTR.3SG

‘Edilwej did not walk, he moved about only running, jumping over rivers and small lakes.’

Kurilov (1991:42)

Another labile verb is **mönd’ie-**. When used as a transitive verb it means ‘to listen’. As an intransitive verb it means ‘to listen attentively’. Verbs, which are not labile must undergo the process of transitivization or detransitivization in order to change their valence, which is discussed in the following subsections. Some verbs are (in)transitive depending on the aspectual suffixes they are combined with (see (242) and (244)). Homonyms differing in transitivity can be found, e.g. **oorej** ‘to become covered with hoar-frost.**INTR**3SG’ vs. **oorem** ‘to point at/to appoint.**TR**.3SG’.

### 3.4.3.2.1 Transitivizers

There are two suffixes in TY deriving transitive verbs from intransitive ones.
Suffix –ri:

(381)  
\[\text{ayal’werim ‘to deride.\text{TRVZ.TR.3SG} < ayal’wej ‘to laugh.\text{3SG.INTR}}\]
\[\text{maalijuorim ‘to be surprised at.\text{TRVZ.TR.3SG} < *maalijuol ‘to be surprised’ < maaliim ‘to surprise.\text{TR.3SG}}\]
\[\text{jaqterim ‘to glorify. \text{TRVZ.TR.3SG} < jaqtej ‘to sing.\text{3SG.INTR}}\]
\[\text{čuŋderim ‘to think about. \text{TRVZ.TR.3SG} < čuŋdej ‘to think.\text{3SG.INTR}}\]

Suffix –re is confined to the semelfactive:

(382)  
\[\text{sal’γarejm ‘to break.\text{TRVZ.SEM.TR.3SG} < sal’γač ‘to break.\text{SEM.INTR.3SG}}\]
\[\text{pomogerejm ‘to circumambulate/to turn around. \text{TRVZ.SEM.TR.3SG} < pomogeč- ‘to turn around.\text{SEM.INTR.3SG}}\]
\[\text{köčegejem}^{170} \text{ ‘to rush at.\text{SEM.TRVZ.TR.3SG} < köčegeč ‘to gallop.\text{SEM.INTR.3SG}}\]

A means of transitivization is the use of the causative, e.g. kőjlesum ‘to break.\text{CAUS.TR.3SG} < kőjlej ‘to break.\text{INTR.3SG}}.

3.4.3.2.2 Detransitivizers

Detransitivization is not productive in TY. A number of suffixes have a detransitivizing effect or derive the intransitive alternant of an equally non-basic transitive counterpart.

Suffix –de^{171}:

(383)  
\[\text{ičuodej ‘to examine.\text{DTRV.INTR.3SG} < ičuom ‘to look.\text{3SG.TR}}\]
\[\text{löldej ‘to lull.\text{DTRV.INTR.3SG} < lölum ‘to raise.\text{3SG.TR}}\]
\[\text{lewdej ‘to eat.\text{DTRV.INTR.3SG} < lewm ‘to drink.\text{3SG.TR}}\]

Suffix –uu:

(384)  
\[\text{mőric < mőruu- ‘to be audible.\text{DTRV}+ -j ‘INTR.3SG} < mőrum ‘to perceive.\text{3SG.TR}}\]
\[\text{newric < newruu- ‘to be scared.\text{DTRV} + -j ‘INTR.3SG} < newrem ‘to scare.\text{3SG.TR}}\]

Suffix –ne:

(385)  
\[\text{layanej ‘to scatterd.\text{DTRV.INTR.3SG} < layaniim ‘to keep a reindeer herd loosely.\text{TR.3SG}}\]

In (385) the transitive counterpart is equally marked as the intransitive one because formally it is a causative form, derived by the suffix –nii.

---

^{170} Note the reverse relative order of the semelfactive and transitivizer suffixes.

^{171} It must be noted that stems a few transitive verbs also end with de, e.g. puđde- ‘to cook’. In them, this sequence does not have a specifically derivational function, though, in the sense that there is no basic intransitive counterpart.
The suffix –d’aa, apart from deriving intransitive verbs, also has a habitual or durative meaning:

(386) *waŋčid’aaj* ‘to engage in looking for. DTRV.INTR.3SG’ < *waŋčim* ‘to look for.TR.3SG’

*amalad’aaj* ‘to engage in medical treatment. DTRV.INTR.3SG’ ~ *amalečim* ‘to treat.ITER.TR.3SG’, *amalerum* ‘to cure.TR.3SG’

*urarid’aaj* ‘to engage in teaching. DTRV.INTR.3SG’ < *urarič* ‘to teach.TR.3SG’

*maad’aaj* ‘to be in the position of someone waiting for something.

DTRV.INTR.3SG’ < *maam* ‘to wait.TR.3SG’

*lajnid’aaj* ‘to be a professional soldier. DTRV.INTR.3SG’ < *lajnuj* ‘to fight.INTR.3SG’

3.4.3.3 Other derivations

3.4.3.3.1 Itive

Itive is derived by means of the suffix –če. It is functionally identical with the supine of the Indo-European languages, specifically with the supine I of Latin, as in e.g. *Veni victum*. ‘I have come to win.’ Unlike in Latin, it does not represent an inflected form of a verbal noun but is purely verbal. Just as the supine I does, the verb forms carrying the suffix –če express the action which is the goal of the movement: A goes/comes etc. to do P. Unlike the Latin supine, in TY the idea of movement is not expressed in a separate verbal lexeme but in the suffix –če itself, synthetically that is. Optionally it can be redundantly conveyed by a separate verb of motion. Krejnović (1982:152) listed this verb form under moods because in his view this form expresses the intention to go somewhere in order to carry out an action. Kurilov (2006:171) regards it as the ‘active voice’. The supine does not alter the government of the base verb, but does detransitivize it optionally.

Morphophonemic alternation accompanying the attachment of the itive suffix can be summarized after Kurilov (2003:95) as follows. The bases final /a/ is lengthened (387a), the base-final /e/ is either lengthened to /aal/ (387b) or diphthongized (387c), the base-final /i/ or /u/ is lengthened to /ii/ (387d, e). Bases ending in a consonant are extended by a long /ii/ before the itive suffix is attached (387f, g):

(387a) *Al’ga ejuuγan monur me miračejiš.*

*al’ga* ejuu-γan mon-ur me=mira-če-jli

fish get.caught say-CIRC PF=walk-ITV-INTR.1PL

‘In order that fish get caught, we went [off the bank] to walk.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:86)

(387b) *Malaa wien čiinjın’ čaγad’aaček!*

*malaa* wien či-i-γın’ čaγad’e-č-e-k

MP other people-DAT work-ITV-IMP.SG

172 For what is normally referred to as ‘active voice’ Kurilov (2006:169) uses the term ‘basic voice’.
‘Come on, go to other people to work!’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:142)

(387c) \textit{Ileŋ ieriečeren ličuorke jewlid’e enmurpe jawnuo aptellek sirilya tuutienunγa.}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{i}le\textit{ŋ}  & \textit{tere-če-reŋ}  \\
\textit{ličuorke} & \textit{jewlid’e}  \\
\textit{enmur-pe} & \textit{jawnuo}  \\
\end{tabular}

reindeer-ITV-SIM \hspace{1em} female.reindeer \hspace{1em} one.year.old.calf \hspace{1em} antler-PL \hspace{1em} all.DO

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{apte-relek} & \textit{siril-γa}  \\
\textit{tuute-nun-γa} &  \\
\end{tabular}

gather-ANT \hspace{1em} lower.edge.of.tent.cover-LOC \hspace{1em} pile.up-HAB-3PL.TR

‘When they go to herd, they gather the antlers of the female reindeer and the one-year-old calves and put them on the ground against the house.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:176)

(387d) \textit{Talawŋin’ uunuj čiile monŋutem lewejnubrebeŋin’ me juød’i‘ičeγi.}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{talawŋin’} & \textit{uu-nu-j}  \\
\textit{čiile} & \textit{moŋ-ŋu-te-m}  \\
\end{tabular}

wild.reindeer \hspace{1em} go-DUR-PTCP \hspace{1em} people-ACC \hspace{1em} say-PL-FUT-TR.3

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{lewejnubrebeŋin’} & \textit{me=juød’i-če-ŋi}  \\
\textit{land-DAT} & \textit{pf=look.ITR-ITV-3PL.INTR}  \\
\end{tabular}

‘About people who go hunting wild reindeer they say: they’ve gone to have a look at the lands.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:156)

(387e) \textit{Ekya jarqa kečićeγa!}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{ekya} & \textit{jarqa}  \\
\textit{keči-če-ŋa} &  \\
\end{tabular}

elder.sister \hspace{1em} ice \hspace{1em} bring-ITV-HORT.TR

‘Sister, let’s go bring some ice!’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:120)

(387f) \textit{N’anme sisayəs-ii-če-k!}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{willow} & \textit{tear-0-ITV-IMP.SG}  \\
\end{tabular}

‘Go and tear some willows!’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:178)

(387g) \textit{Joŋulwa enuŋa japde pun’i‘ičer qanilya me talyuol’elį.}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{Joŋulwa} & \textit{enuŋa}  \\
\textit{japde} & \textit{pun’i-če-r}  \\
\textit{ganil-γa} & \textit{me=talyuol-jeli}  \\
\end{tabular}

Yogulwa \hspace{1em} river-LOC \hspace{1em} geese \hspace{1em} kill-0-ITV-CIRC \hspace{1em} shelter-LOC \hspace{1em} pf=HIDE-INTR.1PL

‘We went to hunt geese on the river Yogulwa and hid ourselves in a little pit.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:100)

(387h) \textit{Maarqad’ej met waaj čambii-če-ŋ.}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{once} & \textit{1SG}  \\
\textit{also help-ITV-1SG.TR} &  \\
\end{tabular}

‘Once I too went to help.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:102)

Whenever there is a lexical verb of motion, the verb with the itive suffix assumes the non-finite form of the circumstantial converb:

(388a) \textit{Hristos ul’ege wiečer kewec.}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{Hristos} & \textit{ul’ege}  \\
\textit{wiečer} & \textit{kewej-j}  \\
\end{tabular}

Christ \hspace{1em} grass \hspace{1em} do-ITV-CIRC \hspace{1em} go-INTR.3SG

‘Christ goes to create grass.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:208)
"I got ready to go to search for some food." (Kurilov and Odé 2012:84)

3.4.3.3.2 Affective forms

- commiserative

Krejnovič (1982:152) treats verb forms with the commiserative suffix –kødi under moods. It expresses regret because of the pitiful situation, in which the subject referent has found himself. Maslova (2003c:33) deals with it in the section entitled ‘miscellaneous’ and labels this suffix ‘hypocoristic’.

(389) Taŋ nimeŋ’ uukødil’ en’ aq titul mond’ esejl čantajrer.

‘He went to that house, poor fellow, because he could not wake you up.’

(Krejnovič 1982:152)

The commiserative suffix is a detransitivizer. In the 3SG the personal ending is realized (cf. also the augmentative below) as a zero in the surface structure:

(390) El’in ködeŋ’ uul kiejie ilen sawa puolekle joŋotej kødi moni, ‘Kinek quode gurcil?’

‘Before [she] came out to the people, she opened the bed-curtains made of a reindeer skin and asked, poor creature, ‘Has anything happened to anyone?’ (Successively the Chukchi woman was killed by her relatives.)

- diminutive:

There are two dedicated verbal diminutive suffixes: -čii and –muol. The latter is restricted to qualitative verbs. Diminutive expresses with action verbs a reduced intensity or duration of an action, while with qualitative verbs it indicates a diminished degree of a state:

(391) joŋdičičiǐ- ‘to open slightly’ < joŋdičiǐ- ‘to open’
    lőgitiečiǐ- ‘to give a little food’ < lőgite- ‘to feed’
    juōčiǐ- ‘to glance’ < juō- ‘to see’
    eguōčiǐ- ‘to stand up for a little while’ < eguo- ‘to stand up’
    lugemuol- ‘to be slightly older’ < luge- ‘to be older’
with quantitative verbs the diminutive has the delimitative meaning ‘only so many’:

(393) Tuŋ čiŋ jaluočiir sayanaamaaŋi.
	tuŋ   čiŋ-ŋ   jaluo-čiŋ-r   saŋane-naa-ŋi
ADL.PROX  people-1SG.TR  be.three-DIM-CIRC  sit-DUR-INCH-3PL.INTR
‘Those people began to live as a group of only three people.’
(Kurilov 2001:109, jaluočiir)

The verbal diminutive suffix in denominal verbs expresses the diminution of the noun serving as the original derivational base:

(394) n’ugurukunn’ečiį- ‘to have a small apron’ < n’ugurukunn’e- ‘to have apron’ < n’ugurukun ‘apron’

- augmentative:

The augmentative, conversely, expresses a greater intensity of an action or, with qualitative verbs, an increased degree of a state. Its exponents are the suffixes -tki and -tegi, which are only slightly different from the nominal augmentative suffixes (see 3.3.2.1 l):

(395a) Ayal’we-tki-regn tilbačen-denj köčege-j-re-te-m.
	laugh-AUG-SIM  be.flat-SIM  jump-SEM-TRVZ-3SG
‘Laughing loudly, with a flat face, he will jump at you.’
(Kurilov 2001:23, ayal’wetki-

(395b) Qaalid’e jewlid’e-le pun’delek tude čumurya suusejrelek ölkieνetegi.
	qaalid’e  jewlid’e-le  pun’-relek  tude  umur-γa
wolf  reindeer.calf-ACC  kill-ANT  3SG.POSS  back-LOC
	suusej-relek  ölke-nu-tegi-γ-j
throw-ANT  run-DUR-AUG-INTR-3SG
‘The wolf, having killed a reindeer calf, threw it on its back and was racing.’

(395c) Tudejlede suren’etki.

tudel-ejlede  suren’e-tki-j
3SG-EMPH  be.fat-AUG-3SG.INTR
‘And itself (about a reindeer female) it is really fat.’ (Kurilov 2001:450, suren’e-

A modification of the augmentative suffix, namely –tte, is also uniquely present in semelfactive verb forms derived by means of the tranzitivizer suffix –re, described in
Krejnović (1982:138) as momental aspect. Semelfactive verbs containing the augmentative suffix –tte describe, according to Krejnović (1982:138), an action that is performed abruptly or a state that is achieved at once. However, considering the fact that the suffix –tte is compatible only with verbs whose semantics already implies a swift action of short duration, this augmentative suffix, can be interpreted as some kind of intensifier of that meaning.

The augmentative suffix –tte ousts the syllable preceding the transzitivizer suffix.

(396)  porčatterej- ‘to splash.AUG.TRVZ.SEM’ < porčayarej-libatterej- ‘to snatch.AUG.TRVZ.SEM’ < libayarej-
čarqatterej- ‘to strain.AUG.TRVZ.SEM’ < čarqayarej-
sisatterej- ‘to tear.AUG.TRVZ.SEM’ < sisayarej-
n’oqotterej- ‘to pull out.AUG.TRVZ.SEM’ < n’oqoγorej- ‘to rip off’

(397)  Tuŋ pajpeŋ miraanudaya Umčagin tuŋ pajpele me libatterejl’elum.

   tuŋ           pajpeŋ      mira-nu-l-daya          Umčagin
   ADL.PROX     woman      walk-DUR-GER-3SG.DS Umčagin

   tuŋ           pajpe-le     me=libatte-re-j-’el-um
   ADL.PROX     woman-ACC     PF=snatch.AUG-TRVZ-SEM-NVIS.-TR.3SG

‘When that woman was passing, Umchagin quickly snatched her.’

(398)  Erew, met ugurče me čarqatterejŋ, juōdaŋa.

   erew       met     ugurče       me=čarqatte-re-j-ŋ    juō-l-daya.
   ITJ 1SG leg   PF=strain.AUG-TRVZ-SEM-1SG.TR see-GER-3SG.DS

‘Oh my, it seems like I strained my legs.’ (Kurilov 2001:136, juodaŋa)

In some cases the sole function of the augmentative suffix -tte is to distinguish between transitive and intransitive uses of the same verb root:

(399)  aatterej- ‘to stop’ (vt) < aarej- ‘to stop’ (vi)

3.4.3.4 Compounding

Verbs, including copular verbs, show a limited capability for compounding. They follow the first member of a compound.

(400)  čunjdegudie- ‘to contemplate’ < čunjde ‘thought’ + kudie- ‘to keep’
       arawgurčii- ‘to undress’ < araw ‘naked(ness)’ + kurčii- ‘to become’
       quodeban- ‘to be unclear/inexplicable’ < quode ‘how’ + pan- ‘be’
       quodegurčii- ‘to happen’ < quode ‘how’ + kurčii- ‘become’

-------------------

173 sposob mgnovennosti dejstvija.
3.5 Pronouns

TY is characterized by a very uneven distribution of pronouns over the different subclasses of this part of speech. Some subclasses, i.e. relative\(^{174}\), reflexive or reciprocal lack altogether in this language. The system of the possessive pronouns is rudimentary. On the other hand, the system of the interrogative pronouns is fairly rich and that of the demonstratives rivals many in its fine-gradedness. Whether TY possesses negative pronouns is debatable.

3.5.1 Personal pronouns

The system of personal pronouns in TY distinguishes three persons and two numbers: singular and plural. The 3\(^{rd}\) person pronouns normally indicate only animate referents although some speakers, including very senior ones, use them, possibly under the strong influence of Russian, indiscriminately for animate and inanimate referents:

\[(401)\] **Molid’aa tudel kötinedaya amuonuni.**

\(\text{molid’aa} \quad \text{tudel} \quad \text{kötine-l-daya} \quad \text{amuo-nun-i}\)

little.bit 3SG be.thick-GER-3SG.DS be.good-HAB-INTR.3SG

‘If it is a bit thick, it is all right.’ (speaking about fishing line)

References to inanimate objects are otherwise made by the independent demonstrative pronouns\(^{175}\) (see 3.5.4).

Personal pronouns in TY differentiate between neither genders nor sexes. The distinction between inclusive and exclusive forms is absent too. This results in the following simple system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>met</td>
<td>mit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tet</td>
<td>tit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tudel</td>
<td>tittel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Krejnovič (1958:73) the truncated forms of the 3\(^{rd}\) person are mentioned: *tude* and *titte* respectively, which are to be used when the pronoun is the subject of the sentence displaying the AF focal pattern\(^{176}\). From the examples in Krejnovič (1958:133) it follows that the final /e/ of those two pronouns gets elided, which yields the forms *tud* ‘s/he’ and *titt* ‘they’ respectively when the following word begins with a vowel. In my corpus the reduced forms are not attested and the contemporary informants reject them.

Personal pronouns are inflected mainly in the same way as nouns. The differences concern first of all the accusative case endings. As long as both the subject and the direct

---

\(^{174}\) Relative clauses are realized in TY with the help of participles and gerunds.

\(^{175}\) The corresponding forms are not reserved exclusively for inanimate referents but they must normally be used when the referent is inanimate.

\(^{176}\) Krejnovič (1958:73) admits, however, in a footnote that some speakers use the full, non-truncated forms in these circumstances.
object refer to interlocutors, the accusative ending is \(-ul\), absent from the nominal declensional paradigm. When the subject is the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person, the pronominal direct object with an animate referent always receives the accusative ending \(-γane/-qane\) but never \(-le\), both present in the nominal paradigm. Another important difference is that personal pronouns do not occur in the instrumental case. Finally, they, unlike nouns, employ only one allomorph of the dative case ending, namely \(-n'\) aided by an epenthetic /i/. Here is an overview of the declensional paradigm of the personal pronouns of TY:

### Table 3.5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>met</td>
<td>tet</td>
<td>tudel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>met/metul/metqane</td>
<td>tet/tetul/tetqane</td>
<td>tudel/tudeγane/tudeγale\textsuperscript{177}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abs.</td>
<td>metek</td>
<td>tetek</td>
<td>tude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erg.</td>
<td>met</td>
<td>tet</td>
<td>tude(e(l))\textsuperscript{178}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>metin'</td>
<td>tetin'</td>
<td>tudin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>metqa\textsuperscript{179}</td>
<td>tetqa</td>
<td>tudeγa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>metqat</td>
<td>tetqat</td>
<td>tudeγat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prol.</td>
<td>metqan</td>
<td>tetqan</td>
<td>tudeγan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com.</td>
<td>metn'εŋ</td>
<td>tetn'εŋ</td>
<td>tuden'ε(ŋ)\textsuperscript{180}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PL</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>mit</td>
<td>tit</td>
<td>tittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>mit/mitul/mitqane</td>
<td>tit/titul/titqane</td>
<td>tittel/titeγane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abs.</td>
<td>mitek</td>
<td>titek</td>
<td>tittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erg.</td>
<td>mit</td>
<td>tit</td>
<td>titt(e(l))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>mitin'</td>
<td>titin'</td>
<td>tittin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>mitqa</td>
<td>titqa</td>
<td>titeγa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>mitqat</td>
<td>titqat</td>
<td>titeγat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prol.</td>
<td>mitqan</td>
<td>titqan</td>
<td>titeγan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com.</td>
<td>mitt'εŋ</td>
<td>titt'εŋ</td>
<td>titten'εŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is apparent from this overview, when the dative case ending is attached to the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person pronouns, their final syllable is truncated. When the endings of other cases are attached, only the final /l/ gets elided.

\textsuperscript{177} This form is idiolectally heavily restricted. Its similarity with the accusative case ending in KY (Maslova 2003a) is obvious.

\textsuperscript{178} As noted above, the reduced forms in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person are only attested by Krejnovič (1958, 1982).

\textsuperscript{179} In Krejnovič (1958:77) one finds the ending form \(-qane\):

\begin{equation}
(402) \text{Met-qane legul me=}=l'e-j.
\end{equation}

1SG-LOC food PF=be-INTR.3SG

‘I do have food.’

Nowadays, speakers reject this locative case ending as ungrammatical.

\textsuperscript{180} The velar nasal is omitted in certain phonological environments, e.g. when followed by another nasal: \textit{tuden'e n'a}ya ‘together with him/her’.
The following examples illustrate some of the case uses.

(403) *Lasu quodeŋ  çaŋad’e? – Leml’e tuđeŋane/tuđeŋale me kerđ’isum.*

Lasu quodeŋ  çaŋad’e
Lasu how work[3SG.ITRG]
leml’e tuđel-ŋane / tuđel-ŋale me=kerđ’i-s-um
boss 3SG-ACC / 3SG-ACC PF=boast-CAUS-TR.3SG

‘How does Lasu work? – The boss praises him.’

(404) *Tetin’ ten serugesnuŋ.*

tet-in’ ten seruge-s-nuŋ
2SG-DAT DM be.noisy-CAUS-DUR-1SG.TR

‘Here I am calling you up.’

(405) *Qad’ir  tajmigi tet-ek köl-l’el-ul.*

MP then 2SG-FOC.ABS come-NVIS.GER.SF

‘And then, you came.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:112)

(406) *Taŋ  tajudeŋ  taŋ kewejdaŋa, aduŋ Alajjidieŋane monnuŋi  tajudeŋ uuɣan,  mîn’eŋ!*

tañ  tajun-deŋ  taŋ kewejl-daŋa aduŋ Alajji-die-ŋane
DM INVS.DEM-ADV DM leave-GER-3SG.DS ADA.PROX Alayee-DM-ACC
mon-nuŋi  tajun-deŋ uuɣan mit-n’eŋ
say-DUR-3PL.INTR INVS.DEM-ADV go-JUSS 1PL-COM

‘In case it (a cross-country vehicle) goes there, they are saying about that little Alayee [girl], “Let [her] go there, with us!” ’

Personal pronouns can have a number of emphatic\(^\text{181}\) suffixed forms. Apart from the intensifying function, the respective suffixes can convey certain more specific meanings. Thus, the suffix –ejk has the meaning ‘also’:

(407a) *Met-ejk  maargi-d’eŋ  taat  id’eŋ-ŋ.*

1SG-EMPH one-ADV so attempt-1SG.TR

‘I also tried once [to do] like that.’

(407b) *Tet-ejk  qad’ir met tite jugulwe-ren  saɣane-t-qaŋen  waaj.*

2SG-EMPH DM 1SG like suffer-SIM sit-FUT-IMP.SG also

‘May you too live like me, suffering.’

In (408) the suffix –ejk has purely emphatic, reinforcing meaning.

(408) *Tet tan el kewejtejek, tetejk?*

tet tan el=kewej-te-jek tet-ejk
2SG and NEG=leave-FUT-INTR.2SG 2SG-EMPH

‘And you yourself, won’t you go?’

---

\(^\text{181}\) The term ‘emphatic’ is used here in the sense that the referent is made prominent without being in focus or contrast.
These forms are available only for interlocutors. In the 3rd person one resorts to the adverb *waaj* ‘also’: *tudel*, *tittel waaj* ‘s/he, they too’

The suffix –*ejlek* expresses the idea that one does something on one’s own, without anyone’s or anything’s assistance or involvement:

(409a) *Tan qomdemede čaajledenmun quruul qan’qaanulgi tetejlek kuril’imek.*

*And that in autumn the weather gets colder every day, you know yourself.’*  
(Kurilov 1994:9)

(409b) *Lewejme mit ile mitejlek kičieččesnunuj.*

*In summer we pastured our reindeer ourselves/on our own.*

The final syllable of the 3rd person pronouns gets truncated when this suffix is attached:

(409c) *Qad’ir tudejlek turid’ie uuunul’en’.*

*He rode on his own, alone.*

(409d) *Quodiir el iliečuon tudejlek anme ayuoldeŋ čaayad’ej saalek?*

*Why is the tree, while simply standing, moving on its own, without the wind?’*  
(A similar function is fulfilled by the forms of the personal pronouns which are suffixed with –*id’ie*. They mean that the referent carries out an action not only without anyone’s help or involvement but without the very presence of anyone else, alone (see also (409c)). In the 3rd person the pronominal stem is represented by *tur-* , which otherwise typically occurs as a non-productive reflexive verbal proclitic:

(410a) *Nuňinnur Kändie juo mêle. ‘Jewluge, met qarandaas, turid’ie n’unmun’al’ya ponjaaj!’ moni Kändie.*

*A pencil is dreaming about his friend Kyondie) ‘In the dream he saw Kyondie who said, “My poor pencil remained alone in the former camp!”’*  
(Kurilov 1994:7)
There are indications that younger speakers of TY begin to lose the ability to discriminate the forms ending in –id’ie and those having the suffix –ejlek, which is illustrated by the hesitation in the following example and the successive application of both forms (see also (409c)):


‘They will set off, wander off the day after tomorrow, after you have left, I believe. – They… Alone? On their own?’ – Yes, they said they would roam on their own.’

Just as –ejk, the suffix –ejlek can have a purely emphatic function:

(411) Met ten met nimeyat keluumujen, metejlek el kuril’iiyen qaduyuden met uul.

‘I am coming from my house and I don’t know myself where I am going.’

The suffix –ejlek can also encode a contrastive topic:

(412a) Tudejlek poltora metra any šchukagi waaj poltora metra.

‘He himself is one and a half meters [tall] and the pike is also one and a half meters [long].’

(412b) Tan tudejlek buollayyna čayad’e-le wančinumle.

‘And as for him, he is looking for a job.’

(412c) Tadaa mod’ej buolla, ‘Metqane el aawesčuon tudejlek mer aawej,’ mod’ej.

‘Then I said feeling vexed, “He did not let me sleep and he himself is sleeping.” ’
The marking of a contrastive topic is also characteristic of the suffix –ejlede:

(413a) **Met-ejlede** me=quodiir köde-n saal taŋigi-ne amutneŋ

1SG-EPMH IND=why man-GEN wood then-EMPH well

iŋi-ŋ.

be.afraid.of-1SG.TR

‘As for me, back then I was quite afraid of graves for some reason.’

(413b) **Iidie, amungi čamuod’erukunek, tudeejlede** kótinej.

Iidie bone-PERT čama-ŋ-je-sukun-ek tudeel-ejlede kótine-j

Iidie bone-PERT big-be-PTCP-thing-COP 3SG-EMPH be.fat-INTR.3SG

‘Iidye was tall and stout.’

“Iidye, her bones were long (lit. “big”) and she herself was thick.”

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:108)

(413c) **Quduon’ tudeejlede. Semien sayanaarelek joqodile ŋorinunum.**

qudol-i tudeel-ejlede. Semien sayane-aa-relek

lie-INTR.3SG 3SG-EMPH Semyon sit-INCH-ANT

joqol-n-d-ile ŋol-rii-nun-um

Yakut-GEN-0-reindeer be-CAUS-HAB-TR.3SG

(‘When the old woman had pain in her back she would say to your brother Semyon, “Sit down on my back!”) Then she would lie down and Semyon would sit down [on her] and play horse.’

“... and Semyon makes [her] a horse.” (Kurilov and Odé 2012:88)

Again, the suffix –ejlede can express emphasis alone:

(414a) **Iidie moni, ‘Uo tet wal’yareŋin ’kewrejk.‘ Tudeejlede aruule ildiĉten monnuni, ayaregi me lolyaj.**

Iidie say-INTR.3SG child 2SG opposite.side-DAT carry.away-IMP.SG

tudeel-ejlede aruule ildič-reno mon-nuni

3SG-EMPH word-ACC push.ITER-SIM say-HAB-INTR.3SG

ayare-gi me=lolya=j

breath-PERT Pf=boil-INTR.3SG

‘Iidye says, ‘Take the child to your quarters.’ And she herself is speaking as if pushing words out; it’s gurgling in her chest.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:110)

(414b) **Tet amaa ŋodayane, me quodiir qad’ir turid’ie lewejmeŋ sayanaanuni. Tudeejlede, juðidi gi el i culo.**

2SG father TOP-CNTR IND=why DM alone summer-ADV

sayane-nun-i. tudeel-ejlede juðidi-gi el=ičuо

live-HAB-INTR.3SG 3SG-EMPH eye-PERT NEG=see[3SG]

182 In the speech of some Yukaghirs the initial /e/ of the suffixes –ejlede as well as –ejlek is long.
‘(At that time we lived at the shore of Sapiyaa Lake). But your father for some reason used to live alone in summer. And he was blind.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:50)

(414c) Tudeejlede čamanenj čawuričiil’en’.
tudel-eejlede čama-nej čawuričii-i-l’el-i
3SG-EMPH big-ADV get.frightened-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘(Your father had a white dog, as big as a wolf, a bitch. […] Once, she went away early and came back in the evening when we were having our evening meal.) And she was very frightened for some reason …’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:50)

What seems to be common to the suffixes –ejk, -ejlek and –ejlede is that they function as topicalizers, sometimes marking referents as contrastive and sometimes simply giving them pragmatic prominence, or emphasis, as it has been termed here, in the discourse. These are apparently complex suffixes since the segments <ej>, <le>, <de> and <k> can be easily discerned. It is, however, difficult to attribute precisely any specific function to any of these morphs. It can be observed that the emphatic topicalizer –ejlede frequently indicates that the content of the comment is unexpected in a given context as in (414c), and even more so in (414b), in the sense that the actions of the topic referent are not in (full) harmony with the information provided in the preceding discourse.

Finally, an isolated instance of use of the solely emphatic suffix –uoll’elk is attested with the personal pronouns:

(415) Tetuoll’elk l’ie, atuujek?
tet-uoll’elk l’ie at-uu-jek
2SG-EMPH MP POT-go-INTR.2SG
‘Well, and you, would you go?’

The suffix –uoll’elk apparently consists of the copula ŋol-, the non-visual suffix –l’el and the pronominal focus marker –k. Much more frequently this complex suffix is used in combinations with the interrogative pronouns, which serve as negative pronouns.

3.5.2 Possessive pronouns

Distinct forms of attributive possessive pronouns exist only in the 3rd person to indicate coreferentiality with the subject of the clause. These are the truncated forms of the personal pronouns: tude ‘his/her’ and titte ‘their’. Otherwise the personal pronouns are employed to indicate a possessive relation. Compare the two following sentences:

(416a) Sal’il tude könn’e-pulγane juö-mele.
Mouse 3SG.Poss relative-PL-ACC see-TR.3SG.OF
‘The Mouse saw her relatives.’

(416b) Sal’il Qaald’e-le tadaat tadel könn’e-pul juö-mele.
Mouse Wolf-ACC and 3SG relative-PL see-TR.3SG.OF
‘The Mouse saw the Wolf and his relatives.’
Possessive pronouns are used also in adjuncts under the same coreferentiality conditions:

(417) Juku köde Apuodie ile tuduurun miraanurey, tude amaayat kuril’ič’el’um …

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{juku köde} & \quad \text{small man} \\
\text{Apuodie} & \quad \text{Apuodie} \\
\text{ile} & \quad \text{reindeer inner.side} \\
\text{tuduru-n} & \quad \text{walk-DUR} \\
\text{mira-n-re} & \quad \text{ask-NVIS-TR.3SG} \\
\end{align*} \]

‘Little Apuodie asked his father while walking in the midst of the reindeer [herd].’

(Kurilov 1994:9)

(418) Tadaa alγad’aa me l’ukuon’, tude uoduorpe dite.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{tadaa alγad’aa} & \quad \text{then MP} \\
\text{me=l’uku-yol-i} & \quad \text{PF=small-be-INTR.3SG} \\
\text{tude} & \quad \text{3SG.POSS} \\
\text{uo-d-uorpe} & \quad \text{child-0-children like} \\
\text{dite} & \quad \text{INTR.3SG} \\
\end{align*} \]

‘Back then she was too small, like her grand children.’

It has to be admitted that the matter is not as simple as it may seem upon first examination. In the following sentence the requirement for the employment of a possessive pronoun is not met.

(419) Tude en’ie-lek pandin-d’e-n-deŋ ewre-jli

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{tude} & \quad \text{mother-INS} \\
\text{en’ie-lek} & \quad \text{cook-NMLZ-VBLZ-SIM} \\
\text{pandin-d’e-n-deŋ} & \quad \text{go-INTR.1PL} \\
\text{ewre-jli} & \quad \text{DEIC fall-INTR.1SG} \\
\end{align*} \]

‘Her mother cooked for us when her father died.’

Another strategy to encode a possessive relation under conditions not allowing the use of possessive pronouns is the employment of the pertensive suffix (see 3.3.1.3 and 4.1.2.1). In the 1st and 2nd persons the respective personal pronouns are used as possessive pronouns:

(420) Met id’ie mit sukun onjie-reŋ ten kerie-jeŋ.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Met} & \quad \text{1SG} \\
\text{id’ie} & \quad \text{now} \\
\text{mit} & \quad \text{1PL} \\
\text{sukun} & \quad \text{thing} \\
\text{onjie-reŋ} & \quad \text{wear-SIM} \\
\text{ten} & \quad \text{DEIC} \\
\text{kerie-jeŋ} & \quad \text{fall-INTR.1SG} \\
\end{align*} \]

‘Here I am being filmed in our traditional clothes.’

(421) Quodiir tet aruu ewl’ikiej?

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{quodiir} & \quad \text{why} \\
\text{tet} & \quad \text{2SG} \\
\text{aruu} & \quad \text{speech} \\
\text{ewl’ikiej} & \quad \text{NEG=be-INCH-INTR.3SG} \\
\end{align*} \]

‘Why don’t you speak?’

Possessive pronouns do not inflect for cases or number as there is no agreement between NPs and their attributes in TY.

The independent possessive pronouns are formed in TY with the help of the relational suffix –l’e, which is also used to derive adjectives from nouns (see 3.6). The final /l/ in the 3rd person is deleted when the possessive suffix is attached.
Table 3.5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>metl’e</td>
<td>mitl’e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tetl’e</td>
<td>titl’e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tudel’e</td>
<td>tittel’e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(422a) *Met tet jaqte jaqte-t-menj tan tet met-l’e.*

1SG 2SG song sing-FUT-TR 1/2SG.OF and 2SG 1SG-RLN

‘I will sing your song and you [will sing] mine.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

(422b) *Taŋnigi čaaj lawnube suske ewl’e, tudel’e qoŋnej tarielkaleŋ.*

then tea drink-DUR-OP cup NEG=BE[3SG] 3SG-RLN be.dented-PTCP

tarielka-leŋ.

‘There were no real tea-cups then, she had a deep plate.’

‘… hers was a deep plate.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:108)

(422c) *Ten’in ten ord’a-adya-n mer okuolnuni tittel’e, pajpell’e jawner jadargaŋolnuni tuŋ’egi ayilgi.*

here-PROL middle-PERT-LOC-PROL 3PL-RLN woman-RLN

tajmer jadargaŋ ol-nun-i tuŋ’-egi ayil-gi
everything bead-TR

‘Here, in the middle, theirs (men’s caps) used to have a hole and the women’s [cap] was decorated by beads on its rim.’

3.5.3 Reflexive and reciprocal pronouns

There are neither reflexive nor reciprocal pronouns in TY, except that possessive pronouns are strictly speaking possessive-reflexive. The functions of the reflexive pronouns are delegated to the noun *kedel* ‘body’ preceded by the corresponding personal/possessive (in the 3rd person) pronoun:

(423a) *Tuŋ met čiiyat … met kedel čama maaruolek čuŋdegudičiŋ.*

ADL.PROX 1SG people-LOC-ABL 1SG body big be.happy-PTCP

kød-e-e ċuŋde-kudičiŋ

person-COP mind-put-1SG.TR

‘Because of these relatives of mine I consider myself a very happy person.’

(423b) *Neme-lek tet kedel wie-nun-mek?*

what-INS 2SG body do-HAB-TR.2SG

‘What do you usually occupy yourself with.’

(423c) *Qad’ir tuŋ kődeŋ taat ayuoldeŋ tude kedelyane lejričnaal’elum.*

EMPHT ADL.PROX man so stand-SIM 3SG.POSS
And so, standing like that, this man began to recall about himself.

Alternatively, the reflexive proclitic is employed (see 3.4.3.1.3). Reciprocal meaning can be harbored by the verb alone (see 3.4.3.1.4)

3.5.4 Demonstrative pronouns

TY has a five-way system of demonstrative pronouns, which exhibit morphological differences depending on whether they act as attributes or heads of NPs.

3.5.4.1 Attributive demonstratives

TY possesses five attributive demonstratives: tu(ŋ), adu(ŋ), tie(ŋ), ta(ŋ) and tide(ŋ). They fulfill deictic and anaphoric functions. In narrative primary sources their use in the latter function is greatly prevalent. As deictic elements, demonstratives occur mainly in direct verbal exchanges, which are infrequent in narrative corpora. In contrast with Maslova (2003c:36), it can be safely stated that all five demonstratives of TY can function as anaphoric devices, and not only three of them. Examples (425a-e) demonstrate this. The sentence in (425a) is taken from a telephone conversation during which the speaker

---

183 In narrations dialogues occur, of course, too, but their presentation can and is often influenced by the narrator’s perspective. Perspective is crucial when it comes to more sophisticated then common deictic systems such as that of TY. Thus, for instance, the convincing force of Maslova’s (2003c:37, (84a) and (84b)) examples intended to prove that tieŋ and taŋ are neutral with respect to the visibility of referent criterion is possibly compromised by the narrator’s perspective. The referent of tieŋ is prominently mentioned earlier in the narration but not in the discourse unfolding between the protagonists. Although tieŋ occurs in the direct speech of the main protagonist and can be regarded as a deictic element, it also can be interpreted, from the point of view of the narrator, as an anaphoric reference. Since visibility of referent is irrelevant in anaphoric references, one cannot see this example as strong evidence in favor of Maslova’s claim about insensitivity of tieŋ to this criterion. In case of taŋ the objects referred to are indeed talked about by the speakers as visible – although, and this is also indicative, they only imagine those objects – but again, the narrator, who is not present at the site of the events, may have chosen the invisible demonstrative being led by his own perspective and knowledge that the objects could not actually be seen. Such an imposition of the narrator’s perspective onto the deictic system can be observed in other visibility sensitive contexts. Consider the following example:

(424) Tadaat taŋ uu-nureŋ iċuodayane maarqan lukunburebeŋa pojouol’e qajċietegpeleŋ ewrienul’elul.
then DM go-DUR-SIM look-GER-3SG.DS one-GEN area-LOC
pojouol-je qajċieteg-pe-leŋ ewre-nu-l’el-ŋu-l
be.numerous-PTCP grandfather-AUG-PL-FOC.ABS wander-DUR-NVIS-PL-GER.SF

‘While flying he looked [and saw] that at one place a lot of bears wandered.’

Here, despite the presence of an explicit indication that one deals with direct visual perception of the protagonist (iċuodayane ‘he looked [and saw]’), the state of affairs seen by him is encoded in a verbal predicate carrying the non-visual mood suffix. This cannot be explained in any other way than the narrator’s reinterpretation of the deictic value of the event described. A similar example is (592a), where the narrator imposes his perspective while depicting a conversation of a father and a son.
cannot see the people whom she is referring to as a subject of the conversation mentioned earlier.

\[ (425a) \text{Tuŋ čii puŋuoseŋ ewri!} \]
\[ tuŋ čii puŋuol-seŋ ewri \]
\[ \text{ADL.PROX people rejoice-CAUS-1SG MP} \]
\[ ‘I will gladden these people then! (a sentence from a telephone conversation where the speaker refers back to a group of people)’ \]

\[ (425b) \text{Tuŋ moŋojd’ii deputatqa el men’l’eqik! Wolmeŋin’ keweč! Tan aduŋ wolme aruugi jaan sukummol’γayl’γa čaŋik!} \]
\[ tuŋ moŋojd’ii deputat-γa el=men’-l’e-γi-k! \]
\[ \text{ADL.PROX married.woman deputy-LOC NEG=take-NEG-PL-IMP} \]
\[ wolme-γin’ kewej-γ! tan aduŋ wolme aruu-γi \]
\[ shaman-DAT go.away-INTR.3SG and ADA.PROX shaman voice-PERT \]
\[ jaan sukummol’γa-γal-γa čaw-γi-k! \]
\[ three.GEN year-LOC cut.off-PL-IMP \]
\[ ‘Don’t elect this woman as deputy! She is married to a shaman! And that shaman should be deprived of his right to vote for three years!’ \]
\[ \text{(Kurilov and Odé 2012:40)} \]

\[ (425c) \text{Taŋnigi tuŋ körel waaj tittel, tieŋ n’iŋjakaaj’il’pulγane waaj me toŋoraal’elum.} \]
\[ taŋnigi tuŋ körel waaj tittel tieŋ n’iŋ=akaaj-il’-pul-γane \]
\[ then ADL.PROX devil again 3PL DIST RECP=brother-PL-PL-ACC \]
\[ waaj me=toŋora-ad=el-un \]
\[ again PF=chase-INCH-NVIS-TR.3SG \]
\[ ‘Then that devil again began to chase them, those brothers.’ \]

\[ (425d) \text{Taŋ gaz benzin dite edienuni.} \]
\[ taŋ gaz benzin dite edie-nun-i \]
\[ INVS.DEM gas(Russ) petrol(Russ) like burn.up-INTR.3SG \]
\[ (A father explains to his son what mineral gas is, which the newly arrived geologists intend to search for.) ‘That gas burns like petrol.’ (Kurilov 1994:9) \]

\[ (425e) \text{Tideŋ puriŋε pulgejdaya onnoŋyor ...} \]
\[ tideŋ puriŋε pulgej-l-daya onnoŋyor \]
\[ anph berry sprout-GER-3SG.DS even(Yak) \]
\[ (from a telephone conversation) ‘If even the (abovementioned) berries ripen ...’ \]

Despite the fact that all demonstrative pronouns can be used for anaphoric reference, most prototypically it is the (sole) function of \( \text{tideŋ}\)\textsuperscript{184}. The remaining four demonstratives can function as deictic devices. One of them, namely the pronoun \( \text{taŋ} \), indicates invisible referents:

\[ \text{184 Thus, for instance, in a tale (Kurilov 2005:242-244) the two main protagonists are referred to anaphorically six times by \( \text{tideŋ} \) while \( \text{tuŋ} \) – and no other pronouns – occurs in this function only once.} \]
If one sits in a room and makes a statement about a knife lying on the kitchen table, only *taŋ* is felicitous:

\[(427) \text{ Taŋ } \text{ čo} \text{ojoj } \text{ mer=} \text{unn’e-j.} \]

‘That knife is blunt.’

The division of labor between the pronouns *tun*, *aduŋ* and *tieŋ* is determined by the distance from the deictic point of reference. *Tun* indicates the referents near the speaker, *aduŋ* those near the addressee and *tieŋ* those distant from both interlocutors.

\[(428) \text{ Tadaat apanalaa moll’en’ tet n’anmen pugil γ} \text{oja relek mitin’ } \text{čambii-bun’de tuŋ } \text{n’oγodaγil albaγa sewk.} \]

\[(429) \text{ Taŋ } \text{köl-relek mon’-l’el-i } \text{el=} \text{čaw-nun-l’ek } \text{aduŋ} \]

‘When she came she said, “Don’t cut [them]! Better burn [them] all in that fire. Let them burn up.”’

\[(430) \text{ Nimeγat jökedię } \text{čumun-saburqak l’iel’elul. Taŋden oore-lebek } \text{čupčęγ moll’en’ } \text{tieγ } \text{čumun saburyat alyan n’iγaγaγeį.} \]

‘At a considerable distance from the house there was a narrow plain between the hills. The Chukcha pointed in its direction and said, “We shall shoot at each other on that plain between the hills.”’ (Kurilov 1991:42)

Contrary to Maslova (2003c:37), the choice of a demonstrative pronoun employed in anaphoric function does not seem to correlate with either anaphoric distance or physical
distance from the ‘deictic center’. Thus in (431a) anaphoric reference is made by means of the proximal demonstrative, which is separated from its antecedents by a considerable chunk of the narration. In the second sentence of (431b) the choice of the same proximal demonstrative is at odds with the not less considerable physical distance, which is adequately encoded in the preceding sentence carrying the antecedent. In turn, in (442) the invisible demonstrative is employed for a referent immediately connected with the deictic center of the utterance.

(431a) Tuŋ Jeguortegeɣane tadaat qajcie Diŋen’kewɣane mer il’iteɣan monur taat moni.

Tuŋ Jeguortegeɣane tadaat qajcie Diŋen’kewɣane
ADL.DEM Jeguor-tegeɣane tadaat qajcie Dingen’kewɣane
ADL.DEM Jeguor-AUG-ACC and grandfather Dingen’kew-ACC
mer=il’iteɣan mon-ur taat mon-i
PF=reprimand-JUSS say-CIRC so say-INTR.3SG
‘[She] said like that in order that [he] reprimand those Yegor and the grandpa Dingen’kew.’

(431b) Maalek tieŋ juku jalya laŋuedeŋ ölkiek. Tuŋ juku jalyaɣa qal’arqaapul me l’iel’elȝuteg moll’en’.

Maalek tieŋ juku jalya laŋudeŋ ölke-ie-k.
MP Dist tieŋ juku jalya laŋudeŋ ölke-ie-k.
ADL.DEM PROX small lake toward run-INCH-IMP.SG
me=l’el’el-ɣu-te-j mon-ʃ’el-i
PF=be-NVIS-PL-FUT-INTR.3SG say-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘He said, “Come on, run toward that small lake. At the lake, there will probably be Ross’s gulls.” ’

In less careful speech it can be observed that there is an ongoing competition between tieŋ and other demonstratives to encode anaphoric reference. Some subtle considerations make speakers prefer one or the other correcting a previous choice:

(432) O-o d’e mendelek qad’ir tuŋ tieŋ n’awn’iklie waŋčimle.

O-o d’e mendelek qad’ir tuŋ tieŋ n’awn’iklie waŋčimle.
ITJ MP take-ANT DM ADL.PROX ANPH polar.fox
waŋči-mle
look.for-TR.3SG.OF
‘And so he took [it (the poker)] and searched for the polar-fox.’

The pronoun tieŋ can be used to reinforce anaphoric reference and yield the meaning ‘that very X’:

(433) Araj juöčiidayane tieŋ n’awn’iklie ŋollen’.

Araj juöči-i-lyaŋane tieŋ n’awn’iklie ŋollen’.
MP glance-GER-3SG.DS ANPH polar.fox be-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘The old man glanced [and realized that] it was that very polar-fox.’

All TY demonstratives share the common initial sound /t/, which probably carries the general deictic meaning further specified by the following vowel or vowel combination.
In *aduŋ* the [t] turns into [d] as a result of the intervocalic voicing after the prefixation of the deictic element <a>. It can be speculated that *aduŋ* evolved from the combination *taŋ* + *tuŋ* > *taduŋ* > *aduŋ* ‘a more distant this’, which is corroborated by the fact that *aduŋ* can be used for invisible referents, at least in the instance of anaphoric reference. Krejnović (1982:237) proposes a similar explanation for the origin of the pronoun *tidęŋ*, turning to KY data.

### 3.5.4.2 Independent demonstratives

Apart from the above forms, which always accompany a noun, TY possesses also independent demonstrative pronouns, which, apart from expressing deictic values, substitute for personal pronouns unavailable for inanimate referents. Independent demonstratives form three series.

1. **1st series**: *tuŋun, aduŋun, tieŋun, taŋun, tideŋun*
2. **2nd series**: *tugi, adugi, tagi*, tiegi
3. **3rd series**: *tuŋ’e(ŋ), aduŋ’e(ŋ), tieŋ’e(ŋ), taŋ’e(ŋ), tideŋ’e(ŋ)*

The 1st series is formed by suffixing –n to the demonstrative stems, aided by the epenthetic /u/. The 2nd series is obtained by suffixing –gi, which replaces the velar nasal of the demonstratives. Finally, the 3rd series is derived by suffixing –n’e. This latter suffix most probably has nothing to do with the comitative suffix –n’e but is underlyingly the suffix –l’e, with whose help independent possessive pronouns – the functional parallel is obvious – as well as relational adjectives are derived. Its palatal must have undergone a manner assimilation and turned into [n’] under the influence of the nasal velar of the demonstrative pronouns (Kurilov 2006:125). If one assumes that it is the labeling of pronouns with the relational suffix that makes them independent – in itself not a far-fetched idea as the presence of a suffix indicating a relation may be taken as a signal that a modified noun is implied – then it can be speculated that the suffix –n of the 1st series is nothing else but the other of the two relational suffixes of TY, the one represented by the genitive case ending. The following examples can be used as an indication in favor of this assumption.

(434a) Paad’eduo səwrelleŋ moll’en’, ‘En’ie, tuŋ’e(ŋ) nemen pöd’elek l’el?’ – ‘E-e, all’ie ten tet amaa uguɾcéduu køjlejuolgi ikčillék lačiływ suusej’y moll’en’. Taŋun pödel ṣoll’eltej,’ moll’en’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>paad’eduo</th>
<th>sew-rellek</th>
<th>mon-l’el-i</th>
<th>en’ie</th>
<th>tuŋ’e(ŋ)</th>
<th>neme-n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>girl</td>
<td>enter-ANT</td>
<td>say-NVIS-INTR.3SG</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>ADL.DEM</td>
<td>what-GEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pöd’el-ek</th>
<th>l’el?</th>
<th>e-e</th>
<th>ten</th>
<th>tet</th>
<th>amaa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>smell-ABS,FOC</td>
<td>be-GER,SF</td>
<td>ITJ</td>
<td>DEIC</td>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>køjle-nol-gi</td>
<td>ikči-relek</td>
<td>lačił-ya</td>
<td>suusej-ŋ</td>
<td>mon-l’el-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>break-be[GER].PERT</td>
<td>bind-ANT</td>
<td>fire-LOC</td>
<td>dump-1SG.TR</td>
<td>say-NVIS-INTR.3SG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>taŋun</th>
<th>pödel</th>
<th>pöl-l’el-te-j</th>
<th>mon-l’el-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INVS.DEM</td>
<td>smell</td>
<td>be-NVIS-FUT-INTR.3SG</td>
<td>say-NVIS-INTR.3SG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some speakers reject this form and use *tagi*. Some others accept it but note that it is used to refer to abstract concepts or states of affairs, while *tagi* refers to concrete entities only. In idiolects of yet other speakers the final syllable of all pronouns of this series is <γi>.

---

185 Some speakers reject this form and use *tagi*. Some others accept it but note that it is used to refer to abstract concepts or states of affairs, while *tagi* refers to concrete entities only. In idiolects of yet other speakers the final syllable of all pronouns of this series is <γi>.
‘The girl entered and said, “Mother, what kind of smell is this?” – “Ah, you see, I have sawn your father’s footwear and thrown the remainders in the fire. It is probably the smell of that/that smell.’


These two examples seem to demonstrate that the independent demonstratives developed from homonymous attributive demonstratives. In the NPs nemen pöd’el ‘what kind of smell’ and taŋun pöd’el ‘the smell of that’ in (434a) as well as in taŋun pöd’el-ek dayi ‘it is that smell, probably’ in (434b), the pronouns may still be seen as attributes of the respective heads, that is, relational. They carry the relational suffix –n, identified as the genitive case ending (3.3.1.1.5), and can be literally translated as ‘whatly smell’ and ‘thatly smell’, the syntactic relation between the head and the modifier in these NPs being much the same as in the NP saan nime ‘wooden house’, where the noun saal is made to a relational adjective by means of the genitive case ending –n\(^{186}\). In contrast to that, in the expression taŋun wiete-relek ‘having untied them’ the pronoun functions as the head of an NP. This function is much more characteristic for the independent pronouns. In some sense their attributive properties are a surprise against the background of the existing descriptive accounts of TY. It can be speculated that at some point a tendency evolved to use the genitive forms, or the 1\(^{st}\) series forms, of demonstratives independently, while for the attributive use the basic forms of the demonstrative pronouns, discussed in 3.5.4.1, were reserved. Examples (434a, b) demonstrate that these uses still overlap in the 1\(^{st}\) series independent demonstratives\(^{187}\).

As for the suffix –gi of the 2\(^{nd}\) series, it may be etymologically linked with the pertensive suffix –gi as Kurilov supposes (2006:125) rather than represent yet another instance of morphological homonymy, which is, admittedly, widespread in TY. Some clarity in this matter can be reached by inquiring into the origin of the possession marker itself. It is conspicuous that the latter exists only in the 3\(^{rd}\) person in TY, while Altaic and Uralic languages, with which TY is probably related, have possession markers for all persons as long as such markers exist in a language belonging to one of these families.\(^{188}\) Why wouldn’t TY? Basically, two scenarios are possible: either TY originally did not have them and acquired at a certain moment only one such marker or it lost along the way the markers for the 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) persons. It is appropriate, as it seems, to note in this

\(^{186}\) That the ending –n is the genitive case ending in pronouns too is confirmed by the fact that the interrogative kin translates both as ‘who’ and ‘whose’.

\(^{187}\) For the interrogative pronoun kin it is still the norm.

\(^{188}\) In Estonian, for instance, pronominal possession is expressed by pronouns, while possession markers on the head do not exist (Fortescue 1998:109).
connection that in some Altaic languages there is a suffix, which is materially quite close to the TY suffix –gi. In Yakut, for example, there is the suffix –yy, whose allomorphs derive relational adjectives with temporal meaning, e.g. anygy ‘current’ < any ‘now(adays)’, sajynyy ‘summer.ADI’ < sajyn ‘summer’, beyeheenji ‘yesterday’s’ < beyehee ‘yesterday’ etc. (Korkina and Slepecov 1972:579). The Khakas cognate suffix –gi, apart from being the suffix of relation, is used to form independent possessive pronouns, e.g. mini ‘mine’ < miniy ‘my’ + -gi (Baskakov 1975: 91-92, 154). Khakas displays some other interesting similarities in the pronominal system. Specifically in the domain of the demonstratives it seems to share the form tigin with TY. In the latter it functions as a deictic particle to indicate distal references while in Khakas it is the second member of the common Altaic three-way system of the demonstrative pronouns (Baskakov 1975:150). These parallels make it reasonable to see the origin of the TY possession marker –gi in the Turkic languages of Southern Siberia189. In the independent demonstrative pronouns of the 2nd series in TY it can be then taken as a device that once was possibly employed to mark relation190.

Thus, the three series of the independent demonstrative would be derived with the help of three relational suffixes available at different times for this function in TY. It may be noted that the demonstratives of the 2nd series are used in a much narrower spectrum of syntactic contexts than those of the other two series and lack the fifth member. This may be interpreted as an indication of their marginalization, promoted by their being perceived as originally foreign elements, once TY’s own linguistic devices, the suffixes –n’e < –l’e and –n, became productive in this function.

In the following, the precise functional distinctions of the independent demonstratives are discussed. The demonstratives of the 2nd series have the smallest functional load. They can act only as subjects and direct objects. In both of these functions they act without any alternation of their shape. Since they are also incompatible with the pragmatic function of focus and cannot carry the pertensive suffix, they do not exhibit any traces of inflection whatsoever. Examples (435a), (435b) and (435c) illustrate their use as S, A and O respectively.

(435a) Taγi waaj wejluon’.
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{tayi} & & \text{waaj} & \text{wej}-\text{yol}-\text{i} \\
invs & & & \text{also} & \text{wide-be-INTR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]
‘That one is also spacious.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:26)

(435b) Taγn’\text{e-}le \text{Aywan’} \text{tude} \text{apanalaan-}n’
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{tayi} & & \text{tude} & \text{apanalaa-n’} \\
invs,\text{dem-acc} & & 3\text{sg.poss} & \text{old.woman-dat}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
tadi-m, & \text{tayi} & mer=\text{elerej-l’el-}um. \\
give-\text{tr.3sg} & \text{invs} & \text{pf=swallow-nvis-tr.3sg}
\end{array}
\]
‘Aywan gave it (an insect) to his wife and she just swallowed [it].’
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:34)

189 Kurilov (1977:28) also suggests a link with Turkic languages. In his view, the TY pertensive suffix, as well as the interrogative kin ‘who’, is somehow related to the Yakut pronoun kini ‘she’.

190 This assumption can be questioned because the relational suffixes attach to modifiers in TY, whereas the pertensive suffix marks the head. Maybe this objection can be refuted by the circumstance that e.g. the possessive relation can be marked both on the head and the dependent in TY.
As is apparent from (435b), and confirmed by a study of the corpus, the 2nd series pronouns are primarily used as anaphora. Contrary to Krejnović’s (1982:240) assumption, the 2nd series demonstratives can function as direct objects when the subject is in the 3rd person as in (436). However, instances of this may be limited to non-finite clauses, in which marking of the direct object as such, i.e. with an accusative case ending, is not obligatory.

(436) Taγi ičuoq gajcie eguorelek laameple juorumurpedayat čald’elek jewligim.

‘Having observed that, the grandfather stood up and stroked the dogs on their foreheads.’

The demonstratives of the 3rd series have a wider array of functions. They can, opposite to Krejnović’s (1982:242) claim, be in the focus of a clause, which is, surprisingly, encoded by the nominal focus marker –le(ŋ) and not by the pronominal focus marker –(e)k:

(437a) Tieŋ’e-leŋ pegie-te-l.

‘That one will follow [us].’ (Kurilov 2001:468, tieŋ’ey)

(437b) Taŋ’e-le met toŋu-du-nun-meŋ.

‘Those were them (mittens blown away by wind gusts) that I chased.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:26)

When acting as a direct object, the 3rd series demonstratives receive the nominal accusative ending –le and not –γane, which is another morphological property that puts the 3rd series demonstratives into the vicinity of nouns (see also (435b)):

(438) Tuŋ’ele jawnuo Anderuuske laŋundeŋ tet akaa Semien tadaat Kūöčere kerewen ličiielek Anderuuske laŋudeŋ tonajna.

‘All this livestock was driven by your brother Semyon and Kwochere to Andryushkino.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:94)

Finally they can bear the nominal possession marker –gi (see also (422c)).
‘Grandfather had a calendar on his walking stick. In the light of the fire one could see notches on it.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:22)

Instance of the use of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} series demonstratives in oblique cases are rather rare. The case endings are those characteristic of nouns:

(440) \textit{Tayn’e-lek nime-γa čii kuril’ii-γu-te-m talaw me=ł’e-j.}  
\textit{INVS.DEM-INS house-LOC people know-PL-FUT-TR.3SG wild.reindeer PF=be-INTR.3SG}  
‘By this the family members will know: a wild reindeer has successfully been hunted.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:156)

(441) \textit{Tayn’e-ŋιn’ tite kurie-j tuŋ quruul.}  
\textit{INVS.DEM-DAT so behave-INTR.3SG ADL.PROX sky}  
(If it gets cold now, the reindeer will begin falling ill.) ‘The sky behaves toward that.’

(Kurilov 2001:173, \textit{kurie-})

The demonstrative pronouns of the 1\textsuperscript{st} series can be used in the widest range of functions. They can take on a wide array of case endings. Their peculiarity is the absolutive case ending –\textit{t}, uniquely characteristic of their declensional paradigm. When it is attached, it ousts the final /\textit{n}/ of the demonstratives, which theoretically makes it possible to speak of it as the nominative/ergative case ending. Since, however, the ergative system in TY is otherwise so singularly marked by its bare ergative and the accusative system by its equally unmarked nominative, for reasons of consistency it is more sensible to regard the removal of /\textit{n}/ as required by the restrictions on consonant clusters. Various case uses of the 1\textsuperscript{st} series demonstratives are illustrated below.

(442) \textit{Ten met juödii-γa lemeleŋ önid’e seguł taŋut pilienumey moll’en’.}  
\textit{Ten met juödii-γa leme-λŋ önid’e segu-l}  
\textit{DEIC 1SG eye-LOC what-FOC.ABS dust get.in-GER.SF}  
\textit{taŋun-t pille-nu-ŋey mon-l’el-i.}  
\textit{INVS.DEM-FOC.ABS wipe-DUR-TR.3SG.OF say-NVIS-INTR.3SG}  
‘ “You see, dust has got into my eyes, I am taking it out,” (the polar fox) said.’

(443) \textit{Met aaweden’ęŋ ewl’ikiej, ten taŋun’in’ tite kurčiil’eltej.}  
\textit{met aawe-den’ęŋ el=l’e-kie-j}  
\textit{1SG sleep-EMPH disappear-INTR.3SG}  
\textit{ten taŋun-in’ tite kurčiil’el-te-j}  
\textit{DEIC ADL.PROX-DAT like become-NVIS-FUT-INTR.3SG}  
‘I even lost my sleep, it must have happened as that (event) approached.’

(Kurilov 2001:475, \textit{taŋun})
(444) Aduŋnyat me čamuon'.

*aduŋnyat-γa-t me=čama-ŋol-i*

ADA.PROX-LOC-ABL PF=big-be-INTR.3SG

'It is bigger than that one.' (Kurilov 2001:30, *aduŋnyat*)

(445) Akaagi saale wiemele. Moni tuŋullek čayadejrukun pun’nunk.

*akaa-gi saal-le wie-mele. mon-i tuŋ-lek*

elder.brother-PERT stick-FOC.ABS make-TR.3SG.OF say-INTR.3SG ADL.PROX-INS

čayade-j-sukun pun’nun-k

move-PTCP-thing kill-HAB-IMP.3SG

‘His brother made a stick and said, “Kill moving things with this.” ’

(Kurilov 1991:475, *tuŋ*)

(446) Čaγaγi āčepul-gi lawje-le men-če-mle taŋun-ŋeŋ n’ied’i-j.

*ćaγaγi āčepul-gi lawje-le men-če-mle taŋun-ŋeŋ n’ied’i-j.*

worker-PL-PERT water-FOC.ABS take-ITV-TR.3SG INVS.DEM-COM talk-INTR.3SG

‘Their worker went to fetch water, [he] (another person) talked to him.’

(Kurilov 2001:460, *taŋun*)

The 1st series demonstratives can have affective forms based on a variant of the augmentative suffix. These are derived by a unique suffix –tegie, which is suspiciously reminiscent of the nominal augmentative suffix –tege, e.g. *taŋuntegie* ‘this little’.

(447) Qad’ir taŋuntegielek mer aawaaködijli.

*qad’ir taŋuntegie-lek mer=aawe-ködi-jli*

MP INVS.DEM-AUG-INS PF=sleep-CMSR-INTR.1PL

(Six persons’ meal consisted of just one frozen sig.) ‘They restricted themselves to just that and went to sleep, poor fellows.’ (Kurilov 2001:461, *taŋuntegie*)

The 1st series demonstratives can be pluralized:

(448) Kin wadul-n-d-uo-k l’eŋu-l. N’umud’el enmun

*kin wadul-n-d-uo-k l’eŋu-l. N’umud’el enmun*

two.GEN Yukaghir-GEN-0-child-FOC.ABS be-PL-GER.SF camp every

taŋ-ŋe-k worper-s-nuŋu-mle.

INVS.DEM-PL-FOC.ABS guard-CAUS-HAB-PL-TR.3.OF

‘There were two Yukaghir boys. They were ordered to guard every time one moved to a new camp.’

(Kurilov 2001:460)

From the syntactic point of view, independent demonstratives can function as dummy heads:

(449) Tuŋ quod’eduŋane jukuolel taŋunyane waaj taŋ nime laŋudeŋ uuselek me sewreįl’elum.

*tuŋ quod’eduŋane jukuolel taŋunyane waaj taŋ nime laŋudeŋ uuselek me sewreįl’elum*

ADL.PROX boy-ACC small-be-PTCP INVS.DEM-ACC also

taŋ nime laŋudeŋ uu-se-l-lek me=sew-re-j-l’el-um

INVS.DEM house toward go-CAUS-GER-INS PF=enter-CAUS-SEM-NVIS-TR.3SG

‘He carried also this son, the young one, to the house and pulled him inside.’
The independent demonstratives in TY can refer to whole clauses:

(450a) Aduŋ’e-le Kakau amaa tet amaa-n’ n’ied’i-l’el-um.
ADA.PROX-ACC Kakau father 2SG father-DAT tell-NVIS-TR.3SG
‘Father Kakau told that to your father.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:38)

(450b) Čuoγajme čajledenmun me pugekietej, taŋ’e-le jaŋdepe me kuril’iiŋa moni amaagi.
čuoγaj-me čajle-d-enmun me=puge-kie-te-j
spring-ADV day-0-every PF=be.warm-INCCH-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘In spring, it will get warmer every day and geese know that,’ said the father.’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

(450c) Taŋ unumeple čuŋdellek qadi waard’aya qabun ile med’uoluoldayane ile uon’er juoŋajdayane taŋullekuril’nunμa.
ťaŋ unume-p-le čuŋ-relek qadi ward’e-γa qabun ile
taj unum-PL-ACC  ċuŋ-relek qadi ward’e-γa qabun ile
INVS.DEM ear-PL-ACC count-ANT which herd-LOC how.many reindeer
men’-γol-γol-dayane ile uo-n’e-r
take-BE[GER]-3SG.DS reindeer child-VBLZ-CIRC
juoŋaj-l-dayane taŋul-lek kuril’ii-nun-ŋa
end-GER-3SG.DS INVS.DEM-INS know-HAB-3PL.TR
‘(During calving herders cut off the tips of the newborn calves’ ears.) Having counted those ears they knew in the end of the calving how many calves were born in different herds.’

Finally, independent demonstratives can have a purely deictic value:

(451a) Eld’e tuŋ’e waaj lemen n’etle-k quduolel?
MP ADL.PROX MP what fox-FOC.ABS lie-GER.SF
‘This is a fox lying, isn’t it?’

(451b) Aduŋ’e mod’γe nemen pũŋuolek? Titqa el me l’ej taatband’erukun.
adaŋ’e mon-jen neme-n pũŋuol-ek?
ADA.PROX say-INTR.1SG what-GEN rejoice[GER]-COP
tit-γa el=me=l’e-j191 taat-pan-d’e-sukun
2PL-LOC NEG=PF=be-INTR.3SG so-be-PTCP-thing
‘What kind of joy is this? You do have [already] something like this, don’t you?’

3.5.5 Interrogative pronouns

Following Krejnovič (1958:87-88), I divide the interrogative pronouns according to their morphological structure into two groups. The first group consists of the basic pronouns

191 Normally the negative proclitic el= does not co-occur with the predicate focus proclitic me= because the latter is inherently affirmative. Here, el= does not express negation but is an emphatic device.
kin(ek)¹⁹² ‘who’, ‘whose’ and neme(ŋ)leme(ŋ) ‘what’. The second group includes derived pronouns whose first syllable is <qa>:

(452) qadunŋ ‘which’, ‘what kind of’ < q- ‘ITRG’ + adunŋ ‘ADA.PROX’ (‘which that’)
qadi ‘which’, ‘what kind of’
quodeband’e ‘what kind of’ < quode ‘how’ + pan- ‘to be’ + -je ‘PTCP’
quadinuoler ‘which’ < qadi ‘which’ + -n ‘GEN’ + -ŋol ‘to be’ + er ‘CIRC’
qaduŋi ‘which’ < q- ‘ITRG’ + aduŋi ‘ADA.PROX’
qaduŋut ‘which’ < q- ‘ITRG’ + aduŋun ‘ADA.PROX’ + -t ‘FOC.ABS’
qabun ‘how many’

Unlike Krejnovič (1958:88), I am inclined to see only the initial /q/ of the interrogative pronouns of the second group as encoding interrogative meaning. A few of the interrogative pronouns are obviously based on the adlocutorial proximal demonstrative and this is where the /a/ of the syllable <qa> stems from. Such an analysis is also supported by some evidence provided by interrogative forms of adverbs (3.7.3).

A couple of examples illustrating the use of the interrogative pronouns follow.

(453) Qadi kind’e-ŋa pulgej-nun?
which month-LOC come.out-HAB[3SG.ITRG]
‘In which month do [leaves] come out?’ (Kurilov 2001:499, qadi)

(454) Qaduŋut at kiime tŋu čoŋoŋpeŋat?
which month-LOC come.out-HAB[3SG.ITRG]
‘Which of these knives would you give [me]? — This [one].’
(Kurilov 2001:499, qaduŋut)

(455) Qabun čaas-ŋa eguo-nun-mut?
how many hour-LOC rise-HAB-2PL.ITRG
Puskijan čaas-ŋa eguo-nun-jeli.
seven GEN hour-LOC rise-HAB-INTR.1PL
‘What time do you get up? — We get up at seven o’clock.’

3.5.6 Negative pronouns

If a negative pronoun is defined as a pronominal item associated with a negation marker, then TY has negative pronouns, which are based on the interrogative pronouns:

(456) Tŋu či el=neme-le el=wie-čuon el=kewej-ŋu-t!
ADL.DEM people NEG=what-ACC NEG=do-PRIV NEG=leave-PL-FUT[3]
‘These people won’t go away without doing something!’
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:94)

¹⁹² The form kin is used in questions about subjects of transitive verbs, while the form kinek is normally reserved for questions about subjects of intransitive verbs.
¹⁹³ This pronoun can be applied to animate referents.
However, this kind of behavior as well as a consistent negative concord is rather rare in TY. Much more often the negative meaning is encoded in the predicate alone, while the interrogative pronouns *kin* ‘who’ and *neme* ‘what’ are accompanied respectively by suffixes *uoll’elk* and *ŋoll’elk* which could be seen as quasi-negators, since they ‘favor the context of negation’ (Maslova 2003a:63). However, the correlation with the context of negation is not strict, and combinations of interrogative pronouns with these suffixes in affirmative sentences acquire universal meaning (Maslova 2003c:40). Therefore, following Krejnovič (1982:22-223), the latter are analyzed here as emphasis markers. These suffixes are complex and obviously consist of the copular verb *ŋol-*, the non-visual suffix *–l’el* and the focus markers *–k* and *–le* *ŋ*. According to (Maslova 2003c:63) the forms *uolle* *ŋ* and *ŋolle* *ŋ* are suffixed to the interrogative pronouns functioning as direct objects, while the forms *uoll’elk* and *ŋoll’elk* are found in subjects. This syntactic correlation is, however not rigid. A few examples follow.

(457) *Kin-uoll’elk el=ann’e.*
who-EMPH NEG=speak[3SG]
‘Nobody is speaking.’

(458) *Samqaraal-ŋa neme-ŋoll’elk el=quduol.*
table-LOC what-EMPH NEG=lie[3SG]
‘Nothing is lying on the table.’

(459) *Ten’i tet nemeŋolleŋ tet wiejuelmoraw ewl’e.*
ten’i tet neme-ŋolleŋ tet wie-ŋol-moraw el=l’e
here 2SG what-EMPH 2SG do-be[GER]-OBLG NEG=be[3SG]
‘You’ve got nothing to do here.’

(460) *Čama kor’ga neme-ŋoll’elk el=lejrii-jeŋ. Suobul’*
big measles what-EMPH NEG=remember-INTR.3SG Sobul
*tit aaka-ŋoll’elk.*
2PL elder.brother-EMPH
‘[When I was ill with] heavy measles, I did not remember anything, not even Sobul, your elder brother.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:126)

Instances of interrogative pronouns acting as adjuncts in the context of negation are very sparse:

(461) *Amaa mon-i Lajbuo kin-uoll’elk ewl’e,*
father say-INTR.3SG Laybo who-EMPH NEG.be
met-in’ n’ied’i-k, met kini-d’eŋ el=pundu-te-jeŋ.
1SG-DAT tell-IMP.SG 1SG who-ADV NEG=repeat-FUT-INTR.1SG
‘Father said, “Laybo, there is nobody, tell me, I will not tell anyone.” ’
(Kurilov 2001:151, *kinid’eŋ*)

(462) *Leme-ŋa-t-ęŋ el=aaarej.*
what-LOC-ABL-EMPH NEG=stop[3SG]
‘He did not stop in front of anything.’
In the following example the pronoun *kin* ‘who’ receives the suffix –*deŋ*, the same suffix that is attached to adverbs under negation.

(463)  
\[
\text{Aq tudem iilugul’e-r kin-n’e-deŋ el=sayane-č-čeŋ.}
\]

constantly 3SG miss-CIRC who-COM-EMPH NEG=sit-FUT-INTR.1SG

‘Since I miss him so much, I will not live with anyone else.’

(Kurilov 2001:152)

3.5.7 Indefinite pronouns

Indefinite pronouns are regularly derived from the interrogative ones with the help of the proclitic *me=*. 

(464)  
\[
\text{Tadaa me kinek ejuul’en’.
}\]

there IND=who get.caught-NVIS-INTR.3SG

‘Somebody moaned (got caught) there.’

(465)  
\[
\text{Anme maargan čajleγa me kinek öruul mörič.}
\]

just one.GEN day-LOC IND=whose cry resound-INTR.3SG

‘And one day somebody’s cry was heard.’ (Odé and Kurilov 1012:140)

(466)  
\[
\text{Akaa tienayarat me nemenę toron’ejrukek mit laŋuđeŋ keluunul.}
\]

elder.brother DIST-side-ABL PF=what be.black-PTCP-THING-FOC.ABS

mit laŋuđeŋ kelu-nu-l

1PL toward come-DUR-GER.SF

‘Brother, from there something black is approaching us.’

(467)  
\[
\text{Maarqad’eŋ Uluruoŋγat anmorji me qabun joqon miraγya sayanejmu.}
\]

once Uluro-γa-t anmorγi me=qabun joqol-n

mit laŋuđeŋ kelu-nu-l

1PL toward come-DUR-GER.SF

‘Once you lived, I believe, a few tens of kilometers from Olera Lake.’

There exists the form (*me=*)*qabunda* ‘a certain number’, ‘several’, which possibly is a calques from the corresponding Yakut expression *chasda*:

(468)  
\[
\text{Umčaginn’e n’aya tuŋ paad’edu iołenę qabunda čajleγa sayanaaľ’elŋi tadaat tuŋ qadumudeŋ el pulgejčuon el quodejčuon.}
\]

Umčagin-n’e n’aya tuŋ paad’edu iołenę qabunda čajleγa

sit-NVIS-3PL.INTR and

ADL.PROX where-ADV-EMPH

el=pulgejčuon el=quode-l’e-čuon

NEG=how-be-PRIV NEG=come.out-PRIV
‘Together with Umchagin the girl stayed home for a long time, for several days, not going anywhere or doing anything.’

3.5.8 Universal quantifiers

The universal quantifier is based on the stem jawne- ‘all’, ‘everything’. Historically, it is most probably a verbal stem, to be more precise, a quantitative verb with universal meaning. This conclusion is plausible not only because other quantitative meanings, concrete numeric or abstract like ‘many’ and ‘few’, are encoded by verbs, and it would be only natural to expect a verb to convey the meaning of quantitative or qualitative totality. More importantly, the historical verb jawne- displays verbal morphological characteristics which at least correlate with its syntactic function. Thus the attributive form of the universal quantifier is jawnej, which can be analyzed as a participial form containing the regular participle ending –j:

(469a) Jawnej čiile pun-nul-’el-um.
    all.PTCP people kill-HAB-NVIS-TR.3SG
    ‘He used to kill all people.’ (about Edilwey, the Yukaghir national hero fighting Chukchis)

(469b) Alasej enu tuŋ lewejnburebeγa jawnej enupulγat čamuon’
    Alasej enu tuŋ lewejnburebe-γa jawnej enu-pul-γa-t čama-ŋol-i.
    Alazeya river ADL.PROX area-LOC all.PTCP river-PL-LOC-ABL big-be-INTR.3SG
    ‘The river Alazeya is the biggest river in this area.’

When the universal quantifier is used as a head of an NP, it assumes the shapes jawner and jawnuo respectively. In the former, the circumstantial converb is easily recognized, while the latter can be analyzed as a truncated gerund form. The form jawner functions as the subject of a sentence, while jawnuo is employed as the direct object. Under this analysis, the clauses with jawner are actually complex sentences that can be paraphrased ‘Being all, (null-subject) does P.’:

(470) Qad’ir jawner sew-l’el-ŋi.
    DM all enter-NVIS-3PL.MNTR
    ‘So, everyone entered.’

Not seldom, jawner occurs in postposition to an overt subject, which increases the formal resemblance of the whole construction with a non-finite clause:

(471) Qad’ir tuŋ sajrepul jawner naŋaal’elγudayay tuŋ körel waaj tiden n’iŋakaaŋilpulγane me tonjorael’elum.
    Qad’ir tuŋ sajre-pul jawner naŋa-l’el-ŋu-daya tuŋ körel
    DM ADL.PROX hawk-pl all fall-NVIS-PL.3DS ADL.PROX devil
    waaj tiden n’iŋ=akaα-jil-pul-γane me=tonjore-l’el-um
    again ANPH RECP=brother-PL-PL-ACC PF=chase-NVIS-TR.3SG
    ‘And when all those hawks fell down, that devil again began chasing the brothers.’
In a similar way jawnuo can occur on its own or follow a noun, acting as a kind of predicativum:

(472a) Tan id’ie l’ie el=taat ban jawnuo me=čuŋ-nun-ŋa.
and now MP NEG=so be everything.DO PF=count-HAB-3PL.TR
‘And nowadays it’s not like that, one counts everything.’

(472b) Ilele jawnuo lewrelek el molčuŋ meruucii’elŋi.
ile-le jawnuo lew-relek el=mol-čuŋ mer=uučii’-l-ŋ.ι.
reindeer-ACC whole eat-ANT NEG =stay.overnight-PRIV PF=pass-NVIS-3PL.INTR
‘Having eaten the whole reindeer, they moved on without staying overnight.’

(Kurilov 1994:8)

Apart from the forms of the stem jawne- ‘to be all’, the pronoun-like word enmun ‘every’ can be employed as an attributive universal quantifier. Its notable syntactic feature for a rather strictly left-branching language such as TY is that it always follows its head:

(473) Tideŋ sukune jawnuo endu jukuolučuo saal enmun welič-im.
tideŋ sukun-le jawnuo endu jukuolučuo saal enmun welič-im
ANPH thing-ACC all.DO DISTR little tree every hang.ITR-TR.3SG
‘He hanged all those things a bit on every tree.’ (Kurilov2001:131, jukuolučuo)

3.6 Adjectives

Adjectives are words of non-verbal provenience which serve as lexical modifiers of nouns and cannot act as heads of NPs. They always precede the head noun in TY. Non-derived adjectives as an open word class do not exist in TY. Only two simple words, čama ‘big’ and juku ‘small’, can be regarded as adjectives without reservations194:

(474) Tieŋ juku jalya laŋudeŋ waaj ölkienaak, ölkienaak.
tieŋ juku jalya laŋudeŋ waaj ölke-nu-aa-k ölke-nu-aa-k
DIST small lake toward again run-DUR-INCH-IMP.SG run-DUR-INCH-IMP.SG
‘Do run toward that small lake.’

(475) Ten tugi waaj čama solỳind’e-γа me=qadaa ewre-r
dec ADL.PROX also big reunion-LOC IND=where go-CIRC
onjie-nun-me ugurče-k.
wear-HAB-PTCP.PASS shoe-COP
‘And these are also shoes which one puts on when one goes somewhere, to a big gathering.’

194 These two words present a case of a peculiar redundancy as the concepts they convey can be just as well encoded in participles of the respective qualitative verbs: čamuod’e < čamuol- ‘to be big’ and jukuod’e < jukuol- ‘to be small’. Expressing qualitative meanings attributively is generally a function of participles in TY. According to one of the informants, the participial form čamuod’e suggests the comparative degree as opposed to the adjective čama, which states the positive degree of comparison.
As one can see, the semantics of these non-derived adjectives fits the predictions made by Dixon (1982) concerning closed adjectival classes in the languages of the world. Apart from these two non-derived adjectives there exists a relatively large subclass of derived relational adjectives in TY. These are formed from nouns with the help of two suffixes: \(-n\) and \(-(l)l'e\).

The suffix \(-n\), which is ousted by an epenthetic \(-d\) when the following word begins with a vowel (see 2.3.1), apparently has its origin in the genitive ending. Even today, when possession in an NP is quite naturally encoded by mere juxtaposition of modifier and head, the suffix \(-n\) can be employed to mark the modifier, rendering the phrase ambiguous. Thus the modifier in the NP *ilen jawul* ‘a reindeer track’ can be interpreted as a referential noun, i.e. a/the track of a specific reindeer, or as a class designation, i.e. a track typical, characteristic or representative of reindeer as a class of referents (see for details 3.3.1.1.5). Presumably, used to mark only the possessive relation originally, the nominal suffix \(-n\) must have extended its functional scope to express a relation between the two nouns involved in a general way, turning the modifier noun into a relational adjective, not unlike those in the English expressions *fatherly love* or *wooden house*. An essential difference from languages like English is that in TY we deal with a genuine inflectional nominal suffix, and, consequently, with an instance of word-class changing inflection.

Another important instance of that is derivation of attributive forms of quantitative verbs. This derivation is accompanied by stem modification. The first nine\(^{195}\) quantitative adjectives are listed here for illustration since their forms cannot be predicted:

\[(476)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
maarqan & \quad \text{‘one’ < maarquol- ‘to be one’} \\
kin & \quad \text{‘two’ < kijuol- ‘to be two’} \\
jaan & \quad \text{‘three’ < jaluol- ‘to be three’} \\
jelukun & \quad \text{‘three’ < jalaklal- ‘to be four’} \\
imdald’an & \quad \text{‘five’ < imdald’al- ‘to be five’} \\
maalajin & \quad \text{‘six’ < maalajlal- ‘to be six’} \\
puskijan & \quad \text{‘seven’ < puskijal- ‘to be seven’} \\
maalajlukun & \quad \text{‘eight’ < maalajlaklal- ‘to be eight’} \\
kunil’ & \quad \text{‘ten’ < kunil’al- ‘to be ten’}
\end{align*}
\]

The origin of the suffix \(-(l)l’e\) is harder to trace. It plays an essential role in the pronomial system, deriving independent possessive pronouns from the personal ones as well as independent forms of some quantifiers. This suffix is, at best, semi-productive in the formation of relational adjectives. It occurs with several designations for humans, spatial and temporal expressions, e.g. with the terms for seasons of the year:

\[(477)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
pajpell’/elpajpepl’e & \quad \text{‘womanly’, ‘of women’ < pajpe ‘woman’} \\
ködell’e & \quad \text{‘manly’, ‘of men’ < köde ‘man’} \\
kejpep(l)l’e & \quad \text{‘manly’, ‘of men’ < kejpe ‘male’, ‘lad’} \\
pudel’e & \quad \text{‘outer’ < pude ‘out(side)’}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{195}\) The attributive form of the quantitative verb *wal’yarumkurul* ‘to be nine’ is not derived by the genitive case ending but is a participle: *wal’yarumkurud’e*. 
“Kejell’e ‘front’ ~ kiejie ‘in front of’
Tidaal’e ‘olden times’, ‘ancient’ < Tidaa ‘long ago’
Tindaal’e ‘former’, ‘olden’ < Tinda ‘earlier’, ‘previously’, ‘long ago’
Qomdel’(me)’e ‘autumnal’ < Qomde ‘autumn’
Qand’el’elqand’emel’e ‘wintry’ < Qande ‘cold’, ‘winter’
Čuoyajl’e ‘of spring’ < Čuoyajm’e ‘spring’
Awjal’e ‘yesterday’s’

(478) Lewejl’e nimelek sayanejli.
lewej I e nime lek sa yane jli
summer-RLN house-INS sit-1PL.INTR
‘We lived in a summer house.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

The petrified form čuol’e ‘ancient’ ~ čuol’uol ‘to be old’, which cannot be traced back to any contemporary derivational base, is, perhaps, historically derived by this suffix.

Alternative forms of these words with the suffix –n are possible too:

(479a) Ten tugi kejpe-n čald’e-d-awur-ek.
Deic Adl.prox kejpe male-GEN hand-0-container COP
‘Here, this is a men’s mitten.’

(479b) Pajpen mojo ten jewlid’en sawayat iirienunuj.
Pajpe-n mojo ten jewlid’e-n sawaγa-t iire-nun-uγ
woman-GEN cap DM reindeer.calf-GEN skin-LOC-ABL sew-HAB-1PL.TR
‘Caps for women we sew from reindeer calf skin.’

Syntactically viewed relational adjectives can stand on their own as in (480a) and (480b). This makes them radically different from the two above mentioned basic adjectives, which cannot as such act as non-verbal predicates.

(480a) Ten kejpe-ll’e-k.
Deic male-RLN-COP
‘Here are men’s ones.’

(480b) Ten jadarqa-lek wie-nun-γa ten ten’i-n pajp-l’e-γane
Deic bead-INS do-HAB-3PL.TR Deic here-prol woman-RLN-ACC
Tan kejpe-p-ll’e jadarqa-lek el=wie-nun-γu,
but male-PL-RLN bead-INS NEG=do-HAB-PL[3]
‘Here one decorates, right here, female [hats], but male [hats] one does not decorate with beads.’

Note that in (6a) the copula –k is employed, which happens when the head noun is modified. Modification is only implied in this example, just as the head noun itself. Alternatively, the choice of this copula can be explained by the presence of the relational suffix. This would entail that there is no ellipsis of an implied head noun but the nominal predicate kejpell’ek itself is represented by a noun. This, in turn, would mean that
derivatives with \textit{–ll’e ‘RLN’}, irrespective of their syntactic function, are generally not adjectives but nouns capable of functioning as attributes, just as in the English translation of (478). I believe that the choice of an alternative analysis is a matter of interpretation of the presented empirical facts and both way of treating these forms are equally adequate in descriptive terms.

The adjectival property of being non-verbal lexical modifiers of nouns is attested for some words derived from nouns with a spatial meaning designating areas in front of or beyond a certain spatial point of reference from the point of view of the speaker\textsuperscript{106}:

(481) \textit{miilgelel ‘closer’ < miilgere ‘the side of smth. located closer to the speaker’}

\textit{jielgalel/jielger/jielginde ‘farther’ < jielgere ‘unknown part of something’}

(482) \textit{Jielgalel kičuol-el serge-ya iire-m.}

\textit{farther be.extreme-ADJZ tethering.post(Yak)-LOC tie-TR.3SG}

\textit{‘He tied [it] at the farther, outer tethering post.’ (Kurilov 2001:121, jielgalel)}

The adjective \textit{albelel ‘lower’} makes it possible to identify the suffix \textit{–lel}, also present in \textit{miilgel} and \textit{jielgel}, which may be assumed to derive adjectives from nouns with spatial meaning:

(483) \textit{Albelel n’umd’egi alun lukulyan uul’en’ taat gitn’er ölke-l’en’}.

\textit{al-be-lel n’umd’e-gi al-un lukul-ya-n}

\textit{lower.side-NMLZ-ADJZ jaw-PERT lower-side-PROL ground-LOC-PROL}

\textit{uu-l’el-i taat kin’er ölke-l’el-i}

\textit{go-NVIS-INTR.3SG so till run-NVIS-INTR.3SG}

\textit{‘His lower jaw reached the ground, so [quickly] he ran.’}

There are two more words that syntactically could classify as adjectives but semantically they exhibit too strong an affinity to reflexive pronouns and occupy thus an intermediate position:

(484) \textit{wayine \sim wayane ‘own (of possessions and kin)’, ‘personal’}

\textit{ewje ‘real’, ‘true’, ‘genuine’, ‘own (of kin)’}

(485) \textit{Čendiluu-pe ewje alajii-pe-łež.}

\textit{Chendiluu-PL real Alayi-PL-COP}

\textit{‘Chendilu and his relatives were real Alayi people.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:248)}

Adjectives in TY do not have degrees of comparison. When the comparative degree of a quality must be expressed, the noun serving as the standard for comparison gets the ablative case ending, which serves as the marker (486). In the superlative degree this ending, preceded by the pertensive suffix, attaches to the word \textit{jawnej ‘everybody’}, as in (487):

\textsuperscript{106}This is comparable with the meaning of the Latin prefixes \textit{cis} and \textit{trans}, as in e.g. \textit{Gallia cисalpina} (the parts of Gallia facing the southern slopes of the Alps, or the closer Gallia from the point of view of the speakers, i.e. Romans) as opposed to \textit{Gallia transalpina} (the parts of Gallia lying to the north of the Alps, or the farther Gallia from the point of view of Romans).
‘Nowadays Yukaghirs live only in Andryushkino; the height above the sea level is not greater than 50-200 meters.’

‘This house was built by the richest man in our settlement.’

The sequence of the relevant elements of a comparative construction in TY is thus standard-marker-quality, which is the common order of these elements in OV languages (Payne 2007:98).

### 3.7 Adverbs

Adverbs were defined in section 3.2 as non-verbal forms modifying verbs or, less prototypically, and other adverbs. ‘Non-verbal’ does not refer to their origin – quite on the contrary, ontologically a great deal of adverbs in TY are (de)verbal since the words they stem from constitute, despite their adjective-like or numeric semantics, a subclass of verbs, namely, qualitative and quantitative verbs (see 3.4.1) – rather it means that they do not represent inflected verb forms, as opposed to converbs, which can modify verbs too. In many Indo-European languages adverbs can also modify adjectives. The same cannot be asserted about TY without reservations simply because adjectives, whose functions are fulfilled by participles, are almost entirely missing in TY. At best adverbs could modify those two non-relational adjectives that there are in TY: čama ‘big’ and juku ‘small’. I, however, have not come across instances of that.

As far as the morphological structure of adverbs is concerned, they can be divided into basic, synchronically derived and historically derived (see 3.1.1).

In the Russian linguistic tradition, e.g. Rozental’ et al. (2002), adverbs are divided from the semantic point of view into attributive and circumstantial. This division principle is fully applicable to the adverbs of TY. ATTRIBUTIVE adverbs (those of manner, degree and quantity) characterize actions internally, while circumstantial adverbs (spatial and temporal) describe an action externally (Lukina 2002:116). There is an interesting type of

---

197 Good overviews of TY adverbs can be found Lukina (2002: 116-121, 2008:59-66). The former deals with the derivation of adverbs, while the latter gives a historical sketch of adverb studies in TY and provides a semantically based classification. The present work draws to some extent on these two overviews.
adverbs in TY, which could be best labeled as relational adverbs, because they specify a quality of a referent as being associated with one of the aspects of the referent’s identity, narrowing down the semantic domain in which the ascription of the quality is unequivocally valid. In this they are similar with external adverbs which delimit actions spatially or temporally, and can therefore be regarded as their third subgroup.

3.7.1 Attributive adverbs

3.7.1.1 Manner adverbs

Derivation of manner adverbs in TY presents a certain typological interest: the most productive derivational device, the suffix –ne(ŋ), is attached to finite forms of qualitative verbs, more precisely to those of the 3SG of intransitive verbs198:

\[(488)\]  
\[n’id’erpejneŋ ‘in a new fashion’ < n’id’erpej ‘[it] is new’ < n’id’erpe- ‘to be new’\]  
\[qalıčıneŋ ‘terribly’ < qalıčı ‘[it] is terrible’ < qaalu- ‘to be terrible’\]  
\[warıneŋ ‘firmly’ < wari ‘[it] is firm’ < wari- ‘to be firm’\]

When a manner adverb is to be derived from a qualitative verb with an integrated copula –ŋol, a dissimilation (n’ → j / _ n) takes place facilitating smooth, quick pronunciation:

\[(489)\]  
\[maaruojneŋ ‘happily’ < maaruon ‘[s/he] is happy’ < maaruol- ‘to be happy’\]  
\[čuguojneŋ ‘quickly’ < čuguoŋ ‘[it] is quick’ < čuguoł- ‘to be quick’\]

It has to be noted that formerly some speakers used the stem of such verbs as derivational base:

\[(490)\]  
\[Taat maaruol-neŋ ewl’ikie-j …\]  
\[so be.happy-ADV disappear-INTR.3SG\]  
‘He died so, happily.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:140)

This is a regular derivational pattern for n’anduolŋeŋ ‘superfluously’ < n’anduol- ‘to exceed’ + -ŋeŋ ‘ADV’, which could be regarded as a degree adverb.

In the derivation of the two following adverbs a further morphophonemic alternation takes place:

\[(491)\]  
\[amutneŋ ‘well’ < amuč ‘it is good’\]  
\[n’aarčıneŋ ‘badly’ < n’aarčıč ‘it is bad’\]

In both of these adverbs the sound [t] emerges. It is not far fetched to assume that the adverb ‘badly’ was once *n’aarčıčneŋ199, according to the same rule which applies in the case of the adverb qalıčıneŋ ‘terribly’. Taking into consideration the existence of the participle amuče, one could postulate also for amutneŋ ‘well’ the ancient form

\[198\] This was first noted by Krejnovič (1958:202) and supported by Kurilov (2006:196).
\[199\] In Lukina (2008:62) an instance of n’arčıčneŋ can indeed be found. It is not clear whether this is a spelling mistake or an isolated example of this pronunciation.
*amučney. Due to its exceedingly frequent use this hypothetic word might have undergone a morphophonemic alternation caused by the regressive place assimilation yielding a more natural sound sequence [tn] instead of [tfn]\textsuperscript{200}. The adverb for ‘badly’ might have then changed its sound shape in analogy to its antonym. In the corpus, the form qaalitney ‘terribly’, which is also a very frequent adverb, can be found too, instead of the dictionary form qaaličney. In the following example it is used rather as a degree adverb:

(492) Tudejlede qaalitney tenubun’iej.

\begin{Verbatim}
3SG-EMPH be.frightful.INTR.3SG-ADV be.hungry-INCH-INTR.3SG
\end{Verbatim}

‘And he himself got terribly hungry.’  (Kurilov 2001:495, qaaličney)

Derivational bases of some manner adverbs undergo irregular alternations:

(493a) warajney ‘early’ < waruon’ ‘[it] is early’
(493b) notiqney ‘neatly’, ‘carefully’ < notinej ‘[it] is beautiful’

Noteworthy in the derivation of manner adverbs is the unproductive lexicalization of converbs:

(494) anmel’erey ‘causelessly’ < anme ‘simply’ + l’e- ‘to be’ + -rey ‘SIM’

In some instances it is impossible to identify the lexeme on whose basis the adverb is formed, e.g. ittney ‘for a long time’. It is definitely derived since it displays the derivational suffix –ney but there is nothing in TY it is derived from. Such adverbs must be regarded as historically derived.

The meaning of particular manner adverbs can be amplified by lengthening the vowel of the verbal inflectional ending:

(495) \begin{Verbatim}
O tiey mit laame war-ii-ney at=iire-j.
oh DIST 1PL dog be.firm-INTR.3SG-ADV POT=tie-1PL.TR
Iimu-j n’awn’iklie-k pun’mele mer iimietej.
Imu-j n’awn’iklie-k pun’mele mer=iimu-ie-te-j
be.rabid-PTCP polar.fox-FOC.ABS kill-TR.3SG.OF PF=be.rabid-inch-FUT-INTR.3SG
\end{Verbatim}

‘Oh, we should tie this dog of ours very firmly. It has killed a rabid polar fox; it is going to become rabid.’  (Kurilov 2001:67, wariney)

Manner adverbs can be derived with the suffix –ney also from parts of speech other than qualitative verbs:

(496) ančejney ‘anxiously’ < ančejl ‘anxiety’
ugunej ‘rightly/correctly’ < uguje ‘truth’

\textsuperscript{200} See e.g. Bybee (2001:11) for how the usage frequency, specifically token frequency, accelerates sound changes.
The above mentioned manner adverbs describe the action as such. Another group of manner adverbs characterizes the modus operandi. Many of them are formed with the participation of the reciprocal proclitic:

(497)  

\[ \text{jukuoluču}^{201} \text{ ‘bit by bit’ < jukuol- ‘to be small’.} \]
\[ \text{n’idono} \ ‘repeatedly’ < n’i= ‘RECP’ + tonore- ‘to follow’, ‘to chase’ \]
\[ \text{n’ilajaat} \ ‘one after another’ < n’i= ‘RECP’ + lajaat ‘behind.ABL’ \]
\[ \text{n’ibure} \ ‘above one another’, ‘in a row’ < n’i= ‘RECP’ + pure ‘upper.part’ \]
\[ \text{n’iduun} \ ‘mixing’ < n’i= ‘RECP’ + tuul ‘contents’ \]

(498)  

\[ \text{An el n’ilajaat talaw uudaya an … pomorčigre uunull’en’}. \]
\[ \text{an el=n’ilajaat} \text{ talaw uu-l-da} \text{.} \]
\[ \text{DEIC NEG=one.after.another wild.reindeer go-GER-3SG.DS} \]
\[ \text{an pomoreči-req} \text{ uu-nun-l’el-i} \text{.} \]
\[ \text{DEIC roll.ITER-SIM go-HAB-NVIS-INTR.3SG} \]
\[ \text{‘That’s because the wild reindeer did not go in a single file but rolled in a tangle.’} \]
\[ \text{(Kurilov and Odé 2012:172)} \]

With the common adverbial suffix –de(ŋ) the adverb wiede(ŋ) ‘differently’, ‘in a different way’ ~ wien ‘(an)other’ is derived:

(499)  

\[ \text{Id’ie l’ie wiedeŋ yolaaj.} \]
\[ \text{now MP different.ADV be-INCH-INTR.3SG} \]
\[ \text{‘Now [it] has become different.’} \]

Among the adverbs belonging to this group, lexicalized convers can be found too, e.g. uureŋ ‘gradually’ < uu- ‘go’ + -reŋ ‘SIM’. Instances of historically derived adverbs of this type may be the words n’inikin^{202} ‘equally of all sorts’, ‘from all sides’, iner^{203} ‘separately’, pölcenme ‘suddenly’, anme^{204} ‘simply’. There are manner adverbs, whose derivational status is unclear: n’angumu/n’angemu ‘intentionally’, ‘deliberately’.

There are also seemingly basic manner adverbs like taat ‘so’, ‘in this way’ and taak ‘groundlessly’.

3.7.1.2 Degree adverbs

Degree adverbs form a small subgroup within the class of attributive adverbs. Some of them are derived by means of conversion directly from the stems of the respective qualitative verbs:

(500)  

\[ \text{jukuol ‘little’ < jukuol- ‘to be small’} \]
\[ \text{alγamlal ‘little’ < alγamlal- ‘to be few/little’} \]

\[ ^{201} \text{-čuo is a diminutive suffix.} \]
\[ ^{202} \text{The segment <n’i> is almost surely the reciprocal proclitic.} \]
\[ ^{203} \text{A connection with inje- ‘to be afraid’ taking the circumstantial converb ending –r can be considered.} \]
\[ ^{204} \text{The segment <me> may be a petrified suffix.} \]
One of the non-relational adjectives serves as the derivational base for the corresponding degree adverb:

(501) čamanęŋ ‘greatly’, ‘very’, ‘too much’ < čama ‘big’

This is not so for the other non-relational adjective, juku ‘small’. Instead, the stem jukuo- ‘to be small’ functions as the derivational base for the corresponding degree adverb, attaching the suffix –čuo. This is accompanied by the truncation of the final stem consonant: jukuočuo ‘a little’. A combination of the suffixes –čuo and –ney produces an enhanced meaning: jukuočuonenų ‘at least a bit’.

Degree adverbs derived with the suffix –d’aa normally express a diminished degree. The suffix can attach to nouns:

(502) čajle ‘day’, ‘light’ < čajlęd’aa ‘in the twilight’

molid’aa ‘a little bit’ < moli ‘for a while’, ‘seemingly’

The adverb aljad’aa ‘very’, ‘excessively’, ‘too’, which is obviously related to the verb aljamlad- ‘to be few/little’, acquires, however, exactly the opposite meaning, intensifying the action it modifies.

There are also some synchronically non-derived degree adverbs in TY or those whose derivational base is obscure:

(503) olyin’ ‘completely’

engeneŋ ‘very’, ‘too much’

An inherently negative quantitative adverb is annmolyin’ ‘not at all’, ‘not in the least’.

3.7.1.3 Quantitative adverbs

Quantitative adverbs give a quantitative characteristic of an action. A general assessment of this kind is made by the adverb pojuojnęŋ ‘many times’, whose derivation follows the general pattern of manner adverbs:

(504) pojuojnęŋ ‘many times’ < pojuon’ ‘[it] is in a great number/quantity’ < pojuol- ‘to be numerous’

Here is an example from a text:

(505) Taat pojuojnę Kakau amaa miraanudaya met en’ie monl’en’ …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>taat</th>
<th>pojuol-j-ne</th>
<th>Kakau amaa</th>
<th>mira-aa-nu-l-da</th>
<th>įyel-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>be.numerous-INTR.3SG-ADV</td>
<td>Kakau father</td>
<td>walk-INCH-DUR-GER-3SG.DS</td>
<td>1SG mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

205 This adverb can also have the meaning ‘loudly’ and falls then, naturally, into the group of manner adverbs.

206 In the corpus the form l’ukucče with the same meaning is attested, too.
‘Uncle Kakau walked up and down and mother said ...’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:38)

Adverbs quantifying an action in a precise way are derived from semantically numeric bases from 1 to 10 with the help of the suffix –d’e(ŋ)\(^{207}\). Regarding the derivational base these adverbs show different provenience:

\[(506)\] maarqad’eŋ ‘once’\(^{208}\) < maarqan ‘one’ (attributive) ~ maarquol- ‘to be one’

kid’eŋ ‘twice’ < kin ‘two’ (attributive) ~ kijuol- ‘to be two’

jalmid’eŋ ‘trice’ < jalmisče ‘third’ ~ jaluo1- ‘to be three’

jalaklid’eŋ ‘four times’ < jalakla1- ‘to be four’

kunil’id’eŋ ‘ten times’ < kun’il’al- ‘to be ten’

\[(507)\] Met lögitiěnunųŋ kid’eŋ.

met lögite-nun-ųŋ kid’eŋ

1SG feed-HAB-1SG.TR twice

‘I feed twice [a day].’

The adverbs in (506) cardinally characterize action. The adverbs in (508) indicate the position of an occurrence in a numerical series. Their derivation is yet more varied with respect to both mechanisms and derivational bases. For some numeric bases alternative forms exist.

\[(508)\] el’in ‘for the first time < el’i ‘at first’ + -n ‘GEN’

kidid’e ‘for the second time’ ~ kijuol- ‘to be two’

jalmasčesur ‘for the third time’ < jalmisče ‘third’ + -s ‘CAUS’ + -ur ‘CIRC’

jalmisčed’eŋ ‘for the third time’ < jalmisče ‘third’ + -d’eŋ ‘ADV’

\[(509a)\] Ten’i jalmasčesur tuŋ tet ayuoluölγa kötkejlyane čulyajtej.

ten’i jalmasče-su-r tuŋ tet ayuolo-jol-γa kötkej-l-γane čulya-j-te-j

here third-CAUS-CIRC ADL.PROX 2SG stand-be[GER]-LOC reach-GER/-1/2SG.DS poke-SEM-FUT-1PL.TR

‘When you reach here, the place you stood at, for the third time, we shall stab you.’

(Kurilov 2001:110)

\[(509b)\] Tadaat iiṭneng ičuo-relek jalmo1če-d’eŋ aji-m.

then long.time look-ANT third-ADV schoot-TR.3SG

‘He aimed carefully and shot for the third time.’

The unproductive\(^{209}\) suffix –me indicates how many persons carry out an action:

\(^{207}\) Except the quantitative verb ‘to be nine’, which forms the corresponding adverb with the ending –ney, i.e. wal’yarumkuronųŋ ‘nine times’ < wal’yarumkuruon’, also replicating the main derivational scheme of manner adverbs.

\(^{208}\) This adverb can simply locate an action vaguely in the past being thus a temporal one. This is, in fact, its much more frequent use.

\(^{209}\) Productively this meaning is expressed by the circumstantial converb of quantitative verbs (see 3.4.2.7)
3.7.2 Circumstantial adverbs

3.7.2.1 Spatial adverbs

Strictly speaking, one cannot posit a word (sub)class ‘spatial adverbs’ in TY applying the morphological criterion rigidly, since there are hardly any words expressing spatial relations in this language which are not related to another word class, i.e. nouns or pronouns, and do not display, at least partly, characteristic inflectional behavior of the latter. For instance, a basic place adverb tadaa ‘there’ shares the same root with the demonstrative pronoun taj ‘that’ (Kurilov 2006:198). It would be possible to speak of the formative –daa as a specific adverbial derivational suffix if the word derived with its help did not attach spatial case endings –t (ablative) and –n (prolative): tadaat ‘from there’ and tadaan ‘over there’ (movement path):

(510) El qaqun uučuon taj qawd’aapulgi anme jalme lukulya sayamaaŋi.
<el=qaqun uu-čuon taj qawd’aa-pul-gi NEG=how.much go-PRIV ADL.PROX uncle-PL-PERT
anme jalme lukul-γa sayane-aa-ŋi simply three.ADV earth-LOC sit-LOC-3PL-INTR

‘Having walked for some time, all three of his uncles sat down on the ground.’
(Kurilov 2001:109, jalme)

Many spatial adverbs based on nouns which are conventionally regarded as postpositions among the scholars of Yukaghir are formed even without the involvement of a potentially word class specific suffix like –daa and represent an inflected form of a bare, etymologically nominal, root, e.g. puren ‘up(wards)’ < pure ‘upper part’ + -n ‘PROL’ or alun ‘below’ < al ‘lower part’ + -n ‘PROL’. The spatial adverb pude ‘outside’ is unambiguously a noun from the morphological point of view, since apart from being capable of inflection for spatial cases it can even be pluralized.

(511) Tidaa čuol’e d’ii tadaa lalime-le pon’i-nun-ŋa.
then ancient people there sledge-ACC leave-HAB-3PL.TR
Qad’ir tadaat210 n’awniklie pun-delek al’ya talaw-le
DM then polar.fox kill-ANT fish wild.reindeer-ACC

‘Back then, people used to leave their sledges there. And then, after hunting polar foxes, wild reindeer and catching fish they [would] go from there to the forest.’
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:218)

(512) Uureŋ pudepulyan egurieŋ.
Uureŋ pude-pul-γa-n egur-ie-j gradually outer.part-LOC-PROL tread-LOC-INTR.3SG

‘Gradually [she] began to walk outside.’
(Kurilov 2001:393, pudepul)

210 This is a lexicalized temporal use of the ablative form of the adverb tadaa ‘there’, which is far more frequent than the spatial meaning of this form.
Therefore, the treatment of what is more appropriately called adverbials with spatial meaning under the label ‘spatial adverbs’ is carried out here only following the long standing tradition established by Krejnović (1958) and continued in e.g. Maslova (2003a) or Kurilov (2006), which is wide spread in the description of Indo-European languages too and, possibly, even more generally. The spatial adverbs derived from postpositions are set off the latter and defined as a separate word class on the basis of their syntactic behavior: they modify verbs and cannot serve as heads of nominal phrases any longer.

It is convenient to divide spatial adverbs into absolute ones, with a pronominal character, i.e. equivalents of ‘here’ and ‘there’ and those characterizing locations in relative terms, i.e. ‘below’, ‘behind’ etc., which always imply a point of reference.

The spatial adverbs of the first type are related to deictic devices of the language and display a four-way deictic system involving two semantic oppositions: proximal/distal and visible/invisible. The differences in distance are realized in three degrees and depend on which pronominal root a place adverb is related to as demonstrative pronouns and deictic particles differentiate these relations:

\[(513) \quad \text{ten’i ‘here’ < ten ‘here’ (proximal adlocutorial deictic particle)} \]
\[(513) \quad \text{adaa ‘there’ < aduŋ ‘that’ (proximal adauditorial demonstrative pronoun)} \]
\[(513) \quad \text{tigiraa ‘there’ < tigin ‘there’ (distal deictic particle)} \]
\[(513) \quad \text{tadaa ‘there’ < taŋ ‘that’ (invisible demonstrative pronoun)} \]

Spatial adverbs related to the deictic particles ten and tigin as well as the one stemming from the proximal demonstrative aduŋ designate visible locations, while tadaa ‘there’, derived from the distal demonstrative pronoun, indicates invisible ones.

Additionally, absolute spatial adverbs can refer, in Krejnović’s (1982:153) terms, to limited (well defined)/unlimited (vague) locations. The idea that a location is not perceived as a more or less concrete, narrow area is encoded by the suffix –ne in whose absence a spatial adverb suffix gives a more precise indication of a location, e.g. ten’i ‘(right) here’ vs. ten’ine ‘somewhere here’. The suffix –ne cannot be attached to the inflected forms of spatial adverbs and thus the respective oppositions are lost in them. This is a very rare form, in my searchable corpus it occurs only once, with the adverb tadaa ‘there’.

\[(514) \quad \text{Tadaa-neŋ mirije ηολ-nun-d’eli kerewe-ŋin’ ul’ege wie-če-r.} \]
\[(514) \quad \text{there-ADV reindeer.file be-HAB-1PL.INTR cow(Russ)-DAT grass make-ITV-CIRC} \]
\[(514) \quad \text{(Prior to this sentence an area is roughly located.) ‘And somewhere there we used to roam when we went to gather grass for cows.’} \]
\[(514) \quad \text{Kurilov and Odé 2012:222} \]

The spatial case endings, those of ablative and proclative, designate a location from which an action is carried out and an area over which an action takes place respectively:

\[\text{211 The translation of this sentence is mine, as the referred source did not provide one, and it is made in such a way that it accommodates Krejnović’s (1982:153) interpretation. I have no independent evidence that his interpretation is correct. Alternatively, the suffix –ne(ŋ) can be seen as an emphatic form of a given spatial adverb in proclative, just as there is a comparable emphatic form with a temporal meaning in ablative: tadaate ‘and then’ (Kurilov 2001:457). Similarly, there is the emphatic ablative form ten’iteŋ ‘and from here’ (Kurilov 2001:481). See also (518b) and consider forms like jukuočuoneŋ ‘at least a bit’ < jukuočuqo ‘a little’, tuduruunenŋ ‘inner.part.EMPH’.}\]
Since in our neighborhood, on the river Chukochya, there were no women, one took [them] from here.'    (Kurilov and Odé 2012:25 2)

'Well, I am cutting my cap. It blows too much at this spot.’   (Kurilov and Odé 2012:150)

There exists also a suppletive form migideŋ ‘here’, derived from the archaic word mige, whose approximate meaning is ‘the side of smth. directed or favorable toward oneself’.

Spatial adverbs with inflectional endings can refer to whole events or states:

‘And from this it becomes clear that they did not care about [her].’   (Kurilov 2001:29, adaateŋ)

---

Krejnović (1982:155 ff.) regards this formative as the (al)lative case suffix. I do not adopt this analysis because the suffix –deŋ is a very common adverbial suffix employed to derive also some temporal and relational adverbs. On the other hand, the string <de> does not function anywhere in the TY grammar as a case ending.
‘And (in reply) to that Macheka said …’ (Kurilov 2001:457, tadaan)

The spatial adverbs of the second type, the relative ones, are mainly represented by the spatial cases of nouns serving as postpositions, e.g. by the prolative case: alun ‘below’, puren ‘above’, ‘up(wards)’, kejen ‘in front’.

(519)  *Metqane kejen sewreŋa.*

met-qane   kiejie-n  sew-re-ŋa
1SG-ACC   front.side-PROL   enter-CAUS-3PL.TR
‘One let me go in front.’

A number of words originating in postpositions and functioning as spatial adverbs are formed with the, probably cognate, suffixes –gur, –γar:

(520)  *iemugur* ‘opposite (usually on the opposite side of a river or lake)’ < *ime*213 ‘opposite’

lajγar ‘behind’, ‘on the back side’ < laja ‘behind’
kejγur ‘in front’ < kiejie ‘in front of’
wal’γar ‘opposite side’
alγar ‘lower side’

These forms can take spatial case endings:

(521)  *lajyudəŋ* ‘back’ (direction)
lajγargurut ‘from the back side’
wal’γargudəŋ ‘in the opposite direction’
kejγude(ŋ) ‘forward’
alγudəŋ ‘down’ (direction)

(522)  *Tuŋ n’iŋakaajilpul ölker ölker tuŋ čumurγan alγudəŋ id’ie ölkieŋutej.*

tuŋ    n’iŋ=akaajilpul  ölke-r  ölke-r  tuŋ  čumur-γa-n  alγar-덴
ADL.PROX   RECП=brother-PL-PL   run-SEM   run-SEM   ADL.PROX   hill-LOC-PROL   lower.side-ADV   id’ie   ölke-ie-ŋu-te-j
now   run-INCH-PL-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘The brothers ran and ran, and now they will run down the hill.’

The same suffix is present in the noun *laayar* ‘side’, whose derivates can have adverbal functions:

(523)  *čawlaayar* ‘north’ < *čawul* ‘sea’ + *laayar* ‘side’

saalαayar ‘south’ < saal ‘wood’ + laayar ‘side’
puregelaayar ‘west’214 < pureg ‘upper reaches of a river’ + *laayar* ‘side’

213 Note the metathesis here.
jugullaayar ‘right side’
jawlaayar ‘left side’

(524a) Čawlaayar čamaney qan’qaadayta mitek maarquon’ pon’aatel?
cawlaayar čama-nen qad’uu-qaa-l-daya
north big-ADV be.cold-INCH-GER-3SG.DS
mit-ek maarquon’ pon’aa-te-l
1PL-FOC.ABS only remain-FUT-GER.SF
‘Shall we remain alone further north when it gets really cold?’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

(524b) Quodiir taŋ’e jugullaayar pon’i-l’el-te-m daajinnene?
why INVS.DEM right.side leave-NVIS-FUT-TR.3SG MP
‘I wonder why he left it on the right side (of the tent.)’
(Kurilov 2001:130, jugullaayar)

Some spatial adverbs are inflected forms of nouns with an inherent spatial meaning that
do not function as postpositions:

(525) lajaat, lajadaya215 ‘(from) behind’, ‘following’ < laja ‘rear part’
lajaan, lajagi ‘behind’
wal’γarenjın ‘to the opposite side’ < wal’γare ‘(other) half’ (spatially)
jöket ‘from far away’ < jökete216 ‘great distance’, ‘far’

(526a) Lajadaya ayuod’e čii maarquon’ wolmomaadayt igijedayat mennunyä.
laja-da-γa ayuol-je čii maarquon’
rear.part-PERT stand-PTCP people only
wolmomaaday-γa igije-da-γa-t men’-nun-γa
perform.shamanic.rituals-3SG.DS belt-PERT-LOC-ABL take-HAB-3PL.Tr
‘People standing behind take the rope only when [the shaman] begins to perform.’
(Kurilov 2001:191, laja)

(526b) Jöke-t kelu-j.
far-ABL come-INTR.3SG
‘He arrived from far away.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:110)

Several spatial adverbs with the same meaning are related to the above mentioned archaic
noun mige ‘the side of smth. directed or favorable toward oneself’:

(527) miilger ‘on the side located closer to the speaker’, ‘in an area situated not beyond
a certain spatial limit’ < miilgere ‘the side of smth. located closer to the speaker’,
‘the space between the speaker and some limit’

---

214 A curious reader may inquire what the Yukaghir for ‘east’ is. This concept is expressed by an expression
with an oblique participle, namely, jerpeje loqojojube ‘[the place] where the sun rises’.

215 Note the presence of the pertensive marker –da. The corresponding postposition, jeklie ‘behind’ does
not give rise to a spatial adverb. Its prolative form jeklien serves only as postposition.

216 This word as such can act as a spatial adverb.
miklien, mikledaya ‘on this side’ < miklie ‘in the area situated between the speaker and a certain spatial limit’ (postposition)

(528a) Uluruoyat miilger ilegi nerid’iel’en’.
uluru-o-γa-t miilger ile-gi nerid’i-ie-l’el-i
Uluru-LOC-ABL on.this.side reindeer-PERT be.exhausted-INCH-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘His reindeer began to lie down before reaching Uluro.’
(Kurilov 2001:241, miilger)

(528b) Ten tuŋ Labunmedenu miklien ennund’eli.
ten tuŋ labunne-d-enu miklie-n en’-nun-jeli
DM DEM ptarmigan-0-river on.this.side.of-PROL live-HAB-INTR.1PL
‘We lived on this side of the river Chukochya.’ (Kurilov 2001:241, miklien)

A few spatial adverbs are reciprocal forms. Their derivational bases cannot always be identified:

(529) n’in’aacin’ ‘opposite each other’ < n’i= ‘RESP’ + n’aache ‘face’ + in’ ‘dat’
n’iloloyo ‘toward each other’ (e.g. throwing smth.)
n’iijkin ‘on/from both sides’

There is possibly one true spatial adverb, namely the word peren ‘aside’. It cannot be traced back to a contemporary noun or pronoun, but the final n indicates that it could potentially be a petrified prolicative form of an ancient noun:

(530) Tet nime-γa el=sew-te-jeg tet-ul peren maa-nun-ut.
2SG house-LOC NEG=enter-FUT-INTR.1SG 2SG-ACC aside wait-HAB-FUT[1SG.TR]
‘I will not enter your house; I shall keep waiting for your aside.’
(Kurilov 2001:229, maa-)

3.7.2.2 Temporal adverbs

Temporal adverbs describe actions in terms of the time periods during which they take place. There are a few temporal adverbs in TY whose derivation is not obvious and which thus have to be regarded as synchronically basic.

(531) eguojie ‘tomorrow’
avjaa ‘yesterday’
id’igajgr ‘morning’
el’i ‘first/for the time being’
uddek ‘always’
motinj ‘already’
id’ie, id’ire ‘now’
tapnigi ‘then’
idaraa ‘later (on)’

From these, secondary adverbs can be derived:
eguojiginde, id’igojinde ‘in the morning’
awjaayandeŋ ‘in the evening’
id’i’eney, id’ireney ‘and now’, ‘still’
tapnigine ‘then (period)’
idaara ‘in the future’
idaaraaney ‘in the future too’
el’ine ‘(at) first’

The suffix –ne(ŋ) appears to be an emphatic device with temporal adverbs, supporting the assumption that with spatial adverbs it rather emphasizes a location than presents it less concretely (see footnote 211).

Some temporal adverbs are the forms of the locative case:

(533) tidajŋa ‘last year’ < tidaa ‘long ago’
idaranjaŋa ‘next year’ < idaraa ‘later (on)’

Temporal adverbs can be derived from nouns via suffix –me(ŋ). The suffix without the final nasal is ambivalent since the resulting derivates can function both as nouns and adverbs, e.g. lewejme ‘summer’, ‘in summer’. In such, probably lexically determined cases, the unequivocally adverbial reading is ensured by the successive attachment of suffix –de: lewejmede ‘in summer’/*‘summer’. In yet other cases the distinction between nouns (534a) and adverbs (534b) is achieved by switching between the basic and nasalized form of the suffix –me(ŋ):

(534a) Čiŋičelme ɲolaar mer aawaaŋi.  
čiŋičel-me ɲol-aa-r mer=aawe-aa-ŋi  
darkness-NMLZ be-INCH-CIRC PF=sleep-INCH-3PL.INTR
‘Since it got dark, they went to sleep.’ (Kurilov 2001:550, čiŋičelme)

(534b) Qad’ir en’ie-gi l’ejke-le čiŋičel-men’ edie-naa-nun-um me=quodiir.  
DM mother-PERT candle-ACC darkness-ADV burn-INCH-HAB-TR.3SG IND=why
‘Her mother got into a habit of burning a candle at night for some reason.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:54)

A curious phenomenon can be observed in derivates with the suffix –din’. It can trigger an optional regressive vowel assimilation of the last stem vowel. The adverb without the alternation of the final stem vowel has a different meaning, i.e. čiŋičid’in’ ‘at night’ vs. čiŋičedin’ ‘all night long’.

(535a) čiŋičid’in’ uuj  
čiŋičel-din’ uu-j.  
darkness-ADV go-INTR.3SG
‘…, he traveled at night.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:110)
Spatial adverbs are frequently used temporarily:

(536)  
    tadaaa ‘then’
    tadaatkumun ‘from then on’
    ten’it kejgude ‘from now on’
    ten’i gin’uo ‘till now’, kejen ‘previously/formerly’.
    lajen ‘later’, ‘afterwards’
    lajane ‘of late’

3.7.2.3 Relational adverbs

Relational adverbs cannot modify action verbs and typically accompany qualitative verbs. The derivational suffix –(le)de(ŋ) is complex; it can be parsed into a common adverbial suffix –deŋ and an optional suffix –le of an unclear function. Relational adverbs are derived from nouns, which denote one of the characteristics of the identity of the referent, to which a quality is ascribed, and confine the quality to this particular domain of the referents identity. These adverbs are not frequently encountered in the primary data. Two examples follow.

(537)  
    Monji taŋ čupčen pajpe marqil’die ŋoll’en’, n’aaceledeŋ amuol’en’.
    say-3PL.INTR INVS.DEM Chukchi-GEN woman girl-DIM be-NVIS-INTR.3SG
    n’aace-ledeŋ amuo-l’el-i
    face-ADV be.good-NVIS-INTR.3SG
    ‘They say that that Chukchi woman looked like a little girl with a beautiful face.’
    (Kurilov and Odé 2012:162)

(538)  
    Pöd’elde amuče pulgid’ilek.
    smell-ADV be.good-PTCP plant-COP
    ‘This is a flower with a pleasant smell.’ (Kurilov 2001:387, pöd’el)

3.7.3 Interrogative, negative and indefinite forms of adverbs

All adverbial question words listed below217 share the same initial element /q/, which seems to impart the interrogative meaning to them. Thus the first item in the list can be most naturally derived from the spatial adverb adaa ‘there’. The interrogative pronoun qadaŋjudeŋ, indicating direction, derives not from qada ‘where’ as one may suppose but from the adverbalized form of the independent adauditorial proximal demonstrative aduŋun ‘that’ by prefixing the interrogative marker q- and thus means literally ‘to which

217 The list is not exhaustive.
that’. The same holds for qaduṇdet ‘from where’. A tentative derivational analysis is given for some other interrogative adverbs:

(539)  
qadaa ‘where’  
qaduṇdeŋ ‘where’ (direction)  
qaduṇdet ‘where from’  
qan’in ‘when’  
qawdeŋ ‘how’  
quodeneŋ ‘how’ < q- ‘ITRG’ + ŋol- ‘to be’ + –deŋ ‘ADV’  
quodiir ‘why’ < q- ‘ITRG’ + ŋol- ‘to be’ + -d’ii ‘CAUS’ + -r ‘CIRC’  
qamlal ‘how many’ < q- ‘ITRG’ + amlal ~ alyamlal- ‘to be few’\(^\text{218}\)  
qamlid’eŋ ‘how many times’

About a reason or purpose one can inquire using adverbs which are derived from the pronoun neme ‘what’:

(540)  
nemuel ‘why’ < neme ‘what’ + ŋol- ‘be’  
nemeyol ‘what for’ < neme ‘what’ + ŋol- ‘be’  
nemeŋin ‘what for’ < neme ‘what’ + ŋin ‘DAT’  
nemeŋot ‘what for’ < neme ‘what’ + ŋol- ‘be’ + -t ‘ABL’

A text example follows:

(541)  
Ten met qadaat köll’eld’e ködek ŋodeŋ?  
ten met qadaa-t köl-l’el-je köde ŋol-jeŋ  
DM 1SG where-ABL come-NVIS-PTCP person be-INTR.1SG

‘Where have I come from?’

There are no dedicated negative adverbs in TY. Instead emphatic forms of interrogative adverbs are used in clauses with negative polarity:

(542)  
Qanineŋ el kelut.  
qanin-neŋ el=kelu-t  
when-EMPH NEG=come-FUT[3SG]

‘Where have I come from?’

(543)  
Qaduṇ̱aayaruteŋ ilije el l’irere.  
qaduŋ̱-laayar-ut-neŋ ilije el=l’irere  
which-side-ABL-EMPH wind NEG=blow[3SG]

‘The wind is not blowing from any direction.’

Indefinite adverbs are obtained in the same way as indefinite pronouns are, with the help of the proclitic me=:

\(^{218}\) This derivational analysis is supported by the ability of qamlal to attach the inchoative suffix –mu to express a change of number.
3.7.2.4 Polysemous adverbs

There are a small number of adverbs in TY whose semantics is so variegated that they either cannot be unambiguously assigned to any of the other semantic groups of adverbs or by the virtue of the wide array of meanings deserve to be presented separately:

maranne ‘idly’, ‘carefree’, ‘without doing or saying anything’, ‘causeless’, ‘easily’
n’injide ‘on the same height, depth’, ‘equally’, ‘simultaneously’, ‘together’

Ed’ilwej maranne sukin’ keweč, ciin’in mörd’iečej.
‘Edilwey went in the wilderness; he went to let people know.’

(547) Me qawdeŋ jaade Anne aruugi tideŋun dite el pojuol.

Somehow, aunt Anna does not speak as much as earlier.”

3.8 Postpositions

3.8.1 Introductory observations

Adpositions occur in TY exclusively after their dependent (pro)nouns, therefore they are postpositions. Postpositions in TY are function words that determine the syntactic relations between their dependent NPs and the predicate of a clause, namely turning the former into adjuncts, and which specify the semantic role of the peripheral constituents introduced by them. A general semantic feature of the TY postpositions is that they hardly indicate other relations than spatial – and in some cases temporal – while other meanings (recipient, cause etc.) are conveyed by other linguistic means. Therefore the definition of postpositions can be refined for TY: they indicate the relative position of an object with respect to a spatial reference point important in a given state of affairs. This latter characteristic is, however, not sufficient for a word to be identified as a postposition. Thus, for instance, in (545) the word sajdeŋ ‘across’ does satisfy this criterion but cannot be regarded as a postposition because it contains the suffix –deŋ typical of adverbials and, what is more important, allows a spatial case suffix in the noun it follows. True postpositions block the attachment of the (spatial) case endings by the dependent nouns (Kurilov 2006:226).
Postpositions are very closely linked to the part of speech ‘noun’. In fact, the linguistic devices that are conventionally regarded as postpositions among the scholars of Yukaghir, represent a subclass of nouns with spatial meaning, which enter a possessive relation with the nominals they follow. The possessive nature of this relation is unambiguously established by the use of a possessive pronoun as long as the subject and possessor are coreferential:

\[(546a)\]
\[
\text{Tude pure } me=\text{kudere-m.} \\
\text{3SG.POSS upper.side PF=put-TR.3SG}
\]

‘He put [it] on himself.’ (literally: ‘on his upper side’)

Compare (546a) with (546b), where the subject of the sentence and the possessor are not coreferential and a personal pronoun is employed instead, which indicates that the same rules apply for possessive constructions with the head represented by a noun or a postposition:

\[(546b)\]
\[
\text{Met tudel pure } me=\text{kudere-ŋ.} \\
\text{1SG 3SG upper.side PF=put-1SG.TR}
\]

‘I put [it] on him.’

The possessive relation between two nouns very often remains unmarked in TY, the nouns in this relation are simply juxtaposed. Sometimes, however, the possessor takes the genitive ending \(-n\). The same kind of marking one can find in phrases whose heads are represented by the lexemes functioning otherwise as postpositions:

\[(547)\]
\[
\text{Nime-n tuduruu amun安心 janun'e-j.} \\
\text{house-GEN inner.side be.good.ADV be.neat-INTR.3SG}
\]

‘The house was very neat. (lit. The inside of the house was very neat.)’

The possessive nature of the relation between postpositions and their dependent nouns, as well as the nominal character of the former, are further substantiated by the capacity of postpositions in TY to take the nominal suffix indicating being possessed and function as heads of an NP. Usages as in (548a), where \(\text{wal}^\prime\) ‘near’ behaves as a \textit{bona fide} noun, show that postpositions in TY are not yet grammaticalized and crystallized as a fully independent part of speech with specific morphological and syntactic properties, which would clearly distinguish them from other parts of speech, in this instance from nouns:

\[(548a)\]
\[
\text{Tuj saal wal'dayya layubuoreŋ quduoll'elul.} \\
\text{tuj saal wal'-da-ŋa layubuo-řeŋ quduol-l'el-ul}
\]

‘Beside that tree a snag was lying.’
The sentence in (548a) could be constructed without any marking on the postposition:

(548b) *Tuŋ saal wal’ layuñuoreŋ quduoll’elul.*

Thus postpositional phrases allow all three types of indicating a possessive relation available for nouns: juxtaposition, marking of the possessor by the genitive case ending and marking of the possessum by the pertensive suffix.

After attaching the pertensive suffix postpositions can occur in TY on their own, or, in other words, they do not have to be adposed to, or lean on, anything, which is an essential syntactic property of content words, as opposed to function words, the class of words adpositions are normally assigned to:

(549a) *Tude aawil yan n’idoŋo kuderelekk puredaya sayanaralek ...*

‘He used to fold his sleeping bag several times and having sat down on it …’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:148)

(549b) *Tit ekyaŋa odayane a bučie-γa-t el=pon’aa*

‘Your sister did not leave this old woman alone, she took her walking stick and walked in front of her, imitating her, limping.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:146)

(549c) *Enu-pe-le, jalil pele maranmi pure−da-γa-n qusadi-j.*

‘He simply jumped over rivers and lakes.’

There is also a more subtle commonality in the syntactic behavior of postpositions and nouns. When postpositions represent the head of a matrix possessive construction they trigger the same morphological process in the head of the embedded possessive construction that a true noun would do, namely the suffixation of the genitive case ending –gi:

(550a) *maarqil’ nime-γi-n wal’*

‘near the girl’s house’ (literally: ‘at the side of the house of the girl’)

(550b) *Omčukur ekye-γi-n uo*

‘the child of Omčukur’s elder sister’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:242)

(550c) *nime-γi-n saal*

‘poles of their house’
Words functioning as postpositions in TY can be found in a position incompatible with the label ‘postposition’, i.e. they can be preposed. This is so, for instance, when they are used as a lexical modifier in compounds with nouns or independent pronouns:

\[(\text{560}) \quad \text{purelukunburebe} \; \text{‘upper world’ (a metaphysical concept) \textless\text{ pure} \; \text{‘upper.side’} + \text{-}\text{n} \; \text{‘GEN’} + \text{lukunburebe} \; \text{‘area’ (literally: ‘area of the upper side’)}}\]

\[
\text{purendayi} \; \text{‘the upper/elder one’ \textless\text{ pure} \; \text{‘upper.side’} + \text{-}\text{n} \; \text{‘GEN’} + \text{tayi} \; \text{‘INVS.DEM’}}
\]

They can even occur as independent modifiers within a possessive construction functioning as possessor, or dependent, thus contradicting the notion ‘postposition’ both from the viewpoint of linear order and the distribution of the syntactic functions: postpositions are the heads of their phrases and occupy the rightmost position in them:

\[(\text{561}) \quad \text{Tay saal tuduruu laayandaya me qoynaačii …} \]

\[
\text{INVS.DEM} \quad \text{tay} \quad \text{saal} \quad \text{tuduruu} \quad \text{laayan-da-γ} \quad \text{me=qoyn-čii}
\]

‘That stick has a deepening on its inner side …’ (Kurilov 2001:184, laayandaya)

Since postpositions share so many properties with nouns otherwise, it comes as no surprise that postpositions in TY are also compatible with the nominal spatial case endings. The resulting forms are mainly employed as spatial adverbials:

\[(\text{562}) \quad \text{puren} \; \text{‘up(wards)’ \textless\text{ pure} \; \text{‘above’} + \text{-}\text{n} \; \text{‘PROL’}}\]

\[
\text{alun} \; \text{‘below’ \textless\text{ al} \; \text{‘under’} + \text{-}\text{n} \; \text{‘PROL’}}
\]

\[
\text{lajaat} \; \text{‘behind’ \textless\text{ lajaa} \; \text{‘behind’} + \text{-t} \; \text{‘ABL’}}.
\]

The applicability, albeit only partial, of the nominal inflectional paradigm to postpositions is yet another reason to consider words like pure, al or lajaa nouns with ‘upper side’,219, ‘lower side’ and ‘back side’ as their respective meanings. It is necessary to note that postpositions, despite the above-said, do differ from regular nouns in at least two aspects. Since they inherently have spatial semantics, they normally do not attach the locative case ending –γa, which needs to be suffixed to nouns in order to form spatial adverbials, e.g. nime ‘house’ ~ nimeyaa ‘at home/in the house’ ~ nimeyat ‘from home/from the house’. A postposition can only take the locative suffix when prior to that it has taken the nominal possession marker –da, having thus strengthened its nominal character. Apart from that, the only syntactic relation nouns functioning as postpositions can go into are those with other nouns. Unlike nouns, postpositions cannot be modified by adjectives or participles. For that they first have to be nominalized:

\[(\text{563}) \quad \text{mod’il’en-d’e pure-wre} \]

\[
\text{be.rough-PTCP} \quad \text{upper.side-NMLZ}
\]

‘a rough surface’

\[\text{219} \quad \text{There are also derived nouns with this meaning where postpositions act as derivational bases: purebe/purewre ‘upper side’, albe/albewre ‘lower side’}.\]
Therefore postpositions cannot be called true nouns and regarding them as a separate
word class, namely postpositions, is justified to some extent.
It is convenient to divide the postpositions found in TY into basic and derived.

3.8.2 Basic postpositions

pure ‘on’, ‘above’

The occurrence of the variant with the voiced plosive is bound to the environments
typical for voicing otherwise (see 2.3.4). However, as seen in (564b), the voicing of /p/ is
not obligatory in these contexts and seems thus to be a matter of idiolect. Oscillations can
be observed even in one and the same speaker.

(564a) *Tuŋ layubuor bure sayanaal’en*.  
\[
\text{tuŋ} \quad \text{layubuor} \quad \text{pure} \quad \text{sayane-aa-l’el-i} \\
\text{ADL.PROX} \quad \text{snag} \quad \text{upper.side} \quad \text{sit-INC-HNVIS-INTR.3SG} \\
\]
‘[He] sat down on that snag.’

(564b) *Qularqaa-pul tideŋ körel bure kerie-nu-ŋu-daya ...*
\[
\text{gull-PL} \quad \text{ANPH} \quad \text{devil} \quad \text{upper.side} \quad \text{fall-DUR-PL-3.DS} \\
\]
‘When gulls were attacking that devil …’

(564c) *Tadaat taŋ monqa bure me quudečeli.*  
\[
\text{tadaat} \quad \text{taŋ} \quad \text{monqa bure} \quad \text{me=quudej-jeli} \\
\text{then} \quad \text{INVS.DEM} \quad \text{hill} \quad \text{upper.side} \quad \text{PF=clime-INTR.1PL} \\
\]
‘Then we went up that hill.’

This postposition can have a more abstract meaning:

(564d) *Tudejlede sukungi čandęŋ loqnaununi. Taŋun puren wayčid’aanuni.*  
\[
\text{tudej-ejlede} \quad \text{sukun-gi} \quad \text{čandęŋ} \quad \text{loqne-nun-i}. \\
\text{3SG-EMPH} \quad \text{thing-PERT} \quad \text{upwards} \quad \text{pile-HAB-INTR.3SG} \\
\text{taŋun} \quad \text{pure-n} \quad \text{wayči-d'aa-nun-i}. \\
\text{INVS.DEM} \quad \text{upper.side-PROL} \quad \text{look.for-DTRV-HAB-INTR.3SG} \\
\]
‘She had belongings in excess. Still she was asking for more.’
(Kurilov 2001:66, *wayčid’aa-*)

al ‘under’

This postposition is rather rarely found in primary data, especially in its basic, uninflected
form.

(565a) *Tuŋ uo lalime al-un ičuo-de-j.*  
\[
\text{tuŋ} \quad \text{uo} \quad \text{lalime} \quad \text{al-un} \quad \text{ičuo-de-j}. \\
\text{ADL.PROX} \quad \text{child} \quad \text{sledge} \quad \text{lower.side-PROL} \quad \text{look-DTR-INTR.3SG} \\
\]
‘The child was looking around under the sledge.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:132)

(565b) *Taŋun kiejie čoŋjo-pe-gi lalime-n n’oŋoŋayil’ al ayite-ŋ.*  
\[
\text{INVS.DEM} \quad \text{front.side} \quad \text{knife-PL-PERT} \quad \text{sledge-GEN} \quad \text{floor.covering} \quad \text{lower.side} \quad \text{hide-1SG.TR} \\
\]
‘Before that I hid his knives under the floor covering of the sledge.’
(Kurilov 2001:33, al)

wal’ ‘near’

(566a) Maarqan nime wal’ taj köreleŋ quduol-l’el-ul.
maarqa-n nime wal’ taj köreleŋ quduol-l’el-ul.
one-GEN house near INVS.DEFL devil lie-NVIS-GER.SF
‘Near one house that devil was lying.’

(566b) Met-ul waaj tIGIN tit en’ie wal’ kudere-ŋi-te-γaneŋ.
1SG-ACC also DEIC 2PL mother near put-PL-FUT-IMP
‘Bury me also there, beside your mother.’

ime ‘opposite’

This postposition does not occur in the available textual primary data, but there is a single example in Kurilov (2001:95, ime):

(567) Al’γa met ime pewgẹč.
al’γa met ime pewgẹč-
fish 1SG opposite splash-INTR.3SG
‘A fish splashed opposite me.’

3.8.3 Derived postpositions

kiejie220 ‘in front of’, ‘before’

This postposition originates from an ancient root kej- (Kurilov 2006:229), which is found in several adverbials with related meaning, e.g. kejgur ‘in front’, kejen ‘earlier’.

(568a) Emd’e l’ie, waaj tIGIN mit kiejie monga-leŋ.
younger.sibling MP again DEIC 1PL front.side hill-COP
‘Hey, little brother, look, there’s again a hill in front of us.’

This postposition can have temporal meaning:

(568b) Taŋun kiejie el’in me miraal’en’.
taŋun kiejie el’in me=mira-l’el-i
INVS.DEFL front.side first PF=walk-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘Before that he went [somewhere] first.’

(568c) Tan ewlikiel kiejie amaapegi moll’en’.
tan ewlikiel kiejie amaapegi moll’en’.
and disappear-GER front.side father-PL-PERT say-NVIS-INTR.3SG
‘And before dying their father said.’

220 Alternative spellings kieje and even keje exist too.
This postposition is probably related to the noun jegil ‘back of the head’ and the adverbial jekleda ‘through’ (Kurilov 2006:229).

(569a) Tan juku jalya jeklie-da-γa ičuo-dayane
DM small lake back.side-PERT-LOC look-3.SG.DS
nime-pe-leŋ ayuol-l’el-ŋu-l.
house-PL-FOC stand-NVIS-PL-GER.SF
‘He saw that behind that small lake houses were standing.’

This postposition can also have a temporal meaning:

(569b) In čajnik jaqtaanaadaga anme ohuoch jeklie me neme qamlid’edŋ pömöreel’en’.
in čajnik jaqte-nu-aa-daga anme ohuoch jeklie
as tea.pot(Russ) sing-DUR-INCH-3SG.DS suddenly fire.place(Yak) behind
me=neme qamlid’e-deŋ pömöre-l’el-i
IND=what how.many.times-ADV roll-NVIS-INTR-3SG
‘Just as the tea-pot began to “sing”, before boiling, he heard something roll several times behind the stove.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:70)

lajaa ‘behind’, ‘after’

This postposition derives from the tautosemous noun laja ‘back side’.

(570a) Titte lajaa-t marqil’ čii-pe-gi
3SG.Poss back.side-ABL girl parents-PL-PERT
tadaate sukun-gi neme-gi uu-ŋu-te-j.
then.EMPH thing-PERT what-PERT go-PL-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘They are followed by the girls parents, the dowry and other things.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:42)

Just as with jeklie temporal meaning is possible with lajaa as well:

(570b) Taŋun lajaa-t qad’ir tun pajpeŋ
INVS.DEM after-ABL DM ADL.PROX woman
me=qabun-de uo-n’e-l’el-ŋi.
IND=how.many-IND child-VBLZ-NVIS-3PL.INTR
‘After that this woman [and he] got some children.’

tuduruu ‘inside’

Kurilov (2006:230) links this postposition, which has an idiolectal variant tuduluu, to the word tudul ‘contents of a bag’ and eventually to the noun tuul ‘contents’ and the verb tuun’e- ‘to contain’, ‘to be loaded’.
pudilie ‘near’

This postposition is clearly derived from the adverb pude ‘outside’ via the noun pudele ‘outer space (of a domicile)’ (Kurilov 2006:229) but has the additional connotation of vicinity to the point of reference. It is extremely rare.

laayar ‘beside’, ‘by’

According to Kurilov (2006:231), this postposition can be traced back to the ancient root lay recognizable in the postposition lajuden ‘towards’ (see below). The suffix –yar or its cognates occur in spatial adverbials such as alyar ‘downstream’, pureger ‘upstream’ or kejgur ‘in front’. Probably, the sequences <γa>, <ge> and <gu> are the ones that contribute spatial meaning, and whose exponent in nominals is the locative case ending –γa.
miklie ‘on this side of’, ‘till’

This postposition is derived from the ancient noun *mige*, approximately ‘the side of smth. directed or favorable toward oneself’. It indicates the stretch of space between the deictic center and the point of reference, which constitutes the limit of that space.

(575a) *Sien Küöl miklie ... Mungurdaach ñod’e jalyitgelegen l’el.*  
*Sien Küöl miklie Mungurdaach ñol-je jalyil-telege-en l’e-l*  
‘On this side of Sien Kyul there is a big lake named Mungurdaakh.’  
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:222)

A temporal meaning is also possible with *miklie*:

(575b) *Talaw juö-re taŋ köde miklie el=ponore-ŋu-t.*  
wild.reindeer see-COND INV.S.DEM man before NEG=scare.away-PL-FUT[3]  
‘If they discover a wild reindeer, they won’t scare it before that man [does].’  
(Kurilov 2001:241, miklie)

*n’aačin’ ‘against’, ‘in front of’

This postposition is the dative of the noun *n’aače* ‘face’ (Kurilov 2006:232).

(576a) *Qad’ir l’ie iliże n’aačin’ uu-nu-l-gane ...*  
DM MP wind against go-DUR-GER-1/2SG.DS  
‘And when I walked against the wind …’

(576b) *Me miraanutej mennid’ieje köde peldudien’ej apanala a n’aačin’. Taat miranureŋ ann’etej.*  
me=mira-nu-te-j mennid’ie-je köde peldudie-n’e-j apanala a n’aačin’.  
taat mira-nu-reŋ ann’e-te-j  
so walk-DUR-SIM speak-FUT-INTR  
‘The matchmaker walks in front of the parents. Walking like this, he speaks.’  
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:40)

čičirkin’ ‘along’

This postposition is the dative of the noun *čičirke* ‘length’, which itself serves as a preposition (see below). It is related to the verb *čične* ‘to be long’.

(577) *U-u mondeŋ juolek jawul čičirkin’ puret alun juöse-m.*  
U-u mon-req juo-lek jawul čičirkin’ puret al-un juö-se-m  
oh-oh say-SIM head-INS track along upper.side-ABL lower.side-PROL see-CAUS.TR.3SG  
‘Saying oh, oh he points with the head, moving it up and down, at the tracks [of the runners].’  
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:126)
čičirke ‘during’

This postposition is basically the temporal counterpart of čičirkin’ ‘along’.

(578) [J]aa-n čajle čičirke-γa jarqa mer=uu-te-j.
three-GEN day during-LOC ice PF=go-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘… drifting of the ice will last three days.’ (Kurilov 2001:555, čičirke)

l'uolγa ‘instead of’

This postposition derives most probably from the noun l'uolul ‘place’ and the locative case ending –γa:

(579) Legul ewl'e čaaj l'uolγa laame-n purie-n pugil law-nun-uj.
food NEG.be tea(Russ) instead dog-GEN berry-GEN leaf drink-HAB-IPL.TR
‘There was no food; instead of tea we used cowberry leaves.’
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:84)

A few items should for certain reasons be regarded as pseudo-postpositions, although their capacity to introduce a peripheral constituent based on a noun would make them qualify as postpositions in TY.

One of them, the word pomniir ‘around’ is, unlike the other postpositions, of clearly verbal origin, being related to the verb pomne- ‘to be round’. It obviously represents the circumstantial converb of the obsolete causative221 in –(r)ii, the semi-productive causative suffix found in e.g. ayal'wii- ‘to make laugh’ < ayal'we- ‘to laugh’, amuorii- ‘to grant well-being’ < amuo- ‘to be well’. The proposed interpretation of –ii in pomniir ‘around’ as a causative suffix despite the existence of another, fully functional causative pomol'es- ‘to round off’ is licensed by the phenomenon of parallel causative forms in TY, for instance, ayal'wii-ayal'wes- ‘to make laugh’. More importantly, pomniir ‘around’ governs accusative – another indication of its verbal, causative character – while genuine postpositions were defined for TY as disallowing inflection in nouns they follow:

(580) Qad'ir tuŋ köde saale pomniir miraanaal'en'.
qad’ir tuŋ köde saal-le pomniir mira-nu-aa-l’el-i
DM ADL.PROX man tree-ACC around walk-DUR-INC-INV-inst.3SG
‘And this man began circumambulating the tree.’

The failure to block the case inflection in the dependent noun holds for two other, related words, namely kitn’uo and kitn’er both meaning ‘up to’ ‘as far as’, ‘till’. Kurilov (2003;2003) links these words to the verb kititi- ‘to exhaust itself’. There is also an apparently related noun kiciil ‘end’. This allows interpreting the words kitn’uo and kitn’er as a truncated gerund and a circumstantial converb respectively. They normally govern the locative:

221 The regular causative is pomol’es- ‘to make round’, ‘to rough-hew’, derived with the help of the productive causative suffix –s.
(581a) mol’γadamun-γa gitn’uo
   knee-LOC up.to
   ‘up to the knees’

(581b) sisidamun-γa gitn’er
   breast.bone-LOC up.to
   ‘up to the breasts’

(581c) Togoγja gitn’uo uu-jeli.
   Tohoj up.to go-INTR.1PL
   ‘We went as far as Tohoj.’

(581d) Buran-γa gitn’uo uu-se-ŋi-k.
   snow-LOC up.to go-CAS-PL-IMP
   ‘Bring [him] to the snow-scooter.’

(581e) Tadaat taŋ kunil’an ćaas-γa gitn’uo
   then DM ten.GEN hour-LOC till
   juोdayane sayane-jli ćaaj law-nu-rej.
   it.seems sit-INTR.1PL tea(Russ) drink-DUR-SIM
   ‘Then we sat probably till 10 o’clock drinking tea.’

However, there are grammatical contexts in which the dependent nominal governed by kitn’uo/kitn’er does not take the locative case suffix. This happens when the governed noun takes up an intermediate position between nouns and adverbs as the designations for seasons do (see 3.3.2.1, i) and thus does not need or cannot take an oblique case ending in order to act as an adverbial:

(582) Tindaane n’id’ayajl’eld’e moŋok oŋjienull’elŋutemle qand’eme gitn’uo.
   tindaane n’id’ayaj-l’el-je moŋo-k oŋje-nun-l’el-yu-te-mle
   in.the.past end-NVIS-PTCP cap-FOC.ABS wear-HAB-NVIS-PL-FUT-TR.3.OF
   qand’eme kitn’uo
   winter till
   ‘In former times one, probably, used to wear old caps till winter.’

Kitn’er forms compounds with demonstratives and introduces subordinate clauses. The latter property makes it functionally similar to conjunctions:

(583) quodiir tidegitn’er tit juödii n’amuće-re-j-daya kitn’er
   why ANPH.till 2PL eye be.red-INC-SEM-3SG.DS till
   oorin’e-mut
cry-2SG.ITRG
   ‘Why have you cried so much that your eyes have reddened?’

The locative suffix is also absent from gerunds followed by kitn’er ‘till’.

(584) Tuy toŋoraanudayâ n’iŋakaajil’pul qad’ir uttejil gitn’er öl’kiel’elŋi.
   tuy toŋore-nu-l-daya n’iŋ=akaa-jil’-pul
   DM chase-DUR-GER-3.DS RECP=brother-PL-PL
   qad’ir uttej-l kitn’er öl’ke-l’el-ŋi.
   DM be.tired-GER till run-NVIS-3PL-INTR
‘Well, as he was chasing them, the brothers ran till they were tired.’

*Kitn’er* can also follow the adverb *taat* as in *taat kitn’er* ‘so much/many’, ‘to such an extent’, which can hardly be reconciled with the status of a postposition:

**(585a)** *Sugud’eegin tibegel aŋadaŋa keluj taat kitn’er injienaam.*

\[
\text{sugud’e-gi-n} \quad \text{tibege-l} \quad \text{aŋa-da-ŋa} \quad \text{kelu-j} \\
\text{heart-PERT-GEN} \quad \text{beat-GER} \quad \text{mouth-PERT-LOC} \quad \text{come-INTR.3SG} \\
\text{taat} \quad \text{kitn’er} \quad \text{injie-nu-aa-m.} \\
\text{so} \quad \text{till} \quad \text{fear-DUR-INCH-TR.3SG}
\]

‘Her heart was in her mouth, so much she got frightened.’

**(585b)** *Taat gim’er qad’ir mojaŋaŋa ljitel lajnujuol lukulpulgi.*

\[
\text{taat} \quad \text{gim’er} \quad \text{qad’ir} \quad \text{moja-ŋaŋa} \quad \text{lji-tel} \quad \text{lajnu-ŋol} \quad \text{lukul-pul-gi} \\
\text{so} \quad \text{till} \quad \text{DM} \quad \text{get.soft-NVIS-INTR.3SG} \quad \text{3PL.POSS} \quad \text{fight-BE[GER]} \quad \text{ground-PL-PERT}
\]

‘To that extent did the ground where they fought become wet.’

### 3.9 Conjunctions

Conjunctions in TY link clauses and coordinate NPs. While the notion of NP coordination can be taken as self-explanatory, linking of clauses has to be explained further. What is intended here under the expression ‘linking of clauses’ is signaling that two clauses are connected to one another by contextual considerations and form a logical unit. What naturally follows from this definition is that the function of a conjunction is not restricted to linking clauses within one sentence but also across sentence boundaries. Consider the following sentences: *You are tired? Then take rest.* The second of these two sentences represents a logical suggestion in the context of one’s observing or assuming that one’s addressee is tired. Therefore the word ‘then’, which introduces the second sentence, unambiguously links the two as the conjunction ‘therefore’ or ‘so’ would, and thus has to be considered a conjunction.

Such an interpretation of conjunctions brings discourse markers and modal particles into their vicinity as these can also establish some kind of link between two sentences, even not occurring sentence initially. Consider the following sentences in Dutch:

**(586)** *Ik zal Jan zeker ook uitnodigen. Hij is toch een van mijn beste vrienden.*

\[
\text{Ik} \quad \text{zal} \quad \text{Jan} \quad \text{zeker} \quad \text{ook} \quad \text{uitnodigen.} \quad \text{Hij} \quad \text{is} \quad \text{toch} \\
\text{I} \quad \text{will} \quad \text{Jan} \quad \text{definitely} \quad \text{also} \quad \text{invite} \quad \text{he} \quad \text{is} \quad \text{MP} \\
\text{een} \quad \text{van} \quad \text{mijn} \quad \text{beste} \quad \text{vrienden.} \quad \text{one} \quad \text{of} \quad \text{my} \quad \text{best} \quad \text{friends}
\]

‘I will invite Jan too. He is, after all, one of my best friends.’

Here the modal particle *toch* enhances the explanatory content of the second sentence, in which the reason is given why Jan will also be among the invited persons, and singles this particular reason out from a number of other potential reasons, approximating in this

---

222 Kurilov (e.g. 2001, 2006) was the first scholar who has discussed conjunctions as a distinct part of speech in TY.
respect the conjunction ‘because’. In order not to lump conjunctions with particles, a stipulation has to be made to the effect that conjunctions are clause linkers without pragmatic content, which is a necessary property of particles as defined in this grammar.

TY is generally characterized by a relatively poor spectrum of conjunctions. It possesses coordinating as well as subordinating conjunctions, but subordination of clauses is in many cases conjunctionless. Conjunctions can be basic and derived. Derived ones are usually based on adverbs and pronouns, or, as typologically common, originate by conversion from postpositions.

3.9.1 Coordinating conjunctions

Coordinating conjunctions connect syntactically equal linguistic units. Using the semantic classification of coordinating conjunctions adopted in Russian linguistics (e.g. Rozental’ et al. 2002:274) one can distinguish three groups of coordinating conjunctions: copulative, adversative and disjunctive (Kurilov 2006:212). TY has both basic and derived copulative conjunctions.

3.9.1.1 Copulative conjunctions

Copulative conjunctions conjoin NPs or clauses, enumerating them. There is only one basic copulative conjunction in TY, namely ejk223 ‘and (also)’. It is employed in negative sentences:

(587)  Tan met mod’en anmolyin’ el mentejen ejk el lewtejen.  
\[\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{tan} & \text{met} & \text{mon-jen} & \text{anmolyin’} & \text{el} & \text{men’-te-jen}  \\
\text{and} & \text{1SG} & \text{say-INTR.1SG} & \text{at.all} & \text{NEG=take-FUT-INTR.1SG}  \\
\text{ejk} & \text{el=} & \text{lew-te-jen}  \\
\text{and} & \text{NEG=eat-FUT-INTR.1SG}  \\
\end{array}\]

‘And I said, “I will take no [meat] whatsoever, neither will I eat [it].” ’

(Kurilov 2001:589, ejk)

The use of a single ejk is rather rare. More frequent is its employment as a double conjunction. Its literal translation then is actually ‘as well as’ but since it is possible only in negative contexts it is usually translated as ‘neither… nor’ or accordingly. When it conjoins NPs, the latter get the obligatory emphatic suffix –\textit{yoll’elk}:

(588a)  Tudel ejk jaqte-l-γane ejk ann’e-l-γane  
\[\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{Tudel} & \text{ejk} & \text{sing-GER-1/2.SG.DS} & \text{and} & \text{speak-GER-1/2.SG.DS}  \\
\text{qanine} & \text{el=} & \text{aaterej-nun.}  \\
\text{ever} & \text{NEG=stop-HAB[3SG]}  \\
\end{array}\]

‘Whether I sing or speak, he never stops me.’

---

223 This is Kurilov’s (2006:209) view, which may have to be revised to the extent that this conjunction is not basic. In 3.5.1 the homophonous, and obviously related, pronominal emphatic suffix –ejk with the lexical meaning ‘also’ was presented. It was observed that combinatorial analysis involving other emphatic suffixes allows parsing of –ejk into –ej and –k. Therefore the conjunction ejk ‘and’ cannot be regarded as basic either.
Yet more frequent is the use of (the double) *ejk* as a disjunctive conjunction (see 3.9.1.3). The other two copulative conjunctions are derived.

*tadaat* ‘and’ is the ablative case form of the spatial adverb *tadaa* ‘there’. The conjunction is the product of conversion of the inflected form with the temporal meaning ‘then’. Just as *ejk* (...) *ejk* ‘and’ it can conjoin both clauses and NPs but, unlike that conjunction, is normally found in affirmative contexts. It tends to be omitted when clauses are coordinated.

(589a) Tittel qajl’pele tadaat “gaz” ŋođ’erukune wanyčinunya.

Tittel qajl’-pe-le tadaat gaz ŋol-je-sukun-le wanyči-nun-ŋa
3PL stone-PL-ACC and gas(Russ) be-PTCP-thing-ACC look.for-HAB-3PL.TR
‘They search for stones and the so-called “gas”.’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

(589b) Sal’il tadaat qawd’idie Qaalid’e sayaneŋi.

Sal’il tadaat qawd’idie Qaalid’e saŋane-ŋi.
mouse and uncle Wolf sit-3PL.INTR
‘There lived a mouse and Uncle Wolf.’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

(590) Tuy ileŋ me čamuon’ (tadaat) me suren’ej.

tuy ileŋ me=čama-ŋol-i (tadaat) me=suren’e-j
ADL.PROX reindeer PF=big-be-INTR.3SG (then) PF=be.fat-INTR.3SG
‘This reindeer is big and fat.’

*waaj ... waaj* ‘as well as’ is a rare double conjunction, derived by conversion from the adverb *waaj* ‘also’, ‘again’. Normally, it is found as a coordinator of NPs. An informant agreed, however, that it could be employed in a sentence like that in (590) instead of *tadaat* ‘and’.

(591) Jeguor waaj met waaj kiileŋ taat janduu’eld’eli.

Jeguor waaj met waaj kiileŋ taat janduul’el-jeli.
Yegor also 1SG also both so fall.asleep-NVIS-INTR.1PL
‘Both Yegor and I fell asleep like that, as it turned out.’ (Kurilov 2001:56, *waaj*)

---

224 Qaalid’e < qaaluu-je ‘be.frightful-PTCP’
3.9.1.2 Adversative conjunctions

Adversative conjunctions link NPs or clauses, confronting them, presenting them as mutually opposing alternatives. The most common conjunction in TY is *tan* ‘and’,225 ‘but’:

(592a) *Erime keriete jqrul čamaney qan’qaatej monur qomdeme qaldaajnuŋ monl’en’ amaagi tan čuoyajme čii puŋuselŋin’ kulnuŋ mondeŋ erime jarqa al’aayan pulgī ilepe amdur jedeŋjuyan!*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>TY Transformation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Erime</em></td>
<td>keri-te-j</td>
<td>snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>keriete</em></td>
<td>jqrul</td>
<td>full-FUT-INTR.3SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>čamaney</em></td>
<td>čama-neŋ</td>
<td>big-ADV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qan’qaatej</em></td>
<td>qad’uu-qaa-te-j</td>
<td>be.cold-INCH-FUT-INTR.3SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>monur</em></td>
<td>mon-ur</td>
<td>say-CIRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qomdeme</em></td>
<td>qaldej-nu-ŋ</td>
<td>autumn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qaldej-nu-ŋ</em></td>
<td>mon-l’el-i</td>
<td>run.away-DUR.3PL.INTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>amaa-gi</em></td>
<td>say-NVIS-INTR.3SG</td>
<td>father-PERT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tan</em></td>
<td>čii puŋuol-se-l-ŋin’</td>
<td>‘and’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>čuoyajme</em></td>
<td>kelu-ŋi</td>
<td>mon-ŋey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jarqa</em></td>
<td>al’aay-an</td>
<td>come-3PL.INTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pulgī tle-pe</em></td>
<td>amdur jedeŋ-ŋyan</td>
<td>say-NVIS-INTR.3SG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘“Since it will snow and get cold, they run away in autumn,” the father said, “and in spring they come to make people glad by saying,” “May the snow and ice melt, may plants appear soon!”’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

(592b) *Sal’il nime ewje wadun nimated ŋoll’en’. Tan qawd’idie Qaalid’e nime wiel qodejnur el nimečuon ewrienuŋ.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>TY Transformation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Sal’il</em></td>
<td>nime</td>
<td>mouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nimedie</em></td>
<td>wadun</td>
<td>house-GEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ŋoll’en’</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>real Yukaghir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tan</em></td>
<td>qawd’idie</td>
<td>be.lazy.to.do.smth-DUR-CIRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Qaalid’e</em></td>
<td>nime</td>
<td>el=aruu-d’aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wie-l</em></td>
<td>qodejnur</td>
<td>be.frightened-NMLZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>el=nime-čuon</em></td>
<td>ewre-nu-j</td>
<td>go-DUR-INTR.3SG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *neg=house-PRIV* |                                        | ‘The Mouse’s house was a real Yukaghir little house. But Uncle Wolf had no home because he was lazy to build one.’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

(592c) *Qaalid’e jonogi qaalaqaar tan Sal’ildie newruur el aruud’aa yolaal’elby.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>TY Transformation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Qaalid’e</em></td>
<td>jon-o-gi</td>
<td>anger-pert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>qaalaqaa-r</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>increase-CIRC and mouse-DIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tan</em></td>
<td>Sal’il-die</td>
<td>be.frightened-CIRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>newruu-r</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>neg=speech-NMLZ be-INCH-NVIS-3PL.INTR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The Wolf and the Mouse lost the ability to speak, because of the anger and out of fear respectively.’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

*tadaat* ‘and’ can function as an adversative conjunction:

(593) *Amaa, tigin jaŋdepe quodziir čuoyajme keluuunuŋ tadaat qomdeme laŋyudeŋ pengejnunŋi?*

\[225\] The contrastive meaning of ‘and’ is intended here, not the copulative one.
‘Father, why ever do geese come in spring and return in autumn?’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

Sentence initially the conjunctions taayanek/taayaney ‘still’, ‘yet’ can be found. They are not frequent, though. It may be speculated that taayaney is an emphatic ‘jussive’ form of the adverb taat ‘so’.

(594a) Taayanek me juō-l’el-mek.
yet PF=see-NVIS-TR.2SG
‘Yet you apparently saw it.’ (Kurilov 2001:456, taayanek)

(594b) Ilije el pomogej dayi taayaney tite kōjrid’en’i.
ilije el=pomoge-j=dayi taayaney tite kōjrid’e-n’-i.
wind NEG=turn.around-INTR.3SG=ASMP still so smoke-VBLZ-INTR.3SG
‘The wind has not changed its direction, still it is so smoky [inside].’ (Kurilov 2001:456, taayaney)

3.9.1.3 Disjunctive conjunctions

Disjunctive conjunctions present the coordinated NPs or clauses as mutually excluding alternatives. The most frequent disjunctive conjunction is (ejk…) ejk ‘(either…) or’, which can occur singly or in a doubled form:

(595a) Uu-nu-l-aqaneŋ tit amaa wegie-je ile-pe-n igije sisayaj-r
or how be-CIRC PF=stop-HAB-3PL_INTR
‘When we migrate, if a rope attached to the harness of the teams steered by your father tears or something happens they stop.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:64)

(595b) Čii-d-aruu-ŋa me=kinek ejk Mikalaj ejk Varvara me=sew-te-j.
people-0-speech-LOC IND=who or Mikolay or Varvara PF=enter-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘Somebody, either Mikolay or Varvara, will become the subject of people’s talks.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:78)

(595c) Kačikan imdal’d’an sukunmol’yaln’ejk me čamuočiij.
Kačikan imdal’d’al-n sukunmol’yal-n’e-j ejk me=čama-ŋol-čii-j
Kačikan five-GEN year-VBLZ-INTR.3SG or PF=big-be-DIM-INTR.3SG
‘Kačikan was five or a little older.’ (Kurilov and Odé 12:108)

The double conjunction ten… ten, deriving from the deictic particle ten ‘here’, ‘voilà’, corresponds to the English double conjunction ‘now… now’.

(596) Taŋ taŋullek kuril’iinull’elum ten juōdayane lukunburube me qanqaaj ten juoda
gane lukunburebe me pugikiej.
tanu tanullek kuril’i-nun-’el-um ten juödayane lukunburube
DM thereby know-HAB-NVIS-TR.3SG now apparently land
me=qad’uu-qaa-j ten juödayane lukunburebe me=puge-kie-j
PF=be.cold-INCH-INTR.3SG now apparently land PF=be.hot-INCH-INTR.3SG

‘(Having departed on that snag, he flew for a long time and while flying he touched
his head with his hand. Sometimes the hair was frozen and sometimes it was thawed
out.) Thus he knew that it had apparently got now cold now warm.’

Two other basic conjunctions, which are rare, have the same function: uuri and ewri.

(597)  
Kin sukun-γa-n uuri jaan sukun-γa-n met amaa-γa
two,GEN year-LOC-PROL or three,GEN year-LOC-PROL 1SG father-LOC
čayad’e-te-j köde-le mon-nun-γi qand’aacé.
work-FUT-INTR.3SG man-ACC say-HAB-3PL.INTR khandyaache

‘A man that will work [off his dowry] at my father’s for two or three years is
called “khandyaache”.’

(Kurilov 2001:492, uuri)

(598)  
Tet-ejlek ewri wie-k.
2SG=EMPH or do-IMP.SG
‘Or do [it] yourself.’ (Kurilov 2001:580, ewri)

The deictic particle an functions, when doubled, as the complex conjunction ‘not … but’:

(599)  
An el n’ilajaat talaw uudaya an … pomorčireŋ uunull’en’.
an el=n’ilajaat talaw uu-l-daya
DEIC NEG=one.after.another wild.reindeer go-GER-3SG.DS
an pomoreči-reŋ uu-nun-’el-i
DEIC roll.ITER-SIM go-HAB-NVIS-INTR.3SG

‘That’s because the wild reindeer did not go in a single file but rolled in a tangle.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:172)

3.9.2 Subordinating conjunctions

Subordinating conjunctions serve the purpose of linking syntactically unequal clauses.
Just as with the coordinating conjunctions, there are basic subordinating conjunctions and
derived ones. According to the semantic relation they express, subordinating conjunctions
can be divided into the following groups: temporal, conditional, causal, consecutive,
comparative. There are no complementizers or relativizers in TY; relative clauses are
mostly realized as participial or gerundial constructions, complement clauses simply
adjoin complement taking predicates.

3.9.2.1 Temporal conjunctions

This is the largest and the most heterogeneous group of subordinate conjunctions.
kiejie ‘before’ is a convert of the preposition ‘in front of’, ‘before’. Its status as a conjunction may be questioned because at first glance it behaves as a postposition being placed after the predicate, which occurs in the form of the gerund:

(600a)  El’in ködeñin’ uul kiejie ile-n sawa puolekle joñotej ködi moni, ‘Kinek quode gurčil?’

‘Before [she] came out to the people, she opened the bed-curtains made of reindeer skin and asked, poor creature, ‘Has anything happened to anyone?’’ (Successively the lady was killed by her relatives.)

(600b)  Kuod’eduon’ej čii n’ieder’l kiejie titte uon’ monytem, ‘Tien’ čiiya sewk, tadaat ileñin’ uuk!’

Despite the fact that the conjunction kiejie ‘before’ resembles here the homonym postposition in that it occupies the position right behind the nominalization it governs, it is more reasonable to treat kiejie ‘before’ in (600a) and (600b) as a conjunction and regard the gerund it follows as a dependent clause. The reason for this is that the gerunds are not prototypical nouns; one deals here with so called syntactic derivation only, which is characterized by the retention of certain features of the part of speech to which the derivational base belongs. Specifically, the gerunds followed by kiejie ‘before’ have to be considered predicates – and thus kiejie ‘before’ has to be treated as a conjunction – because gerunds indeed can constitute clausal nuclei in TY, which is illustrated by the next example.

(601)  Mit qanaar kötkejl kiejie me keluununi.

‘When we roamed, he used to come [to a new camp] before we reached [it].’
that of the converb. If the gerund in (601) is thus recognized as a clause, than *kiejie* ‘before’ can only be interpreted as a conjunction.

Apart from that gerunds maintain the argument structure of the underlying verb. The following pair of examples proves that the pronouns *tit* ‘you’ and *tudel* ‘s/he’ on the one hand and the word *kniga* ‘book’ on the other hand are indeed the subjects and the direct object respectively since the replacement of *tit* ‘you’ by *tudel* ‘s/he’ conditions differential object marking in accordance with the common rule valid in TY (see 3.3.1.1.2):

(602a) Wadud aruulek pulgejl’eld’e tuŋ elill’e kniga tit čuŋnaal kiejie met titin’ me monuolmorawn’ejeŋ.

wadu-d-aruu-lek pulgejl’el-je tuŋ el’ill’e kniga tit čuŋ-naa-l kiejie
Yukaghir-0-language-INS come.out-NVIS-PTCP ADL.PROX first book 2PL read-INCH-GER before
met tit-in’ me=mon-ŋol-moraw-n’e-jeŋ
1SG 1PL-DAT PF=say-be-OBLG-VBLZ-INTR.1SG

‘Before you begin to read this first book [written] in Tundra Yukaghir, I must tell you [something].’ (Ado 1980:3)

(602b) Wadud aruulek pulgejl’elde tuŋ elill’e knigale tudel čuŋnaal kiejie ...

wadu-d-aruu-lek pulgejl’el-je tuŋ el’ill’e
Yukaghir-0-language-INS come.out-NVIS-PTCP ADL.PROX first
kniga-le tudel čuŋ-naa-l kiejie
book-ACC 3SG read-INCH-GER before

‘Before he begins to read this first book [written] in Tundra Yukaghir, …’

Triggering switch-reference effects and retention of the argument structure are unequivocally verbal properties. It would, however, be a simplification to say that gerunds are rather verbal in nature that nominal. A version of (602a) is possible where the gerund has the nominal plural marker agreeing with the subject of the underlying verb, the pertensive suffix and the genitive case ending, all exclusively nominal properties:

(602c) Wadud aruulek pulgejl’elde tuŋ elill’e knigale tittel čuŋnaalpegin kiejie ...

wadu-d-aruu-lek pulgejl’el-je tuŋ el’ill’e
Yukaghir-0-language-INS come.out-NVIS-PTCP ADL.PROX first
kniga-le tittel čuŋ-naa-l-pe-gi-n kiejie
book-ACC 3PL read-INCH-GER-PL-PERT-GEN before

The ambivalent character of gerunds is not a surprise. The above examples were meant to demonstrate that it is at least as reasonable to regard the gerunds followed by postpositions as nuclei of clauses, and, consequently, the accompanying postpositions as subordinating conjunctions.

\[\text{in} = ‘(just) as’, ‘as soon as’ is a basic conjunction: \]

(603) In jawulγa sayaŋi Qaalid’e tubegejl’en’ lögitek örtejl’en’.

in jawul-γa sayaŋ-i qaalid’e tubegejl-l’el-i
just.as road-LOC disappear-3PL.INTR Wolf rush.in-NVIS-INTR.3SG
They had hardly they disappeared on the road, when the Wolf rushed in and shouted, “Feed [me]!”

(Kurilov 1994:8)

The interrogative proform *quodeŋ* ‘how’ is employed in temporal subordinate clauses and has then the meaning ‘as soon as’ or ‘once’ in them:

(604) *Quodeŋ qawd’aa ayaregi čayaa mer amaqaaj.*

*how uncle breath-PERT separate[3SG.ITRG] PF=be.good-INCH-INTR.3SG*

‘As soon as the uncle died, [she (his wife)] got well.’ (Kurilov 2001:525, *quodeŋ*)

The interrogative *quodeŋ* ‘how’ is also found in dependent clauses whose meaning cannot be reduced to a temporal one. Moreover, the temporal meaning even appears to be only secondary, concomitant, while the meaning at least as prominent as the temporal one is that of describing a circumstance accompanying the action of the main clause. In this use *quodeŋ* could be called a temporal manner conjunction, which makes the clause introduced by *quodeŋ* resemble converbs, which also describe a circumstance, a background, so to speak, against which the action of the main clause unfolds. Clauses with *quodeŋ* ‘how’ seem to have an additional shade of meaning: they imply that the transition from the action of the dependent clause to the action of the main clause was inevitable and took place without a conscious effort on the part of the subject referent(s):

(605) *Quodeŋ čii aaweŋi taat aawereŋ jabaanul’elŋi.*

*how people sleep-3PL.INTR so sleep-SIM die-DUR-NVIS-3PL.INTR*

‘(One month, two months passed and they heard that Chukchis began to die. Their houses, yarangas, were simply collapsing.) (Just) as they slept, they were dying.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:162)

There is an unusual thing about this sentence: the predicate of the dependent clause is conjugated according to the affirmative paradigm whereas it should be conjugated according to the interrogative paradigm, which is always triggered by interrogative proform, even in indirect questions (see also (604)), which in this example would yield the ending –*ŋu*, and not –*ŋi*. This indicates probably that in this example the word *quodeŋ* ‘how’ has completely lost its interrogative character and become a pure conjunction.

3.9.2.2 Conditional conjunctions

Conditional clauses can be introduced by the complex conjunction *ejk ewri* ‘if’:

(606) *Eu ejk ewri eguojie al’γaŋ ejuudayane tel’iedal’γa mer=at=wie-j.*

*euk ewri eguojie al’γaŋ ejuul-dayane*  
*ITJ if if tomorrow fish get.caught-GER-3SG.DS*  
*tel’ie-l’d-al’γa mer=at=wie-j.*  
*dry-GER-0-fish PF=POT=make-1PL.TR*
‘Oh, if only fish got caught tomorrow, we would make yukola.’

(Kurilov 2001:589, ejk ewri)

3.9.2.3 Causal conjunctions

*al-ad’aa* ‘since’, which is actually an intensifying modal particle, can also be used as a causal conjunction. In my own textual corpus I have only two occurrences of this word in my textual corpus, in neither of which it introduces a dependent clause. In the corresponding entry in Kurilov’s (2001) dictionary there is only one example that can be potentially taken as an illustration of the causal meaning attributed to this word by Kurilov (2006:220). However, the clause in which *al-ad’aa* occurs stands in that example on its own, thus representing an independent clause. Besides it is followed by another sentence containing the information about the consequence of the action described in the sentence with *al-ad’aa*. That second sentence is introduced by *taatl’er* ‘therefore’, making any notion of ‘since’ in the preceding sentence superfluous. The only example where *al-ad’aa* arguably acts as a causal conjunction can be found in Kurilov (2006:220):

(607) *Met araad’iwa el mönd’ienund’eŋ al-ad’aa waawačedaruu el kuril’jiijeŋ.*

\[\text{1SG radio NEG=hear-HAB-INTR.1SG MP waawače-d-aruu el=kuril’ii-jeŋ} \]

‘I don’t listen to the radio because I don’t understand the Russian language.’

Otherwise, the meaning of ‘because’ can be rendered by the expression *quodiir monulyane/monlaqane*, which literally means ‘if I/you/we say why’, where *quodiir* means ‘why’ and *monulyane/monlaqane* are the nominalized (suffix –l) forms of the verb *mon-* ‘say’ with the suffixes employed in TY to indicate disjoint reference, namely ‘say.GER.1/2SG.DS’ and ‘say.GER.1/2PL.DS’. The conjunction is thus realized as a lexicalized dependent clause. Both (608a) and (608b) are taken from Kurilov (2006:220):

(608a) *Semjon ile-ŋa el=čayad’e-t quodiir monlaqane*

\[\text{Semyon reindeer-LOC NEG=work-FUT[3SG] because because} \]

‘Semyon will not work as a reindeer herdsman because he is too lazy.’

(608b) *Eguoje met čayad’e-l-ŋin’ el=uu-te-jeŋ*

\[\text{tomorrow 1SG work-GER-DAT NEG=go-FUT-INTR.1SG quodiir monulyane met sal’yarii jawl.} \]

‘I will not go to work tomorrow because I have a toothache.’

3.9.2.4 Consecutive conjunctions

This semantic relation can be encoded by several conjunctions.
**taatl’er** ‘therefore’, ‘that’s why’, ‘so’, a derivate from *taat* ‘so’ and the circumstantial converb of the copula *l’e*-:

(609) **Taatl’er sovchoz direktor moni, ‘Čayad’ek! Id’ie l’ie čii el pelieŋu. Taatl’er taat ileŋin’ arŋaa stadaŋin’ počesejŋa.’**

Therefore sovkhoz director say-INTR.3SG work-IMP.3SG now MP people

el=pelieŋu taatl’er taat ileŋin’ arŋaa stadaŋin’ počesejŋa.

‘(Then I returned to my birthplace. When I came here, I did not complete my education.) Therefore the director of the sovkhoz told me, ‘Work! There is a shortage of manpower now.’ So [they] sent me to the western herd.’

**tadaat** ‘then’, ‘so’ (see 3.7.2.1 on derivation):

(610) **Me quodiik Joqon muolŋa kötejrelek juóčii’elum me marqaan čald’edawure moojmele! Tadaat, quode l’etem? Me pengeč, qan’γa!**

me=quodiik Joqon muolŋa kötej-relek juóčii-l’el-um
tadaat quode l’e-te-m. me=pengej-j qan’γa

‘It seems that having got to the lake Yokhon-mol he noticed that he had only one mitten! Then (what could he do?) he returned, it was cold!’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:70)

**taŋullek** ‘thereby’, ‘thus’, ‘that’s why’, derived by conversion from the independent form of the invisible demonstrative *taŋun* and the instrumental case ending –*lek*:

(611) **Taŋ taŋullek kuril’iinull’elum ten juodayane lukunburube me qanqaaj ten juoda gane lukunburube me puģikiej.**

DM ten apparently land

me=qad’uu-qaa-j ten juódayane lukunburube me=puf-ki-j

‘(Having departed on that snag, he flew for a long time and while flying he touched his head with his hand. Sometimes the hair was frozen and sometimes it was thawed out.) Thus he knew that it had probably got now cold now worm.’

3.9.2.5 Comparative conjunctions

The function of a comparative conjunction is fulfilled by the words *dite* ‘as if’, ‘just as’ and *daŋdite* ‘as if’. The latter is a combination of the invisible demonstrative *taŋ* ‘that’ and the adverb *tite* ‘so’:
(612a) Jalyl puren miraanulya jarqa sisayajl daŋdite möŋere möriyey.

jalyl     puren-n  mira-nu-l-γa  jarqa  sisayajl     (day)dite
lake      upper.part-PROL walk-DUR-GER-1/2SG.DS ice crack-GER as.if
möŋere-le  möri-γey
noise-FOC.ABS  hear-TR.1/2.OF

‘When I walked over a [frozen] lake, I heard a sound as if ice was cracking..’

(612b) Met unumeγa ilije keriel dite band’ey.

met      unume-γa  ilije  kerie-l  dite  pan-jeγ
1SG  ear-LOC  wind  fall-GER as.if  be-INTR.1SG

‘I felt as if the wind started blowing in my ears.’

In (612a, b) the conjunction follows a gerund, but the verb of the dependent clause can also occur as the circumstantial converb:

(613) Mit čama grippqa jamd’ir dite tuŋ apanalaa čamayatek jamd’aal’en’.

mit      čama  gripp-γa  jamd’i-r  dite  tuŋ  apanalaa
1PL big influenza-LOC be.ill-CIRC just.as ADL.DEM old.woman
čama-γatek  jamd’i-aa-l’el-i
big-AUG  be.ill-INCH-NVIS-INTR.3SG

‘That old woman fell very ill, just as we are ill during a heavy influenza.’

3.10 Particles

There is a multitude of particles in TY. The first and so far the only extensive treatment of this part of speech was done by Kurilov (2008:82-100)\(^{226}\). In this section an overview is given of only those particles that occur in the examples throughout the grammar. A conspicuous fact about particle usage in TY is that particles borrowed from Yakut are massively employed even when a TY equivalent is available. The spontaneous speech of Yukaghirs is literally strewn with Yakut borrowings, while the rest of the speakers’ lexicon could be genuinely indigenous. For this reason the present section successively deals with the original TY particles and the most frequently used Yakut ones.

3.10.1 Original TY particles

3.10.1.1 Modal and emphatic particles

\(aγan\) expresses the certainty that an action is going to take place.

\(alγad’aa\) expresses an excessive degree of a property or action.

\(aγan\) is compatible with verb forms marked for the future tense only (Kurilov 2008:92). It is preposed to the verb. Depending on the intonation it can be interpreted as an assent, invitation, permission or even order to do something.

\(^{226}\) The functional descriptions of TY particles given here are adapted from this work or from the corresponding entries in Kurilov (2001).
anmorji expresses uncertainty about an assumption.

aq implies a realization by the speaker of something one was previously unaware of.

aqun has a variety of meanings. It emphasizes the utterance (‘even’), expresses a concession (‘at least’), marks an action as desirable (‘if only’) and embodies an emotional assessment (‘and besides’).

daajinne(ne) expresses curiosity or a guess.

ejk imparts a shade of a surmise or doubt to a question.

eld’e emphasizes a question with a shade of astonishment or perplexion and serves to emphasize a request or order too.

el’uguon’ expresses surprise, a desire to find out something. As a lexicalized item it corresponds approximately to the expression ‘Wait a minute!’

ise indicates a supposition: ‘maybe’, ‘perhaps’. Its use triggers the attachment of the complex suffix l’elte- to the predicate verb, which indicates assumptions.

köčejk reinforces the jussive mood.

l’ie can express pure emphasis or soften an order.

mal(aa) is an incentive, it serves to encourage an addressee to carry out an action.

maalek indicates a forced consent or decision to carry out an action: ‘well (all right)’, ‘if so/if the circumstances are such, than …’

mire signals a warning not to do what is encoded in the predicate. It is not treated as an alternative imperative marker since the verb remains in the indicative.

mol expresses consent, has incentive meaning, or simply serves for emphasis.

ŋoll’elk is a purely emphatic particle

qad’ir is a very common particle. As a modal particle it expresses the idea that an action takes place after a long expectation. It reinforces an order, request or wish. As a discourse marker it is generally employed to impart a greater expressivity to an utterance.

quodiiik expresses a doubt, assumption, supposition with varying degrees of uncertainty: ‘possibly’, ‘looks like’, ‘probably’, ‘must be’.
*quoden* can initiate sentences implying that the action expressed in the predicate of the sentence is a forced one or carried out as having no alternative\(^{227}\).

*quolem* occurs in explicit or implicit questions and implies that the speaker anticipates the opposite polarity to be true than that of the clause it is contained in.

*uguney* is equivalent of the expression ‘it is good that …!’ or ‘how good it is it that …!’

*waaj* is actually an adverb meaning ‘again’, ‘also’, but it can be used as a modal particle expressing disapproval.

*wal’* is synonymous with *maalek*.

3.10.1.2 Deictic particles

Three deictic particles, namely *ten*, *an* and *tIGIN*, have the spatial values ‘adlocutorial proximal’ (close to the speaker), adauditorial proximal (close to the addressee) and distal (remote from both speaker and addressee). According to my understanding, their closest equivalents in better known languages are the Russian deictic dyad *vot* and *von*, which distinguishes only a general proximal and distal, and the Italian *ecco* originating in a functionally similar Latin *ecce*. This means that these particles simply point at objects and do not locate them as adverbs would. Therefore their translation with ‘here’, ‘there’ or demonstrative pronouns, necessary due to a limitation of the English language lacking this kind of deictic devices, should not be mistaken.

3.10.1.3 Discourse markers

*qad’ir* is a discourse marker with a function that is hard to formalize. In fact, in its function as a discourse marker *qad’ir* might be simply a kind of filler without a clearly defined meaning. A similar use is characteristic of demonstrative pronouns, especially *tan*, in some idiolects and the deictic particle *ten*.

*ηodaγane* marks contrastive topics.

*tan* often occurs with topics, sometimes doubled by its Yakut correspondence in some speakers’ speech

3.10.2 Particles borrowed from Yakut

TY speakers make extensive use of Yakut modal particles. This happens even when an adequate TY particle can be found. The functional descriptions of the Yakut particles are based on Korkina and Slepcov (1972).

\(^{227}\) The quasi-verbal combination of the homonymous interrogative adverb *quoden* ‘how’ with the future tense marker is lexicalized as a modal particle *quodiituok* ‘what can be done?’, which indicates the forced character of an action.
any is a modal particle expressing a misgiving or an anxious supposition: ‘what if …’, ‘heaven forbid’.

araj as a modal particle has several meanings. It increases the conditional meaning of a verb with a shade of supposition, apprehension, desire and limitation: ‘and what if …’, ‘if only …’ It reflects the forced nature of a choice made with a shade of doubt, hesitation and limitation. As a discourse marker it serves to attract the special attention of the listener.

buolla is a modal particle, which expresses the desire to find out something, an interest or regret, annoyance or perplexity.

buollayna is a contrastive particle.

buollar is very often used in TY as the equivalent of qad’ir.

d’e is a modal particle with a number of functions. It indicates that the action takes place after a protracted expectation: ‘finally’, ‘at last’. It can express contempt and aversion. It has a general emphatic meaning, intensifying an order, request and desire as well as underlying a thought. It enters into numerous combinations with other modal particles and interjections.

du serves to indicate uncertainty on the part of the speaker.

qata is a multifunctional particle. It indicates an opposition to what has been said or what is expected (‘on the contrary’), expresses a preference (‘it is better if …’) or joy of the speaker about an outcome awaited with apprehension (‘thanks God that …’, ‘but luckily …’), conveys the speaker’s desire to encourage the addressee and, finally, marks an abrupt transition to another thought.

3.10.3 Interjections

There is a wealth of interjections in TY. They are described in detail in Kurilova (2012).

ee is, according to Kurilova’s (2012:90) classification, so-called phatic interjection signaling the addressee’s interest in what is being communicated by the speaker. It can function as an equivalent of ‘yes’, which is absent from TY as a separate word.

erew is an expression of astonishment or pain.

eu is another equivalent of ‘yes’.

\(^{228}\) This particle is not listed in Korkina and Slepcov (1972).

\(^{229}\) A comparison with the phenomenon of aizuchi, or echoing, in the Japanese speech etiquette (Kolesnikov 1993:24) suggests itself.
*jukud’eya* is an interjection belonging to the class of admiratives (Kurilova 2012:160). It expresses surprise about an unexpectedly small size of an object. It is derived by the productive suffix *–γa* from the participial from of the verb *jukuol-* ‘to be small’.

*oo* is a sign of astonishment, potentially with a shade of fear, perplexity, vexation or distress (Kurilova 2012:39).

*qan’γa*, derived from the verb *qad’uu-* ‘to be cold’, is an interjection used to indicate that it is cold.

*qaalaγajuo*, which stems from the qualitative verb *qaaluu-* ‘to be frightful’, expresses the highest degree of apprehension or fear: ‘how terrible!’ The suffix *–γa* and its combination with *–juo* are very productive in interjection derivation, with nearly a hundred of derivates based on the stems of intransitive verbs alone (Kurilova 2012:126).
4. Syntax

4.1 Noun phrase

4.1.1 Word order

A general principle of the syntax in TY is that a dependent precedes its head\(^{230}\). (614), an elicitation, and (615), a dictionary example taken from field materials, illustrate that the relative order of the dependents in a noun phrase is as follows:

DEM/POSS NUM ADJ HEAD\(^{231}\)

(614) Tuŋ / Tit jaan n’id’erpe-j urariciiče-peŋ me=sayane-ŋi.
ADL.PROX / 2PL three.GEN be.new-PTCP teacher-PL PF=sit-3PL.INTR
‘These / Your three new teachers sit.’

(615) Tuŋ tet pulije el lačinčaa med’uon’.
       tuŋ    tet    pulije    el=lačin-čaa    men’-ŋol-i
ADL.PROX 2SG uncle NEG=firewood-NMLZ take-be-INTR.3SG
‘That uncle of yours was born in a place where there wasn’t firewood.’
(Kurilov 2001:202, lačinčaa)

The dependent of a possessive NP can function as the head of another NP. It is possible to modify the possessee by ADJ and NUM but not by DEM in such constructions:

(616) Tit n’id’erpe-j urariciiče jaan l’uku uorpe-gi me=juoraa-nu-ŋi.
       2PL be.new-PTCP teacher three.GEN small children-PERT PF=play-DUR-3PL.INTR
‘Three little children of your new teacher are playing.’

If the head of the possessive NP is to be modified by DEM, the relative order of the head and the dependent in a possessive NP is reversed, and the dependent receives the relational suffix –l’e:

(617) Tuŋ l’uku uorpe tit n’id’erpe-j urariciiče-l’e me=juoraa-nu-ŋi.
       ADL.PROX small children 2PL be.new-PTCP teacher-RLN PF=play-dur-3PL.INTR
‘These little children of your new teacher are playing.’

The position of relative clauses is not specifically addressed here because they are normally realized as participles. Deviations from the basic order of constituents of an NP are possible. They are always ‘in favor’ of POSS, which is placed closer to the head:

\(^{230}\) Only the pronoun enmun ‘every’ (see e.g. (72) in 3.5.8) can follow a noun.
\(^{231}\) ADJ implies here an attributive form of a qualitative verb, e.g. a participle, NUM stands for a word with a numeric meaning, i.e. an attributive form of a quantitative verb, while POSS refers to a pronominal possessor.
(618) *Pojuod’e mit sukunyt neme ŋoll’elk el pon’aa.*

be.numerous-PTCP 1PL thing-LOC-ABL what EMPH NEG=remain[3SG]

‘From our numerous things nothing remained.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:58)

(619) *Kin met juödii tuduruul-γane jawnuo juoru-m.*

two GEN 1SG eye inner.part-ACC everything DO scratch-TR.3SG

‘[She] scratched the inside of both of my eyes.’

4.1.2 Modification

As follows from the formula for the linear order of the dependents in an NP, the head of an NP can be modified by a pronoun, an attributively used numeric base, adjective and participle. Apart from that, it can be modified by another NP, i.e. by a possessor, or a noun in apposition. Since the other modifiers have already been presented in 4.1.1, only possessive constructions and cases of apposition are discussed in the following.

4.1.2.1 Possession

The core meanings of possession are ownership, the whole-part relation (including inanimate possessors such as plants) and the kinship relation (Payne 2007:104, Aikhenvald 2013:3). In many languages, however, the same construction can cover other closely related meanings, which can be generally labeled as those of association, e.g. ‘John’s dentist’ (Aikhenvald 2013:4-5). This is true for TY too. Therefore ‘possession’ will serve here as a cover term for a wide range of meanings comparable with those of the core meanings of possession.

There are three strategies to encode a possessive relation in TY: juxtaposition of the possessor and the possessum in this order, marking of the possessor with the genitive case ending –*n* and marking of the possessum with the pertensive suffix –*gi-*/*da-. For non-human animate possessors all three strategies are available. Thus the NP ‘a trace of a reindeer’ can be rendered in TY by the following expressions, where *ile* means ‘reindeer’ and *jawul* stands for ‘track’:

(620a) *ile jawul*  
reindeer track

(620b) *ile-n jawul*  
reindeer-GEN track

(620c) *ile jawul-gi*  
reindeer track-PERT

The expression in (620b) can also be used non-referentially and thus be translated as ‘a reindeer track’, or a track with the properties of a reindeer track, which endows the form *ilen* with the qualities of a relational adjective (see discussion in 3.3.1.1.5).

Nouns denoting humans in the vast majority of cases enter possessive relations as possessors according to the schemes in (620a) and (620c):
(621a) Anna Kurilova n’iedi-l-pe
Anna Kurilova narrate-GER-PL
‘Anna Kurilova’s stories’ (the title of Kurilov and Odé 2012)

(621b) tude amaa kerie-γ
3SG.POSS father name-ACC
‘his father’s name’ (Kurilov 2001:282, nides-)

(621c) tuŋ apanalaa uo
ADL.PROX old.woman child
‘the son of that old woman’ (Kurilov 2001:227, l’uoriiče)

(621d) nimelesiiče lejtorej-l
writer remind-GER
‘the writer’s reminder’ (Ado 1979:3)

(622a) čii sayane-l-pe-gi
people sit-GER-PL-PERT
‘people’s lives’
(622b) Aluona aduo-gi
Alyona son-PERT
‘Alyona’s son’

(622c) Qojl l’ie toile-l-gi
God support-GER-PERT
‘God’s support’
(622d) könmel’e-pul l’ie ile-pul-gi
other-PL MP reindeer-PL-PERT
‘others’ reindeer’

Marking of human possessors with the genitive case ending is very rare:

(623a) Tuŋ uo-n kirije Qabanga
ADL.PROX child GEN name Khabanga
‘This child’s name was Khabanga.’ (Kurilov 2005:192)

(623b) Tiden paipen kewejuolyan ičuonaal’elum.
tiden paip-e-n kewej-ŋol-γa-n ičuonaal’el-um
ANPH woman-GEN leave-be[GER]-LOC-PROL look-INCH-NVIS-TR.3SG
‘He began to examine [the hole in the tree] through which the woman disappeared.’

Cases of multiple redundancy can be found with human possessors:

(624) qawd’aa Miičee ile-gi-n-da-γane
uncle Miche reindeer-PERT-GEN-PERT-ACC
‘uncle Michele’s reindeer’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:106)

The presence of the genitive case ending in the head in (624) cannot be explained at the moment. There is no head licensing it. The suffix sequence –gi ‘PERT’ + -n ‘GEN’ + -da ‘PERT’ seems to be an idiolectal peculiarity restricted to nouns in object position (-γane ‘ACC’).

Inanimate possessors can be zero-marked:
Zero-marked dependent inanimate nouns functioning as possessors should not be confused with those serving simply as attributes having essentially converted to relational adjectives:

Inanimate nouns carrying the genitive case ending also more often than not convert to relational adjectives, but can function as possessors as well, especially in cases of embedded possessive constructions (see below). The marking of an inanimate possessor with the pertensive suffix seems to be limited to instances in which postpositions serve as heads:

A possessive relation can be redundantly marked both on the head and on the dependent:

When a possessive construction is embedded in another possessive construction, a variety of constellations is possible: GEN-0-0 (629a), GEN-GEN-0 (629b), possessive pronoun-0-PERT (629c), ellipsis-PERT-PERT (629d), 0-PERT+GEN-0 (629e, the most frequent strategy) and ellipsis-PERT+GEN-PERT (629f).
4.1.2.2 Apposition

In instances of apposition of two nouns, the first of them is normally the dependent:

(630a) Kurilew  peldudie
Kurilov  old.man
‘the old man Kurilov’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

(630b) Edilwej  alajii  wadul-ek.
Edilwey  Alayee  Yukaghir-COP
‘Edilwey was an Alayee Yukaghir.’ (Kurilov 2005:126)

The reverse order is also possible, though:

(631) met  öčidie  Puraama-ya
1SG  paternal.uncle  Puraama-LOC
‘with my paternal uncle Purama’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:24)

4.1.3 Agreement

The dependent never agrees with its head in the TY noun phrase:

(632) pude  l’ej  qaalid’epele
pude  l’ej  qaaluu-je-pe-le
outside  be-PTCP  be.frightful-PTCP-PL-ACC
‘creatures of the wilderness’

Conversely, the head of a possessive construction exhibits some limited agreement, taking the plural suffix in a possessive construction when the possessor is a 3rd person:
Since this agreement takes place irrespective of the head’s own number, in case of ellipsis of a pronominal possessor it makes alternative interpretations possible\(^{232}\):

(634) **Ten amaa-pe-gi.**

DEIC father-PL-PERT

‘This is their father.’ or ‘These are his/their fathers.’

### 4.1.4 Coordination

Two NPs can be coordinated with the help of the comitative suffix –n’e:

(635) **wadul odul-n’e folklore-gi**

Tundra.Yukaghir Kolyma.Yukaghir folklore(Russ)-PERT

‘the folklore of the Tundra and Kolyma Yukaghirs’ (the title of Kurilov 2005)

The first of the coordinated NPs can be verbalized and surface as a participle:

(636) **wegii-n’e-j köde-k jedej-l**

team.with.sledge-VBLZ-PTCP man-FOC.ABS appear-GER.SF

‘[A] team with a sledge appeared’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:122)

Proper nouns are coordinated by the conjunction *tadaat* ‘and’:

(637) **Varvara tadaat Sutawkan**

‘Varvara and Sutawkan’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:250)

Coordinated NPs can be simply juxtaposed:

(638) **Erime jarqa al’aa-yan!**

snow ice melt-JUSS

‘May the snow and ice melt!’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

Attributes of a head of an NP can also be coordinated by a conjunction:

(639) **Jaan ejk jelukun uorellek ...**

jaan ejk jelukun uo-re-relek

three.GEN or four.GEN child-VBLZ-ANT

‘After getting three or four children ...’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:154)

Juxtaposition occurs as well:

\(^{232}\) This is reminiscent of the situation in Turkish.
In those times our folk had winter and summer clothes.

4.2 Simple sentences

4.2.1 Word order

4.2.1.1 Basic word order

From Krejniović (1968:450) the idealized basic word order of TY can be inducted: SO(X)V:

(641) Tidaa tet amaa maarqan čigirči-j apanalaa-k
    long.ago 2SG father one.GEN limp-PTCP old.woman-FOC.ABS
    mit-in’ kečimele.
    1PL-DAT bring-TR.3SG.OF

‘Once, a long time ago your father brought an old lame woman to our place.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:146)

This conclusion needs some consideration. The basic, unmarked word order of a language is determined in what Payne (2007:77) calls ‘pragmatically neutral clauses’. Though admitting that it might not be easy to identify such clauses, Payne (2007:77) suggests that certain clause types have to be excluded from the consideration as a priori not pragmatically neutral. These include – apart from dependent clauses, which in any case cannot be the subject of this section – paragraph-initial clauses234, clauses that introduce participants, interrogative and negative clauses, as well as clearly contrastive clauses (clefts, answers etc.)235. Additionally, the pattern potentially identifiable as basic in the remaining clause types should recur with some reasonable regularity.

TY allows quite some variation in the word order of major constituents: predicate and core arguments. Establishing a basic order for these is additionally complicated by the pronounced characteristic of TY to omit activated arguments (see 4.2.3.2.1 for examples). For this reason, it is difficult to find sentences with a transitive verb whose full argument structure would be represented overtly making it possible to determine the relative order of the core arguments. Another problem stems from the fact that TY rather favors subordination over coordination. Therefore, sentences which could otherwise be taken as good instantiations of word order templates, have to be discarded. Thus, the

---

233 Temporal adverbials normally occur sentence initially. Other adverbials occupy the position after the object as frequently as in front of it, therefore the sequence S(IX)OV could just as well be regarded as the basic word order. In Kurilov’s opinion (personal communication) the word order SO(X)V isn’t, in fact, pragmatically neutral since the immediate preverbal position is focal.

234 This condition would disqualify (641) as a diagnostic sentence.

235 One may wonder how valuable the identification of a basic word order in the remaining clause types is. Moreover, to what extent can it still be regarded as the basic word order in a given language? It is hardly representative statistically, which becomes clear after even a superficial analysis of textual material during a tedious search for ‘suitable’ sentences.
following sentence would be a good example of a clause with both S and O overtly present and indicate the SOV word order if its two predicates were coordinated. Since, however, its first predicate is realized as a converb, its arguments, the direct objects, belong to that clause, while the subject of the sentence is the only argument of the sentence final intransitive verb, the other clause.

(642)  
\[
\text{Edilwey tude qajčieyane abučieyane ubaa-relek me keweč.}
\]
\[
\text{Edilwey tude qajčie-yane abučie-yane ubaa-relek me=kewe-j}
\]
\[
\text{Edilwey 3SG.POSS grandfather-ACC grandmother-ACC kiss-ANT}
\]
\[
\text{PF=leave-INTR.3SG}
\]

‘Edilwey kissed his grandfather and grandmother and left.’ (Kurilov 2005:128)

However, it can be safely stated that TY is basically a verb final language. Both S- (643a) and O-arguments (643b) as well as adjuncts (643c, d) normally precede the predicate.

(643a)  
\[
\text{Tudel maarquon’ me=qonyayaj-nun-i.}
\]
\[
\text{3SG only PF=bow-HAB-INTR.3SG}
\]

‘He would only bow [to greet].’  (Kurilov 2005:130)

(643b)  
\[
\text{Ilele tonaanuj ködek juomele.}
\]
\[
\text{ile-le tono-nu-j köde-k juo-mele}
\]
\[
\text{reindeer-ACC drive-DUR-PTCP person-FOC.abs see-TR.3SG.of}
\]

‘[She] saw a man who was driving reindeer.’  (Kurilov 2005:146)

(643c)  
\[
\text{Qad’ir qajčietegen’ey me keweč.}
\]
\[
\text{qad’ir qajčie-tege-n’ey me=kewe-j}
\]
\[
\text{MP grandfather-AUG-COM PF=leave-INTR.3SG}
\]

‘And so [she] went with the bear.’  (Kurilov 2005: 144)

(643d)  
\[
\text{Lawje-d-ekuu-γa juoraa-nun-d’eli.}
\]
\[
\text{water-0-whole-LOC play-HAB-INTR.1PL}
\]

‘We played at an ice-hole.’  (Kurilov and Odé 2012:20)

A context in which both core arguments are likely to be overtly expressed is one in which one of them is in focus and the other refers to a referent which needs to be (re)activated. Under such circumstances, it can indeed be demonstrated that the basic order of the core arguments and their predicate is SOV:

(644a)  
\[
\text{Kin pajpe kin mirije-gi monil’e-gi anγi-nu-γu-mle.}
\]
\[
\text{two.Gen woman two.Gen wife-PERT hair-PERT comb-DUR-PL-TR.3.of}
\]

‘Two women, his two wives, were combing his hair.’ (Kurilov 2005:132)

(644b)  
\[
\text{Tadaat aran’n’e-j d’ii enu-λenq qusad’i-γu-te-mle.}
\]
\[
\text{then be.deft-PTCP people river-FOC.abs jump.ITR-PL-FUT-TR.3.of}
\]

‘Then deft people would jump over the river.’  

Kurilov (2001:526, qusad’i-)
4.2.1.2 Marked word orders

Different deviations from the basic word order can be observed in the recorded material. Most, if not all of them, are in one or another way dictated by pragmatic considerations. Very generally they fall into two groups: left and right dislocation. The reference point of the latter is normally the predicate.

4.2.1.2.1 Right dislocation

Right dislocation affects S, O and peripheral constituents alike. It can be motivated by the desire of the speaker to reactivate a referent, even though it may still be explicitly (645), (646), (650) or implicitly (647), (651) active, or to focalize it\(^{236}\) (648) and (649). Right dislocation aiming at a reactivation is sometimes accompanied by a short pause, which is reflected by a comma in writing. Thus it could be interpreted as a kind of afterthought completing the utterance and, hence, have to be taken as an extra-clausal element. Strictly speaking, if this interpretation is correct, such instances of postposed constituents cannot be regarded as instances of deviant word order.

postverbal S:

(645) *Nimedord`aya quduon` tan leml`epulgi.*

house-0-middle-LOC lie-INTR.3SG INVS.DEM boss-PL-PERT

‘In the middle of the house he lay, that chieftain of theirs.’ (A couple of sentences earlier the chieftain was introduced.) (Kurilov 2005:132)

(646) *Awjaayar enmun jerkeje-n-nun-i qajčie.*

evening every tambourine-VBLZ-HAB-INTR.3SG grandfather

(‘They asked grandfather to perform the shamanic rite. It turned out that this boy had fallen ill.) [He] performed the right every night, my grandfather, that is.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:154)

postverbal O:

(647) *El`uguon ten`i maa-k met-ul*

MP here wait-IMP.SG 1SG-ACC

‘Just a second, wait for me here, …’ (After being invited to go along.)

(Kurilov 2005:144)

\(^{236}\) According to Kurilov (personal communication) the postverbal position is associated with the pragmatic function of focus and is a purely syntactic means to attach the function of focus to a constituent.
In some instances right dislocation in the preverbal field seems to serve the goal of focalization of arguments. In the following example the subject occurs later in the clause than the peripheral constituent and is arguably the focus of the utterance, which is in this case realized by purely syntactic means:

(652) **Ile-γα-t qawd’aa Toŋti kelu-ŋi.**

reindeer-LOC-ABL maternal.uncle Tongti come-3PL.INTR

(A number of people had just been introduced.) ‘My uncle Tongti came from the herd’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

4.2.1.2.2 Left dislocation

Left dislocation is meant for topicalization of constituents other than the subject, most typically the direct object as in (653a, b) and for emphasis (654a, b, c):

(653a) **čii-pe-da-γα-γαne köde-pul me=pun-l’el-ŋa.**

people-PL-PERT-ACC person-PL PF=kill-NVIS-3PL.TR

‘…, his parents were killed by some people.’ (Kurilov 2005:126)

(653b) **Sukun-pe-da-γα-γαne taŋ kelu-je d’iι me=men-l’el-ŋa.**

thing-PL-PERT-ACC INVS.DEM come-PTCP people PF=take-NVIS-3PL.TR

‘Their property was taken by those intruders.’ (Kurilov 2005:126)
(654a) *Tamunjane janyepe waaj me kuril’iŋa.*

(And that in autumn the weather gets colder every day, you know yourself.) That is known to geese too.’

(Kurilov 1994:9)

(654b) *Oryi oryi köde-le moŋojd’ii juŋya-re-j-ŋa,*

‘Old women nearly finished off the man.’ (The person had just been introduced.)

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:32)

(654c) *Amunŋe uuči čawner?*

‘Everything went well, [didn’t it]?’

4.2.1.2.3 Position of question words

An SOV language is expected to place question words in the immediate preverbal position, and this is what one finds in TY:

(655a) *Met emd’e neme-lek puŋuol-d’ii-te-m?*

‘How shall I make my younger brother glad?’

(655b) *Qajčie tuŋ köden saalya tite gitn’er pojuol’e enmurle quodiir kudere-l’eŋu?*

‘Grandfather, why has one put so many antlers on this man’s grave?’

However, this position is not obligatory for question words and they can occupy the clause-initial position or, less frequently, occur clause-medially:

(656a) *Quodiir tet čyojo n’aače-s-nu-mek?*

‘Why are you sharpening your knife?’

(656b) *Abučie quodey čuy-nunu-mk taŋ čama ilije-ŋa med’uol-l’el-d’e jewlid’e-pul?*

‘Grandmother, how did you count the reindeer calves born during a storm?’

(657) *Tuŋ uorpe quodiir tite uttejl kitn’er ewrienunŋu?*

‘Grandmother, how did you count the reindeer calves born during a storm?’
‘Why have these children been tired by work so much?’

4.2.2 Alignment system

The alignment system is not uniform in TY. The predicate always agrees with the subject (S or A) of the sentence and never with its object, therefore from this perspective the accusative alignment system is present. On the other hand, verbal personal endings differ depending on whether the subject is S or A. Thus there is no formal alignment of the S with A as far as conjugation is concerned. Moreover, there are two agreement patterns for S and three for A, depending on the type of focus expressed in a given sentence (see the paradigms in 3.4.2.1). As for the core arguments, the alignment of a nominal S either with A or O is determined by a pragmatic factor, namely by the focal status of S. If it is in the focus of an utterance and is actually focalized it aligns with the focal(ized) O and differs from A, either under focus or not, thus giving rise to the ergative alignment system. If S is not assigned the pragmatic function of focus it aligns with A and differs from O, which results in the accusative alignment system. Previously, it was believed that the focus opposition was neutralized in negative sentences (Comrie 1992:64, Matić and Nikolaeva 2008:2), which left no room for ergative alignment under negation. Recently this claim was proven incorrect (Schmalz 2012:93-97): the alignment rules are equally applicable in affirmative and in negative clauses (see 5.2.6).

The ergativity split is conditioned not only by information structure of a clause but also by the position of the core arguments in the person hierarchy. Specifically, the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person pronouns disrupt the pragmatically triggered regular alternation between accusative and ergative alignment characteristic of other syntactic classes of core arguments: under focus, the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person pronouns have neutral alignment. If not in focus, the distinction between pronominal and nominal arguments in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person becomes irrelevant and two alignment patterns can be distinguished depending on whether the subject of the clause is represented by an interlocutor pronoun or a different linguistic item: the neutral pattern and the accusative pattern respectively. Thus, TY not only has split ergativity, it also has split accusativity. What was said above is illustrated below in Tables 4.2.1, 4.2.2 and 4.2.3.

Table 4.2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1\textsuperscript{st} person</th>
<th>2\textsuperscript{nd} person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+foc]</td>
<td>metek</td>
<td>metek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-foc]</td>
<td>met</td>
<td>tet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>metek</td>
<td>met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>met</td>
<td>tet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>metek</td>
<td>tet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>metul/metqane</td>
<td>tet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>tet</td>
<td>tet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3rd person pronominal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+foc]</td>
<td>[-foc]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>tudel</td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>tittel</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A is 1st or 2nd  A is 3rd  A is 1st or 2nd  A is 3rd

Table 4.2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3rd person nominal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+foc]</td>
<td>[-foc]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>ilelenge²³⁷</td>
<td>ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>ile</td>
<td>ile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A is 1st or 2nd  A is 3rd

Table 4.2.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3rd person argument</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+foc]</td>
<td>[-foc]</td>
<td>[+foc]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alignment</td>
<td>ergative</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nominal</td>
<td>pronominal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These facts are summarized in Table 4.2.4.

It is clear that in a transitive clause only one of the arguments may potentially follow the ergative alignment pattern since the pragmatic function of focus can be assigned morphologically to one constituent only. The other core argument will necessarily follow the accusative or neutral alignment pattern. Therefore the ergative construction in TY is trans-clausal: the arguments exhibiting the ergative alignment must occur in separate clauses. This analysis might seem unorthodox at first glance, but if one considers that the determination of the alignment system in a language already involves looking across clause boundaries in order to establish what S aligns with, one should not be opposed to recognizing an ergative pattern if all core arguments following it are in different clauses. Since the trans-clausal distribution of case markers displaying the ergative pattern is conditioned by information structure, the phenomenon can be conveniently labeled ‘pragmatic ergativity’, as opposed to morphological, or intra-clausal, ergativity and syntactic, or inter-clausal, ergativity, the two structural ergativity types recognized by Dixon (1994).

In the following the ergative and accusative alignment system of nominal arguments is demonstrated for illustration.

²³⁷ *ile* stands for ‘reindeer’. 
- ergative alignment:

focal S

(658) Apanalaa-pe-ley pon’aa-ŋu-l.
old.woman-PL-FOC.ABS remain-PL-GER.SF
‘Only the old women stayed.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:32)

focal A

(659) El’in tovariščestve-le met amaa wie.
first.ADVP association-ACC 1SG father[FOC.ERG] make[AF]
‘First, my father organized the association.’ (Kurilov 2001:589, ejk)

focal O

(660) Tittel buollar lewejmenq aq n’id’ayajl’eld’e sawdayil’ek oŋienumŋumle.
tittel buollar lewej-mentq aq n’id’ayaj-l’el-le sawdayil’-
etq3PL MP summer-ADV constantly end-NVIS-PTCP coat-FOC.ABS
oŋie-nun-q-m-le
wear-HAB-PL-TR.3.OF
‘They constantly wore a worn out coat in summer.’

- accusative alignment:

non-focal S

(661) Puge-če čajle-pe ayyol-ŋi.
be.hot-PTCP day-PL stand-3PL.INTR
‘The days are hot.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:206)

non-focal A and O

(662) Ganja tude amaa-γane önid’e-lek suŋdii-nu-m
Ganya 3SG.POSS father-ACC clay-INS throw.ITR-DUR-TR.3SG
‘Ganya was throwing clay at his father.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:96)

The alignment principles delineated above are sometimes violated and reliable claims
cannot always be made about the reasons for that. A few cases of deviant alignment are
presented below.

(663) Id’ire an met-ek qad’ir qoyi-nu-be kudiči-nun-ŋ.
now DM 1SG-FOC.ABS DM dig-DUR-NMLZ put.ITR-HAB-1SG.TR
‘And, you see, now I myself put a toothpick next to me.’
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:46)

---

238 In lexically modified arguments the focus suffix is usually –k, and not –ley.
This sentence has an impossible combination of a transitive verb with a subject formally encoded as an S-argument. The verbal ending also does not show agreement in focus with the subject: the SF verbal ending would be expected given the marking of the S-argument, but the verb is in the BC form that would normally indicate adjunct-focus. The consequence of (663) is that focalized core arguments can follow the neutral alignment system under focus. This entails a descriptive problem: the focus markers are treated here as absolutive case endings since they show an ergative distributional pattern marking S and O. But (663) shows that the focus marker can be used indiscriminately with all core arguments under focus. The consequence of this is that the ergative distributional pattern is not there any longer. How can one speak under such circumstances about the focus markers being absolutive case endings? A potential solution for this problem is a possibility that the sentence is incorrect. Indeed, three informants consulted regarding this sentence rejected it substituting metejlek ‘1SG.EMPH’ (see 3.5.1) or met waaj ‘I too’ for metek. The suggested substitutions are compatible with the rest of the sentence both from the viewpoint of the alignment system and of the agreement system.

Kurilov (personal communication) claims that the accusative ending –le is attached to a non-interlocutor O regardless of the person of the subject.

(664) Met-ek ile-le nuu-l.
1SG-FOC.ABS reindeer-ACC find-GER, SF

‘It is I who found the reindeer.’

According to the existing descriptions this ending is attached only if the subject is a non-interlocutor. This elicited sentence poses the same problem as (663) and another one, suggesting that nominal non-focal direct objects follow the accusative alignment pattern irrespective of the position of A in the person hierarchy. This contradicts what is reflected in Tables 4.2.3 and 4.2.4. Again, several informants regard the sentence in (664) as ungrammatical. Yet another informant gave controversial judgments on different occasion ranging from rejection to acceptance. In the former case he claimed that the correct sentence would be (665), which is common way to encode a focal A. In the latter case he said that (664) was equivalent to (665).

(665) Ile met nuu.
reindeer 1SG[FOC,ERG] find[AF]

‘It is I who found the reindeer.’

I take these deviant alignment structures as signs of incepting erosion of the focus system in TY, which are especially clearly manifest in younger speakers (see 5.2.8).
4.2.3 Predication types

4.2.3.1 Nonverbal predicates

Nominal, locative and existential predicates are nonverbal in TY. Predication of properties is done by qualitative verbs (but see 4.2.3.1.5). The bulk of nonverbal predicates require a copula device. There are four linguistic devices to form a copular clause: the copula –leŋ or –k as well as the copular verbs ŋol-, l’e-, and pan-. The terminological distinction made here between ‘copula’ and ‘copular verbs’ is justified by the differences in their behavior on different levels. The copula can have the non-future tense reference only, does not take personal endings and cannot be used if the subject of the copular clause is not in the 3rd person. The plural is denoted only in the predicate noun itself and not in the copula. The copula is suffixed to the predicate noun and forms an integral part of it; no pause is possible between the copula and the predicate. The use of the copular verbs, on the other hand, is not restricted by the person of the subject or the tense frame. They agree with the subject both in person and number attaching regular personal endings of intransitive verbs. It is possible to insert a pause or even a clitic between the predicate nominal and a copular verb. Despite the formal similarities between copular verbs and true verbs, the former are regarded here as forming non-verbal predicates because they are semantically empty.

The copula and the copular verbs occur clause-finally as verbs usually do in TY. Several types of copular clauses can be distinguished.

4.2.3.1.1 Identification: This is R

Identification clauses are characterized by the absence of a subject, an entity is merely recognized as such. Identification clauses are supported by the copula –leŋ/-k and the copular verb ŋol-, but these devices show partly complementary distribution: in clauses with future tense reference the copular verb is the only option:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEIC</td>
<td>house-COP</td>
<td></td>
<td>DEIC</td>
<td>1SG-COP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

239 It is necessary to note here that many qualitative verbs seem to require the copular verb ŋol- in order to be capable of acting as predicates. But the relation between the base and the copular verb in those verbs is different from that between this copular verb and noun predicates, which makes it reasonable to regard adjectival predicates as verbal. See 3.2 for details.

240 The choice of a copula is determined by the internal structure of the respective NP. If its head is not modified in any way, the copula –leŋ is employed. If the head of an NP constituting the predicate of a nonverbal clause is modified lexically or by a derivational morpheme (e.g. by the diminutive suffix), the copula normally surfaces as –k.

241 In this sense the TY copular verbs are unusual as ‘copular verbs tend to be very irregular’ (Payne 2007:117).

242 The designation R is borrowed from Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008:88) where it stands for ‘Subact of Reference’, which is ‘an attempt by the Speaker to evoke a referent’.

243 Ten and an in the illustrating examples are purely deictic element used for pointing at objects being identified and do not fill an argument position. They differ from other deictic devices, demonstrative pronouns, also in that they cannot function as attributes.
‘Here is a house.’

(668) Ten paipε-n moŋo-k.  
DEIC woman-GEN cap-COP

‘Here’s a women’s cap.’

(669) Ten kejen nime-leŋ\textsuperscript{244}.  
DEIC previously house-COP

‘This was a house.’

This distribution of the copular devices is summarized in Table 4.2.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-future tense</th>
<th>Future tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-leŋ/-(e)k</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋol-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The deictic particle ten often occurs in identification clauses but isn’t obligatory:

(670) An kejen nimeyon’.  
DEIC previously house

‘This was a house.’

(671) Ten nimeyotej.  
DEIC house-be-FUT-INTR.3SG

‘This will be a house.’

Nouns functioning as predicates that are overtly marked as possessed must lack the copula, a behavior which can also be observed when the copula is used as the nominal focus marker (see 5.2.1.2).

(672) Neme wienuj čiipeleŋ?  
what do-DUR-PTCP people-PL-COP

‘What are [these] people doing?’

Geologpeleŋ.  
group-PL-COP geologist-PL-COP

‘[These] are geologists.’

(Kurilov 1994:9)

Nouns functioning as predicates that are overtly marked as possessed must lack the copula, a behavior which can also be observed when the copula is used as the nominal focus marker (see 5.2.1.2).

(673) Ten amaa-gi.  
DEIC father-PERT

‘This is his/her father.’

(674) Ten mit uraričiće.  
DEIC 1PL teacher

‘This is our teacher.’

The copular verb is not subject to such a restriction:

(675) Kakau amaa čulyad’ii ŋoll’en’.  
Kakau father poke-NMLZ be-NVIS-INTR.3SG

‘It was father Kakau’s ice-pick’  
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:20)

Identification clauses are negated by the regular negative proclitic el=:\textsuperscript{244}

(676) (Ten) el=ile-leŋ.

\textsuperscript{244} A speaker rejected this sentence because of the cognitive contradiction between the proximal value of the particle ten and the past tense reference, which is perceived as distant. The particle, which expresses proximity to a lesser degree would be quite felicitous.

Table 4.2.1
4.2.3.1.2 Equation: $R_1$ is $R_2$.

In equation clauses the referents of two NPs are identified with each other. An equation clause has an overt subject NP. They are also supported by both the copula –leŋ/-k and the copular verb ŋol-, having the same temporal scope as in identification clauses:

(677) $Tugi^{245}$ nime-leŋ.  (678) $Tugi$ kejen nime-leŋ.

‘This is a house.’ ‘This will be a house.’

(679) $Tugi$ kejen nimeŋon’

‘This was a house.’

(680) $Tugi$ nime ŋotej.

‘This was a house.’

(682) Tudel tetčie-leŋ.

‘He is a rich man.’

(683) Roza amaa-gi Aleksej-die ilwiiče-leŋ.

‘Roza’s father, Aleksashka, worked as a herder.’

As is stated in footnote 240, the suffix –k is employed when the nominal predicate is modified:

(684) Ed’ilwej alajii wadul-ek.

‘Edilwey is a Yukaghir from the Alayee clan’

(685) Ed’ilwej eln’iimije-k

‘Edilwey is an orphan, …’

The same happens if the modification is purely morphological. In the following example an ancient root not easily interpretable synchronically (therefore no detailed gloss) is preceded by the negative clitic el= and possibly the reciprocal clitic n’i=.

(686) Neme-leŋ  čaaqii-nu-meŋ

245 Some speakers do not accept this kind of clauses and replace $tugi$ by $ten$. They obviously perceive them as identification clauses and resort to the deictic particle.
what-FOC slice.fish.while.eating.it-DUR-TR.1/2SG.OF
el=muoqad-uo-k?
NEG=broad.whitefish-child-COP

‘Isn’t it broad whitefish fry that you are eating while slicing it?’
(Kurilov 2001:272, muoquaduo)

Nonverbal clauses can be quite complex in written TY.

(687) Čiiŋ amutneŋ el kuril‘iime, el mōri-me, tan ućunajqe amutneŋ el uraričuol
tadaate el d’anjut n’imelesuol juorpure ennuj maarqan omopegi wadulpeleŋ.
čiiŋ amutneŋ el=kuril‘i-me el=mōri-me ućunaj-pe
people well NEG=know-PTCP.PASS NEG=hear-PTCP.PASS scholar(Russ)-PL
amutneŋ el=urarič-uol tadaate el=čanjut n’imeles-uol
well NEG=study-BE[GER] and.EMPH NEG=well describe-be[GER]
juorpure en’-nu-j maarqan omo-pe-gi wadul-pe-leŋ
tundra be.alive-DUR-PTCP one.GEN folk-PL-PERT Yukaghir-PL-COP
‘Yukaghirs are one of the peoples living in the tundra, about who people hardly
know or have heard anything and who has poorly been studied and described by
scientists.’       (Kurilov 2000:7)

Nominal predicates encoded without a copula are common when naming referents:

(688) Met kirije N’iraqa.
1SG name Nyirakha
‘My name is Nyirakha.’ (Kurilov 1991:38)

Compare (688) with (689), where the predicate is a common noun and the copula is
obligatory.

(689) Alajip Muoqatke jalyilen
alajip muoqatke jalyil-leŋ
Alayip Muokhatke lake-COP
‘Alayip Muokhatke is a lake, …’ (Kurilov 2001:272, muoqan’-)

The omission of the copula in (688), as opposed to (689), marks the distinction between
specification and characterization (Hengeveld 1992:82-89).
Equation clauses with referential nouns as predicates are formed in the same way as those
with non-referential noun predicates.

(690a) Tan köde uraričiiciε yon’.
tan köde uraričiiciε yol-i
INVS.DEM man teacher be-INTR.3SG
‘That man is a teacher.’

(690b) Tan köde n‘id’erpej uraričiiciε yon’.
tan köde n‘id’erpe-j uraričiiciε yol-i
INVS.DEM man new-PTCP teacher be-INTR.3SG
‘That man is the new teacher.’
As is apparent from the examples, the verbal focus marker, the proclitic me(r=), is omitted in nominal predicates supported by the copular verb. However, the proclitic is compatible with nominal predicates and fulfills pragmatic functions (see 5.2.3).

The alternative use of the copula and copular verb can in an appropriate context bring about a semantic difference. While (691a) is a categorical statement not allowing any doubts, (691b) implies that the subject referent does not consider himself Yukaghir although he has Yukaghirs among his ancestors:

(691a) Tudel wadu-leŋ.
3SG Yukaghir-COP
‘He is Yukaghir.’

(691b) Tudel wadul ŋol-i.
3SG Yukaghir be-INTR.3SG
‘He is Yukaghir.’

Negation of the copular verb ŋol- is achieved by the use of the negative proclitic el=, which is employed in this function with verbal clauses too:

(692) Ukul’e, tet metul akaa el monl’ek, ten met tetqa el akaa ŋođ’eŋ.
ukul’e tet met-ul akaa el=mon-l’ek
Akulina 2SG 1SG-ACC elder.brother NEG=say-PROH.1SG
ten met tet-qa el=akaak ŋođ-jeŋ
DM 1SG 2SG-LOC NEG=elder.brother be-INTR.1SG
‘Akulina, don’t you call me [your] elder brother; I am not your elder brother.’

Again, if the predicate noun is overtly marked as having entered a possessive relation, there is no copular device:

(693a) Semien el=tet akaa.
Semyon NEG=2SG elder.brother
‘Semyon isn’t your elder brother.’

(693b) Tuŋ saal čupče apanalaa saal.
uŋ saal čupče-n-d apanalaa saal
ADL.PROX wood Chukchi-gen-0 old.woman wood
‘This grave is an old Chukchi woman’s grave.’

The suffix deriving relational adjectives produces the same effect:

(694) Jarqa dite n’aawee-j ile-pe wadul-pe-l’e.
ice like be.white-PTCP reindeer-PL Yukaghir-PL-RLN
‘Reindeer white as ice belong to the Yukaghirs.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:176)

4.2.3.1.3 Existence (There is R) and Location (R₁ is at R₂)

Existential and locative clauses make use of the same linguistic means, namely of another copular verb, l’e-. An important difference between the two types of clauses is that existential clauses may be analyzed as lacking a subject and merely asserting the
existence of an entity that is not presupposed. Locative clauses always have a subject with a presupposed referent, whose location is asserted. One of the important pragmatic functions of existential clauses is to open a narrative as in (695a, b) or introduce a new participant into the discourse as in (696).

(695a) *N’id’anmijil’-pe-k l’e-ŋu-l*  
brothers-PL-FOC.ABS be-PL-GER  
‘There were two brothers, …’  (Kurilov 1991:30)

(695b) *Eln’iimije wadulpe l’iel’elŋi.*  
eln’iimije wadul-pe l’e-l’el-ŋi  
orphan Yukaghir-PL be-NVIS-3PL.INTR  
‘There lived Yukaghirs, which were orphans.’  (Kurilov and Odé 2012:182)

Existential clauses may contain a location. The crucial distinction between such existential clauses and locative clauses is that in the former the location is often, as in (696), though possibly not always, part of the presupposition, while the entity whose existence is asserted is never presupposed. In other words, in existential clauses the theme expression (in terms of Dryer (2007:241)) is in focus, not the location, which is reflected in a corresponding focus agreement ending of the copular verb, making expressions in (696) and (697a, b) formally distinct constructions: existential and locative, respectively.

(696) *Tadaat l’ie stada-ŋin’ počesej-ŋa met-qane.*  
then MP herd(Russ) bring-3PL.TR 1SG-ACC there hear(Russ)-LOC  
met brigadier Kurilov Ivan Vasil’evič l’e-l.  
1SG team-leader Kurilov Ivan Vasilyevich be-GER.SF  
‘Then [one] sent me to the herd. There, in the herd, there was my team-leader, Kurilov Ivan Vasilyevich.’

Locative nonverbal clauses locate a presupposed entity in space without the help of a lexical verb:

(697a) *Met taymigi pude l’e-jeng.*  
1SG then outside be-INTR.1SG  
‘At that moment I was outside, …’  (Kurilov 2006: 209)

(697b) *Tuustaaq Sien ɬod’e poselokqa l’ukuoče l’e-jenj.*  
Tuustaaq Sien ɬol-reŋ poselok-qa l’ukuoče l’e-jenj  
Tustakh Sien be-SIM settlement(Russ)-LOC a.little be-INTR.1SG  
‘Then I lived for a while in the settlement Tuustakh-Sien.’

Interrogative location clauses are special in the sense that they are formed with the help of the interrogative copula *qoll’e*, which is most probably the result of amalgamation of the question word *qada* ‘where’ and the copular verb *l’e*.

(698) *Saand’awjii qoll’e dajinne?*
saal-n-čaw-jii goll’e dajinne
wood-GEN-cut-NMLZ where MP
‘Where is the saw?’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:106)

4.2.3.1.4 Possession: \textbf{R₁ has R₂} or \textbf{R₁ is of R₂ / R₁ belongs to R₂}

Apart from the verbal clauses whose predicate is derived from nouns by the verbalizing suffix –n’e (see 3.4.1.4), possession can be expressed by non-verbal predicates. The majority of possessive clauses with non-verbal predicates are of two types. The formation of the first type of possessive clauses involves a locative construction. The possessor behaves as if it was a location, constituting together with the copular verb l’e- the predicate, and the possessum, if overtly present, is the subject of the clause:

(699a) Tadaat buollar ise titqa me l’iel’eltej.
then MP(Yak) MP(Yak) 2PL-LOC PF=be-NVIS-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘But then, maybe you have it.’

(699b) Met-qa legul (me)=l’e-j.
1SG-LOC food (PF)=be-INTR.3SG
‘I have food.’

In the second type of possessive clauses the possessum is also the subject, but the predicate does not employ a copular device and consists only of an independent possessive pronoun denoting the possessor:

(700a) Tuŋ nime met-l’e.
ADL.PROX house 1SG-RLN
‘This house is mine.’

(700b) Tugi tudel’e.
ADL.PROX 3SG-RLN
‘This is his.’

Additionally, TY has a strategy for expressing possession which is characteristic for Turkic languages. The possessive relation is encoded in a possessive construction whose head is the subject of an existential non-verbal clause:

why kill-DUR-TR.2SG DEIC 1PL food PF=be-INTR.3SG
‘Why are you slaughtering [a reindeer]? Here, we have food. (Our food exists.)’
(Kurilov 2001:227, l’e-)

4.2.3.1.5 Qualification: \textbf{R has a property T}\textsuperscript{246}

As stated in 4.2.3.1, encoding properties in predicates follows the pattern of verbal predicates. This is not the only strategy: the lexeme expressing a property can form a

\textsuperscript{246} The letter T stands for ‘Subact of Ascription’ (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008:88), which is ‘an attempt by the Speaker to evoke a Property’.
compound with the word *sukun* ‘thing’ and be predicated with the help of the copular verb *ŋol-* (see also 711)\(^\text{247}\).

(702) *Tamongi nimepegi jukurukun ŋoll’en*.  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tamongi} & \quad \text{nime-pegi} & \quad \text{juku-sukun} & \quad ]\text{ŋol-l’el-i} \\
\text{then} & \quad \text{house-PL-PERT} & \quad \text{small-thing} & \quad \text{be-NVIS-INTR.3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘At that time their tent was small.’

Some of the meanings are covered by the copular verb *pan*–:

(703) *N’iruonban yan n’amiidamunden’uo.*  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{n’iruon-ban-yan} & \quad \text{n’amiil-n-d-amun-den’uo} \\
\text{separately-be-JUSS} & \quad \text{neck-GEN-0-bone-EMPH}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Let the neck vertebrae also be separate.’

The clause in (703) presents a transition to comparative clauses described below.

4.2.3.1.6 Comparison: \textbf{R is so}

This very general, trivial indeed, formulation of the function fulfilled by comparative clauses is chosen because the copula *pan*–, specialized in these clauses, forms predicates with nouns and adverbs alike. In (703), which could be taken as an instance of comparative clauses, it predicates the adverb *n’iruon* ‘separately’. Another adverb commonly associated with this copula is *taat* ‘so:

(704) *Tan id’ie l’ie el=taat ban, jawuo me=ćuy-nun-ŋa.*  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{and} & \quad \text{now} & \quad \text{MP} & \quad \text{NEG=so} & \quad \text{be} & \quad \text{everything.DO} & \quad \text{PF=count-HAB-3PL.TR}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Nowadays it isn’t like that, one counts everything.’

Such expressions with *pan*– can be taken as compounds, a fact which is sometimes reflected in writing:

(705) *Tadaat l’ie mono-pul-gi bukatyn wiede-ban-i.*  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{then} & \quad \text{MP} & \quad \text{cap-PL-PERT} & \quad \text{completely} & \quad \text{another.ADV=be-INTR.3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Back then, caps were quite different.’

The copular verb *pan*– interacts with the word *jöke* ‘far’, which functions as an adverbial, but is, in fact, a noun, since it can be inflected for spatial cases:

(706) *Nime-pul n’aajal’aruul jöke ban-i.*  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{house-PL} & \quad \text{interval} & \quad \text{far} & \quad \text{be-INTR.3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The houses are situated far from one another.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:58)

\(^{247}\) This is a wide spread construction. It can be used also with attributive forms of action verbs:

(707) *Nasiilej ann’e-j-rukun*  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{with.difficulty(Russ)} & \quad \text{speak-PTCP-thing}
\end{align*}
\]

‘He speaks with difficulty.’
With nouns serving as a standard for comparison, the copular verb *pan*- is normally associated via the adverb *dite* ‘like’:

(708a) *Anme samolet seruge dite ban-i.*
  just airplane(Russ) drone like be-INTR.3SG
  ‘It is just like the drone of an airplane.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:58)

(708b) *Tet Nataša dite ban-i.*
  ‘[He] was like your Natasha.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:150)

4.2.3.1.7 Compatibility of nonverbal predicates with TAM markers.

It is often a characteristic of nonverbal predicates that the range of TAM markers they are compatible with is narrower than that of verbal predicates. From some of the examples above it is apparent that the only true temporal affix of TY, the suffix *–t*, is readily compatible with nonverbal predicates. These can attach aspectual markers as well. In (709) the habitual aspect suffix indicates that the pike catch is abundant if one applies a certain fishing technique.

(709) *Amutneŋ pojuod'e li'e umuje ŋolun*.
  be.good.INTR.3SG-ADV be.numerous-PTCP MP pike be-HAB-INTR.3SG
  ‘There is really much pike normally.’

Nonverbal predicates can interact with the inchoative. The copular verb *ŋol*- acquires the meaning ‘to become’ in this event:

(710) *Tuŋ körel örn'ere ŋquorere me nayaal’en’ taŋ nayadayə lukumburebe jawner köd’e ŋolaal’en’.*
  ADL.PROX devil cry-SIM scream-SIM PF=fall.down-NVIS-INTR.3SG
  DM fall.down-3SG.DS ground everything worm be-INCH-NVIS-INTR
  ‘That devil cried, screamed and fell down. When he fell down the whole ground turned into worms.’

In (711) the non-visual mood suffix accompanies successively the verbal and the nonverbal predicate.

---

248 The choice of the copular verb *ŋol-*, used in identification and equation clauses, is unexpected here because the pike is already identified in the immediately preceding discourse and it is the only fish species that is spoken about. In this context the sentence can be interpreted only as existential one, asserting the existence of the known referent under given circumstances. Existential clauses require the copular verb *l’e*-.

Informants have divided opinions about the grammaticality of this sentence.
The combination of the non-visual and future tense suffix in (47) expresses the belief on the part of the speaker that a fish sort is found in the reservoir spoken about. With verbal predicates, the combination of these suffixes also has epistemic value.

Apart from the non-visual mood, the copular verb yol- is compatible with the desiderative mood suffix:

(713) Met doktor yolaalbud’en.  
met doktor yol-aa-l-bun’-jeŋ  
1SG doctor be-INCH-GER-DES-INTR.1SG  
‘I wish to become a doctor.’ (Kurilov 1994:43)

4.2.3.2 Verbal predicates

Verbal predicates in TY are very clearly divided into intransitive and transitive. The clarity of the division stems not only from the capacity of transitive verbs to take direct objects that are marked as such with the accusative case ending, or from the number of the arguments possible, but also from the existence of the distinct conjugational paradigms for transitive and intransitive verbs (see 3.4.2.1).

As is not uncommon cross-linguistically, predicates represented by intransitive verbs can be further subdivided into groups according to different (sets of) criteria. Thus, for instance, there are five subgroups of intransitive verbs according to their semantics: intransitive action verbs, qualitative, quantitative, denominal and deictic verbs. These groups of verbs exhibit also other differences from each other, apart from the obvious semantic one (see 3.4.1 for details). Highly important for communicative purposes is the subgroup of denominal intransitive verbs that express possession.

Another important division that can be made with respect to intransitive predicates is purely syntactic in nature: argument taking predicates and zero-place predicates. TY grammar allows ditransitive predicates, which form a subgroup of predicates represented by transitive verbs.

One encounters discrepancies in TY between the expected argument structure and the (in)transitivity of a verb, which can be classified as instances of semi-transitivity in TY, in terms of Dryer (2007:270-274). Semi-transitive clauses display mixed properties of intransitive and transitive clauses. The nuclei of semi-transitive clauses belong to two uneven groups. Only a handful of them are determined lexically, e.g. the verbs mon- ‘to
say’, čuŋde- ‘to think’, juoŋaj- ‘to finish’. The whole rest of the semi-transitive clauses are conditioned by negation, information structure or presence of detransitivizing suffixes (e.g. the desiderative suffix), thus grammatically.

4.2.3.2.1 Intransitive vs. transitive predicates

The main general difference between intransitive and transitive predicates lies in the capability of the latter to take more than one argument. Thus, in (714) the only further participant apart from that of the primary one, or the S-argument, can be an adjunct.

(714) Maarqad’eŋ waaweeče-p-leŋ mit-qa kelu-ŋu-l.
    once Russian-PL-ABS.FOC 1PL-LOC come-PL-GER.SF

‘Once Russians came to us.’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

In (715), on the other hand, whose predicate is represented by a transitive verb, two arguments are present, the pronominal subject and two objects, explicitly marked as such.

(715) Tittel qaql’pele tadaat gaz yo’d’erukune wanjčinunŋa.
    tittel qaql’-pe-le tadaat gaz yoł-je-sukun-le wanjči-nunŋa
    3PL stone-PL-ACC and gas(Russ) be-PTCP-thing-ACC look.for-HAB-3PL.TR

‘They search for stones and the so-called gas.’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

Arguments denoting activated referents can be and often are omitted. This may make them look like zero-argument predicates but they still crucially differ from those in that it is possible to supplement them with their arguments whereas zero-argument predicates can under no circumstances take overt NPs as arguments. The predicates of the two last finite clauses in (716) are stripped of their subjects, whose referents are known.

(716) Waaweečepe keweŋjudaŋya met wal’be’n’eŋ Mejqeqn’eŋ geolog yołənŋ uzorajli. […]
    Geologpe dite jök’de ayuod’e monqan’iŋ. […] Mejqeq tan gaz laćil’ya lołysut
    mondelek ewresuol čaajnikki, lawjen’iire eluojij. Iral’an!’
    Russian-PL leave-PL-GER-PERT-LOC 1SG friend-COM Meykhey-COM
    geologist be-SIM play-INTR.1PL
    geologist-PL like far-DIM stand-PTCP knoll-DAT
    Mejqeq tan gaz laćil’ya lołysu-s-ut mon-relek ewre-suol
    Meyqeq INV$-DEM gas fire-LOC boiИ-CAUS-FUT[1SG] say-ANT go-CAUS-be[GER]
    čaajnik-gi lawje’n’-ii-ren eluojij-i. iral’al-i
tea.pot-PERT water-VBLZ-CAUS-SIM carry-1PL.TR be.heavy-INTR.3SG

‘When the Russians left, I played geologists with my friend Meykhey. […] [Just] like geologists, [we walked] to a knoll standing pretty far away. […] We dragged along Meykhey’s tea-pot full of water about which he had said, ‘I will cook on the fire of that gas’. [It] was heavy!’ (Kurilov 1994:9-10)

249 The two latter verbs take clauses and not NPs as their semantic O-arguments.
After the protagonists of this children’s story, the narrator and his friend Meykhey, have been introduced into the discourse as a group, they do not surface in the following sentences as long as they are considered by the narrator as identifiable, except in the verbal ending, as the subject of the transitive verb *eluoji-* ‘to carry’. In the concluding clause the tea-pot is only implied as the only argument of the intransitive verb *iral’al-* ‘to be heavy’.

In (717) both arguments of a transitive verb are omitted:

(717)  
Qad’ir me=kewrej-m.
DM PF=carry.away-TR.3SG

‘(“I will take with me only the old woman. Where is her son?”’ A young man stepped forward and said, ‘Here am I.’ Edilwey said, “You too, take the reindeer and clothes. If you don’t mind, I would like to take you with me.” – “Why should I mind, I’d rather be glad.”’) So [he] took [them] away.’ (Kurilov 2005:158)

4.2.3.2.2 Subgroups of intransitive predicates

As stated in 4.2.3.2, intransitive verbs can be divided into five groups according to the lexical meaning of the verbs functioning as their predicates. The verbs belonging to the first group predicate actions. Within this subgroup, TY does not make a distinction between stative and dynamic verbs based on the notion of greater or lesser agentivity of the subject referent. Neither does the volitionality of the action play any role, therefore the general cover term ‘action intransitive verbs’ for this subgroup. (718a) and (718b) illustrate this point.

(718a) Akaagi tite jaqtaal’en’.

akaa-gi tite jaqte-aa-l’el-i
elder.brother-PERT so sing-IMPER-NVIS-INTR.3SG

‘The elder brother began to sing like that.’

(718b) Nimepegin saal in’uor purepeda keriel’en’.

nime-pe-gi-n saal in’uor pure-pe-da-γa kerie-l’el-i.
house-PL-PERT-GEN stick even upper.part-PL-PERT-LOC fall.down-NVIS-INTR.3SG

‘Suddenly the carrying poles of their house fell down on them.’

The verbs belonging to the two following semantic subgroups of intransitive verbs predicate qualities and quantities respectively:

(719)  
Sukungi nemegi jawner amuoll’en’.

sukun-gi neme-gi jawner amuo-l’el-i
clothes-PERT what-PERT everything be.good-NVIS-INTR.3SG

‘Her garments, just everything was beautiful.’

(720)  
Met laame imdald’an’, tan tetl’e?

met laame imdald’al-i tan tet-l’e
1SG dog be.five-INTR.3SG and 2SG-RLN

‘I have five dogs, and you?’ (Kurilov 2001:95, *imdald’an’-)*
The morphosyntactic distinctions between these three semantic groups of intransitive verbs are presented in 3.4.1.

A very important subgroup of intransitive clauses is that derived from nouns. They predicate e.g. the possession of the referent of the verbalized noun to the subject referent. The derivational device of these ‘verbs of possession’ is homophonous to the comitative suffix –n’e:

(721) **Met** taŋ’eŋ law-re ise mer=at=uo-n’e-jeŋ.  

1SG INVS.DEM drink-COND MP PF=POT=child-VBLZ-INTR.1SG

‘If I drink this I might have children.’

The last group of intransitive verbs is represented by the deictic verb (see 3.4.1.5 for details).

While transitive predicates can have more than one argument, intransitive predicates can have less than one argument in TY, or, in other words, be zero-argument predicates. The conjugational ending of the verb in such a predicate does show agreement with 3SG and could thus be said to have a syntactic subject on that level but unlike other intransitive verbs it can never be actually supplied with an overt NP in the subject position.

As might be expected, zero-place predicates are typically represented by verbs describing some atmospheric phenomena:

(722a) **Tuŋun wal’ awjaayandeŋ jukuoču tiwen’iel’elde id’igojgindeŋ ise mer at amuč.**

**Tuŋun wal’ awjaayandeŋ jukuoču tiwe-n’e-l’el-re id’igojgindeŋ**  
ADL.PROX instead.of yesterday a.little rain-VBLZ-NVIS-COND in.the.morning

ise mer=at=amu-o-j  
MP PF=POT=be.good-INTR.3SG

‘If instead of that it had rained yesterday, the weather would possibly improve in the morning.’  
(Kurilov 2001:462)

(722b) **Tuŋ čajle-ya quode-ban?** — **Mer=erin’e-j.**

**ADL.PROX day-LOC how-be[3SG.ITRG]**  
PF=thaw-INTR.3SG

‘How is [the weather] today?’  
‘[It] is thawing.’  
(Kurilov 2001:604, erin’e-)

4.2.3.2.3 Ditransitive predicates

Ditransitive predicates allow, as the name suggests, two arguments apart from the subject (A-argument): the direct (T-argument) and indirect object (R-argument). The indirect object/R is encoded, as may be expected, with the dative case. The T-argument is marked depending on its pragmatic status either by the accusative or the absolutive case.

(723) **Taŋ kewejnaadaya amaapulgi tuŋ wolmeŋin’ tideŋ čaŋad’ejuoldaya ten mitin’ ködelek me čaŋad’ej monur me wolmewej monur taŋ ködeŋin’ kin ilek tadil’elmele.**

**taŋ kewej-naa-l-daya amaapul-gi tuŋ wolme-ŋin’ tideŋ čaŋad’e-ŋol-daya**
‘When he was leaving, their father gave two reindeer to the shaman for his coming to them, for his work, the exorcism.’

4.2.3.2.4 Discrepancies between the (in)transitivity of a predicate and argument structure

There are two main types of semi-transitive clauses in TY. Those of the first type are characterized by the combination of a formally intransitive verb (it can be intransitive either primarily like the verb mon- ‘to say’ and a few other or detransitivized in a certain grammatical context) with two core arguments. Moreover, the direct object of such an intransitive verb can have an overt accusative case ending if the conditions for that are met (see 3.3.1.1.2). The grammatically conditioned predicates of semi-transitive clauses are found in the context of negation when no core argument is under focus:

(724) Mit čii wiđeŋ an’aanul’el’ŋi waawečedaruule el kuril’iiŋu.
mit čii wiđeŋ an’e-nu-l’el’ŋi
1PL people another ADV speak-DUR-NVIS-3PL.INTR
waaweče-n-d-aruul-le el=kuril’iiŋu
Russian-GEN-0-language-ACC NEG=know-3PL

‘Our people pronounced [it] differently; they did not speak Russian.’

Semi-transitive predicates also obtain when a grammatical affix with a subsidiary detransitivizing function is attached, e.g. the desiderative suffix bun’-250.

(724) Ilije köde-le nayate-l-bun’-i.
wind person-ACC blow.down-GER-DES-INTR.3SG
‘The wind wants to blow one down.’

The subclass of the lexically determined semi-transitive predicates is confined to the verb mon- ‘to say’:

(725) Mit moŋo malaqcaj monnunŋi waawečed aruulek.
mit moŋo malaqcaj mon-nunŋi waaweče-n-d aruul-lek
1PL cap malakhay say-HAB-3PL.INTR Russian-GEN-0 language-INS
‘One calls our caps “malakhay” in Russian.’

Semi-transitive clauses of the second type contain predicates which are formally transitive verbs. The deviation does not affect the number of the core arguments but has to do with their formal properties. Since focalization triggers application of the ergative

---

250 According to Kurilov (2006:161) transitive verbs do not undergo detransitivization in the desiderative mood, but many speakers, including Kurilov (personal communication) do detransitivize in this grammatical context in spontaneous speech.
alignment system to the focal core argument (see 4.2.2), constellations arise of an A-argument in the nominative combined with an O-argument in the absolutive case or of an A-argument in the ergative co-occurring with the O-argument in the accusative case. A true transitive clause must, however, contain either an O-argument in the accusative or an A-argument in the ergative. Therefore the former constellation (nominative + absolutive) classifies as a pragmatically conditioned instance of clausal semi-transitivity, while the latter one (ergative + accusative) could be more appropriately labeled as 'super-transitive', if A-arguments in the ergative differed formally from A-arguments in the nominative.

Apart from these discrepancies, which are in themselves regular and do not contradict the TY grammar, there are also such that are best understood as signs of the focus system being unstable, because they do reflect contradictory constellations. In the following example, for instance, the interrogative pronoun functioning as the semantic A-argument of a transitive verb displays the absolutive case ending, available only for focal S- and O-arguments. The verb itself is in a form characteristic for the AF pattern and has a direct object in the overtly marked accusative. Thus (726) presents an ‘impossible’ combination of formal properties of the predicate and one of its arguments.

(726) Tet kewejγane kinek endiit titteγane.

Tet  kewej-l-γane  kin-ek  en’-ii-t  tittel-γane
2SG  leave-GER-1/2SG.DS  who-FOC.ABS  be.alive-CAUS-FUT[AF]  3PL-ACC
‘If you leave, who will provide for them?’

This kind of deviation is especially characteristic of the question word ‘who’ functioning as subject. Some more examples of the alignment principles being violated are presented in 4.2.2 and occur throughout the text of the grammar.

4.2.4 Sentence types

In TY several types of sentences can be distinguished: declarative, interrogative, imperative (including hortative and jussive) as well as exclamative.

4.2.4.1 Declarative sentences

The main function of declarative sentences is to assert something. Depending on the focus type there can be 6 morpho-syntactic patterns of declarative sentences: predicate focus (intransitive verb), predicate focus (transitive verb), S-focus, A-focus, O-focus and X-focus. They are illustrated in the following examples

predicate focus (intransitive verb):  predicate focus (transitive verb):

(727) Met me kewečen.

Met  me=kewejeŋ
1SG  PF=leave-INTR.1SG
‘I am leaving.’ (Kurilov 2005:144)

(728) Lawje-le  mer=uu-se-m.

Water-ACC  PF=go-CAUS.TR.3SG
‘She brought the water away.’ (Kurilov 2005:144)
Verbal predicates in negated declarative sentences – except those whose subjects are in the 3rd person; they carry a zero personal ending – follow the conjugational pattern of intransitive verbs under predicate focus. This kind of detransitivisation does not occur in sentences with a focal direct object (see 5.2.6). The negation is conveyed by the proclitic *el=*

(733) El=möri.

‘She does not listen.’ (Kurilov 2005: 144)

(734) Tayi el=amuo-nun.

‘That is not good.’

(735) Elen’. El=kuril’ii-jey mon-i.

‘No. I don’t know,’ he says. (Kurilov and Odé 2012:20)

(736) Tet mod’ek učuonajpe nemen end’erukune el nuuŋu lejtejmenŋ.

‘Note that the focal argument of the verb ‘recall’ is a whole clause.'
‘You said that scientists had not discovered any living entities [in space]. That I recalled.’  (Kurilov and Odé 2012:48)

4.2.4.2 Interrogative sentences

Interrogative sentences focusing on peripheral constituents can have finite verb forms with a specific conjugational paradigm (see 3.4.2.1), e.g. in the 3rd person of intransitive verbs it is a meaningful zero:

(737) Tan quodiir tittel čamaney qan’qaadarə elkewey努?
    tan quodiir tittel čama-neŋ qad’u-qaa-l-daya el=keweje-ŋu?
and why 3PL big-ADV be.cold-INCH-GER-3SG.DS NEG=leave-PL[3.ITRG]
‘And why don’t they leave [only] when it gets very cold?’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

If it is polarity that is in the scope of interrogation, the morpho-syntactic pattern is identical with that of declarative sentences but the sentence has a specific intonation contour, with a prominent pitch rise on the penultimate syllable of the predicate followed by an abrupt pitch fall in the last syllable (see 2.6.2 for an oscillogram and pitch contour):

(738) Malaa n’i=jaqte pundu-r juora-jli?
     MP RECP=song repeat-CIRC play-INTR.1PL.
‘Come on! Shall we play imitating each other’s songs?’
     (Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

Interrogative sentences introduced by quodeŋ ‘how’ are often rhetoric:

(739a) Iide, quodeŋ čaaj lawtem? Tet istuol el=loyorol!
    iide quodeŋ čaaj law-te-m? tet istuol el=loyore-ŋol
aunt how tea drink-FUT-1SG.ITRG 2SG chair(Russ) NEG=wash-be[3SG]
‘Aunt, how should I drink tea, your table has not been wiped clean.’
     (Kurilov and Odé 2012:38)

(739b) Quodeŋ el=oorin’e-t-uok?
     how NEG=cty-FUT-1PL.ITRG
‘How could we withhold our tears?’

(739c) Quode l’etuok? Taŋudeŋ, taŋ jaryiŋ’in miraajeli.
    quode l’e-t-uok? taŋun-deŋ taŋ jaryil-jin’ mira-jeli
how be-FUT-1PL.ITRG INVS.DEM-ADV INVS.DEM lake-DAT walk-INTR.1PL
‘What could we do? We went there, to that lake.’
     (Kurilov and Odé 2012:38)

(739d) Amaa quode wie-te-m? Lačil tuduruu sew-releк kukuul’
    father how do-FUT-TR.3SG fire inner.part enter-ANT sleeping.bag
    quonmedawur-da-γa (aq pugud’e-γa sew-l’el-te-j)
partition.for.legs-PERT-LOC MP heat-LOC enter-NVIS-FUT-INTR.3SG
uo-le waarej-releк kelu-j.
    child-ACC take.out-ANT come-INTR.3SG
(A house caught fire and one of the female tenants forgot her child inside.) ‘What
could your father do? He entered the flames, grabbed the child from the bottom of
the sleeping bag (the child must have crawled into the sleeping bag fleeing the heat) and came out.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:58)

The interrogative ending –m seems, unlike the interrogative ending –(j)uok, compatible with explicitly future tense verb forms alone:

(740a) *Eld’e met quode juora-m?

(740b) Eld’e mit quode juora-juok?

‘How did I play?’

‘How did we play?’

The question in (740b) can be formulated with the regular verb form used in declarative sentences:

(741) Eld’e mit quode juora-jli?

‘How did we play?’

According to a speaker the question in (741) is a ‘neutral’ one, about the objective manner (‘We took a ball, put it in the middle of the field and …’), whereas (740b) is a request to give an assessment.

Interrogative sentences with question words trigger specific focus patterns in accordance with the syntactic function of the question word, while interrogative sentences without question words are compatible with different focus patterns. The following example illustrates the SF pattern.

(742) Aluona aduo-gi tan el=panie-l-bun’-il?

Alyona son-PERT DM NEG=fish-GER-DES-GER.SF

‘Is it Alyona’s son who doesn’t want to fish?’

As is clear from (742), questions may contain a negation. This is illustrated by another sentence below:

(743) Quodiir čiņičelmenę el=aarejnund’eli?

why night-ADV NEG=stop-HAB-INTR.1PL

‘Why don’t we stop at night?’

For transitive verbs in polarity questions one can speak of a separate subtype of negative interrogative clauses. In interrogative sentences with negative polarity transitive verbs do not undergo detransitivisation, which is otherwise obligatory, with an exception, in declarative negative sentences (see 4.2.4.1). In other words, the positive conjugational paradigm with the (in)transitivity distinction, characteristic for declarative sentences under predicate focus and otherwise neutralized in negative sentences with non-focal direct object, is maintained:
Under this label the sentences are subsumed whose predicates are either in the imperative, or hortative, or jussive mood, since they all share the idea of prompting for an action. For the sake of clarity of presentation the mood labels will be used in the following to refer to the subtypes of imperative sentences as just defined.

Syntactically, imperative sentences are characterized by the omission of the subject, which is a cross-linguistically common phenomenon (König and Siemund 2007:304). This is natural in sentences where the directive speech act is issued to an interlocutor, i.e. in the imperative and hortative, because the personal endings in the predicate unequivocally indicate the addressee. In the jussive, however, due to a multitude of potential ‘addressees’ it is not uncommon to have a subject, which is omitted only when the successful identification by the listener of the referent for which the speech act is valid is not at risk:

(4.2.4.3 Imperative sentences)

Out of e.g. politeness, one may introduce a clause with the predicate in the imperative by naming the addressee even when his identity is quite clear:
As can be understood from the above, predicates of imperative sentences are morphologically marked as such by dedicated endings clearly distinguishing the different subtypes of this sentence type among themselves and from other sentence types as well as differentiating singular and plural forms. The hortative is an exception. Its plural form of intransitive verbs is identical with the corresponding indicative form, their common ending being –jeli. A singular form of the hortative does not exist in TY, which is in accordance with the hierarchy established by Aikhenvald (2003 cited by König and Siemund 2007:303): 2 > 1PL (inclusive) > 3SG/PL > 1SG and/or 1PL (exclusive). The hortative is special among the subtypes of imperative sentences in one more aspect: the (in)transitivity is irrelevant in the imperative and jussive but is reflected in the forms of the hortative, where the ending of transitive verbs is –γa, as opposed to –jeli:

(747a) ‘Me kewejnaajeli!’ mod’eŋ252.
me=kewej-naa-jeli mon-jeŋ
PF=leave-INCH-INTR.1PL say-INTR.1SG
‘Let’s get ready for leaving!’ I say.
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:146)

(747b) Neme-ŋin’ sew-jeli.
house-DAT enter-INTR.1PL
‘Let’s go inside.’
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:154)

(745) Luguje čiiŋin’ tadi-ŋa.
luge-je čii-ŋin’ tadi-ŋa
be.old-PTCP people-DAT give-HORT.PL
‘Let’s give [it] to the elderly.’
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:132)

The negative imperative employs in TY the third strategy listed in König and Siemund (2007:308). It makes a combined use of the negator found in declaratives and a verb form ‘other than the positive imperative’ (see more examples in 3.4.2.4):

(746) Abučie tet mit-ul el=janaspejre-l’ek!
grandmother 2SG 1PL-ACC NEG=forget-PROH.SG
‘Grandmother, don’t forget us!’
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:230)

As for indirect strategies for encoding directive speech acts, a non-verbal substitute for the jussive exists. Its jussive meaning is conveyed by the particle köčejk, which is not uncommon in verbal jussives too:

(747) Köčejk čoyune-j-rukun.
MP be.thin-PTCP-thing
‘Let it [be] thin.’

252 Note the presence of the focal proclitic me=.
4.2.4.4 Exclamatives

Exclamatives are often introduced by the modal particle *ugunen* ‘oh, (how) nice that …’:

(748)  
\[
\text{uguneŋ ilije kerie-r engeŋeŋ el=puguče-re-jeŋ.}
\]

‘It is good that the wind is blowing; I have not sweated.’

4.2.5 Agreement

As was already mentioned in 4.2.2, the TY predicate shows agreement with the subject. It agrees with it in person and number. Apart from that it agrees with whichever constituent (subject, object or an adjunct) is in focus of the utterance, indicating the focus type. The respective conjugational paradigms can be reviewed in 3.4.2.1 or 5.2.

The absence of plural marking in a subject represented by a generic noun can result in discrepancy in the agreement in number:

(749)  
\[
\text{ileŋ lewejme pulgid'ilele lewnunumle qand'eme n'ord'ele lewnunya.}
\]

‘In summer reindeer graze green plants and in winter reindeer moss.’

Speakers may chose to employ a singular verb form of the verb in such a case:

(750)  
\[
\text{tet mitqa jedeček mit ile pojuol-mu-j! monnuni metin' met amaa.}
\]

‘You were born and our reindeer [herd] increased in number!’ my father used to tell me.  
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:20)

NPs with the comitative trigger plural agreement:

(751a)  
\[
\text{Tan akaa Semenn'ey maargan qand'e-γa.}
\]

‘And with [my] elder brother Semyon I herded one winter.’

(751b)  
\[
\text{Umčaginn'e n'eya tūŋ paad’eduo iitneŋ qabunda čajleya sayanaal’elŋi tadaat tūŋ qaduŋudeňel el pulgejčuon el quodejčuon.}
\]

---

253 Note the lack of the OF pattern in the second clause, where the BC pattern is employed instead. The contrastive meaning implied by the translation would actually make one expect OF in the second clause too.
Together with Umchagin the girl stayed home for a long time, for several days, not going anywhere or doing anything.'

4.2.6 Impersonal constructions

The impersonal character of a clause can be indicated by employing the word köde ‘person’ functioning as an impersonal subject:

(752) Sukunn’iel’eldayane köde kide’ at čuŋrej.

‘If he had clothes, one could have alternative assumptions. (i.e. one could hope that the person, who lost his way, is still alive)’ (Kurilov 2001:447, sukunn’e-)

A much more common strategy is, however, to encode the predicate as 3PL with subject ellipsis:

(753) Ilediisiile qajaq wienunŋa. L’ukumon’ŋoŋya tuutellek me mojienunŋa, sukune loyorel dite. Tadaat ganče lukul qawarqayą kuderienunŋa. Amdur qajaq dite ikl’amununi.

‘From reindeer milk one makes khayakh (condensed milk). One puts (milk) into a (cleaned reindeer) stomach and rubs [it] as if washing clothes. Then one puts it in a cold place, in a pit. It hardens quickly.’ (Krilov and Odé 2012:188)

4.3 Complex sentences

Complex sentences in TY subsume instances of complementation, adverbial subordination, relative clauses and compound sentences.

4.3.1 Complementation

Complementation is defined as ‘the syntactic situation that arises when a notional sentence or predication is an argument of a predicate’ (Noonan 2007:52). This definition has to be extended for TY in order to accommodate the special kind of complementation existing in TY, in which the predicate semantically requiring an object complement is
formally an intransitive verb and cannot take another argument apart from the subject for syntactic reasons. Thus, for the purpose of this presentation a complement clause is a clause that represents a necessary, purely semantic complement of the predicate of another clause.

The complement types can be classified as follows. Complement clauses can be both reduced and sentence-like. The nucleus of a reduced complement is non-finite and represented either by a gerund or a converb (4.3.1.1). In case of nominalization, the relation between the predicate of the complement with its arguments is that of possession. The nominalized predicate, or the head of this possessive construction, carries the accusative case ending when it functions as an object complement and the general requirements for the overt object marking (see 3.3.1.2) are met. The predicate of the complement can also occur in the dative case. Sentence-like complements (4.3.1.2) have finite predicates in the indicative, whose argument structure is preserved. Complement taking predicates (CTP) take sentence-like complements without the help of a complementizer.

4.3.1.1 Reduced complements

The predicate of a desententialized complement in most cases realized by the gerund, which enters a possessive relation with the notional subject (cf. 754a) and (754b) with (754c), which is a more common constellation cross-linguistically than both arguments having this relation with the predicate (Noonan 2007:70):

(754a) Qad’ir kösl’elek köde sayanelgi anaan at amuč id’ie.

(754b) Mol tuŋ moŋoŋd’ii me=qan’ineŋ čajlen’-il-gi el=juō-nun-jeŋ.

(754c) Mit bočka potaŋa-re-j-l čantajre-ŋ.

When a reduced complement acts as an O-argument of a CTP, it can be marked as such by the accusative case ending:

(755) ... tindaŋ uo-gi men’-ŋol-l’el-daya wanar-lek pilie-ŋol-γane jабал киеjие леjтеj’eJtem.

---

254 Basically, these are cases of semi-intransitivity (see 4.2.3.2 and 4.2.3.2.4), in which the O-argument is represented not by an NP but by a whole clause.
Before she died, she probably recalled how [her cub] was wiped by [her] tongue, licked and let suck when it was born, long ago.'

Reduced complements can be introduced by the interrogative adverb *quode* 'how':

(756) *Mit čajle quode uučijuol olyn' el kuril'iiund'eli*255.

mit čajle quode uučii-yol olyn' el=kuril'ii-nun-jeli
1PL day how pass-be[GER] completely NEG=know-HAB-INTR.1PL

'We did not notice at all how our day passed.'

A complement clause can also be represented by the dative case form of the gerund256:

(757a) *Taŋudeŋ uulŋin’ čuŋden’i.*

taŋun-deŋ uu-l-ŋin’ čuŋde-n’-i
INVS:DEM-ADV go-GER-DAT thought-VBLZ-INTR.3SG

‘He intends to go there.’ (Kurilov 2001:567, čuŋden’-)

(757b) *Met taŋudeŋ uulŋin’ mer=inya-ŋ.*

met taŋun-деŋ uu-l-ŋin’ mer=inya-ŋ.
1SG INVS:DEM-ADV go-be[ger]-OBLG PF=be.afraid-1SG.TR

‘I am afraid to go there.’

The same expression can be supplemented by the obligative suffix without a discernible change of meaning:

(758) *Met taŋudeŋ uujuolmoraw mer=inyaŋ.*

met taŋun-деŋ uu-ŋol-moraw mer=inyaŋ.
1SG INVS:DEM-DAT go-be[ger]-OBLG PF=be.afraid-INTR.1SG

‘I am afraid to go there.’

A reduced complement whose predicate is a gerund, can be encoded in the same way as a dependent adverbial clause (see 4.3.2):

(759a) … *mer ičuom punnuŋudayane.*

mer=ičuo-m pun'-nu-ŋu-l-dayane
PF=look-TR.3SG kill-DUR-PL-GER-3SG.DS

‘… he saw how they were killing.’ (Kurilov 2005:126)

(759b) *Uoduorpegi mōndieŋudayə amutneŋ amuč juōdayane.*

uoduorpe-gi mōndie-ŋu-l-daya amuč-neŋ amuŋ-j juođayane
grandchildren-PERT listen-PL-GER-3SD.DS be.good.INTR.3SG-ADV be.good-INTR.3SG it.seems

‘It is very nice for her grandchildren to listen, as it seems.’

---

255 This sentence shows that the marking of the possessive relation between the nominalized predicate of the complement and its subject is sometimes foregone.

256 This is an interesting parallel to Turkish, where the dative of the gerund is also used for goals (Noonan 2007:71).
Encoding predicates of reduced complements as converbs is a much less frequent phenomenon in TY:

(760a) Met čayad’er me juoyačen.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{met} & \quad \text{čayad’e-r} \quad \text{me=juoya-j-jeŋ} \\
1\text{SG} & \quad \text{work-CIRC} \quad \text{PF=finish-INTR.1SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I stopped working.’

(760b) Juorpure tadaatęŋ saal tuduruunęŋ n’ord’e pulgejnuni taatl’er ten’i ile moojuolde amuč.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{juorpure} & \quad \text{tadaat-ęŋ} \quad \text{saal} \quad \text{tuduruu-neŋ} \quad \text{n’ord’e} \quad \text{pulgej-nun-i} \\
\text{tundra} & \quad \text{and-EMPH} \quad \text{wood} \quad \text{inner.part-EMPH} \quad \text{reindeer.moss} \quad \text{come.out-HAB-INTR.3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘In the tundra there is a lot of reindeer moss, therefore it is good to keep reindeer here.’

The interpretation of the dependent clauses in (760a) and (760b) is based only on the presence of CTPs. They are borderline cases between genuine complement clauses and adverbial clauses. The complements in (760b) could be also translated as ‘… if one keeps reindeer here, it is good’, while (760a) is already rendered into English as if it were an adverbial clause.

4.3.1.2 Sentence-like complements

A complement clause can occur as a finite clause accompanying the predicate of a main clause that requires a complement. Such sentence-like complements are only possible in the object function:

(761a) Kind’e kin kind’e uučiil’eldaya mőrioŋa čuŋčepe me jabaanaal’elŋi.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kind’e} & \quad \text{kin} \quad \text{kind’e} \quad \text{uučiil’el-daya} \quad \text{mőrioŋa} \\
\text{month} & \quad \text{two.GEN} \quad \text{month} \quad \text{pass-NV[GER]-3SG.DS} \quad \text{hear-3PL.TR}
\end{align*}
\]

‘One month, two months passed and they heard that Chukchis began to die.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:162)

(761b) Mörioŋ čiŋxaanureŋ me nemeleŋ miraanul!

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mőrioŋ} & \quad \text{čiŋxa-ru-nej} \quad \text{me=neme-leŋ} \quad \text{mira-nu-l} \\
\text{hear-1SG.TR} & \quad \text{crunch-DUR-SIM} \quad \text{IND=what-FOC} \quad \text{walk-DUR-GER.SF}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I hear something moving about outside, crunching on the snow!’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:32)

It is noteworthy that a sentence-like complement clause follows a CTP. Normally no predicates follow that of the main clause, except in compound sentences (4.3.4). Just to illustrate the default word order involving a reduced clausal complement of the same \textit{verbum sentiendi} the following example may be given:
Sentence-like complementation can also be conditioned by purely semantic considerations, as in the following examples, where the verbs requiring complementation are intransitive and whose only argument slot is already filled:

(763a) Met čuŋde-jëŋ tudel me=kelu-te-j.
1SG think-INTR.1SG 3SG PF=come-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘I thought that he would come.’

(763b) Met čuŋde-jëŋ mit n’ikönmiepe ŋol’eli.
met čuŋde-jëŋ mit n’i-könme-pe ŋol-jeli.
1SG think-INTR.1SG 1PL RECP-friend-PL be-INTR.1PL
‘I thought that we were friends.’

(763c) Met čuŋde-jëŋ tadaat me=kelu-te-j.
1SG think-INTR.1SG then PF=come-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘I thought that he would come later.’

The same, purely semantic, relation exists between the intransitive verb mon- ‘to say’ and its sentence-like complements (see 4.3.1.4.1).

The logical complement clause can be promoted to the status of the main clause while the logical matrix clause is demoted to a dependent clause:

(764) Met mõri-l-ya me=kinek me=jaqte-j.
1SG hear-GER-1/2SG.DS IND=who PF=sing-INTR.3SG
‘I heard somebody singing.’

“When I heard, somebody was singing.”

(765) Id’iene lewejme mõnd’iel-γane taŋ mit lajaat waaj qabun kõdek taat kurčiil’elul.
id’ie-ne lewejl-me mõnd’ie-l-γane taŋ mit lajaa-t
now.EMPH listen-GER-1/2SG.DS DM 1PL back.part-ABL
waaj qabun kõde-k taat kurčiil’el-ul
more how.many person-FOC.ABS so become-NVIS-GER.SF
‘I heard now, in the summer, that after us some more people became like this (were poisoned by charcoal fumes).’

(Kurilov 2001:261, mõnd’iel)

4.3.1.3 Complementation in embedded clauses

The matrix clause of a clausal complement can itself be an embedded clause. This kind of supplementation does not differ principally from that of main clauses: the complement clause appears as the gerund functioning as an argument of the predicate of the embedded clause.
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(766) Met quodega čayad’elpegi quodega iiselpedi ičuor itimen sayanaamund’eŋ.
met quodega čayad’e-l-pe-gi quodega iise-l-pe-gi ičuo-r
1SG how stir-GER-PL-PERT how suck-GER-PL-PERT look-CIRC
itimen sayane-nun-jeŋ
for.a.long.time sīil-HAB-INTR.1SG
‘I sit for a long time watching them move about and suck.’

(767) Tan qawd’idie Qaalid’e nime wiel qodejnur el nimečuon ewrienuj.
tan qawd’idie qaalid’e nime wie-l qodej-nu-r
but uncle Wolf house do-GER be.lazy.to.do-CIRC
el=nime-čuon ewre-nu-j
NEG=house-PRIV go-DUR-INTR.3SG
‘(The Mouse’s house was a real Yukaghir little house.) But Uncle Wolf had no home because he was too lazy to build one.’ (Kurilov 1994:8)

(768) Čama-ne edie-l-gi mör-delek me=segu-j.
big-ADV burn-GER-PERT notice-ANT PF=enter-INTR.3SG
‘Having noticed that it burnt heavily, he entered.’ (Kurilov (2001:586, ediel)

4.3.1.4 Speech-reporting strategies as instances of clausal complementation

Speech can be conveyed directly and indirectly in TY. Direct speech is characterized by the use of the finite forms of its predicates and the retention of reference perspective, while indirect speech can be represented by gerunds, just as other non-finite complement clauses are, and is accompanied by a shift in person reference of the subject.

4.3.1.4.1 Direct speech

The indicator of direct speech is the verb mon- ‘to say/to speak’ which can either follow or precede the direct speech:

(769a) El=kewej-l’ek mon-ŋi.
NEG=leave-PROH.SG say-3PL.INTR
‘They say, “Do not go!” ‘ (Kurilov 2005:144)

(769b) Peldudie mon-i sukun me=cingicčer-i qadun Judeŋ
old.man say-INTR.3SG thing PF=get.dark-INTR.3SG where
kewej-nu-k? Eguojie kewej-k.
leave-DUR-2SG[ITRG] tomorrow leave-IMP.SG
‘The old man said, “It is getting dark. Where will you go? Go tomorrow.” ‘ (Kurilov 2005:144)

Instead of the verb mon- ‘to say’ another verbum dicendi can be used:

(770) In jawul’ya sayaaŋi Qaalid’e tubegejl’en’ lōgitel orjel’en’.
in jawul-γa sayaa-ŋi qaalid’e tubegejl-l’el-i
just.as road-LOC disappear-3PL.INTR Wolf rush.in-NVIS-INTR.3SG
Sometimes indirect speech too must be considered a purely semantic complement, because a *verbum dicendi* cannot not take another complement for valence reasons. The direct speech in (771) cannot be the complement of the finite perception verb either, since its only available argument position is already filled. This means that the direct speech enters here a kind of relation with the rest of the sentence which is formally not to distinguish from parataxis. Semantically, however, it is quite clear that (771) is not a case of coordination.

(771) *Ladid’aa ann’elgi mörič tideŋ qajčiepul nimepegin jëwčeŋ.*

softly speak-GER-PERT be.heard-INTR.3SG ANPH grandfather-PL house-PL-PERT check.on-1SG.TR

‘I hear him saying softly, “I will go and check the house of those old people.” ’

4.3.1.4.2 Indirect speech

The same marker *mon-* ‘to say’ can be used to introduce indirect speech, which is a significantly rarer phenomenon than direct speech. The reported speech is a complement clause whose predicate is encoded as a gerund.

(772) *Met kewejl mod’eŋ.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>met</th>
<th>leave-GER</th>
<th>mon-jeŋ</th>
<th>say-INTR.1SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

‘I will tell [them] that I am leaving.’

(Kurilov 2005:144)

The indirect speech can surface as a finite clause too:

(773) *Ee, tittejlek qanaŋytej monyi.*

| ee   | 3PL-EMPH      | tittel-ejleq | roam-PL-FUT-INTR | say-3PL.INTR |

‘Yes, they said they would roam on their own.’

It has to be noted that indirect speech is not equally acceptable with all speakers. Some reject (772) as ungrammatical and form the sentence using direct speech:

(774) *Met tittin’ me=mon-te-jeŋ me=keweji-nu-jeŋ.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>met</th>
<th>3PL-DAT</th>
<th>me=mon-te-jeŋ</th>
<th>me=keweji-nu-jeŋ</th>
<th>me=keweji-nu-jeŋ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

‘I told them, “I will leave.” ’
4.3.1.5 Predicate clause as a subtype of complement clauses

A predicate clause (term from Hengeveld, personal communication) is essentially the clausal complement of a copula:

(775) Čuguod’ε čojojek juorul dite bani.
čugu-ŋol-je čojojek juorul tite pan-j
sharp-be-PTCP knife=INS scratch-GER like be-INTR.3SG
‘[It felt] as if one scratched with a sharp knife.’

4.3.1.6 Substitutes for complementation

Despite the fact that complementation is widespread in TY this language shows a tendency to avoid it. This may be conditioned by the lack of corresponding CTPs available in other languages and becomes obvious only in elicitation sessions. Thus for achievement CTPs one employs the desiderative mood or future tense verb forms. For phasal CTPs expressing termination of an action one may simply resort to negation:

(776) Met amunye uraalbud’εn / uraa-te-jen.
met amuć-neg uraa-1-bun’-jen / uraa-te-jen
1SG be.good.INTR.3SG-ADV learn-GER-DES-INTR.1SG learn-FUT-INTR.1SG
‘I try to learn well.’
“I want to learn well. / I will learn well.”

(777) Met tet-in’ me=čambii-t. (778) Met el=čaγad’ε-jeŋ.
1SG 2SG-DAT me=čambii-t. (778) Met el=čaγad’ε-jeŋ.
1SG NEG=work-INTR.1SG
‘I decided to help you.’
‘I stopped working.’
“I will help you.”
“I did not work.”

Sometimes one simply creates two adjacent independent clauses:

(779) L’ie tet el pegitejek mer amuć.
l’ie tet el=pegite-jek mer=amu-o-j
EP 2SG NEG=steal-INTR.2SG PF=be.good-INTR.3SG
‘After all, you did not steal [and] this is good.’

The equivalent of a CTP can be a synthetic verbal category. This is the case e.g. with desiderative (780) and manipulative (781), in Noonan’s (2007:132, 136) terms, predicates:

(780) Tittel el=lewde-l-bun’-yu.
3PL NEG=eat-GER-DES-3PL
‘The don’t’ want to eat.’

(781) Tudel metqane čuuleŋ lewsemle.
tudel met-γane čuul-λεŋ lew-se-mle
3SG 1SG-ACC meat-FOC.ABS eat-CAUS-TR.3SG.OF
4.3.2 Adverbial clauses

Adverbial clauses describe a circumstance (temporal, causal etc.) that serves as a background against which the action of the main clause unfolds. Adverbial clauses can be linked with main clauses via a conjunction (see 3.9) or the connection can be conjunctionless. In this latter case the parameter of [±coreferentiality] plays a central role in determining the form of the predicate and the rules of switch-reference (4.3.2.1) apply. A peculiar feature of conjunctionless adverbial clauses in TY is that they are often underspecified as far as the semantic relation between their predicate and the predicate of the main clause is concerned, i.e. one and the same encoding strategy can be employed to convey a range of meanings. In this sense adverbial clauses in TY are very generally circumstantial. Which specific meaning is intended by a given adverbial clause, is in most cases determined by the context.

4.3.2.1 Switch-reference

The predicate of an adverbial subordinate clause, as long as it is realized as a non-finite verb form, takes different shapes depending on whether or not its subject is coreferential with that of the following clause. If it is, a converb is used in the dependent clause. If the subjects are not coreferential, a gerund in the locative case is employed, which can have the extension –ne, which tends to be associated with conditional clauses. The form of the gerund makes it possible to distinguish number and person of the subject to some extent. The interlocutors are set off from the 3rd person by the pertensive suffix, which appears only in the latter. The exponents of plural are the verbal suffix –ŋu in 3PL and the vowel /a/ in 1PL and 2PL (see 3.3.2.1 g for the paradigm).

Dependent adverbial clauses whose predicate is a converb naturally lack an overt subject, for it is coreferential with that of the main clause. In clauses with disjoint reference the pronominal subject is normally omitted in the 3rd person since the corresponding singular and plural verbal forms are distinct. When the subject is one of the interlocutors, where there is a potential confusion between the 1st and 2nd person due to the identity of their verb forms in singular and plural respectively, the subject is preferably omitted if the identity of its referent is clear or can be easily deduced within the discourse. In fact, alternative identification of the subject of an adverbial clause as the 1st or 2nd person and ambiguity stemming form that are only theoretically possible when the subject of the main clause is in the 3rd person. If both clauses have speech act participants as their subjects as in (785), then the non-coreferential subject of the ambiguously encoded predicate of the dependent clause is necessarily the respectively other speech act participant than that represented by the subject of the main clause, in which its person and number are clearly indicated. When the subject of the main clause is in the 3rd person and that of the adverbial clause is an interlocutor, this mutual exclusiveness is not given any longer and ambiguity may arise.

In (782) one can see the concatenations of gerund+finite verb form, converb+finite verb form as well as converb+gerund+finite verb form. In (783) the

257 This is always so when subordination is conjunctionless.
concatenation gerund+converb+finite verb form is exemplified. Sentences with more than three clauses are hardly found.

(782) "When you stop talking, I begin to sing out of love.

(783) ‘Well, when he sat down, the snag began to stir. And having stirred, it flew up high in the sky. After he had flown up on that snag, he flew, he flew for a long time. While flying, he touched his head with his hand. Sometimes his hairs were frozen and sometimes they thawed.’

A few more examples illustrating different switch-reference forms depending on the grammatical properties of the subject follow.

(784) ‘When I go home, don’t follow me.’

(785) ‘When you stop talking, I begin to sing out of love.’
It is interesting that gerunds functioning as complements can trigger the application of the switch-reference rule while remaining insensitive to it, i.e. they themselves do not carry exponents of this grammatical category and, consequently, do not have reference clauses.\(^{258}\) This is not to be confused with the lack of adjacency of a marking clause and a reference clause, mentioned in Haiman and Munro (1983:xiii, G). The existence of such ruptures in marking switch-reference does not seem to be adequately reflected in the typology of switch-reference.

Quite striking is the fact that in TY even participles can function as reference clauses:

The following example shows that it is not merely the grammatical properties of the subjects in the main and dependent clauses that determine the form of the predicate in the latter, but rather the actual, physical identity of the subjects. The DS marker is employed despite the grammatical characteristics of the subjects in the chained clauses being identical, as long as the actual subject referents are different:

Children, the subject of the dependent clause in (789), naturally cannot own reindeer. The identity of the subject referents of the main clause must thus be different. At the same time the grammatical properties of these subjects, despite their being formally encoded as non-coreferential, are the same: 1PL. The we of the dependent clause is exclusive of anyone but the speaker and her siblings, which were small at the time referred to, while in the main clause the subject we is inclusive of the parents and maybe other adult members

\(^{258}\) In terms of Haiman and Munro (1983:xii), the clause in which switch-reference is marked is identified as the marking clause and the clause with respect to which switch-reference is marked as the reference clause. In a concatenation of more than two clauses, one and the same clause will, normally, be a reference clause and a marking clause at the same time, as long as it is not the first or the last one in the sentence.
of the family, who could possess reindeer. Since this purely semantic difference is the
only thing that differentiates the subjects of the main and dependent clause in (789), one
is compelled to conclude that the switch reference markers of TY are semantic in nature.

On the other hand, SS verb forms can be found in contexts when there is no
complete identity of the subject referents. This is often the case when the relation
between two subject referents is that of a part to a whole (e.g. body parts), or when the
speaker wants to associate two different referents, for pragmatic reasons:

(790a) Juòdii-gi jaw-r taat tiwad’i-nun-i.
eye-PERT ache-CIRC so blink.ITR-HAB-INTR.3SG
‘He keeps blinking like that because his eyes are aching.’
(Kurilov 2001:462, tiwad’i-)

(790b) Me=n’imie-j uu-nu-re.
PF=go.out-INTR.3SG go-DUR-SIM
‘It (the engine of the snow-scooter) went out while we were riding.’

SS verb forms are also used in idiomatic expressions serving as adverbials irrespective of
the actual switch-reference considerations:

(791) Jalmid’ey moldelek čamuod’e l’uoriiče k l’etel.
thrice stay.overnight-ANT be.big-PTCP game-FOC.ABS be-FUT-GER.SF
‘In three days there will be great games.’ (Kurilov 2001, 227, l’uoriiče)
‘After having stayed overnight three times …’

4.3.2.2 Types of adverbial clauses

As indicated in 4.3.2, different types of conjunctionless adverbial clauses are often
realized in the same way, without the employment of specific devices to indicate the
particular clause type: either, under coreferentiality of the subjects, as one of the converbs
available in TY or according to the switch-reference rule described above when the
identity of the subject referents is different. Obligatory, clear specializations exist only
under coreferentiality of the subjects for the conditional and final meanings. Other
specializations represent optional, alternative encoding strategies.

4.3.2.2.1 Temporal clauses

Temporal clauses relate a preceding clause to the following one from the viewpoint of the
relative time at which the action of the dependent clause takes place. Three relative
temporal values are recognized: anteriority, simultaneity and posteriority.
Under coreferentiality of the subjects anteriority and simultaneity are expressed by the
converbs terminating in –relek and –rey (see 3.4.2.7) respectively:

(792) Jawnuo juòrelek mit nimien’ me kewečeli.
everything.DO see-ANT IPL home-DAT PF=leave-INTR.IPL

‘After we had checked all [nets], we returned home.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:26)

(793) Me miraanutej mennid’ieje köde peldudien’ej apanalaa n’aacín’. Taat miranureŋ ann’etej.
me=mira-nu-te-j men-and-INS-LOC man old-man-VBLZ-PTCT old-woman in.front.of
so walk-DUR-SIM speak-FUT-INTR
‘The matchmaker walks in front of the parents. Walking like this, he speaks.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:40)

Under disjoint reference, both anteriority (794) and simultaneity (795a) and (795b) are conveyed by a corresponding gerund form, as discussed in (4.3.2.1):

(794) Kuril’ golova ewlikieda ilegi čaureŋ tet amaan’ tadijaa.
Kuril head(Russ) NEG-be-INCH-GER-3SG.DS reindeer-PERT cut.off-SIM
tet ama=T-NSAM tadi-na
2SG father-DAT give-3PL.TR
‘When chief Kuril died, they divided his reindeer and gave [a number of them] to your father.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

(795a) Čaaj lawnujudaya amaayt kuril’ičiŋ.
čaaj tea drink-DUR-PL-GER-3.DS ask-1G.SG
ama=Ya-t kuril’ič-iŋ father-ABL enter-INS
‘While they were drinking tea, I asked my father.’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

(795b) Taŋ körel quduoldaya maarqan nimeyat maarqan pajpe lawjele menčiel’elmele.
taŋ devil lie[GER]-3SG.DS one.GEN house-LOC-ABS one.GEN woman
lawje-le water-FOC.ABS take-ITV-ABS-TR.3SG.OF
men’-če-l’el-mele.
‘While that devil was lying, a woman came out of one of the houses and went to fetch water.’

Note that the suffix –reŋ of the converb in (794) expresses anteriority rather than simultaneity, which is a not infrequent phenomenon:

(796) Kakau amaa sewreŋ jalmid’en qonyač.
Kakau father enter-SIM thrice bow.down-SEM-INTR.3SG
‘Father Kakau entered and bowed three times.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:38)

This semantic difference might be conditioned by the telicity of the verbs. Atelic verbs with the suffix –reŋ seem to express simultaneity in all instances, while telic verbs with this suffix convey anteriority. The translation of the successively used converbs čendejnureŋ and uunureŋ in (782) is an especially telling illustration of this semantic dichotomy.
Posteriority in temporal clauses cannot be rendered by conjunctionless clauses. Along with other finer shades of temporal meaning, its expression is facilitated by conjunctions (see 3.9.2.1). The reader is also referred to 4.3.2.1, where there are several examples of temporal adverbial clauses.

4.3.2.2.2 Conditional clauses

Conditional clauses contain the condition necessary for the completion of the action of the main clause. The predicate of a non-coreferential subject of the conditional clause is encoded according to the switch-reference rule described in 4.3.2.1. There is a strong tendency to employ the extended form of the DS verb form (see also (786)):

(797a) L’ukudal’γα naaduodayane259 mekinke men’γan l’ie metqat.
    l’uku-d-al’γa naaduol-dayane
small-0-fish be.necessary[GER]-3SG.DS
me=kinke men’γan l’ie met-γa-t
IND=who take-JUSS MP 1SG-LOC-ABL
‘If small fish is necessary, let somebody take it from me.’

(797b) Maarqan nimeγα qabun Anne l’edayane montem tet Annad’aa ηοlk tan Mejqej en’ie Anna!
    maarqa-n nime-γα qabun Anne l’e-l-dayane mon-te-m
one-GEN house-LOC how many Anna be-GER-3SG.DS say-FUT-TR.3SG
    tet Annad’aa ηol-k tan Mejqej en’ie Anna
2SG Annadya be-IMP.SG and Meykhey mother Anna
‘If there were more Annas in the house, he used to say, “You will be Annadya and the mother of Meykhey [will be] Anna.” ’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:30)

(797c) Anyiγudaγα buollar jawner sisad’itej buolla taatl’er el anyiçuoŋ iüreнюŋa maranmi taat.
    anyi-γu-l-daya buollar jawner sisad’i-te-j buolla
scrape.inner.side.of.hide-PL.GER.3SG.DS MP(Yak) everything tear.ITER-FUT-INTR.3SG MP(Yak)
    taatl’er el=anyi-çuoŋ iire-nun-γa maranmi taat
therefore NEG=scrape.inner.side.of.hide-PRIV sew-HAB-3PL.TR just so
‘If one scrapes the inner side of the hide, they (mittens) will tear soon, that’s why one sews just like that, without scraping.’

(797d) Met tudin’ monulya tudel me kelutej.
    met tudel-in’ mon-ul-γa tudel me=kelu-te-j
1SG 3SG-DAT say-GER-1/2SG.DS 3SG PF=come-FUT-INTR.3SG
‘If I ask him, he will come.’

Encoding of the predicate of a conditional clause with a coreferential subject is one of the few specializations of the TY adverbial clause. It is achieved with the help of the converbal suffix –re/-de/-te:

259 This form shows an idiosyncratic morphophonemic behavior. The base-final /l/ is retained in the event of the disjoint reference suffix attaching to such a base.
(798) **Pojuol čayad’ere tetčie meŋolaatej.**

be.numerous[GER] work-COND richman PF=be-INC-CH-FUT-INTR.2SG

‘If you work a lot, you will become rich.’

The presence of the verbal proclitic **at=**, the indicator of the potential mood, in the apodosis indicates irrealis:

(799a) **Poyode mende magazin’in’ mer at keweč.**

money take-COND shop[Russ]-DAT PF=leave-INTR.3SG

‘If he had money, he would go shopping.’

(799b) **Met ilen čieme lewlyane at amuč.**

1SG reindeer blood drink-GER-1/2SG.DS POT=be.good-INTR.3SG

‘If I drank reindeer blood, it would be good.’

The non-visual suffix **–l’el** in the protasis signals past tense reference (800a-c) or presents the condition as counterfactual (800d):

(800a) **Met qajčie fonarik met menl’el-γane kinuoll’elk metqane at el ann’e.**

grandfather torch.light 1SG take-NVIS[GER]-1/2SG.DS who-EMPH

‘If I had taken my grandfather’s torch-light, no-one would have rebuked me.’

(800b) **Tadaa tet juösiel’elyane tadaa mer at kuril’iiŋa.**

there 2SG see-CAUS-NVIS[GER]-1/2SG.DS there PF=know-3PL.TR

‘If you had had yourself examined there, there they would know [it].’

(800c) **Iidie wien köde ηol-l’el-de mer=at=ewre-s-um.**

aunt another person be-NVIS-COND PF=go-CAUS-TR.3SG

---

260 The gloss of this form requires some explanation. **l’el** is a mood suffix, i.e. a purely verbal device and as such cannot indicate a gerund, a noun that is. Theoretically, the expected relevant surface structure here is *-l’el-ulγane*, where **–ul** is the nominalizer suffix deriving gerunds. Phonologically nothing prevents this hypothetical string. The suffix sequence **-l’el-ulγane** exists and the velar fricative of the 1/2SG.DS suffix **–γane** does not, unlike **-la**, present in the 3SG.DS suffix **–daya**, exert any restrictive influence upon the sonorant of the gerund suffix, which can be concluded from the form **monulγa** ‘when/if I you said’, as in (16d). How can then the absence of the gerund suffix be explained here? Possibly it could be explained by analogy: verb bases ending in an **l**/do not receive this suffix when they act as gerunds (see 3.3.2.1 g) unless they function as predicates of clauses with SF. Thus the gloss **GER** attached to the suffix **-l’el** in this narrow grammatical context does not by any means suggest a nominalizing faculty of this suffix but simply reflects this postulated analogy and the inner necessity of the TY grammar that the disjoint reference verb form be a verbal noun, a gerund.
‘If she had been a different kind of person, [my] aunt would have taken me with her.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:126)

(800d) _Met leml’e ŋoll’elɣane met vremja at ewl’e_.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>met</th>
<th>leml’e</th>
<th>ŋol-l’elɣane</th>
<th>met</th>
<th>vremja</th>
<th>at=el-l’e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>boss</td>
<td>be-NVIS(GER)-1/2SG.DS</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>time(Russ)</td>
<td>POT=NEG-be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘If I were a boss, I wouldn’t have time.’

The non-visual suffix occurring in the apodosis does not place the state of affairs into the past and most probably has its original modal meaning. Such examples are rare:

(801) _Kötinedaŋa at amuo’len’_.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kötine-l-daya</th>
<th>at=amuo-l’el-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be.thick-GER-3SD.DS</td>
<td>POT=be.good-NVIS-INTR.3SG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘If it [fishing line] were thick, it would be nice.’

Conditional clauses can be marked by the conjunction _ejk ewri_ ‘if’ (see 3.9.2.2).

4.3.2.2.3 Causal clauses

Causal clauses indicate the cause of the action of the main clause. Under coreferentiality of the subjects their predicates tend to be represented by the circumstantial converb:

(802) _Injie-r met el ičuo-jey_.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fear-CIRC</th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>look-INTR.1SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

‘Out of fear I did not look.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:34)

In case of disjoint reference, the predicate of the causal clause is represented by the default gerund form discussed in 4.3.2.1. The causal meaning can be optionally enhanced by the modal particle _aq_ ‘excessively’, ‘too much’, ‘only’:

(803a) _Metuolde pude čaajle lolɣa-s-nu-meŋ aq puguodaya_.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>met-uolde</th>
<th>pude</th>
<th>čaaj-le</th>
<th>lolɣa-s-nu-meŋ</th>
<th>aq</th>
<th>puguol(^{261})-daya.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG-TOP.CNTR</td>
<td>outside</td>
<td>tea-FOC.ABS</td>
<td>boil-CAUS-DUR-TR.3SG.OF</td>
<td>excessively</td>
<td>be.warm(GER)-3SG.DS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘And I was cooking tea in the yard because it was very warm.’

(Kurilov 2001:391, puguo-)

\(^{261}\) This is a theoretical form required by the inner logic of the TY grammar, namely that gerunds must have an /l/ word-finally. In the majority of qualitative verbs, to which _puguo_- ‘to be hot’ belongs, the word final /l/ stems from the integrated copular verb _ŋol_-.

Despite the fact that the pure base, indicated in the dictionary and confirmed by the negation test (see 3.4) of this verb does not have an /l/, it must be present at some level of phonology in this verb since its BC form in the 3SG is _puguon’_ ‘[it] is hot’, just as with all verbs whose bases end with /l/, and not *puguč, the form that would be expected if the /l/ was absolutely absent (sf. _amuč_ ‘[it] is good’ < _amuo_- ‘to be good’).
Because of a long line I had to wait for quite a while in front of the chief’s cabinet.

(Kurilov 2001:229, maad’aa-)

See also 4.3.2.2.8

Causal clauses formed with the help of a conjunction are discussed in 3.9.2.3.

4.3.2.2.4 Consecutive clauses

Consecutive clauses contain the consequence of the action or state of the main clause. TY does not seem to possess conjunctionless consecutive clauses. Consecutive clauses introduced by a conjunction are described in 3.9.2.4.

4.3.2.2.5 Final clauses

Final clauses express the goal of the action of the main clause. The second of the two aforesaid specializations (see 4.3.2.2) is displayed in final clauses with a subject that is coreferential with that of the main clause. For the purpose of encoding of its predicate the dative case form of the gerund is used as in (804a) and (804b). Alternatively the circumstantial converb (804c) is employed:

(804a) Maarqan jewlid’e tude en’ieyane iisenaadayane kunil’id’ie jewlid’e iiselyin’ köčеgejrienuŋa.

maarqa-n jewlid’e tude en’ie-γane iise-nu-aa-l-dayane

one-GEN reindeer.calf 3SG.POSS mother-ACC suck-DUR-INCH-GER-3SG.DS

kunil’-id’ie jewlid’e iise-l-ŋin’ köčеge-j-re-nun-ŋa
ten-approximately reindeer.calf suck-GER-DAT rush-SEM-TRVZ-HAB-3PL.TR

‘When one reindeer calf begins to suck his mother, about ten [other] calves rush to suck.’

(804b) Qad’ir tuŋ Edilwej’iŋ’ tigin Kuluma jemuguryat pojuoler kelul’elŋi tudeyane pun’išiŋn.’

qad’ir tuŋ Edilwej’iŋ’ tigin Kuluma iemugur-γa-t

DM ADL.PROX Edilwey-DAT DEIC Kolyma opposite.side-LOC-ABL

pojuol-er kelu-’el-ŋi tude-γane pun’-il-ŋi

be.numerous-CIRC come-NVIS-INTR.3PL 3SG-ACC kill-GER-DAT

‘Many people came to Edilwey from the other side of Kolyma in order to murder him.’

(804c) Qan’in Spaasew yolaat taŋ mőričer kelujeŋ.

qan’in Spaasew yol-aa-t taŋ mőri-če-r kelu-jeŋ.

when Savior.POSS(Russ) be-INCH-FUT[3SG] INVS.DEM hear-ITV-CIRC come-INTR.1SG

‘I have come to learn when it will be the Day of the Savior.’

(Kurilov 2001:265, mőrič-e-)
When there is no coreferentiality, the only way to form final clauses is to use the converb *monur* ‘in order that’ (see 4.3.2.2.8). The final meaning coupled with the idea of motion can be expressed in a final verb form in a main clause (see 3.4.3.3.1).

Negative final clauses can be encoded in a language in a different way than affirmative ones. Compare the English final conjunctions ‘in order that’ and ‘lest’. This holds also for TY, where the predicate of a negative final clause is a finite verb form in the jussive mood and the final clause itself is formally an independent one.

(805)  
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{met-ul} & \text{ende-t-qanek} & \text{met-ul} & \text{köd’e el=lew-\text{yan} } \\
\text{1SG-ACC} & \text{burn-FUT-IMP} & \text{1SG-ACC} & \text{worm NEG=eat-JUSS.SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘Burn me, lest insects eat me …’  
(Kurilov and Odé 2012:28)

4.3.2.2.6 Concessive clauses

Concessive clauses present a circumstance despite which the action of the main clause is carried out or a state is achieved. Concessive clauses are formed in a similar way as temporal ones.

- coreferential subjects:

(806a)  
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{joqol} & \text{ŋ} & \text{olde} & \text{ŋ} \\
\text{2PL} & \text{like be-INTR.1SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘Although I am Yakut, I resemble you.’

- non-coreferential subjects:

(806b)  
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{met} & \text{joqol} & \text{ŋ} & \text{yol-\text{yan}e} \\
\text{1SG} & \text{Yakut} & \text{be-1/2SG.DS}
\end{array}
\]

‘Although I am Yakut, you consider me yours.’

An optional specialization allows rendering the concessive meaning in copulative dependent clauses by the emphatic particle *ŋoll’elk* when the subjects are coreferential.

(807)  
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{joqol} & \text{ŋoll’elk} & \text{tit} & \text{tite} \\
\text{Yakut} & \text{EMPH} & \text{2PL} & \text{like be-INTR.1SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘Although I am Yakut, I resemble you.’

4.3.2.2.7 Comparative clauses

Comparative clauses imply (an imaginary or subjective) likeness. Their formation is in all instances aided by the postposition *(da)ndite* ‘as if’ (see 3.9.2.6).
4.3.2.2.8 The converb monur.

The circumstantial converb monur, which is a form of the verb mon- ‘to say’ plays an important role in creating adverbial clauses. In this function it behaves as a complement taking predicate, whose complement is grammaticalized direct speech. Together with its complement clause the converb monur constitutes a dependent clause, whose function is either final or causal, depending on the mood of the predicate of the complement clause of the converb. The indicative mood signals the causal meaning, while the final meaning is indicated by the jussive mood.

- causal meaning:

(808a) **Tuŋ’e Moturuona l’ukduo činičele čaaļele kuril’iitem monur l’ejke ediemek?**

&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;Tuŋ’e Moturuona l’uku-d-uo činičel-le čaaļ-le kuril’i-te-m

&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;DM Motryona small-0-child darkness-ACC light-ACC know-FUT-TR.3SG

**mon-ur** l’ejke edie-mek

&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;say-CIRC candle burn-TR.2SG

‘So, Motryona, you light up a candle since you think that the suckling can distinguish day from night, don’ t you?’

‘So, Motryona, you burn a candle saying, ‘The child will be able to tell darkness from light,’ don’t you?’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:54)

(808b) **Čuoyajney met qajcie Ponqotaa metin’ čambe ņotejek monur Tustaaq pisuolekqa laamelek kelu.**

&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;čuoyajney met qajcie Ponqotaa met-in’ čambe ņol-te-jek

&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;spring.ADV 1SG grandfather Ponkhota 1SG-DAT help be-FUT-INTR.2SG

**mon-ur** Tustaaq pisuolek-qa laame-lek kelu-j

&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;say-CIRC Tustakh settlement(Russ) dog-INS come-INTR.3SG

‘In spring, my grandfather Ponkhota came riding his dogs to me, to the settlement Tustakh, thinking that I would be of help.’

‘In spring, my grandfather Ponkhota came riding his dogs to me, to the settlement Tustakh, saying, ‘You will be of help.’ ”

(808c) **Taŋ nime laŋudeŋ uu-nu-ren’ d’e tuŋ kōrel metqane kuril’iitem monur iŋjer lad’id’aa miraal’en’.**

&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;taŋ nime laŋudeŋ uu-nu-ren’ d’e tuŋ kōrel

&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;INVS.DEM house toward go-DUR-SIM MP(Yak) ADL.PROX devil

**met-qane** kuril’i-te-m mon-ur iŋje-r lad’id’aa mira-l’el-i

&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;&emsp;1SG-ACC know-FUT-TR.3SG say-CIRC get.scared-CIRC slowly walk-NVIS-INTR

‘Going toward that house and being afraid that that devil would recognize him, he walked cautiously.’

‘Going toward that house and saying in fear, ‘That devil will recognize me,’ he walked cautiously.’

- final meaning:

(809) **Tuŋ Jeguorteyeŋane tadaat qajcie Diŋen’kewŋane mer il’iteyan monur taat moni.**
In (808a, b) and (809) the converb monur resembles a complementizer somewhat and in (808c) it approximates a complementizer in its function, because it does not function as a complement taking predicate, delegating this function to the converb ijer ‘being afraid’. Yet, in all these examples the converb monur takes a complement in the form of direct speech suggesting that even here it formally acts as a proper verbum dicendi and that its grammaticalization into a complementizer is not completed. That monur is on a grammaticalization route is corroborated, on the other hand, by the fact that normally no other converb of the verb mon- ‘to say’ can be employed in this function and translating it with a form of the verb ‘to say’ would be unnatural in the above examples, which is indicative of an advanced semantic bleaching. The following example serves to illustrate this point. Compare the use of the converb monur in (809), where it marks a final clause, and that of the converb mondey in (810), where it actually introduces reported speech.

(810) Tan čuoyajme čii puŋuosel’ni’ kelųni mondey erime jarqa al’aa yan pulgid’ilepe amdur jedej’uyan
and spring.ADV people rejoice-CAUS-GER-DAT come-3PL_INTR say-SIM
erime jarqa al’aa yan pulgid’ile-pe amdur jedej’-u’-yan
snow ice melt-JUSS.SG plant-PL quickly appear-PL-JUSS
‘And in spring they come to make people glad by saying, “May the snow and ice melt, may plants appear soon!” ’

(Kurilov 1994:9)

4.3.3 Relative clauses

4.3.3.1 General observations

Relative clauses are understood here as clauses that function as attributes of NPs. As there are no relative pronouns in TY, relative clauses are realized as participial constructions or gerunds. Participles of TY are not readily compatible with the simple typological division in terms of orientation, applied in Haspelmath (1994:153-154). In TY there is no generally applicable participial form that would indiscriminately be oriented toward agent, patient and, as is possible in many languages, to a peripheral constituent, therefore the TY participles cannot be regarded as contextually oriented. On

It is important to note that restrictive relative clauses are represented by the form of the gerund which is used to indicate SF and differs formally from non-focal gerunds in verbs whose bases end with /l/, the latter being converted bases and the former derived by the suffix -l. For simplicity of presentation and, more importantly, due to the fact that they are not in all case modifiers of S-arguments, they are glossed simply as GER and not as GER.SF.
the other hand, the most common participial markers -j(e), -če, -d’e do not indicate orientation of participles. Rather it is the verbal stem that provides this information: if it lacks the copular verb yol-, it is active and the participle is normally agent-oriented, if it contains the copular verb, it is a passive form and patient oriented.

The matter is, in fact, more complicated: there are two participial markers that do indicate orientation of the participles. The first of them, the suffix –me, shows that the participle of a transitive verb is patient-oriented, and this without the presence of the passivizing copular verb, which obligatorily lacks in these participles. The second, the suffix –be, is a marker of participles oriented toward a peripheral constituent. However, it occurs only in participles of transitive verbs. For attributive forms of intransitive verbs to be adjunct oriented there are two strategies: a regular participle in the active voice or a gerund can be employed. The former strategy has a restricted usage and seems to be possible only when there is a strong cognitive link between the verb and the adjunct, which acquires the status of a quasi-object, the only one semantically possible with a given intransitive verb (cf. the Mamas and Papas’ ‘Dream a little dream of me!’), which is illustrated in (811a). If such a tight conceptual link is not there, the –l-gerund (see 3.3.2.1 g on gerund formation) must be employed as in (812a). Apart from the –l-gerund, the –yol-gerund is available for the purpose of creating attributive forms of intransitive verbs with adjunct orientation.263 The functional difference between the participle and –l-gerund on the one hand and the –yol-gerund on the other hand lies in their aspectual value. The presence of the copula yol- lends it a perfective, or resultative meaning (811b), or simply indicates past tense reference (812b), whereas its absence, sometimes coupled with the presence of the durative aspect suffix, indicates imperfectivity (811a) and (812a).

(811a) Tudel uuunuj / uuunul jawulgi erimelek umduon’.
   tadel   uu-nu-j / uu-nu-l   jawul-gi   erime-lek   umduol-i
   3SG  go-DUR-INTR.3SG / go-DUR-GER   path-PERT   snow-INS   be.covered-INTR.3SG
   ‘The road he was walking along was covered with snow.’

(811b) Tudel uujuol jawulgi erimelek umduon’.
   tadel   uu-yol   jawul-gi   erime-lek   umduol-i
   3SG  go-be[GER]   path-PERT   snow-INS   be.covered-INTR.3SG
   ‘The road he walked along was covered with snow.’

(812a) Met *sayane-j / sayane-l nime juku nime-k.
   1SG   sit-PTCP / sit-GER   house small  house-COP
   ‘The house I live in is small.’

(812b) Met sayanejuol nime juku nimek.
   met   sayane-yol   nime   juku   nime-k
   1SG   sit-be[GER]   house small  house-COP
   ‘The house I lived in is small.’

263 Adjunct orientation of –yol-gerunds is not confined to primarily intransitive verbs. Gerunds obtained by conversion from bases of passivized transitive verbs also can act as adjunct oriented relative clauses.
Resuming, TY participles cannot be regarded in their totality as either contextually or inherently oriented, which is undoubtedly a peculiar typological feature.

From the above it is clear that TY participles can be oriented toward arguments and peripheral constituents. It is noteworthy in this connection that the accessibility of adjuncts for relativization seems to be primarily a characteristic of languages with clearly contextually oriented participles (Schmalz 2008:89), among which TY, as has been explained, cannot be counted.

4.3.3.2 Syntactic types of relative clauses

Relative clauses in TY can have a head and can be headless as well. Different constellations of orientation and presence or absence of a head are illustrated in the following examples.

- agent oriented, headed:

This kind of relative clauses can be realized only by the –je, -če, -d’e participles.

(813a) Sugud’eyat pulgeče jaqte řolaar l’uku řoldaya ewlikiel’eld’e tude en’ieyane leitejl’elum.

sugud’e-γa-t pulgej-je jaqte řol-a-a-r l’uku řol-da-yaa
heart-LOC-ABL come.out-PTCP song be-INCH-CIRC small be[GER]-3SG.DS
ewlikie-l’el-je tude enie-γane leitej-l’el-um
disappear-NVIS-PTCP 3SG.POSS mother-ACC recall-NVIS-TR.3SG

‘Since it was a song, which came from the heart, she recalled her mother, who had died when she was small.’

(813b) qajl’e wayčij čii.

qajl’-le wayči-j čii
stone-ACC look.for-PTCP people

‘people searching for stones.’ (Kurilov 1994:9)

- agent oriented, headless:

This kind of relative clauses is represented very sparsely in my material and actually only in the form of nominalized participles:

(814) Metul mennaar aruudewresče póčesejitem.

met-ul men’-nu-a-a-r aruud-d-emre-s-je póčesej-te-m
1SG-ACC take-DUR-INCH-CIRC speech-0-go-CAUS-PTCP send-FUT-TR.3SG

‘In order to marry me, they sent a match-maker.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:36)

- patient oriented, headed:

The predicate of a patient oriented relative clause can be encoded as –je-participle (815a) or –me-participle (815b) as well as be represented by a gerund (815c).
(815a) *Tide met peldudie mirin' tuđe čama nonyalawjettegeγane, ilen sawayat wiejuod'e mayil čidonojdeγeyat waarej-*
  
*tide met peldudie mirin’ tuđe čama nonyalawje-tere γane*
  
ANPH 1SG old.man just 3SG.POSS big pipe-AUG-ACC

*ile-n sawaγa-t wie-ŋoγe mayil čidonoj-daγa-t waarej-m*
  
reindeer-GEN skin-LOC-ABL make-be-PTCP dress pocket-PERT-LOC-ABL take.out-TR.3SG

‘That old man of mine had just pulled his big pipe, made of a reindeer skin, out of a pocket of [his] dress.’

(815b) *met ogötienume nime*
  
*met ogöte-nu-me nime*
  
1SG erect-DUR-PTCP.PASS house

‘the house I am building’

(815c) *Uorpedie, met tindaak kunil’kin sukummol’γan’er ileγa ilwiicė ŋolden ewrer mörijuol met n’iéd’il n’iéd’īteγey.*
  
*uorpe-die met tindaak kunil’-kin sukummol’γal-n’e-r ile-γa*
  
children-DIM 1SG long.ago ten-two,GEN year-VBLZ-CIRC reindeer-LOC

*ilwiicė ŋol-γey ewre-r möri-ŋol met n’iéd’i-l n’iéd’i-t-meγey*
  
herd-NMLZ be-SIM walk-CIRC hear-be[GER] 1SG narrate-GER narrate-FUT-TR.1/2SG.OF

‘Little children, I will tell you a story which I heard long ago when I, a 12 year old child, worked as a herder.’

A relative clause involving a transitive verb often contains the agent, which occupies the position in front of the attributively used verb form.

(816a) *… l’ukuolγa tet en’ie jaqtejuol jaqtelgi.*
  
*l’ukuolγa tet en’ie jaqte-ŋol jaqte-l-gi*
  
small-be[GER]-1/2SG.DS 2SG mother sing-be[GER] sing-GER-PERT

‘… the song your mother sang when you were small.’

(816b) *Tittel wiejuolpegin nime mer amuč.*
  
*tittel wie-ŋol-pe-gi-n nime mer=amuo-j*
  
3PL make-be-PL-PERT-GEN house PF-be-good-INTR.3SG

‘The house built by them is nice.’

The following example demonstrates that a relative clause in TY does not have to precede its head and linguistic material can be inserted in-between.

(817) *Sukungi ilegi čiiγat me’duolul taat pojuon’ kičilgi el kurul’uol.*
  
*sukun-gi ile-gi čii-ga-t men’ŋol-ŋol taat pojuol-i*
  
thing-PERT reindeer-PERT people-LOC-ABL take-be be.numerous-INTR.3SG

*kičil-gi el= kurul’-ŋol*
  
end-PERT NEG=know-be[3SG]

‘The belongings and reindeer that were taken away [by him] from people were so numerous that they were endless.’

(Kurilov 2005:130)
- patient oriented, headless:

This kind of relative clauses is represented only by –ŋol-gerunds and forms, in fact, together with the doer of the action expressed by the gerund, a possessive construction, the gerund being the possessum and the preceding nominal being the possessor.

(818a) Met sibaajuol maranme liynareŋ kerienuni.

met siba-ŋol maranne liy-ŋareŋ kerie-nuni
1SG besmar-be[GER] simply be.nice-SIM fall-HAB-INTR.3SG

‘[What] I have besmeared, just falls off in pieces.’

(Kurilov 2001:181, kerie-

(818b) L’ie čii kečijuol monnungi qad’ir puŋuoldeŋ.

l’ie čii keči-ŋol mon-nun-ŋi qad’ir puŋuol-reŋ
MP people bring-be[GER] say-HAB-3PL..INTR MP rejoice-SIM

‘But [this is] what people have brought,’ they say rejoicing.

- adjunct oriented, headed:

Some examples of headed adjunct oriented relative clauses were given above (811a, b) and (812a, b). Here is an example with the oblique participle:

(819) Al’γadeluojinube kuul’γa mit amaape qajl’ čiribepe tuutellek me miraajeli.

al’γa-d-eluoji-nu-be kuul’γa mit amaap-pe qajl’ čiribe-pe
fish-0-carry-DUR-OP sack-LOC 1PL father-PL stone plummet-PL

tuute-relek me=mira-aa-jeli
put-ANT PF=walk-INCH-INTR.1PL

‘We put our fathers’ stone plummets into a sack for carrying fish and began to walk.’

(Kurilov 1994:9)

- adjunct oriented, headless:

Unlike the preceding headless relative clauses, these can be represented by both nominalized oblique participles (820a) or by gerunds (820b). They too can be interpreted syntactically as possessive constructions.

(820a) Elugurčend’e peldudie Luoqaa čuguod’e čoŋojeɣane lačin sisayasnubeyə

el=ugurče-n’-je peldudie Luoqaa čuguo-je čoŋoje-ɣane
NEG=leg-VBLZ-PTCP old.man Luokhaa be.sharp-PTCP knife-ACC

lačil-ŋ sisaya-s-nu-be-ŋa sayane-ŋe n’aačes-nu-m
fire-GEN tear-TR-DUR-OP-LOC sit-SIM grind-DUR-TR.3SG

‘The legless old Lokhaa ground the sharp knife sitting at [the place] for chopping firewood.’

(820b) Tuŋ köddeŋ tude saalŋin’ waaj laŋyudeŋ ködeleŋ qad’ir tideŋ pajpen kewejuolɣan ičuonaal’elum.
tuŋ ködeŋ tude saal-ŋin’ waaj lajyudenŋ köl-relek
ADL.PROX man 3SG.POSS tree-DAT again toward come
qad’ir tideŋ pajpe-n kewej-ŋol-ŋa-n ičuo-naa-l’el-um
MP ANPH woman-GEN leave-be[GER]-LOC-PROL look-INCH-NVIS-TR.3SG
‘That man came up to the tree and began to examine the hole through which that woman disappeared.’

4.3.3.3 Restrictive vs. non-restrictive relative clauses

As is common in many languages, TY makes a distinction between restrictive relative clauses, which single out one referent from a multitude of potential referents, and non-restrictive relative clauses, which simply provide an optional description of a referent.

According to Kurilov (personal communication), restrictive relative clauses are realized as gerunds. This claim can be refined by saying that gerund forms otherwise employed to signal SF can have only restrictive meaning:

(821a) Luge-l peldudie n’aače-gi me=n’amucen’-i.
be.older-GER old.man face-PERT PF=be.red-INTR.3SG
‘The oldest of the seniors had a red face.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:86)

(821b) Jewl’id’e med’uolel kind’eŋa puolek me keriesnumuŋ me kuderej.
jewl’id’e men’-nol-el kind’eŋa puolek me=kerie-s-nun-uj
reindeer.calf take-be-GER month-LOC fur.curtain PF=fall-CAUS-HAB-1PL.TR
me=kudere-j.
PF=put-1PL.TR
‘In the month when reindeer calves are born, we take off the fur curtains and put them aside.’ (Kurilov and Odé 2012:176)

(821c) Ieruuče wadun nimele Čamuolel Uluruoŋa ögetem.
ieruuče wadu-n nime-le Čamaŋol-el Uluro-ŋa ögete-m.
hunter Yukaghir-GEN house-ACC Big-be-GER Uluro-LOC install-TR.3SG
‘The hunter put the tent at [the shore of] Big Uluro.’

(821d) Tan Sveta kelul kind’eŋa moni l’ie otpuskaŋ juoŋajdaya ten’i bol’nicaŋa me
sepwej moni čayad’aacër.
tan Sveta kelu-l kind’eŋa mon-i l’ie otpuska-gí juoŋaj-l-daya
and Sveta come-GER month-LOC say-INTR.3SG holidays(Russ)-PERT end-GER-3SG.DS
ten’i bol’nicaŋa me=sew-te-jeŋ mon-i čayad’e-če-r
here hospital(Russ)-LOC PF=enter-FUT-INTR.1SG say-INTR.3SG work-ITV-CIRC
‘And Sveta said that next month, when her holidays were over, she would go to work in the hospital here.’

As for the non-focal gerund forms, these also seem to embody restrictive relative clauses but not as consistently. Thus in the following example the first gerund certainly represents a non-restrictive relative clause because the woman’s husband is intended by the head of the participial construction, who principally does not require being singled out since Yukaghirs are monogamous. The second gerund can, however, be interpreted as indicating a restrictive relative clause since money could be borrowed or stolen:
As for the participial forms, it appears that they also allow both readings: restrictive and non-restrictive. In Kurilov’s opinion (personal communication) participles in –j(e), -če, -d’e are by default non-restrictive. In (815a) the relative clause is arguably non-restrictive, while in (823) it is undoubtedly restrictive. It should be noted, however, that in (823) the participle is accompanied by the adverb aq ‘only’, which might be responsible for the restrictive meaning.

(823) Ličuorkele me pon’im, aq uruod’edilelek keweč.
ličuorke-le  me=pon’i-m  aq  uraa-ŋol-je-d-ile-lek  kewej-j
defemail.reindeer-ACC  PF=leave-TR.3SG  only  learn-be-PTCP-0-reindeer-INS  leave-INTR.3SG

‘He left female reindeer [and] traveled on the trained reindeer only.’
(Kurilov 2005:128)

Summarizing, it can be stated that focal forms of gerunds always represent restrictive relative clauses. This is probably true also of –me and –be-participles. As for non-focal gerundial forms and the –j(e), -če, -d’e participles, they are insensitive to the criterion of restrictivity and, depending on the context and presence of other linguistic devices, such as the adverb aq ‘only’ in (823), produce both restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses.

4.3.3.4 Relativizers

Although it was stated in 4.3.3.1 that relative pronouns are absent from TY, interrogative pronouns can aid the formation of relative clauses.

(824) Školaya kinek el’uọya’rej’eld’e čii aptaanunj’a.
škola-γα  kinek  el=l’uọya-re-j’el-je  čii  apte-nun-ηα
school(Russ)-LOC  who  NEG=finish-TR-SEM-NVIS-PTCP  people  gather-HAB-TR.3PL

‘They gather the people who have not finished school.’

4.3.4 Compound sentences

Coordinated clauses in TY form compound sentences with or without the help of a conjunction. Since compound sentences without an explicit coordinating signal can be difficult to distinguish from a sequence of adjoining independent clauses, only such conjunctionless sentences are regarded as compound in the following overview which consist of clauses which, in turn, constitute a semantic whole describing a state of affairs as if representing different facets of one and the same state of affairs. This typically applies to same subject clauses, but can hold also for predicates with non-coreferential

This made Maslova (2003a:369) assert the absence of compound sentences for the related KY.
subjects if the (admittedly subjective) degree of interrelation of the clauses involved is relatively high, judging by the context. A useful formal criterion in this connection could be the identity of the focus pattern of the clauses in question, which makes viewing co-occurring predicates as describing one and the same situation from different angles more plausible.

Following Rozental’ et al. (2002:380-384) sentences involving coordination of clauses are grouped and characterized according to the semantic relations the coordinated clauses comprising the sentence enter into with one another. Those are copulative, adversative, disjunctive, explanatory, contrastive and additive relations.

4.3.4.1 Copulative compound sentences

Copulative clauses can be coordinated in TY without a conjunction. In (825) and (826) the typical cases of multipredicative sentences with one shared subject are illustrated. The coordinated clauses in (825a) and (825b) are enclosed in square brackets.

(825a) Anmolyin’ nemej el lawčuon taat köcíd’iejeŋ jaqtanaajeŋ.
   anmolyin’ nemej el=law-čuon taat [köcíd’i-ie-j] [jaqte-nu-aa-jeŋ]
   at.all what NEG drink-PRIV so dart.about-INCH-INTR.1SG sing-DUR-INCH-INTR.1SG

Without drinking anything [alcoholic] I began to jump and sing like that.       (Kurilov 1991:45, anmolyin’)

(825b) Taŋ wolmetke jaqtaanureŋ aŋale [paduryusaam][ köcíd’iej]!
   taŋ wolme-tke jaqte-nu-ren aŋa-le paduryu-s-aa-m
   INVS.DEM shaman-AUG sing-DUR-SIM mouth-ACC tremble-CAUS-INCH-TR.3SG
   köcíd’i-ie-j
   dart.about-INCH-INTR.3SG

‘This huge shaman, while singing, began to smack his lip and dart about.’       (Kurilov and Odé 2012:32)

In (826) the two predicates arguably describe one state of affairs exhibiting the same focal pattern and are thus regarded as coordinated.

(826) ‘Tet mitqa jedeček mit ile pojumuj!’ monnuni metin’ met amaa.
   tet mit-γa jedej-jek mit ile pojuol-mu-j
   2SG 1PL-LOC appear-INTR.2SG 1PL reindeer be.many-INCH-INTR.3SG
   mon-nun-i met-in’ met amaa.
   say-HAB-INTR.3SG 1SG-DAT 1SG father

‘You were born and our reindeer [herd] increased in number!’ my father used to tell me.       (Kurilov and Odé 2012:20)

In (827) the coordinated clauses with non-coreferential subjects describe together the cause for the action of the main clause. Again, their focal patterns are identical:

(827) Erime kerieteŋ quruul čamaneŋ qan’qaateŋ monur qomdeme qaldejnuŋi.
   erime kerie-te-j quruul čama-ren qad’uu-qaa-te-j mon-ur
   snow fall-FUT-INTR.3SG sky big-ADV be.cold-INCH-FUT-INTR.3SG say-CIRC
For the sake of contrast the example in (828) is given, where the interpretation of the sentence as compound is controversial. These might just as well be two separate juxtaposed clauses. The subjects of the clauses as well as their focal patterns are different. The SF focal pattern in the second clause is indicative of the introduction of a new topic, therefore it cannot be plausibly taken as describing the same state of affairs as the first clause:

(828) N’umun’alya quduon’, erimeley kerienaal …
former.nomad.camp-LOC lie-INTR.3SG snow-FOC fall-DUR-INCH-GER.SF
‘[But there] he lies in the camp, it started to snow …’

(Kurilov 1994:7)

Finite clauses are unambiguously coordinated when they are joined with the help of conjunctions, which in the case of copulative clauses are *tadaat* ‘and’ and *tadaate* ‘and.EMPH’:

(829) Čupče peldudie mer eguoj tadaata tude aduoŋin qonyad’inaa j.
Chukchi-GEN old.man PF=get.up-INTR.3SG
‘The Chukchi old man woke up and began to bow down before his son.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:24)

4.3.4.2 Adversative compound sentences

Sentences of this type ‘express opposition or confrontation, sometimes with different additional shades of meaning (discrepancy, limitation, concession etc.)’ (Rozental’ et al. 2002:382) Coordination of clauses in adversative compound sentences is normally mediated by the conjunction *tan* ‘but’, ‘and’ as in (830a) and (830b) or is conjunctionless as in (830c).

(830a) Met tudel me=maaŋ tan tudel el=kelu.
1SG 3SG PF=wait-1SG.TR but 3SG NEG=come[3SG]
‘I waited for him but he did not come.’

(830b) Jerpeje me=sayaa-j tan juorpure wajidek me=cajle-n’-i.
sun PF=disappear-INTR.3SG but tundra still PF=light-VBLZ-INTR.3SG
‘The sun has set down but it is still light in the tundra.’

(830c) Mit wadulpe ŋod’eli (tan) tittel joqolpeley.
1PL Yukaghir be-INTR.1PL and 3PL Yakut-PL-COP
‘We are Yukaghirs and they are Yakuts.’

4.3.4.3 Disjunctive compound sentences

Sentences of this type ‘indicate alternation of events, their succession, incompatibility’ (Rozental’ et al. 2002:383).

(831) Kačikan imdal’d’an sukunmol’γaļn’ej ejk me čamuočiij.

Kačikan imdal’d’al-n sukunmol’γal-n’e-j ejk me=čama-γol-čii-j

Kačikan five-GEN year-VBLZ-INTR.3SG or PF=big-be-DIM-INTR.3SG

‘Kačikan was five or a little older.’ (Kurilov and Odé 12:108)

4.3.4.4 Explanatory compound sentences

Explanatory compound sentences contain clauses that provide supplementary, clarifying, paraphrase-like information about the state of affairs described in another clause.

(832) Anaan amuče čajle ɣon’, jerpen’i, l’ukučuq qad’uučii, neme ɣoll’elk el mőruu.

ananaan amuo-je čajle ɣol-i jerpeje-n’-i

very be.good-PTCP day be-INTR.3SG sun-VBLZ-INTR.3SG

l’ukučuq qad’uu-čii neme ɣoll’elk el=mőruu

little.bit be.cold-DIM what EMPH NEG=be.audible[3SG]

‘It was a very nice day; it was sunny, slightly frosty and completely quiet.’

4.3.4.5 Contrastive compound sentences

Contrastive compound sentences ‘express discrepancy, limitation, opposition of the confronted clauses’ (Rozental’ et al. 2002:383).

(833) Met el=ıňje-naa-jeŋ maarrqon’ met ćuŋda-ɣa el=amuo.

1SG NEG=be.afraid-INCH-INTR.1SG only 1SG mind-LOC NEG=be.good

‘It’s not that I got scared but a timid feeling crept into my heart.’

4.3.4.6 Additive compound sentences

In this type of sentences ‘the contents of the second clause represent additional information or a supplementary remark, related to the first clause’ (Rozental’ et al. 2002:384).

(834) Čii čamu-ne gy lew-l-bun’-ie-gi ile-pul waaj

people big-ADV drink-GER-DES-INCH-3PL.INTR reindeer-PL also

werwe-pe-gi n’id’ayaj-l.

strength-PL-PERT be.exhausted-GER.SF

‘The people became very hungry, the reindeer also needed rest.’
5. Information structure

5.1 Topic

Realization of topic has, to my knowledge, not yet been a subject of academic research\textsuperscript{265} on TY, at least not nearly as extensive as the studies on focus. The following basic overview certainly does not encompass all manifestations of this pragmatic category, being only an initial step in studying it.

Judged by the impact topic has on the morpho-syntactic shape of clauses in TY, it is far less significant than focus, never leading to alignment splits or directly determining conjugational patterns as focus does. In the great majority of cases the topic remains unmarked, apart from being placed at the beginning of the sentence. This can be seen in a multitude of examples in this chapter and throughout the grammar, therefore unmarked instances of topic are not illustrated here.

There exist a few devices in TY which do mark contrastive topics. These are the particle \textit{ŋodayane} (835), the suffix –\textit{uolde} (836) and the adversative conjunction \textit{tan} ‘and’, ‘but’ (837).

(835) \textit{Rjukzakpegi ŋodayane me jukuoluŋi! ‘Jukud’eyə rjukzakpegi!’ ćuŋdeγan mod’εy ayal’wejčireŋ. Anaape ŋodayane juorpure me pojuolŋi!}  
\textit{rjukzak-pe-gi ŋodayane me=juku-ŋol-nu-ŋi! jukud’eya}  
\textit{rjukzak-pe-gi! ćuŋde-γa-n mon-jeŋ ayal’we-čii-reŋ.}  
\textit{anaa-pe ŋodayane juorpure me=pojool-ŋi!}  
\textit{mountain-PL TOP-CNTR tundra PF=be.numerous-3PL.INTR}  
\textit{say-INTR.1SG laugh-DIM-SIM}  
\textit{I thought smiling. And mountains are numerous in tundra.’}  
\textit{(The father has just explained to his inquisitive son that the newly arrived people were geologists searching for stones in tundra.) ‘But their rucksacks are small.‘What small rucksacks [are] theirs!’}  
\textit{(Kurilov 1994:9)}

(836) \textit{Metuolde pudečaaγle lolya-s-nu-ṃeŋ aq puguodaγa.}  
\textit{met-uolde pude ćaaj-le lolya-s-nu-ṃeŋ}  
\textit{SG-TOP-CNTR outside tea-FOC.ABS boil-CAUS-DUR-TR.3SG.OF}  
\textit{aq puguol-daya.}  
\textit{excessively be.warm[GER]-3SG.DS}  
\textit{‘And I was cooking tea in the yard because it was very warm.’}  
\textit{(Kurilov 2001:391, puguo-)}

(837) \textit{Tan akaa Semenn’ẹŋ maarqan qand’e-γa}  
\textit{and elder.brother Semyon-COM one.GEN cold-LOC}  
\textit{265 One of the few statements about formatives presumably having to do with the pragmatic function of topic is the conclusion by Krejnovič (1982:228) that the complex suffix –\textit{lede} accentuates the topic of an utterance. In his view this suffix simultaneously gives prominence to the comment, or rhema in Krejnovič’s terminology. I regard this suffix as the marker of relational adverbs (see 3.7.2.3) and do not associate it with the pragmatic function of topic.}
n’a γa ilwii-jeli.

‘And with [my] elder brother Semyon I herded one winter.’ (from a narration about one’s relatives)

Emphatic topics can be marked by the modal particle ŋoll’elk[^266].

(838) Tuŋ köde-γa idaraa-neŋ neme-n čuul köjle ewl’et.

Sayane-l-gi ŋoll’elk taat ban-te-j.

‘This man won’t have a piece of meat in future. His whole life will be like that.’

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:168)

A clause can have a primary and a secondary topic in TY. The first clause in (839) opens with a proper name denoting a person who becomes a primary topic of the clause. This primary topic recedes, however, immediately, making place for a secondary topic, the person’s stature, to be resumed in the following clause in the form of an emphatic pronoun:

(839) Iidie, amungi čamuod’erukunek, tudeejlede kötinej.

Iidie amun-gi čama-γol-je-sukun-ek tudelejle kötine-j

‘Iidie was tall and stout.’

“Iidie, her bones were long (lit. “big”) and she herself was fat.”

(Kurilov and Odé 2012:108)

5.2 Focus[^267]

Unlike topic, focus in TY has long attracted the attention of linguists since Krejnovič (1958, 1968, 1982) described it. His works along with the contributions by Maslova (2003c) and Kurilov (2006) form nowadays a considerable body of the descriptive sources on TY generally and on its focus system in particular. A number of other scholars addressed the issue of (morphological) marking of the pragmatic category of focus in TY: Harms 1977; Ard 1982; Comrie 1992; Fortescue 1996; Maslova 1989a, 2005, 2006).

The focus system of TY is fascinating for several reasons. Its primary linguistic devices are morphological and their employment is highly grammaticalized. The nominal focus markers show a very unusual ergative distributional pattern. The predicate participates in focus marking of the arguments by taking ‘focal agreement suffixes’ (Matić and Nikolaeva 2008:2) and focus on the predicate is overtly marked. The combination of these features, each of which by itself could be sufficient to attract the linguist’s attention, makes the TY focus system an intriguing research object, especially from the typological perspective. Some of the most basic morpho-syntactic properties of this language, i.e. the encoding of the core syntactic relations S, A and O, depend on the

[^266]: See also the discussion of emphatic forms of personal pronouns in 3.5.1.

[^267]: This section is a revised and abridged version of Schmalz (2012).
given focal pattern of a sentence. Therefore, for understanding TY grammar as such, it is crucial to fully understand its focus system.

The focus system of TY is characterized by a number of formal and distributional features. The focus markers as such are the proclitic mer=, the nominal suffix –len and the pronominal suffix –ek.\textsuperscript{268} The focus markers show complementary distribution, thus only one constituent in a sentence can be marked for focus. The focal constituent is reflected in the verbal agreement endings different for intransitive and transitive verbs. Focus on the subject leads to a dramatic loss of finiteness in the verb as out of the 6 personal endings only the one distinguishing 3\textsubscript{PL} is left. The nominal focus markers show an ergative distributional pattern with marked S and O on the one hand and unmarked A on the other hand. The ergativity is thus split, the conditioning factor being the pragmatic function of the argument, i.e. ±focus.

The following overview of the TY focus system is briefly sketched after Krejnovič (1958:131, 133, 146, 152) and Comrie (1981a:259)\textsuperscript{270}.

- intransitive verbs (\textit{uu}- ‘to go’):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>predicate focus</th>
<th>subject focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG1</td>
<td>met mer=uu-jen</td>
<td>met-ek uu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tet mer=uu-jek</td>
<td>tet-ek uu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tudel mer=uu-j</td>
<td>tudel uu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>köde</td>
<td>mer=uu-j</td>
<td>ile-len uu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>mit mer=uu-jeli</td>
<td>mit-ek uu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tit mer=uu-jemut</td>
<td>tit-ek uu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tittel mer=uu-ŋ</td>
<td>tittel uu-ŋu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čii</td>
<td>mer=uu-ŋi</td>
<td>ile-pe-len uu-ŋu-l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- transitive verbs (\textit{aji}- ‘to shoot’) :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>predicate focus</th>
<th>subject focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG1</td>
<td>met mer=aji-ŋ</td>
<td>met aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tet mer=aji-mek</td>
<td>tet aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tudel mer=aji-m</td>
<td>tud aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>köde</td>
<td>mer=aji-m</td>
<td>köde aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL1</td>
<td>mit mer=aji-j</td>
<td>mit aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tit mer=aji-mk</td>
<td>tit aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tittel mer=aji-ŋ</td>
<td>titt aji-ŋu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čii</td>
<td>mer=aji-ŋa</td>
<td>čii aji-ŋu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{268} Modified focal nouns receive pronominal focus marking. (Krejnovič 1958:46)

\textsuperscript{269} The same is true for the pronominal focus markers in 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person.

\textsuperscript{270} The word \textit{ile} in the paradigms means ‘reindeer’, the word \textit{köde} and its suppletive plural form čii mean ‘man’ and ‘people’ respectively.
In the following sections a more detailed presentation of the focus system in TY is offered. Most of the presented examples are elicitations conducted with a questionnaire the structure of which is given in the Appendix below.

5.2.1 SAs\textsuperscript{271} with the single pragmatic function of focus

Several pragmatic functions can be assigned to a single constituent: focus + contrast, topic + contrast etc. In this section only constituents with the sole function of focus are systematically looked at.

5.2.1.1 Focal predicate

This section illustrates the morpho-syntactic structure of sentences carrying focal predicates expressed by intransitive (SV\textsubscript{F}) and transitive (AOV\textsubscript{F}) verbs.

SV\textsubscript{F}

The pragmatic function of focus in (840) and (841a-d) is unambiguously marked by the verbal clitic me=. The predicate is the only constituent in the answers which does not contain given information.

\begin{align*}
(840) & \quad U_o \quad \text{neme-le(\text{\textbeta})} \quad \text{wie-nu-mle?} \\
& \text{child} \quad \text{what-FOC.ABS} \quad \text{do-DUR-TR.3SG.OF} \\
& \text{What is the child doing?'} \\
& \quad U_o / \text{Tudel} \quad \text{mer ayal’waanuj} \\
& \quad uo / \text{tudel} \quad \text{mer=ayal’we-nu-j.} \\
& \quad \text{child / 3SG} \quad \text{PF=laugh-DUR-INTR.3SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘The child / S/he is laughing.’} \\
\end{align*}

AOV\textsubscript{F}

According to Krejnovi\'c (1958:43) the answers with a focalized transitive verb are prompted by the questions with the structure ‘What did A do?’ In fact such questions

\textsuperscript{271} SA stands for ‘Subact’ in terms of Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008).
regularly produce answers with the pattern characteristic of sentences with the configuration $AO_F VF$ ($OF$ pattern) exemplified in (847a, b). In order that just a focalized verb form be obtained in the answer, both $A$ and $O$ have to be mentioned in the question. This makes them the constituents carrying given information in the answer and thus deprives them of the status of the potentially focalizable ones. Note in this connection also the choice of the interrogative expression to trigger the focus articulation $AO_F VF$. The employment of the question word *neme* ‘what’ for a literal translation of the English question into TY would, as noted above, have yielded the $OF$ pattern since the interrogative pronoun would be in the object position and, being a carrier of Questioning focus, would inevitably attract Completive focus (in terms of Dik 1997, 1:332), which would frustrate the communicative goal of the inquirer.

(841a) *Ieruuče lalime le quodel’ iim?*

\[ \text{Ieruu-če / Tudel} \quad \text{lalime-le / tagi-e-le} \quad \text{me=köjle-s-um.} \]

\[ \text{hunt-NMLZ / 3SG} \quad \text{sledge-ACC / INVS.DEM-ACC} \quad \text{PF=break-CAUS-TR.3SG} \]

What did the hunter do with the sledge?

‘The hunter / He broke the sledge/it.’

(841b) *Lalime tet quodel’iimek?*

\[ \text{lalime tet} \quad \text{quode-l’e-ii-m-k?} \]

\[ \text{sledge 2SG} \quad \text{how-be-CAUS-TR.2SG} \]

‘What did you do with the sledge?’

\[ \text{Met} \quad \text{lalime(η)} \quad \text{me=köjle-s-um.} \]

\[ \text{1SG} \quad \text{sledge} \quad \text{PF=break-CAUS-1SG.TR} \]

‘I broke the sledge.’

For the answer to the question from (841b) to be understood as it is intended according to its translation, a short pause would have to follow the personal pronoun in order that its function be disambiguated, i.e. that it be interpreted as the subject of the sentence. Otherwise it could be taken for a possessive pronoun modifying the word *lalime(η)*, the object of the sentence, which would result in the meaning: ‘[I] broke my sledge’. This functional disambiguation can take place in an alternative manner, by employing a marked word order as in (841c):

(841c) *Lalime met me=köjle-s-um.*

\[ \text{sledge 1SG} \quad \text{PF=break-CAUS-1SG.TR} \]

‘I broke the sledge.’

An ambiguity of this kind does not arise if an independent demonstrative pronoun functions as the object:

(841d) *Met tagi me=köjle-s-um.*

\[ \text{1SG} \quad \text{INVS.DEM} \quad \text{PF=break-CAUS-1SG.TR} \]
‘I broke it’

5.2.1.2 Focal core argument

The single focal constituent of a sentence can be represented by a core argument. With intransitive verbs it can be only S, while transitive verbs can have either the focal subject (A) or the focal direct object (O). The morphological equipment of the focal arguments and their predicates encoded in accordance with the syntactic function of the focal arguments is shown in (842a-845b).

S\textsubscript{F}V

All informants over 50 years of age form the sentences with the focal S in a uniform and predictable way demonstrated in (842a). The assignment of the function of focus to the subject takes place through attaching to it the nominal focus marker, the suffix –leŋ:

(842a) \textit{Kinek ayal’waanul?}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{Kin-} & \textit{ayal’we-nu-l?} \\
\textit{who-FOC.ABS} & \textit{laugh-DUR-GER.SF} \\
\end{tabular}

‘Who is laughing?’

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{Uoleŋ ayal’waanul.} & \\
\textit{uo-leŋ} & \textit{ayal’we-nu-l.} \\
\textit{child-FOC.ABS} & \textit{laugh-DUR-GER.SF} \\
\end{tabular}

‘A/The child is laughing.’

In the short answer with the configuration S\textsubscript{F}(V) the subject is invariantly accompanied by the nominal focus marker –leŋ irrespective of the age of the informant:

(842b) \textit{Uo-}leŋ.
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{uo-} & \textit{ayal’we-nu-l.} \\
\textit{child-FOC.ABS} & \textit{laugh-DUR-GER.SF} \\
\end{tabular}

‘A/The child.’

The greater degree of uniformity in the answers with the reduced configuration of this focus articulation could be explained by the supposition that the focal marker –leŋ is reinterpreted by the speakers as the homonymic copula, which must not be missing in a TY sentence with a nominal predicate.

A\textsubscript{F}OV\textsuperscript{272}

In both of his major treatises of TY Krejnović (1952, 1982) gives hardly any examples with the full configuration of this focus articulation. However, his presentation does give an impression that a direct object can be used in the sentences with focal A occupying the

\textsuperscript{272} The word order in this symbolic abbreviation reflects the unmarked word order in the majority of sentence types with a verbal predicate in TY. Being an abstract symbol, it should not be taken as the actual or sole word order in the sentences with this particular focus articulation.
position either in front of the group $\text{AFV}$ or behind it. The scarcity of available information about this focus type makes it especially interesting. Another intriguing and controversial feature of this focus articulation is the fact that in Kurilov’s (2001) view its predicate is encoded in exactly the same way as is the predicate in the focus articulation $\text{SFV}$, which contradicts completely the accounts by Krejnović (1958, 1982) and Kurilov (2006).

The focus articulation $\text{AFOV}$ shows the greatest variation from speaker to speaker and within single speakers. It is especially true for its full configuration. In spite of the relatively high degree of divergence, three common encoding patterns can be distinguished and certain tendencies in encoding the constituents of the sentences with this focus articulation can be observed. In discussing this matter it is reasonable to differentiate between the full configuration of this focus articulation and the reduced forms thereof: $\text{AF}(O)V$ and $\text{AF}(OV)$.

In the sentences with the configuration $\text{AF}(O)V$ the AF pattern prevails. It is characterized by the fact that both the subject and the predicate are deprived of any inflexion, the only exception being the 3PL form of the verb that has a plural affix $–\text{yu}$.

(843a) *Kin* lalime-le köjle-s?
who[FOC.ERG] sledge-ACC break-CAUS[AF]
‘Who broke the sledge?’

$Ieruu-če / \text{Met} *köjle-s.$
hunt-NMLZ[FOC.ERG]/ 1SG[FOC.ERG] break-CAUS[AF]
‘A/The hunter / I broke [it].’

With the configuration $\text{AF}(OV)$, the number of the informants who encode the only overt constituent, the subject, as an SF form\(^{273}\) increases. It is regarded as an alternative even by those informants who reject the SF form of the subject in the sentences with the configuration $\text{AF}(OV)$. The employment of the nominal focus marker, characteristic of the SF pattern and unexpected in (843b), can probably be explained by the same logic as in (842b).

(843b) *Kin* lalime-le köjle-s? – Met-ek.
who[FOC.ERG] sledge-ACC break-CAUS[AF] 1SG-FOC.ABS
‘Who broke the sledge?’ – ‘I [did].’

In the full configuration, the expected AF pattern is sometimes replaced by the BC form of the verb. For this reason the form of the subject in such sentences, though formally identical with that of the subjects in the sentences formally encoded as having AF, cannot be called the AF form any longer.

(843c) *Kin-ek* lalime-le köjle-s-um?
who-FOC.ABS sledge-ACC break-CAUS-TR.3SG
‘Who broke the sledge?’

\(^{273}\) Notably, this happens, if at all, only if the subject is not 3SG.
Ieruu-čē lalime-le köjle-s-um.
hunt-NMLZ sledge-ACC break-CAUS-TR.3SG
‘A/The hunter broke the sledge.’

Two out of 10 consulted informants employ the OF pattern with the full configuration.

(843d) Kin-ek lalime-le salγarej-m?
who-FOC.ABS sledge-ACC break-TR.3SG
‘Who broke the sledge?’

Met lalime-le salγarej-meg.
1SG sledge-FOC.ABS break-TR.1/2SG.OF
‘I broke the sledge.’

Possible reasons for the deviant patterns in (843c) and (843d) are suggested in section 5.2.1.7.

From Kurilov’s remarks (personal communication) it follows that there are basically two strategies of encoding the focus articulation A\_F OV: the basic form of the subject is accompanied by the AF or SF verb form. The former is normally employed in utterances in which the object is not expressed like in (843a). The latter, also known from KY, can occur also in sentences containing a direct object. Note the absence of the focus marker on the subject:\(^\text{274}\):

(844a) Laame čuule lew-l.
laame čuul-le lew-l
dog meat-ACC eat-GER.SF
‘[It is] the dog [that] has eaten the meat.’

While the subject and the object in (844a) can switch places, the former strategy of expressing AF in sentences with an overt object is associated with the fixed marked word order OAV:

(844b) Čuule laame lew.
čuul-le laame lew
meat-ACC dog eat[AF]
‘[It is] the dog [that] has eaten the meat.’

According to Kurilov (personal communication), (844b) is more categorical: ‘the dog and no-one else’.

(844a) represents a mixed syntactic structure as the morphological equipments of the predicate and the subject are not congruous: the predicate is encoded as focalizing S while the subject lacks the focal ending characteristic of S-arguments. The mix-up can have the opposite constellation as in (844c) where the focal ending –ek of the question word that normally should occur in sentences with the SF verb form is accompanied by the AF form of the verb.

\(^{274}\) Kurilov admitted, however, that, though less frequently, the focus marker can be attached to the subject
With ditransitive verbs, only the strategy in (844a) appears to be possible:

(844d) \( \text{Tet} \) kewejl \( \gamma \) anek end'iit titteya? \\
\( \text{tet} \) keweji-l-\( \gamma \) anek en'-d'iit tittelaya? \\
2SG leave-GER.1/2PL.DS who-FOC.ABS be.alive-CAUS-FUT[AF] 3PL-ACC \\
‘Who will support them if you leave?’  Kurilov (2001:152, kinek)

All but one elderly speaker encode this focus articulation in the same way, fully conformant with the previous descriptions.

(845a) \( \text{Ieruu} \)-če neme-le(\( \eta \)) köjle-s-mele? \\
hunt-NMLZ what-FOC.ABS break-CAUS-TR.3SG.OF \\
‘What did the hunter break?’

\( \text{Ieruu} \)-če lalime-le(\( \eta \)) köjle-s-mele. \\
hunt-NMLZ sledge-FOC.ABS break-CAUS-TR.3SG.OF \\
‘The hunter broke a sledge.’

(845b) \( \text{(Tet)} \) neme-le(\( \eta \)) köle-s-men? \\
(2SG) what-FOC.ABS break-CAUS-TR.1/2SG.OF \\
‘What did you break?’

\( \text{(Met)} \) lalime-ley kojle-s-men. \\
(1SG) sledge-FOC.ABS break-CAUS-TR.1/2SG.OF \\
‘I broke a sledge.’

The younger speakers have different deviations from this pattern.

5.2.1.3 Focal peripheral constituent

When a sentence contains a focal peripheral constituent, it is regularly accompanied by the omission\(^\text{275}\) of the verbal focus marker, the clitic \( me= \), but no special marker is employed. The verbal endings in the answers are those of BC. Thus, this focus articulation is marked negatively in affirmative sentences\(^\text{276}\), as far as the morphological means are concerned. A few examples follow to illustrate that.

\(^{275}\) Some informants consider such an omission facultative when asked specifically about the possibility of retention of the clitic but never fail to omit \( me= \) in spontaneous utterances with focal peripheral constituents. See however 5.2.3 for the usage of cliticized verbs in sentences with focal peripheral constituents and the explanation of that phenomenon.

\(^{276}\) There is a special interrogative paradigm for questions to peripheral constituents (Maslova 2003c:20)
- oblique cases

(846a) Tet wadun nime qadaa ögetejmek?

Tet wadul-n nime qadaa ögete-j-mek?

2SG Yukaghir-GEN house where put-SEM-TR.2SG

‘Where did you put the tent?’

Met wadun nime Čamuol-el Uluro ayaduol’daya ögetejŋ.

met wadul-n nime Čama-ŋol-el Uluro ayaduol’-da-ŋa ögete-j-ŋ.

1SG Yukaghir-GEN house Big-be-GER Uluro shore-PERT-LOC put-SEM-1SG.TR

‘I put it at the shore of Big Uluro.’

- adverbials

(846b) Lasu qanin kewej? – Lasu awjaa keweč.

Lasu qanin kewej? Lasu awjaa kewej-j.

Lasu when leave[3SG,ITRG] Lasu yesterday leave-INTR.3SG

‘When did Lasu leave?’ – ‘Lasu left yesterday.’

A comparison of the message conveyed in (846c) and (846d) is very illustrative too.

(846c) Malaa tet čii quodeŋ sayane-l-pe-gi n’ied’i-k!

MP 2SG people how sit-GER-PL-PERT tell-IMP.SG

‘Well then, tell [me] how your parents are doing!’

Met čii amutney sayane-ŋi.

1SG people be.good.ADV sit-3PL.INTR

(Tittel) Me čayad’aanunj.

(tittel) me=čayad’e-nu-ŋi.

(3PL) PF=work-DUR-3PL.INTR

‘My parents are doing well. They continue to work.’

The presence of a modal adverb accounts predictably (see Krejnović 1958:151) for the lack of the verbal focal clitic me= in the first sentence of the answer. Just as logical is the presence of that clitic in the last line of (846c), represented by the verb-only sentence in which the predicate carries the new relevant information. But this changes if a focal peripheral constituent is added which is marked by its preverbal position in the sentence and by intonation:

(846d) Tittel Jakuuskajya čayad’aanunj.

tittel Jakuuskaj-ŋa čayad’e-nu-ŋi.

3PL Yakutsk-LOC work-DUR-3PL.INTR

‘They continue to work in Yakutsk.’

This pattern was recognized by Comrie (1992), who proposed the label ‘neutral focus’ for it because he regarded the corresponding forms as basic. Since the word ‘focus’ very generally implies concentration of attention on something, the term ‘neutral’ is not
completely suitable here. Neither can the designation ‘unmarked indicative’, proposed by Fortescue (1996:21) be adequate for these verb forms. First of all, they are, contrary to what Fortescue (1996) believed having analyzed Krejnovič’s (1958, 1982) material, not confined to the indicative mood. Second of all, verb forms as in (846d) serve to express the narrow focus on a peripheral constituent and are in such contexts anything else but functionally unmarked. However, they seem to represent a ‘default’ option in certain other contexts (e.g. the use of the BC form in APSs, see 5.2.2.1) To my mind, it is therefore more preferable to designate the verb form of the predicate in (846d) simply as the ‘basic conjugation’ form, or, abbreviated, the BC form of the verb.

Focus is the main communicative point to be conveyed by the speaker to the listener. The constituent(s) effecting such transfer of information is/are called focal. Focal constituents are encoded, or focalized, in TY with morphological means. Since morphological markers of TY have complementary distribution, only one constituent in a given sentence can be actually focalized morphologically. So far only cases with a single focal constituent have been dealt with. Therefore, it is interesting to find out now which of the multiple focal constituents receives the corresponding morphological marking. This is done in sections 5.2.1.4 to 5.2.1.6 that follow.

5.2.1.4 Topical argument

\[ A_O F_V_F \]

The absolute majority of the informants encode this focus articulation employing the OF pattern:

(847a) \( \text{Ieruu-če neme-len}\ y\ wie-mele? \)

hunt-NMLZ what-FOC.ABS do-TR.3SG.OF

‘What did the hunter do?’

\( \text{Ieruu-če lalime-len køjle-s-mele.} \)

hunt-NMLZ sledge-FOC.ABS break-CAUS-TR.3SG.OF

‘The hunter broke a/the sledge.’

(847b) \( T\ et neme-le wie-men? \)

2SG what-FOC do-TR.1/2SG.OF

‘What did you do?’

\( M\ et lalime-len køjle-s-men. \)

1SG sledge-FOC.ABS break-CAUS-TR.1/2SG.OF

‘I broke a/the sledge.’

This quite regular pattern is just as regularly broken if the sentence pair is designed in a certain way:

(847c) \( \text{Lasu quode(ŋ) čayad’aanu?} \)

Lasu quode(ŋ) čayad’e-ŋu?

Lasu how work-DUR[3SG.ITRG]
‘How does Lasu work?’

\[ \text{Tude \ wie-l-moraw-\gamma ane \ me=wie-nun-um.} \]
\[ 3\text{SG do-GER-OBLG-ACC PF=do-HAB-TR.3SG} \]

‘[He] fulfills his tasks.’

One’s tasks equal one’s work, therefore it does not surprise that the word \text{wielmoraw\gamma ane} is degraded in the answer in its focal status. It simply is not new. It actually carries implicitly given information despite not having been explicitly mentioned in the question. Instead the speaker concentrates his attention and the attention of the inquirer on the predicate whose content cannot be foreseen by the latter, thus PF.

\text{AFOV\textsubscript{F}}

This focus articulation is not covered in Maslova (2005) and the following description is thus an attempt to close this gap. Considering the high degree of divergence attested for the focus articulation \text{AFOV}, it is not surprising that this focus articulation shows varying patterns of encoding, sometimes even in one speaker. To illustrate it, a few examples are quoted:

\begin{align*}
\text{(848a) Ieruu-če \ quode \ gurčii?} \\
\text{hunt-NMLZ \ how become[3SG.ITRG]} \\
\text{‘What has happened to the hunter?’}
\end{align*}

\[ \text{Tude-γale \ qajčie-tege \ uu-se / -mle / -m.} \]
\[ 3\text{SG-ACC grandfather-AUG go-CAUS[AF] / -TR.3SG.OF / -TR.3SG} \]

‘A bear attacked him.’

“A big grandfather touched/disturbed him (lit. “made him go”).”

The interpretation of the alternative verb forms in the answer is additionally made harder by the informant’s claim that neither of them emphasizes a constituent, but all of them rather just state a fact. It is conspicuous that in spite of the indifference of this particular informant she does not use the PF form of the verb in this context. When the configuration is reduced to \text{AF(O)V\textsubscript{F}}, the OF form of the verb, naturally, does not occur any longer but both others do. The PF form of the verb does occur when the subject of the sentences with such reduced configuration is a pronominal one, especially when it is omitted. The latter is probably the reflection of the normally obligatory usage of the clitic \text{me=} in verb-only sentences:

\begin{align*}
\text{(848b) Quode \ gurčii \ ilwii-če? – (Met) \ mer=il’ite-η.} \\
\text{how become[3SG.ITRG] graze-NMLZ (1SG) PF=reprimand-1SG.TR} \\
\text{‘What has happened to the herdsman?’ – ‘(I) reprimanded [him]’}. 
\end{align*}

Some other speakers are more liberal with the usage of \text{me=} attaching it also to predicates with nominal subjects.

A specific attested usage is represented by application of exclusively the BC form of the predicate for this focus articulation, which could be a sign of deterioration of the
focus system. In a more competent speaker this usage is spontaneous as long as the subject is nominal. Here it might be an expression of a compromise in a conflicting situation.

Some elderly speakers are very clear about the usage of the verb forms in the two following alternative answers with reduced configuration to the question ‘What has happened to the teacher?’, (848c) stressing the subject and (848d) emphasizing the action.

(848c) *Met l’iteges.*

1SG[Af] beat-[Af]

‘I have beaten [him] up.’

(848d) *Me=l’iteges-uy.*

PF=beat-1SG.TR

‘[I] have beaten [him] up.’

This confirms that there is a high degree of confidence in the competent speakers regarding the choice of the focal pattern when redundant constituents, here O, are absent. It is only natural that no informant with the exception of two uses the OF form of the verb with the focus articulation *AfOVf*.

The occurrence of the AF focus pattern in the focus configuration *AfOVf* as exemplified in (848c) corrects Maslova’s (2005:606) claim that ‘the AF construction … marks the remainder of the clause … as its pragmatic supposition and is available only if *q*(x, O) can be assumed to be known by the listener(s)’. That the AF construction, contrary to what Maslova (2005:607) concludes, need not encode “only narrow focus on A”, is confirmed also elsewhere. The following sentence pair is taken from a story in which a glutton approaches different entities trying to find out who is the strongest one. In (848e) it asks this question of a cloud.

(848e) *Tet-ek werwe-l?*

2SG-FOC.ABS be.strong-GER.SF

‘Are you strong?’

_Elen’, metqane ilijey uusaanun_

_elen’ met-jane ilijey uu-se-nun._

NEG 1SG-ACC wind go-CAUS-HAB[Af]

‘No, the wind tosses me [around].’ (Kurilov 2005:242)

The same story contains an instance of this focus articulation being encoded as having predicate focus, which very clearly shows that both patterns are equally possible:

(848f) *Tet qad’ir me=werwe-jek?*

2SG MP PF=be.strong-INTR.2SG

‘You [must be] strong.’

_Elen’, sukundawa met-qane mer=umusej-nun-um._

NEG cloud 1SG-ACC PF=cover-HAB-TR.3SG

‘No, the cloud obscures me.’ (Kurilov 2005:242)

---

277 For one of them it does not seem to have its focal function and the other did it with the subject in the 1SG. In the paradigm of verbal endings of this latter consultant, however, the corresponding ending _-men_ seems to express PF sometimes.
The choice of the particular focus construction in (848e) and (848f) is most probably dictated by the focus construction employed in the questions: the subject and the predicate are focalized respectively. Normally the same focus construction is used in the anticipated form of an answer to a question. Besides, the subject and the predicate in the answers in (848e) and (848f) are used contrastively with respect to their counterparts in the questions, which naturally triggers the corresponding focus constructions.

In some situations, even if the answer is not given in the anticipated form, certain choices seem to be favored. The absolute majority of the informants answer the question in (848g) with the PF verb form:

(848g) Lasu quode čayad’aanu

Lasu how work-DUR[3SG.ITRG] ‘How does Lasu work?’

Leml’e-(gi) (tude-γane) me=kerd’is-nun-um.
chief-(PERT) 3SG-ACC PF=praise-HAB-TR.3SG ‘(His) chief praises (him).’

No one forms this sentence with AF. This is not surprising in the given context because once the speaker has chosen this somewhat unusual form of the answer judging Lasu’s work by how much he is praised for it by others, it is the chief whose opinion and attitude is most important. The chief is therefore an expected participant of the state of affairs described in the sentence, or an inferred topic, whereas his opinion cannot be foreseen by the listener, thus the emphasis on the predicate.

In the second sentence of (848h) all but one informant spontaneously put the predicate in its BC form, the “stray” variant being PF, which is ungrammatical according to the judgment of at least one informant asked about that. It is claimed (Kurilov, personal communication) that the subject is emphasized in the reacting speaker’s utterance.

(848h) Lasu amuče-köde-k.

Lasu be.good.PTCP-man-COP ‘Lasu is a good person.’

(Tan) l’ie Lasu-γane jawner jewligi-ŋa.
(and) MP Lasu-ACC all love-3PL.TR ‘Yes, everybody loves Lasu.’

While the second speaker’s choice of the particular verbal lexeme in this short dialogue cannot be foreseen by the first speaker, it is not really something conceptually new to the latter if the second speaker agrees with him in assessing Lasu’s personality. Since the second speaker’s opinion does coincide with that of the first one, the second speaker does not consider it necessary to focalize the predicate. On the other hand, it is quite reasonable to stress that literally everybody likes Lasu. The subject is, in such a case, emphasized here by syntactic means only (immediate preverbal position), the morphological AF marking lacking altogether. It seems to be a property of the pronoun
jawner that it carries the focus of the utterance by default and the predicate need not be in the AF form.

Unfortunately, clear generalizations can hardly be made with respect to the full configuration of this focus articulation. With the reduced articulation lacking an explicit object, which is more frequent in natural speech, the choice of either an AF or PF verb form in competent speakers depends predictably on which of the constituents they wish to emphasize.

5.2.1.5 Topical predicate

\( A_F O_F V \)

The absolute majority of the informants choose OF while encoding this focus articulation.

(849a) \( \text{Motuu-ŋin’ med’uol-uol čajle-da-γa neme-γa tadi-ŋu-mle?} \)
\( \text{Motuu-DAT be.born-be[GER] day-PERT-LOC what-FOC.ABS give-PL-TR.3.OF} \)
‘What did one give Motuu for her birthday?’

\( \text{Lasu tudi-in’ mono-le tadi-mle.} \)
\( \text{Lasu 3SG-DAT cap-FOC.ABS give-TR.3SG.OF} \)
‘Lasu gave her a cap.’

(849b) \( \text{Met tudi-in’ mono-leγa tadi-meg.} \)
\( \text{1SG 3SG-DAT cap-FOC.ABS give-TR.1/2SG.OF} \)
‘I gave her a cap.’

It appears that the object has a priority of being formally assigned the focal status in the focal pairs \( A_F O_F \) and \( O_F V_F \).

5.2.1.6 Thetic sentences

\( S_F V_F \)

This focus articulation was studied in two types of dialogue. In the first dialogue (850a) a rather extraordinary or unexpected event is reported in an excited manner. In the second dialogue (850b), the events that are probably expected or at least natural and in no way extraordinary, are reported in a peaceful manner.

While the majority of elder informants apply PF with this focus articulation, the younger speakers show the tendency to drop the clitic \( me= \), which transforms the verb form into BC.

(850a) \( \text{(Mörde(ŋ)) me=möri-mk? – (Elen’) Neme-(leγa) quode-gurčii-l?} \)
\( \text{(news) PF=hear-TR.2PL (NEG) what-(FOC.ABS) how-become-GER.SF} \)
‘Have you heard (the news)?’ – ‘(No), What (has happened)?’
In the dialogue of the second type the speakers show much more uniformity encoding the non-modified predicates as PF:

(850b) Neme-le(ŋ) ni’ed’i-te-mk? –
what-FOC.ABS tell-FUT-TR.2PL
‘What’s new?’

Tan l’ie, met paad’eduo ködeŋin’ uuj278 tadaat me keweč, met kuod’iduo armijayat kelu tadaat me ćayad’aanuj. Met könme eguojie költej. Jawner mer amuč.

and MP 1SG daughter man-DAT go-INTR.3SG then
met=kewej-j 1SG son armija-ya-t kelu-j
PF=leave-INTR.3SG 1SG army-ABL-PROL come-INTR.3SG

‘Well, my daughter married and went away; my son came back from the army and works [now]. My wife is coming tomorrow. Everything is all right.’

These findings seem to contradict Maslova’s (2005:605) observations about thhetic sentences involving intransitive verbs, namely that ‘the SF construction subsumes both […] S-focus and sentence focus’. This, however, is only an apparent contradiction because in all three examples that Maslova (2005) gives in order to substantiate her claim the S-argument fulfills not only the function of focus but also that of the topic thus being a part of a presentative sentence. Presentative sentences behave differently from non-presentative sentences regarding the encoding strategies of the pragmatic function of focus. Presentative sentences are discussed in section 5.2.2.1. The S-argument of a thetic sentence is assigned only the function of focus. In the vast majority of cases the sentence is then encoded as having PF and not SF.

Notwithstanding the above-mentioned, in the dialogues of both types one informant prefers an SF verb form:

(850c) Met mirije eguojie kelu-te-l.
1SG wife tomorrow come-FUT-GER.SF
‘My wife is coming tomorrow.’

278 It is not quite natural for TY to have more than one finite verb in the same sentence, unless the verbs express alternative actions. This translation must be a replica of the Russian sentence. Normally, a TY speaker would attach the personal endings only to the last verb in a sentence encoding all other verbs as converbs. Note the lack of the clitic me= with the verb forms uuj, keluj and költej. Both verbs are modified unlike their counterparts with the focal clitic.
This deviation from the common encoding choice shows that the choice becomes relatively free once a discourse goes beyond a simple question-answer constellation. In the particular context of the second dialogue the SF choice is logical in a sense. The verb ‘to come’ had become topical by the time the speaker reached the point at which he uttered the sentence in (850c). He had been speaking about his son’s coming back from the army and now it is his wife who is coming. So, notwithstanding the fact that there is often a preferred focal encoding pattern, depending on the speaker’s perspective and provided that the context allows it, alternative encoding patterns can be chosen, as could be expected of a living language.

A_F O_F V_F

This focus articulation was studied in the same types of dialogues as the preceding one. For the first type of dialogue the translations could be obtained only from 5 informants and thus can hardly have any statistical value. But even those few translations again indicate how much variation in the encoding of the predicate there is when A is a focal constituent. Three informants choose BC, one OF, and yet another one uses AF to encode the predicate of the affirmative sentence conveying the new information. The more common choice, the BC, is exemplified here:

(851a) (Mörde(ŋ)) me=möri-mk? – (Elen’) Neme-(le)ŋ (quode-gurčii-l?)

news PF=hear-TR.2PL (NEG) what-(FOC.ABS) how-become-GER.SF

‘Have you heard (the news)?’ – ‘(No), What (has happened)?’

Uraa-nu-j uo uraričiće l’iteges-(l’el)-um.

learn-DUR-PTCP child teacher beat-(NVIS)-TR.3SG

‘A pupil has beaten up a teacher.’

The picture is not less colorful in the second type of dialogue. However, the encoding of the predicate(s) as PF prevails numerically and is observed in speakers of different ages. The encoding pattern CVB+PF (see footnote 278) is employed here to illustrate this focus articulation:

(851b) Neme-le(ŋ) ni’ed’i-te-mk?

what-FOC.ABS tell-FUT-TR.2PL

‘What’s new?’

Tan l’ie met kuod’ido uraa-nu-be nime-(le)

MP 1SG son learn-DUR-OP house-(ACC)

juoya-re-j-relek (motineŋ) ćayad’e-le me=nugu-m.

finish-TRVZ-SEM-ANT (already) work-ACC PF=find-TR.3SG

‘Well, my son finished school and (already) found a job.’

It should be noted that despite a clear tendency to prefer PF verb forms some speakers employed other encoding patterns which are presented below for the sake of completeness. These can be divided in two groups: both predicates are represented by
finite verbs vs. only the last predicate is finite. The informants’ choices are then as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st group</th>
<th>2nd group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC+BC (2 speakers)</td>
<td>CVB+PF (2 speakers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF+PF (2 speakers)</td>
<td>CVB+OF (1 speaker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF+OF (1 speaker)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is in clear disagreement with Maslova’s (2005:606) generalization that this focus articulation is subsumed under the OF construction.

The $A_F O_F V_F$ focus articulation obtains also when a sensible answer simply does not contain any constituent of the question. With the following question-answer pair elderly informants construct the answer with the OF form of the verb and the younger ones with its BC form.

(851c) Lasu quode($η$) čayad’aamu?

Lasu how work-DUR[3SG.ITRG]

‘How does Lasu work?’

Leml’e wien ċii-k kerd’i-s-nun-mele.

boss other people-FOC.ABS boast-CAUS-HAB-TR.3SG.OF

‘The boss praises others.’

This answer obviously carries contrastive meaning. Since it is the object that is contrastively used, the occurrence of the OF verb form in this somewhat unusual answer is but natural. This sentence is an indication that focus and contrast are expressed by the same morphological means in TY.

5.2.1.7 Focus articulations of TY: generalizing remarks

On the basis of the examples in sections 5.2.1.1 to 5.2.1.6 an overview of the focus system of TY can be given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>single focal element</th>
<th>multiple focal elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$SV_F \rightarrow PF$</td>
<td>$A_F O_F V_F \rightarrow$ divergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$AOV_F \rightarrow PF$</td>
<td>$AO_F V_F \rightarrow$ OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SF V \rightarrow$ $SF$</td>
<td>$A_F O_F V \rightarrow$ OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_F O_V \rightarrow$ divergent</td>
<td>$SF V_F \rightarrow$ mainly $PF^{279}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$AO_F V \rightarrow$ mainly $OF$</td>
<td>$A_F O_F V_F \rightarrow$ tendentially $PF$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral constituents $\rightarrow$ $BC$</td>
<td>$\quad$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

279 This holds unless there is a focal peripheral constituent, then BC.
Ultimately, it is the particular context of the state of affairs described that decides over the speaker’s choice of a focal pattern as has clearly been shown in (847c), (848g), (850c) and (851c).

Several hierarchies for focalizing a constituent in sentences with multiple focal constituents can be established. (846d) and (850b) suggest that a peripheral constituent carrying new information is perceived by the speakers as more salient than a predicate with the same information structure, which results in the BC form of the predicate, thus: \( X_F > V_{\text{INTR}}F \), where \( X \) represents the peripheral constituent. There is only one comparable example with a sentence containing a transitive verb in my material but it clearly indicates that the opposition transitive/intransitive is irrelevant. In no single elicitation of it do informants use the PF form of the verb, which makes it possible to state the hierarchy more generally as \( X_F > V_F \). It must be admitted, however, that the matter is additionally complicated here by the presence of a direct object which also ranks rather high in the focal hierarchy. The choice of the particular focus pattern in sentences with a transitive verb goes hand in hand with the placement of the focal direct object or the focal peripheral constituent in the immediate preverbal position, a privileged position for assigning the function of focus. If the object stands in it, the sentence is encoded as having \( OF \), if that slot is occupied by a peripheral constituent, the \( BC \) form of the verb is chosen assigning the focus function to that peripheral constituent. It is one of the clearest proves of the influence of the syntax in the domain of pragmatics in TY, a language which is famous for its morphologically marked focus.

The other two hierarchies are as follows:

- in non-thetic sentences: \( OF > AF/V_F \)
- in thetic sentences: \( V_F > SF \) and less consistent but tendentially \( V_F > AF/OF \)

The above-mentioned observations allow to equate in non-thetic sentences the direct object with the peripheral constituent with respect to their rank in the focal hierarchy: \( OF = X_F \).

It is apparent that among the speakers of TY there is a substantial degree of variation in encoding different focus articulations. As could be expected from an endangered language, the speakers pertaining to the older generation, on the whole, show more conformity with the previous descriptions of TY in employing focal patterns. The deviant usages in some of the younger speakers can definitely be taken as signs of the deterioration of the focus system in TY. For instance, the youngest informant consulted does not use the morphological patterns of \( SF \), \( AF \) and \( OF \) switching only from \( BC \) to \( PF \). Another informant used the verbal endings of \( AF \), \( OF \) and \( BC \) interchangeably denying their emphatic value. Some informants provide translations that are contradictory not only to the existing descriptions of TY focus system but to their own comparable translations made on other occasions, which is indicative of the focus system being unstable in them (see also 5.2.8.1). On the other hand, there seem to be instances of deviant usages that are of a more systematic nature. One good example of this is the use of the \( BC \) form of a transitive verb to stress the object of the sentence as long as the

\[280\] She does not use them even in questions with the question word playing the role of the subject and direct object respectively.
subject is 3rd person (see 5.2.8.2). In this latter case one probably cannot speak of the deterioration of the focus system but should consider those deviations as (systematic) modifications of that system, whatever their origin may be. Thus, alternative focus subsystems would have to be recognized for TY.

The least divergences are observed in sentences involving a predicate expressed by an intransitive verb. In the sentences with transitive verbs the stability of the focal patterns is mostly maintained as long as A is not among the focal constituents. Out of 4 focus articulations involving a focal A only one, \( A_F O_V F \), is stable. While the divergence in encoding focus in the focus articulations \( A_F O_F V \) and \( A_F O_V F \) is more or less natural\(^{281}\), its presence in \( A_F O_V \) calls for an explanation. The instability of the focal patterns in the sentences containing a focal A could be explained by two reasons. Firstly, this type of focus is very rarely attested in the textual material of TY. If the same holds true for the spoken language, it simply can be the first victim of the deterioration of the focus system in TY speakers, whose traces are observable in younger speakers.

The other reason is a possible interfering influence of the topical constituents\(^{282}\) that are normally omitted in speech (see also Kurilov 2006:267-268), since they are readily retrievable from the context, but are present in the constructed examples of this work\(^{283}\). What appears in the sentence are the focal constituents and when normally suppressed topical constituents also turn up in the surface structure of a sentence, it leads to a cognitive clash in some speakers who apparently cannot interpret and treat them as topics any longer and sometimes assign the focal status to them, which is reflected in a corresponding encoding pattern. Thus, for instance, the most natural answer to the question triggering the focus articulation \( A_O V_F \) – and it was the spontaneous answer with the majority of informants – is a verb-only clause. When an informant is prompted to give an answer with an overt object, it probably produces in him or her a signal that the object, since it is present, might be the constituent to be stressed. This leads to a reinterpretation of the answer as having focus on the object with the subsequent attachment of the OF verbal endings to the predicate. The fact that the answer is not an immediate reaction to a question but rather a translation, being thus perceived as somewhat detached from the question, additionally induces such a reinterpretation. A similar effect is manifested in (843d) where the redundant direct object must cause the choice of the OF pattern. This is, in fact, harmonious with the overall tendency that the object is preferred over the other focal constituents in being focalized.

One may object that a comparable reinterpretation and its consequences do not take place in the answers in which the object is missing but the subject is present, i.e. \( A(O) V_F \). This possibly has to do with the status of the predicate in the sentences with AF. While predicates that display PF and OF forms can be called true predicates as having full-fledged inflexional paradigms and lacking nominal properties whatsoever, predicates representing AF that are, with the exception of 3PL, zero-ending forms, resemble possessa

\(^{281}\) The degree of divergence in encoding a focus articulation generally increases together with the number of the focal constituents in it. This is logical and self-explanatory.

\(^{282}\) As already has been noted, the sentences with the configuration \( A_F (O)V \) are more consistent in encoding AF.

\(^{283}\) The elicitation of the sentences having full configuration of a given focus articulation was necessary because such sentences can naturally occur in the speech flow, particularly when no constituent can be regarded as given but the speaker does not treat the utterance as a thematic sentence but deliberately gives focal prominence to one of its constituents treating the other (ones) as background.
of possessive NPs (see Krejnovič 1958:134) and express secondary features of the focalized subjects. This led Krejnovič (1958:133) to call them ‘non-predicative forms of the verb’ and later to group them together with $SF$ predicates under the label ‘rank II predicates’ (Krejnovič 1982:204) characterized, among other things, by the fact that they cannot occur on their own.

This is to show how $PF$ and $OF$ predicates are cognitively perceived as more similar to each other than in comparison to $AF$ predicates. If the constituents, here predicates showing $AF$ and $OF$, are not readily comparable, their arguments, the subject associated with a predicate encoded as the $AF$ form and the direct object associated with a predicate encoded as $OF$ are not comparable either. Therefore the occurrence of $A$ in the surface structure of a sentence does not produce the same effect as the occurrence of $O$. Indeed, when both $A$ and $O$, or both candidates for an alternative potential focus assignment, are there in the answer, the only alternative assignment of the focus function that can occur in the context of the focus articulation $AOV_F$ is the one signaling the presence of $OF$, never $AF$.

5.2.2. SAs with multiple pragmatic functions

Almost all focal constituents in the examples in sections 5.2.1.1 to 5.2.1.6 had only this one pragmatic function. In this section the encoding of a combination of two pragmatic functions will be presented: focal topics (5.2.2.1) as well as the combinations Focus/Contrast and Topic/Contrast (both 5.2.2.2).

5.2.2.1 Focal topics (presentative sentences)

The combination of focus and topic obtains in so called presentative sentences meant to introduce a new topic (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008:99).

When discussing presentative sentences in TY, it is reasonable to divide them into two groups: absolute presentative sentences (APS) which initiate a text being thus (normally) free from any preexisting context and relative presentative sentences (RPS) which introduce a new topic into an already existing context within a text.

As for the RPSs, in the overwhelming majority of them the new topic is encoded as an $SF$ form which is expected for obvious reasons:

(852a) *N’aac’in čamuod’e ibalek l’e-l.*

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{n’aac’in} & \text{čamuol-je} & \text{ibal-ek} & \text{l’e-l} \\
\text{opposite} & \text{be.big-PTCP} & \text{mountain-FOC.ABS} & \text{be-GER.SF}
\end{array}
\]

‘Opposite there was a big hill.’ (Krejnovič 1982:273)

In very rare instances the predicate of a sentence carrying a new topic appears in its $BC$ form and the noun representing the new topic, correspondingly, in its basic form, without the nominal focus marker:

(852b) *Ta'nigine čii-in l’uorel l’ienuni.*

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{ta’nigine} & \text{čii-n} & \text{l’uore-l} & \text{l’e-nun-i} \\
\text{then} & \text{people-GEN} & \text{play-GER} & \text{be-HAB-INTR.3SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘In those times there used to be a festival.’ (Krejnovič 1958:259)
In fact, the sentence in (852b) was the only example of this encoding strategy in the longest available text in TY. Since the encoding of focal topics in RPSs is otherwise very regular, one could presume that in (852b) another constituent is actually focalized. The morphological equipment of the constituents indicates that it is a peripheral constituent\(^{284}\), the word \textit{taŋnige}. But with this interpretation the sentence could not be regarded as presentative, which it undoubtedly is. Therefore an alternative explanation for the use of the BC form of the verb in this exceptional example should be sought.

Further instances of BC verb forms encoding focal topics in RPSs could be detected. Consider the beginning of a children story:

(852c) \textit{Kin wal’be saa tuduruun miraal’elgi. Pölcenme titte kiejie qajčietege jedej’el’en’}.  
\textit{Me kócgejrem.}

\begin{tabular}{llllll}
\textit{kin} & \textit{wal’be saal} & \textit{tuduruu-n} & \textit{mira-l’el-ıi.} & \textit{pölcenme} & \textit{titte} \\
\textit{two,gen} & \textit{friend} & \textit{forest} & \textit{inside-prol} & \textit{walk-nvis-3pl.intr} & \textit{suddenly 3pl.poss} \\
\textit{kiejie} & \textit{qajčietege} & \textit{jedejej’el-i.} & \textit{me=kócgej-re-m.} & & \\
\textit{in,front.of} & \textit{grandfather-aug} & \textit{appear-nvis-intr.3sg} & & & \\
\end{tabular}

‘Two friends were walking in a forest. Suddenly a bear appeared ahead. [It] charged [at them].’

(Kurilov 1994:12)

There is no doubt that the sole purpose of the first two sentences is to introduce successively two new topics. In the third sentence they represent given information and are spoken about, which is signaled by their omission. The first two sentences are thus clearly presentative ones but the predicates in both of them are encoded as BC forms. What could be the reason for the use of the BC form of the verb in the RPS in this example? Given the status of this sentence as being presentative, i.e. one in which the functions of focus and topic are combined in one constituent, focalizing of the adverb “suddenly” appears impossible on pragmatic grounds, since manner adverbs are not established as topics in narrative texts. In other words, it would have to be the topic of this sentence that gets focalized. Besides, there are instances of very similar RPSs that contain SF verb forms, which shows that the choice of the BC verb form is not obligatory in presentative sentences containing a focal peripheral constituent:

(852d) \textit{Araj purewre-t anme jaqte-leq möruu-l.} 
\textit{MP above-abl simply song-loc.abs be.heard-gsr.sf}

‘Then, suddenly, a song resounded from above.’

(Krejnovič 1982:189)

The situation in (852c) could be explained in the following way. The status of its second sentence as RPS is relative because there has hardly been anything in the text that has already been spoken about. The narration is so far practically free of the preexisting context. Therefore the second sentence could be considered a counterpart of the first sentence necessary to set the scene. Such interpretation allows regarding the second sentence also as APS, whose predicates as will be seen further are far less rigidly encoded

\(^{284}\) This is in accordance with the earlier observed overall tendency to give preference to focalizing peripheral constituents rather then other potentially focal constituents in TY.
as SF forms. The sentence in (852d), on the other hand, appears in a text after a young man that had been established as the topic in the introductory sentence of that text had been spoken about for quite a while. Therefore there is a need to mark the transition to a next topic in a very clear manner, of which seemingly only SF forms are capable.

Another potential explanation for the focal pattern of the RPS in (852c) is connected with the fact that, as will be seen in 5.2.5, emphasis is expressed in TY with the same grammatical means as focus. In this sense focus and emphasis can be equated in TY. Given the strong overall tendency for focal peripheral constituents to be focalized and since focalization and emphasis can be equated with respect to the formal means of their expression in TY, one can assume that there is a competition between the focal topic of this sentence and the peripheral constituent for the formal assignment of the function of focus and emphasis respectively. Since intra-clausal focal patterns of TY are complementary, the speakers have to opt for one of these, either focalizing the new topic or emphasizing the peripheral constituent. With this interpretation, one would have to conclude that in this particular instance the narrator decided to give preference to the emphasis over the focus. The same reasoning could be applied to account for the corresponding focus pattern in (852b), which, unlike the RPS in (852c), by no means can be regarded as APS, which, as will be seen in the following, can in a number of instances display the BC pattern instead of the SF pattern.

Native speakers of TY (Kurilov, personal communication) confirm that for the sentence in (852b) to accentuate pragmatically the topic it would have to follow the SF pattern:

(852e) Taŋnigine čii-n l’oura-l-ek l’e-l.  
then people-GEN play-GER-FOC be-GER.SF

‘In those times there used to be a festival.’

Analysis of textual material reveals that there is more variation in encoding focal topics in APSs. Numerically SF prevails as with RPSs but BC does not produce an impression of an exceptional phenomenon at all. In fact, these two encoding patterns occur almost evenly. Out of 11 APSs found in Kurilov’s book of children stories in 5 of them the predicate is encoded as BC form of the verb. Regularity can be observed there. The verb l’e- ‘to be’ always appears in its SF. Another existential verb, sayane- ‘to live’ occurs both in its SF and BC form. All other verbs introducing a new topic, those with the meaning of coming into appearance, are used only in their BC forms. A few examples illustrate that:

(853a) N’id’anmijil’-pe-k l’e-ŋu-l, …  
brothers-PL-FOC .abs be-PL-GER.SF

‘There were two brothers, …’  (Kurilov 1991:30)

(853b) Sal’il tadaat qawd’idie Qaalid’e sayane-ŋ.  
Mouse and uncle Wolf sit-3PL_INTR

‘There lived a mouse and the Uncle Wolf.’  (Kurilov 1994:8)

(853c) Sal’il tude nime tuduruut ölkiej  
sal’il tude nime tuduruu-t ölke-ie-j.  
mouse 3SG.POSS house inside-ABL run-INCH-INTR.3SG

(853d) Taŋnigine čii-n l’oura-l-ek l’e-l.  
then people-GEN play-GER-FOC be-GER.SF

‘In those times there used to be a festival.’
With APSs even PF of the verb can be encountered:

(853d) Qajčietege n’awn’iklie-ŋ me=n’i-nuu-ŋi.  
bear arctic.fox-COM PF=RECP-find-INTR.3PL

‘A bear and a polar fox met.’ (Kurilov 2005:240)

It could be argued that (853d) is not a genuine presentative sentence due to the lexeme choice for the predicate. But in my view the verb is semantically empty here. It is not essential whether the protagonists met, dined together or fought. The verb solely describes the circumstances in which the participants became important for the narration. They are clearly accentuated, not the action. The lexical emptiness of the verbal predicate in (853d) becomes especially clear when it is confronted with (853e), the first sentence of a story too, where the predicate delivers along with the subject an essential piece of information. For this reason the sentence cannot be regarded as presentative but should be viewed as an ‘all-new’ sentence whose predicate is predictably encoded as a PF form.

(853e) Tindaa tindaa juorpure en-nu-j omo-pe  
previously previously tundra be.alive-DUR-INTR.3SG tribe-PL

me=lajnu-l’el-i.    PF=fight-NVIS-3PL.INTR

‘Long time ago peoples living in tundra fought [with each other].’ (Kurilov 1994:38)

The less consistent encoding of focal topics in APSs as SF may result from the fact that since they occur in the beginning of a text there is less pragmatic pressure to label them as such for the lack of competitive preexisting topics. They are so to speak the only available topics, which accounts for the choice of the default BC form of the verb and the basic form of the subject. The new topics within a narration cannot be recognized as readily as such by the listener unless the speaker uses a device, the SF marking, to signal that the subject spoken about has changed.

Considering a relatively widespread use of BC verb forms in APSs, it has to be postulated that this encoding pattern apart from focalizing a peripheral constituent has a default function and is chosen when no particular constituent of a clause needs to be emphasized (see also 5.2.3 and 5.2.5), which in view of the above-said probably is the case in APSs.

5.2.2.2 Contrastive foci and contrastive topics

These two categories are treated together because elicitations have shown that they are encoded mainly in the same way. The morphological devices employed are the same as

---

The reflex of the original lexical meaning of the verb seems to play a role in the choice of the focus pattern of the predicate in presentative sentences. The more lexical content there is, the sooner the predicate is encoded as the BC or even PF verb form.
those for marking focus. While their usage in contrastive foci can be conditioned by the necessity to mark focus, in contrastive topics they can only serve to mark contrast.

In terms of Dik (1997, 1:330-334) contrastive foci are represented by the focus types Replacing and Expanding while contrastive topics are exemplified by the types Rejecting, Restricting, Selecting. A sixth type, the so called Parallel (contrastive focus) is characterized by the simultaneous occurrence of two pairs of contrastive constituents in the same sentence. One of them is focal, the other one is normally topical. The fuller forms of Expanding and Restricting as well as the combination of Rejecting and Replacing necessarily involve more than one SA with multiple pragmatic functions.

The encoding of contrast is systematically illustrated with the example of contrastive predicates (expressed by intransitive verbs\textsuperscript{286}) because in them contrast is expressed in a most consistent way throughout all six types of contrastive focus within Dik’s (1997) classification. The encoding of contrast in intransitive verbs shows also the least degree of divergence from speaker to speaker.

The subscript capital letter \( C \) stands in the following presentation for ‘contrast’.

\[ SV_c \]

Replacing:

(854a) \( Uo \merge ayal’waanuj. – Elen’, tudel mer oorin’aanuj. \)

\( \begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{uo} & \text{mer}=\text{ayal’we-nu-j} & \text{elen’} & \text{tudel} & \text{mer}=\text{oorin’e-nu-j} \\
\text{child} & \text{PF}=\text{laugh-DUR-INTR.3SG} & \text{NEG} & 3\text{SG} & \text{PF}=\text{cry-DUR-INTR.3SG} \\
\end{array} \)

‘The child is laughing.’ – ‘No, it is crying.’

Expanding:

(854b) \( Uo \merge ayal’waanuj. \)

\( \begin{array}{cccc}
\text{uo} & \text{mer}=\text{ayal’we-nu-j} \\
\text{child} & \text{PF}=\text{laugh-DUR-INTR.3SG} \\
\end{array} \)

\( \begin{array}{cccc}
\text{tudel wajide mer iimid’ienuj.} \\
\text{3SG still PF=dance-DUR-INTR.3SG} \\
\end{array} \)

‘The child is laughing.’ – ‘It is also crying.’

Rejecting:

(854c) \( Uo \merge aawaaj. – Elen’, tudel el aawaa. \)

\( \begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{uo} & \text{mer}=\text{aawe-aa-j} & \text{elen’} & \text{tudel} & \text{el}=\text{aawe-aa} \\
\text{child} & \text{PF=\text{sleep-INCH-INTR.3SG} NEG} & 3\text{SG} & \text{NEG=\text{sleep-INCH[3SG]} } \\
\end{array} \)

‘The child fell asleep.’ – ‘No, it did not fall asleep.’

\textsuperscript{286} Contrastive predicates expressed by transitive verbs morphologically behave in the same way as those expressed by intransitive verbs. The only divergence is observed with Parallel (contrastive focus) where the first predicate is encoded as BC form of the verb. Since the corresponding sentence was elicited from one person only, it cannot be taken into this account as a fully reliable piece of information but has to be confirmed with other speakers first.
Restricting:

(854d) *Uo ayal’waanureŋ mer iimid’ienuj*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>trans.</th>
<th>phon.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>uo</em></td>
<td>child</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ayal’we-nu-req</em></td>
<td>PF=laugh-DUR-SIM</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mer=iimid’i-nu-j</td>
<td>PF=dance-DUR-INTR.3SG</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> Elen’, tudel maarquon’ mer=ayal’waanuj.
> elen’ tudel maarquon’ mer=iimid’ienuj

‘The child is laughing and dancing.’ – ‘No, it is only laughing.’

Selecting:

(854e) *Uo mer ayal’waanuj ejk mer iimid’ienuj?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>trans.</th>
<th>phon.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>uo</em></td>
<td>child</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mer=iimid’ienuj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ejk</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> Tudel mer ayal’waanuj.
> tudel mer=iimid’ienuj

‘Is the child laughing or dancing?’ – ‘It is laughing.’

Parallel:

(854f) *Lasu taat Motuu n’ikönmiepeleŋ.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>trans.</th>
<th>phon.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lasu</td>
<td>RECP</td>
<td>partner-PL-COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taat</td>
<td>Motuu</td>
<td>n’i=könme-pe-leŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Lasu and Motuu are husband and wife.’

> Motuu me čayad’aanuj tan Lasu me janduon’.
> Motuu me=čayad’e-nu-j tan Lasu me=janduol-i

‘Motuu is working and Lasu is sleeping.’

From (854a-854f) it becomes clear that the function of the verbal clitic *me* is not confined to encoding focus but covers contrast too. With intransitive verbs, there is only one instance of a contrastive predicate expressed by the affirmative form of a verb that does not carry the focus/contrast marker. It is found in the fuller form of Expanding:

(854g) *Uo mer ayal’waanuj.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word</th>
<th>trans.</th>
<th>phon.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>uo</em></td>
<td>child</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mer=iimid’ienuj</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

287 Speakers’ opinions vary on whether the focal clitic *me* may be used with the finite verb form if a converb occurs in the same sentence. It seems that the clitic must be absent if the converb carries focal information.
A comparable sentence pair with transitive verbs repeats this pattern. It could be speculated, therefore, that in case more than one affirmative ascriptive SA with multiple pragmatic functions is present in a sentence, only that expressing focus gets the focus/contrast marker, which makes it reasonable to consider focus and contrast separate pragmatic functions despite the fact they are encoded in the same way in TY.

With contrastive arguments (S and O) the picture is not so uniform. Normally they carry the focus/contrast markers as in (855a) and (855b):

**ScV**

Replacing:

(855a) *Uo mer aŋal’waanuj. – Elen’, čamuködek aŋalwaanul.*

> child PF=laugh-DUR-INTR.3SG NEG big-man-FOC.SBS laugh-DUR-GER.SF

‘A child is laughing.’ – ‘No, it is an adult [who] is laughing.’

**AOcV**

Selecting:

(855b) *Uoŋ purie-leŋ aptaanumle ejk sanmaldajŋ’e-le?*

> child berry-FOC_ABS gather-DUR-TR.3SG_OF or mushroom-FOC_ABS

‘Is the child picking berries or mushrooms?’

> child berry-FOC_ABS gather-DUR-TR.3SG_OF

‘The child is picking berries.’

While focus/contrast markers are consistently attached to contrastive topics (855b) and to contrastive focal S (855a), this does not happen with contrastive focal O. It is unclear yet whether this is a systematic phenomenon.

The extreme is represented by speakers in whose speech all contrastive arguments systematically lack the nominal focus markers. Their predicate is then used in its BC form:

**ScV**

Replacing:

(856a) *Uo mer aŋal’waanuj.*

> child PF=laugh-DUR-INTR.3SG
Elen’, čama köde ayal’waanuj.
elen’ čama köde ayal’we-nu-j.
NEG big man laugh-DUR-INTR.3SG
‘A child is laughing.’ – ‘No, an adult is laughing.’

AOcV

Selecting:

(856b) Uo puriele ejk samnaldajm’ele aptaanum?
uo purie-le ejk samnaldajm’ele apte-nu-m?
child berry-ACC or mushroom-ACC gather-DUR-TR.3SG
‘Is the child picking berries or mushrooms?’

Uo puriele aptaanum.
uo purie-le apte-nu-m.
child berry-ACC gather-DUR-TR.3SG
‘The child is picking berries.’

Given the existence of a specific way of encoding OF (some speakers consistently use the basic conjugation forms to encode OF as long as the subject is 3rd person, see 5.2.8.2 on paradigmatic deviations) and considering the observation that focus and contrast are encoded in the same way, the encoding of contrastive objects as in (856b) is not surprising. Unlike that, the failure to use nominal focus/contrast markers with contrastive S cannot be accounted for by assuming a subsystem because their omission is not systematic from speaker to speaker and even with the same speaker. Remnants of the expected patterns can be found in speakers, who otherwise use basic forms in sentences with contrastive S, in the combination Rejecting + Replacing and in the fuller form of Restricting of which the latter is illustrated in (856c): 

ScV

(856c) Uo taat čama köde mer ayal’waanujjí.
uo taat čama köde mer=ayal’we-nu-ηi.
child so big man PF=laugh-DUR-3PL.INTR
‘A child and an adult are laughing.’

Elen’, el čame köde-(len) ayal’waanul tan maarquon’ uo.
elen’ el=čame köde-(len) ayal’we-nu-l tan maarquon’ uo.
NEG NEG=big man-(FOC) laugh-DUR-GER, SF but only child
‘No, it is not an adult [who] is laughing but (only) a child.’

The fact that some speakers allow both SF and basic forms for the combination Rejecting + Replacing means that the shift from the focal/contrastive forms to the basic forms is ongoing. This shift can be viewed as a sign of the overall tendency toward simplification by generalization in younger speakers of TY.
An interesting pattern was observed in Parallel contrast of S:
In the second sentence in (857) only one of the two contrastive arguments carries the nominal focus/contrast marker and has the predicate in the SF form. The other appears in its basic form accompanied by the predicate in the PF form. It has yet to be confirmed, whether this is a systematic restriction.

As far as the encoding of contrastive A is concerned, there are two different strategies. It can be done by purely syntactic means switching from the unmarked AOV word order of TY to AVO. Speakers applying this strategy do it quite consistently. The only exception is the Restricting type of contrast where the usual AOV word order is observed. This may be conditioned by the fact that restrictive sentences are normally formed with the help of the words like ‘only’. Possibly this lexical device is considered sufficient for expressing contrastive meaning. Morphologically both the contrastive argument and its predicate are basic forms. Interestingly, speakers resorting to syntactic means to present A contrastively assign the function of focus to it in the same way, which is another indication that these pragmatic functions merge in the cognitive apparatus of TY speakers. Consider the following examples:

\[ \text{A}_{\text{COV}} \]

Selecting:

(858a) *Puriele aptaanum uo ejk čama köde?*

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{purie-le} & \text{apte-nu-m} & \text{uo ejk čama köde} \\
\text{berry-ACC} & \text{gather-DUR-TR.3SG} & \text{child or big man}
\end{array}
\]

‘[Is it] a child [who] is picking berries or an adult?’

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{uo aptaanum purie-le.} \\
\text{child gather-DUR-TR.3SG berry-ACC}
\end{array}
\]

‘[It is] a child [who] is picking berries.’

\[ \text{A}_{\text{FOV}} \]

(858b) *Kin-ek lalime-le sal’γarej-m?*

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{who-FOC.ABS} & \text{lalime-ACC} & \text{sal’γarej-TR.3SG} \\
\text{hunt-NMLZ} & \text{break-TR.3SG} & \text{sledge-ACC}
\end{array}
\]

288 The nominal focus/contrast marker is not attached to the pertensive suffix in TY.
‘Who broke the sledge?’ – ‘A/the hunter broke the sledge.’

The other strategy combines syntactic and morphological means. The encoding pattern corresponds to the one expected for encoding focal A: zero-ending forms of the contrastive argument and the predicate. A occupies the preverbal position.

\( \text{AcOV} \)

Selecting:

\[(859a) \text{Puriele uŋ aptaanun ejk} \quad \text{čamukódek?} \]
\[\text{purie-le} \quad \text{uŋ} \quad \text{apte-nun} \quad \text{ejk} \quad \text{čama-köde-k?}^{290} \]
\[\text{berry-ACC} \quad \text{child[FOC.ERG]} \quad \text{gather-HAB[AF]} \quad \text{or} \quad \text{big-man-COP} \]

[Is it] a child [who] picks berries or an adult?

\text{Puriele uŋ aptaanun.}

\[\text{purie-le} \quad \text{uŋ} \quad \text{aptaa-nun.} \]
\[\text{berry-ACC} \quad \text{child[FOC.ERG]} \quad \text{gather-HAB[AF]} \]

[It is] a child [who] picks berries.

Putting A in the immediate preverbal slot can by itself testify of the contrastive usage of A as in the second sentence in \((859b)\).

\text{Parallel:}

\[(859b) \text{Uorpeŋ puriele tadaat samnaldayn’ele aptaanunŋa.} \]
\[\text{uorpeŋ} \quad \text{purie-le} \quad \text{tadaat samnaldayn’e-le} \quad \text{apte-nun-ŋa.} \]
\[\text{children} \quad \text{berry-ACC} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{mushrooms-ACC} \quad \text{gather-HAB-3PL.TR} \]

‘Children pick berries and mushrooms.’

\text{Puriele paad’eduorpe aptaanunŋa tan quod’eduorpe samnaldayn’ele.}

\[\text{purie-le} \quad \text{paad’eduorpe} \quad \text{apte-nun-ŋa} \quad \text{tan} \quad \text{quod’eduorpe} \]
\[\text{berry-ACC} \quad \text{girls} \quad \text{gather.INCH-HAB-3PL.TR} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{boys} \]
\[\text{samnaldayn’e-le} \quad \text{mushrooms-ACC} \]

‘Girls [are those who] pick berries and boys [are those who] pick mushrooms.’

\((858a)\) and \((859b)\), with the generalized word order \((O)AV(O)\), in which syntax is the only means to assign the pragmatic function of focus/contrast, might be indicative of the role syntax is acquiring in encoding information structure in modern TY. It appears that

\[^{289} \text{According to Kurilov (personal communication), the constituent immediately preceding the predicate is emphasized. Note that the verb retains its clause-final position, which is more natural for TY than the word order AVO occurring in (858a).} \]
\[^{290} \text{The ending} \text{–k here probably is not the focus/contrast marker but the device it evolved from, namely the copula. The corresponding portion of the sentence would have to be understood then as a copular sentence: ‘… or is it an adult?’} \]
to enable syntax to determine the focal/contrastive status of the main constituents, is another function of the BC form of the verb.

Summarizing, it can be said that the pragmatic function of contrast is encoded with the same morphological means that are used do denote focus on the respective constituent. Deviations from this can be attributed to either language change or the decreasing linguistic competence of some speakers and are, apparently, additionally conditioned by the preference of syntactic means for encoding contrast over the morphological ones.

5.2.3 The proclitic me=

Whereas the function of the nominal focus markers –le(ŋ) and –k is quite obvious, the function of the clitic me= is not so transparent. In his early work Krejnović (1958:39) called the verb forms with this clitic ‘affirmative/assertive-predicative conjugation’ as opposed to the verb forms serving to emphasize the core arguments. In his account Krejnović (1958:150-151) enlists a number of conditions in which the proclitic me= can be dropped. For the discussion of the focus system only two of them are important because they concern verbal forms participating in the morphological marking of the function of focus, namely finite verbs in affirmative indicative sentences. Only one of the two conditions is formal: the presence of a qualitative adverb. The other condition is the lack of the necessity to emphasize the verb. This condition is formulated and illustrated somewhat vaguely. In his later work Krejnović (1982:187ff) does not take into account the omission of the proclitic me= any longer, grouping the verb forms with and without it in the same category labeled as ‘rank I predicates’ as long as they display the same person/number endings. The predicates from this category carry new information and characterize a known subject, while the rank II and III predicates (in this work they correspond to SF/AF and OF respectively) do not carry new information.

A decade later scholars showed renewed interest in this issue. One of the main points in Comrie’s (1992) article is that the omission of me= takes place when a peripheral constituent is in focus. Fortescue’s (1996:22) analysis led him to say that the functions of the clitic me= were the narrow focus on the predicate itself and the wider focus foregrounding the whole predication. The verb forms belonging to the rank I predicates in Krejnović’s (1982) terminology and not accompanied by the proclitic me= are regarded by Fortescue (1996:20) as default indicative forms in most cases unmarked for their focal status.

The latest academic contribution dealing with the proclitic me=, a presentation by Matić and Nikolaeva (2008), is concerned with the cliticized verbs only. The authors come to a similar preliminary conclusion Fortescue (1996) made, namely that the

---

291 The original Russian label is utverditel’no-predikativnaja forma sprjaženija (Krejnović 1958:39). The alternative translations thereof into English derive from the alternative possibilities of interpreting it. As it appears from the description – Krejnović (1958) points out the complementary usage of the clitic me= and the negation clitic el= – the term is employed with the meaning ‘affirmative’. However, the following presentation of the focus system of TY, in which the clitic me= is involved, hints at the opposition ‘presupposed/asserted information’.

292 In the section dedicated to the expression of the focus in negative sentences (5.2.6) it will be demonstrated that the focal patterns known from the affirmative paradigms are found in negative sentences as well, except that PF and focus on a peripheral constituent cannot be discerned morphologically.
proclitic me= ‘signals that the main verb is focused, without further specification of the focus scope’ (Matić and Nikolaeva 2008:5). With the help of numerous examples they convincingly demonstrate that me= can express broad focus that includes constituents other than the predicate itself and narrow focus on the predicate alone. For determining the type of narrow focus they provide the following interpretational hierarchy: focus on the lexical content of the verb

   focus on the polarity
   focus on TAM
   pragmatic enrichment of the content of the verb

My own observations confirm the conclusions made by Matić and Nikolaeva (2008) and enrich them with a few new facts. My data (see 5.2.1.3) also support Comrie’s (1992) proposal of an additional focus type for TY, manifest when the focal constituent is not one of the main constituents of the sentence.

I would like to begin the discussion with two phenomena I was able to detect in TY that up to now were considered ungrammatical in the literature. They concern the allegedly obligatory usage of the proclitic me= in verb-only clauses and the obligatory omission thereof in sentences with qualitative adverbs.

It is true that all speakers normally use me= in verb-only clauses and some of them reject verb-only sentences without it as incorrect. However, a considerable number of them, including elderly people, accept verb-only clauses without me= as in (860a) and (860b) or at least do not consider them as entirely incorrect.

(860a) Uo mer oorin’aanuj?

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{uo} & \text{mer=oorin’e-nu-j} \\
\text{child} & \text{PF=cry-DUR-INTR.3SG} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Is the child crying?’

\[\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{elen’} & \text{el=oorin’aa-nu aayal’we-nu-j} \\
\text{NEG} & \text{NEG=cry-DUR-3SG laugh-DUR-INTR.3SG} \\
\end{array}\]

‘No, [it] is not crying, [it] is laughing.’

(860b) Tudel me=kelu-j? – Kelu-j.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{3SG} & \text{PF=come-INTR.3SG} \\
\text{come-INTR.3SG} & \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Did he come?’ – ‘[He] came.’

This usage is definitely substandard, but the degree of its incorrectness does not even approach that of what would be considered by all native speakers a grave error, such as a wrong agreement ending. One elderly speaker claimed that the cliticized forms and those

---

293 Except the categorical claim that me= must be used in case of the narrow predicate focus. See 5.2.4 in this regard.
294 Comrie (1992:62) was possibly the only one who noticed that the latter was not true, bringing a counterexample from Kreinović (1958).
295 Even the late mother of some of the elderly informants used to form verb-only sentences without me. So, this phenomenon cannot be attributed to the loss of linguistic competence of the speakers.
without *me= could be used interchangeably since there was absolutely no change in the meaning:

(861)  *Uo lemeŋ wienumle? – *(Mer) aŋal’waanuj.
       *uo leme-ŋ wienu-mle? – *(Mer)=aŋal’we-nu-j
    child what-FOC.ABS do-DUR-3SF.OF  (PF)=laugh-DUR-INTR.3SG
What is the child doing? – [It] is laughing.

There is even more tolerance toward the uncliticized form when the predicate is represented by a so called qualitative verb:

(862a) *Tet nime me wejluon’? – *Wejluon’.
        *tet nime me=wejluol-i? – *Wejluol-i.
   2SG house PF=be.wide-INTR.3SG    be.wide-INTR.3SG
‘Is your house spacious?’ – ‘[It is] spacious.’

(862b) *Tet ile me čaal’uon’ uuri me n’aawe.
        *tet ile me=čaal’uol-i uuri me=n’aawe-j.
   2SG reindeer PF=be.bay-INTR.3SG  or  PF=be.white-INTR.3SG
   N’aawe-j.
   be.white-INTR.3SG
‘Is your reindeer bay or white?’ – [It is] white.

With verbs derived from nouns the proclitic *me= is used in polarity questions to ask for a mere confirmation of already known information (863a). When the inquiring person does not anticipate the answer, the proclitic is omitted (863b). The answer invariantly repeats the focal pattern of the question.

        *me=brigadir-ŋol-jek? – *me=brigadir-ŋol-jej.
   PF=team.leader-be-INTR.2SG       PF=team.leader-be-INTR.1SG
   ‘[You] are a/the team-leader, [aren’t you]?’ – ‘[I] am a/the team leader.’

(863b) Brigadirŋod’ek? – Brigadirŋod’ej.
   team.leader-be-INTR.2SG         team.leader-be-INTR.1SG
   ‘Are [you] a/the team-leader?’ – ‘[I] am a/the team-leader.’

(863a) provides the first evidence that the proclitic *me= can be detached from the function of focus and express emphasis alone (see also (865a) and (865b)).

Verbal forms expressing possession can also occur without *me= if it is not present in the question:

(864) Ile-n’e-jek? – Ile-n’e-jej.
    reindeer-VBLZ-INTR.2SG         reindeer-VBLZ-INTR.1SG
   ‘Do [you] have reindeer?’ – ‘[I] have reindeer.’
With quantitative verbs, the proclitic $me=$ is preferably dropped in verb-only clauses because otherwise the idea of limitation is stressed too much:

(865a) $Maarqadaduon’ej$.  
\[maarqa-n-d-aduo-n’e-j.\]  
\[\text{one-gen-0-son-VBLZ-INTR.3SG}\]  
‘[He] has one son.’  
(Krejnovič 1982:185)

(865b) $Me$ $maarqadaduon’ej$.  
\[Me=maarqa-n-d-aduo-n’e-j.\]  
\[\text{PF=one-gen-0-son-VBLZ-INTR.3SG}\]  
‘[He] has only one son.’

As one can see in (865a), verb-only clauses without the proclitic $me=$ are not a new discovery. In fact, corresponding examples could be found already in Kreinovič’s (1958) earlier work:

(866) $L’iteguod’e$.  
\[be.beaten.INTR.1SG\]  
‘[I] was beaten.’  
(Krejnovič 1958:259)

There are three instances of verb-only sentences describing seasonal changes in the text that contains (866). All of them lack the proclitic $me=.$ One of them is quoted in (867).

(867) $Lewejl-ŋ$ $ol-aa-j$.  
\[summer-be-INCH-INTR.3SG\]  
‘Summer arrived.’  
(Krejnovič 1958:256)

The above quoted examples prove that there is a wide array of verb-only sentence types in which the proclitic $me=$ does not occur with various degree of obligation. Lest a wrong impression arise, be it repeated that with verbs that are sometimes designated as ‘dynamic’ $me=$ does normally occur, but there is no absolute prohibition of its omission. As for the obligatory omission of $me=$ in sentences with qualitative adverbs, the following sentences relativize it. They are taken from a short children’s story in which a girl named Lyalyu finds a snow crane with an injured wing and intends to treat it:

(868a) $L’al’uu$ $marl’e-leŋ$ $men’-mele$.  
\[Lyalyu\]  
\[gauze(Russ)-FOC.ABS\]  
\[\text{take-TR.3SG.OF}\]  
\[\text{be.good.ADV}\]  
\[\text{PF=bind-TR.3SG}\]  
‘Lyalyu took gauze. [She] bandaged [the wing] well.’

The search for similar examples in the earlier primary sources brought to light three comparable sentences two of which are quoted in (868b) and (868c).

(868b) $Aŋil’-da-ŋane$.  
\[opening-PERT-ACC\]  
\[\text{firm.intr.3sg-ADV}\]  
\[\text{PF=bind-TR.3SG}\]  
‘[He] bound tightly its opening ’  
(Krejnovič 1982:273)

(868c)
Again, there is undoubtedly a strong tendency for the omission of \textit{me=} in sentences with qualitative adverbs because in most cases the narrow focus on the adverb is intended, but it has to be recognized that it is only a tendency, not an absolute rule.

It has been established in 5.2.1.3 that the proclitic \textit{me=} is dropped in sentences whose sole focal constituents are peripheral. There are, however, instances in which a focal peripheral constituent co-occurs with a focal cliticized verb. The following example illustrating that is the opening sentence of a children story.

\begin{verbatim}(868c) Id'ire mit sayane-l waari-ne čal'de-γa me=med'-ij. now 1PL sit-GER firm.intr.3SG-ADV hand-LOC PF=take-TR.1PL
\end{verbatim}

‘Now [we] have firmly taken our life in [our] hands.’ (Kreinovič 1958:202)

Since it can be counted as proven that the presence of \textit{me=} normally indicates predicate focus and the emphatic function does not irresistibly suggest itself in the case of (869), the notion of broad focus postulated for TY by Matić and Nikolaeva (2008) is a very plausible solution. Broad focus that includes the verb explains probably, at least partly, also the presence of the proclitic \textit{me=} in sentences like the ones in (868a), (868b) and (868c). The idea of the specific focus domain ‘predicate + peripheral constituent’ is particularly lucky because it reconciles the fact, that patterns in (868a), (868b), (868c), (869) and in many other instances are attested in TY, with the first hierarchy established for the choice preference when encoding focus in sentences with multiple focal constituents: $X_F > V_F$. The use of the proclitic \textit{me=} in sentences containing focal predicate and focal X might be simply the way of neutralizing the otherwise obligatory narrow X focus reading, letting the focal interpretation of an utterance spread over the whole predication.

Another interesting issue is the usage of \textit{me=} in sentences that do not carry peripheral constituents. Here the proclitic \textit{me=} is normally present as long as the predicate is focal:

\begin{verbatim}(870) Met wadun aruu mer uraričnuŋ. met wadul-n aruu mer=urarič-nu-ŋ. 1SG Yukaghir-GEN language PF=learn-DUR-1SG.TR
\end{verbatim}

‘I am learning the Yukaghir language.’

It is not ungrammatical though to omit it. Since there is no peripheral constituent to produce the corresponding narrow focus by such an omission, there has to be another effect. Informants claim that the omission of \textit{me=} in (870) and similar simple sentences, also with intransitive verbs, would produce an utterance made in a ‘matter of fact’ way, or in passing, or as if in hurry, often conditioned by the mood of the speaker. This lack of expressivity can be taken as another indication that \textit{me=} has some emphatic function. Summarizing the above it can be stated that:
- $me=$ focalizes the predicate (but see section 5)
- $me=$ is omitted in clauses with the narrow X focus
- $me=$ is retained in clauses with focal X(s) if the predicate belongs to the focus domain; the presence of $me$ indicates then that there is no narrow X focus in the clause
- $me=$ can be omitted in sentences without X, indicating a decrease of expressivity

The emphatic use of $me=$ will be an object of closer examination in section 5.2.5.

5.2.4 Narrow focus on the predicate accompanied by a qualitative adverb

Adverbs are verbal modifiers. In 5.2.1.3 the narrow focus on them is described. The cliticized form of the verb has been recognized as testifying of the presence of the broad focus in the presence of a peripheral constituent, such as an adverb. The logical question to be posed is how the narrow focus on the modified member in this relation, the verb, is encoded. It is especially interesting to find this out for instances in which a manner adverb serves as the modifier, since manner adverbs show the least tolerance toward the presence of the proclitic $me=$, that is the device for marking predicate focus. Elicitations have shown that it is achieved through the nominalization of the verb which becomes the subject of the sentence while the adverbial peripheral constituent is verbalized and promoted to the position of the predicate:

(871a) Tiŋ  köde nemele wielgi amuć?
tieŋ köde neme-le wie-l-gi amuo-j
DSIT man what-FOC.ABS do-GER-PERT be.good-INTR.3SG

Tudel iiimid’ilgi amuć.
tudel iiimid’i-l-gi amuo-j
3SG dance-GER-PERT be.good-INTR.3SG

‘What does that man do well?’ – ‘He dances well.’

Instead of the nominalized form of the verb, its converb form can be used. This means, in effect, that the predicate and the peripheral constituent (a manner adverb) of the underlying sentence exchange their functions in the surface structure. In other words, peripheral constituents rank so high in the focus assignment hierarchy that the predicate accompanied by a peripheral constituent, in order to be assigned the function of narrow focus has to be converted into a peripheral constituent, pushing the peripheral constituent of the underlying sentence out of this privileged syntactic slot and making it fill the less privileged predicate slot:

(871b) Lasu neme-le wie-r amdu-nun?
Lasu what-FOC.ABS do-CIRC haste-HAB[3SG.ITRG]

Lasu miraar amdununi.
Lasu mira-r amdun-ni
Lasu walk-CIRC haste-HAB[3SG.INTR]

‘What does Lasu do quickly?’ – ‘Lasu walks quickly.’
The following examples demonstrate the narrow contrast on the predicate.

Restricting:

(872a) Lasu lewdelgi amuč taat čayad’elgi amuč.

Lasu lewe-l-gi amuo-j taat čayad’e-l-gi amuo-j
Lasu eat-GER-PERT be-good-INTR.3SG so work-GER-PERT be.good-INTR.3SG

‘Lasu eats and works well. – No, [he] only eats well.’

Selecting:

(872b) Motuu suskele loyorelgi ejk silyal’esulgi čugon’?

Motuu suske-le loyore-l-gi ejk silyal’e-s-ul-gi čuguo-l-i
Motuu cup-ACC wash-GER-PERT or dry-CAUS-GER-PERT be.quick-INTR.3SG

‘Did Motuu wash or dry the dishes quickly?’

Motuu suskele loyorelgi čugon’.

Motuu suske-le loyore-l-gi čuguo-l-i
Motuu cup-ACC wash-GER-PERT be.quick-INTR.3SG

‘Motuu washed the dishes quickly.’

Parallel:

(872c) Lasu taat Motuu n’ikönemiepeleŋ. Motuu čayad’elgi n’aarčic tan Lasu janduo-lgi n’aarčic.

Lasu taat Motuu n’i=könme-pl-leŋ. Motuu čayad’e-l-gi n’aarçuu-j
Lasu so Motuu RECP=partner-PL-COP Motuu work-GER-PERT be.good-INTR.3SG
tan Lasu janduolgi n’aarčuu-j.
and Lasu sleep-GER-PERT be.good-INTR.3SG

‘Lasu and Motuu are husband and wife. Motuu works bad and Lasu sleeps bad.’

It follows from the examples presented in this section that peripheral constituents in TY are such strong focus and contrast attractors that a special construction has to be applied in order to focalize or contrast exclusively the predicate in a sentence containing a peripheral constituent.

5.2.5. Functional scope of the focus markers in TY

It has been shown in section 5.2.2.2 that the focus markers can fulfill the function of contrast markers as well. In 5.2.3 the possibility of use of the verbal proclitic me= as an emphasis marker has been pointed out. The following examples, in my view, further strengthen, if not decisively prove, that assumption.
A: *'Have you heard? Motuu’s youngest child Lasu has begun to speak.'*
B: *'Lasu has begun to speak?! But he isn’t even two years old yet.'*
A: *'And yet, he has begun to speak.'*

The SF focus marker in the second speaker’s astonished question as well as the PF marker in the confirmation provided in the last sentence of this short dialogue cannot express focus in terms of the commonly accepted definitions of focus. The notion of focus is often connected with the idea of newness. However, the information conveyed by the constituents these focus markers are attached to, is not new. Maslova (1997) already established with all clarity for KY that the choice of a focus construction cannot be always explained in terms of the opposition ‘given/new information’. I am making a similar observation for TY now with an essential addition. Focus is not just about the identity of a referent but also, and maybe even more importantly, about the relation it goes into. In the two last sentences of (873) the constituents carrying the focus markers contain information that is not new either in the sense of referent or relation. According to a modern definition of focus given by Smit (as cited in Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008:89)), it is an ‘update instruction to the Addressee’. The constituents in question could hardly be seen as carrying such an instruction. Neither do the focus markers here denote the ‘semantic component of a pragmatically structured proposition whereby the assertion differs from the presupposition’, which is the definition of focus given by Lambrecht (1994:222). The sole purpose of the focus markers under scrutiny is apparently to put emphasis on the focalized constituents. Such instances are treated by Dik (1997, 1:326-327) as focus, but this is a very broad definition of focus.

Resuming what was said above, all contrastive and emphatic uses of the focus markers in TY would have to be either lumped together as instances of focus after an appropriate modification of the definition of the focus concept or it would have to be recognized that those markers have a functional spectrum encompassing focus, contrast and emphasis. Within the theoretical framework chosen to present the data in this article, the latter solution is certainly preferable, not to speak of the former one’s being unwarrantedly unorthodox.
5.2.6 Focus in negative sentences

Comrie (1992:64) claims, with a reference to Krejnovič (1958), that the focus opposition is lost in negative clauses in TY, stating, however, just a few sentences later that ‘the negative prefix is the focus, thus usurping the position of the predicate focus marker me(r)- and also preventing focus from being marked on any other constituent of the clause’. The view that an argument cannot be focalized in negative sentences has persisted among scholars (see also Matič and Nikolaeva 2008:2). Krejnovič (1958) himself did not specifically express himself with respect to this question, merely giving the negative conjugational paradigm. It is the same for transitive and intransitive verbs and differs from the BC form of intransitive verbs only in 3rd person as is clearly seen in the following overview from Krejnovič (1958:138, cf. the paradigmatic tables in 5.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG1</th>
<th>met</th>
<th></th>
<th>PL1</th>
<th>mit</th>
<th>el=aji-jeli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tet</td>
<td>el=aji-jek</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>tit</td>
<td>el=aji-jemut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tudel</td>
<td>el=aji</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>tittel</td>
<td>el=aji-ju</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since no other negative paradigms were established by Krejnovič, negative sentences of TY were considered focus neutral. The focus opposition indeed seems to be lost between predicate focus and focus on a peripheral constituent for formal reasons. In affirmative sentences this opposition is effected by the presence or absence of the focal proclitic me= (see 5.2.1.3). But in negative sentences the predicate focus marker me= is replaced by the negation particle el=, which, naturally, cannot be omitted, which, in turn, does not allow this opposition to come about.

Contrary to the generally accepted view it is, however, quite possible to focalize arguments. Krejnovič (1958:140) already pointed at such a possibility. But his account suggests that only a modified focal object can carry a focus marker:

\[
\text{(874) Met amučedilek el bun'meg.}
\]
\[
\text{met} \quad \text{amuo-je-d-ile-k} \quad \text{el=bun’-meg.}
\]
\[
1SG \quad \text{be.good-PTCP-0-reindeer-FOC.ABS} \quad \text{NEG=kill-TR.1/2SG.OF}
\]

‘I did not kill a good reindeer.’

Other scholars for lack of primary data had to take this for granted. The phenomenon was regarded as a specific case and there were attempts to explain it as such. Krejnovič (1958) reasoned that with modified objects the negation was only partial. A completion of a transitive action in such sentences is negated only with respect to a certain representative of a class of referents, thus singling this representative out, presenting him contrastively and making it a constituent “deserving” the focal status. By the sentence I did not kill a good reindeer one can imply that one may have killed a bad reindeer. In such a context the direct object needs to be and is focalized in TY.

My data show that the focalization of arguments in negative sentences in TY is of a general nature. It can take place irrespective of the syntactic function of the arguments and does not depend on the presence of modifiers. The following examples illustrate that.

---

296 It has to be admitted that Krejnovič (1958:140) quotes an example from Jochelson that involves a focalized pronoun in the negative context but he does not elaborate on it.
The assignment of the function of focus is not as consistent in negative sentences as it surely is in affirmative ones. Thus answers in (875a), (875b) and (876b) have in my material alternative patterns lacking the (pro)nominal focus markers and containing predicates that stand in what can be called the negative BC form. The speakers admit, however, that it is rather the action that is emphasized then. This is exemplified in (876c), an alternative answer to the question in (876b).

(875a) Kin-ek el=kelu-l?
who-FOC.ABS NEG=come-GER.SF
‘Who did not come?’

Urarićiće-legen’id’erpe-j urarićiće-k /Met-ek el=kelu-l.
teacher-FOC.ABS /new-PTCP teacher-FOC.ABS /1sg-FOC.ABS NEG=come-GER.SF
‘The teacher / The new teacher / I did not come.’

(875b) Kinek el oorin’aanunul?
Kin-ek el=oorin’e-nun-ul?
who-FOC.ABS NEG=cry-GER.SF
‘Who does not cry?’

Werwej čuŋden’de čii el oorin’aanunul.
werwe-j čuŋde-n’-je čii-k el=oorin’e-nun-ŋu-l.
be.strong-PTCP thought-VBLZ-PTCP people-FOC.ABS NEG=cry-HAB-PL-GER.SF
‘Real men do not cry.’

(876a) Tudel neme-leŋ el=lew-nun-mele?
3SG what-FOC.ABS NEG=eat-HAB-TR.3SG.OF
‘What does he not eat?’

Tudel čuuleŋ el=lew-nun-mele.
tudel čuul-leŋ el=lew-nun-mele.
3SG meat-FOC.ABS NEG=eat-HAB-TR.3SG.OF
‘He does not eat meat.’

(876b) Tudel kin-ek el=kuril’ii-mele?
3SG who-FOC.ABS NEG=know-TR.3SG.OF
‘Whom does he not know?’

Tudel tet-ek el=kuril’ii-mele.
tudel tet-gane el=kuril’ii.
3SG 2SG-FOC.ABS 2SG-ACC NEG=know[3SG]
‘He does not know you.’
It is indeed impossible to focalize an argument in yes-no negative interrogative sentences as it can be learnt from the existing accounts (Matić and Nikolaeva 2008:2).

In all the above sentences it was the predicate that was negated. In sentences containing a contrastive negation of an argument the corresponding focal pattern also occurs readily. The focus markers obviously fulfill the function of contrast in them. Compare the focal patterns of the sentences with an intransitive (877a) and (877b) and a transitive (878a), (878b) and (878c) verb. The negation particle is moved from the preverbal position to a position in front of the negated constituent.

(877a) *Met el=qal’we-jeŋ.*
1SG NEG=laugh-INTR.1SG
‘I did not laugh.’

(877b) *El=met-ek ayal’we-l.*
NEG=1SG-FOC.ABS laugh-GER.SF
‘[It is] not me [who] laughed.’

(878a) *Met čuul el lewnund’eŋ.*
met čuul el=lew-nun-jeŋ
1SG meat NEG=eat-HAB-INTR.1SG
‘I do not eat meat.’

(878b) *Čuul el=met lew.*
meat NEG=1SG[FOC.ERG] eat[AF]
‘[It is] not me [who] ate [the] meat.’

(878c) *El čuuleŋ lewmeŋ.*
el=čuul-leŋ lew-meŋ.
NEG=meat-FOC.ABS eat-TR.1/2SG.OF
‘[It is] not meat [that I] ate.’

Just as in the case of affirmative sentences, the OF pattern obtains not only when the question triggers the narrow object focus but also when along with the object the predicate is focal (AO_FV_F focus articulation):

(879a) *Lasu neme-leŋ el=qie-mele?*
Lasu what-FOC.ABS NEG=do-TR.3SG.OF
‘What did Lasu not do?’

\[Tudel nimele-le(ŋ) el=qoše-j-l’el-mele.\]
3SG letter-FOC.ABS NEG=send-NVIS-TR.3SG.OF
‘He did not send the letter.’

However, when the answer does not contain an object, the predicate expressed by a transitive verb loses both its transitivity marker and the OF marker appearing in its negative BC form:
The identical encoding of the focus articulations $AO_F V$ and $AO_F V_F$ both in affirmative and negative sentences along with the fact that the lack of an overt direct object results in preventing the encoding of the OF pattern even though the question (like in 40a) demands the OF pattern, can be taken as an indication that there is a verb phrase in TY.

So far no example with focal A was presented in which the negation would scope over the whole predication (in (878b) it scopes only over A itself). As is the case with focalizing A in affirmative sentences, there is a degree of variation in encoding a focal or contrastive A. This is illustrated by the two following examples kindly elicited for me by Cecilia Odé.

A-Focus:

(880) Uorpe-die, kin-ek wajidek el=juö-l n'awn'iklie-le?
children-DIM who-FOC.ABS still NEG=see-GER.SF polar.fox-ACC

‘Children, who has not yet seen a polar fox?’

Met-ek el=juö-l n'awn'iklieγ.
1SG-FOC.ABS NEG=see-GER.SF polar.fox

‘I have not seen a polar fox.’

A-Contrast:

(881) Tet aq qan’ineγ n'awn'iklieγ el=juö-jek.
2SG EMPH ever polar.fox NEG=see-INTR.2SG

‘You have not ever seen even a polar fox.’

Tet-ek n'awn’iklieγ el=juo.
2PL-FOC.ABS polar.fox NEG=see[AF]

‘It’s you who has not seen a polar fox.’

Although these focus patterns deviate from the prototypical pattern of encoding AF which is characterized by the use of bare stems of the focalized A-argument and its predicate, their existence is undeniable and, with it, the claim is now fully substantiated that the morphological expression of focus in negative sentences is just as real and systematic a phenomenon as it is in affirmative ones.

Resuming, it can be said that the focus system of TY employs the same morphological means for marking focus both in affirmative and negative sentences. The only difference between the two categories of sentences is that in negative sentences there is no morphological differentiation between PF and the focus on a peripheral constituent. It is therefore reasonable to unite these two under the designation ‘non-argument focus’. The argument focus comprises, as in affirmative sentences, the types SF, AF and OF.
5.2.7 Focus in the passive

The presentation of the passive voice in Krejnovič (1958:119) takes up slightly more than half a page. In his later work Krejnovič (1982) does not treat this topic at all. This might have been caused by the fact that this voice is a relatively rare morpho-syntactic phenomenon in TY grammar. The functioning of the focus system in the passive voice has not been elucidated even roughly, which makes it an intriguing topic of research.

The elicitations show that the passive voice, however marginal it may be as such in the language, is fully incorporated into the focus system of TY. Passive verb forms behave essentially as any form of an intransitive verb in the active voice showing thus three focal patterns: that of the focal subject (SF), the focal predicate (PF) and the focal peripheral constituent. This is illustrated in the following examples.

SV_F

(882)  
_Tet me lejtejuod'ek?_ – _ (Met) me lejtejuod'εν._

tet  me=leitej-ŋol-jen  (Met) me=leitej-ŋol-jen
2SG  PF=recognize-be-INTR.2SG  (1SG)  PF=recognize-be-INTR.1SG

‘Were you recognized?’ – ‘I was recognized.’

SF_V

(883a)  
_Kinek uraričićelek leitejuolel?_

Kin-ek  uraričiće-lek leitej-ŋol-el?
who-FOC.ABS  teacher-INS  recognize-be-GER.SF

‘Who was recognized by the teacher?’

Uraričićelek  met-ek / ieruče-legen  leitej-ŋol-el
teacher-INS  1SG-FOC.ABS / hunter-FOC.ABS  recognize-be-GER.SF

‘I / The hunter was recognized by the teacher.’

Uraričićelek  uoŋod'e  ieručpek leitejuoljul.
uraričiće-lek  uo-ŋol-je  ieruč-pe-k leitej-ŋol-ŋu-l
teacher-INS  child-be-PTCP  hunter-PL-FOC.ABS  recognize-PERT-PL-GER.SF

‘(The) young hunters were recognized by the teacher.’

(883b)  
_Nimelesićelek nemeleŋ nimelesuocelel?_

nimelesiće-lek  neme-legen  nimeles-uol-el
writer-INS  what-FOC.ABS  write-be-GER.SF

‘What was written by the writer?’

Nimelesićelek n’iedileŋ nimelesuocelel.

nimelesiće-lek  n’iedil-legen  nimeles-ŋol-el
writer-INS  story-FOC.ABS  write-be-GER.SF

‘A story was written by the writer.’
A good story was written by the writer.

\[SX_F^V\]

\[(884)\] Lalime nemelek köjlesuon’?

\[lalime \ neme-lek \ köjle-s-ŋol-i?\]

sledge what-INS break-CAUS-be-INTR.3SG

‘What was the sledge broken by?’

Lalime n’imud’ii-lek köjlesuon’.

\[lalime \ n’imud’ii-lek \ köjle-s-ŋol-i.\]

sledge axe-INS break-CAUS-be-INTR.3SG

‘The sledge was broken by an axe.’

Since the subject of a passive sentence is normally the object of its active counterpart or, in other words, passivization of a sentence with OF pattern will produce the SF pattern, it could be anticipated that the same effect will accompany passivization of a sentence in which not only the object is focal, but also the predicate (focus articulation AOFVF) as such sentences display OF pattern too. This is, indeed, what one finds in TY:

\[(885)\] Nimelesiičelek nemeleŋ wiejuolel.

\[nimelesiič-lek \ neme-ŋe \ wie-ŋol-el.\]

writer-INS what-FOC.ABS do-be-GER.SF

‘What was done by the writer?’

Nimelesiičelek kinigeleŋ nimelesuoel.

\[nimelesiič-lek \ kinige-ŋe \ nimele-ŋol-el.\]

writer-INS book-FOC.ABS do-be-GER.SF

‘A book was written by the writer.’

Elicitations have made it possible to establish the three focal verbal paradigms in the passive voice. They are presented below.

\[SV_F\] (\textit{ed’uosuoł- ‘to be frightened’})

\begin{tabular}{ll}
SG1 & met mer=ed’uosuod’eŋ \cite{297} \\
2 & tet mer=ed’uosuod’ek \\
3 & tudel mer=ed’uosuoŋ’
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
PL.1 & mit mer=ed’uosuod’eli \\
2 & tit mer=ed’uosuod’emut \\
3 & tittel mer=ed’uosuolŋi
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{297} A phonological process described by Krejnovič (1958:146-149) takes effect here conditioning the occurrence of the palatalized plosive as a result of the interaction between the liquid of the passive suffix and the approximant of the person ending. The underlying forms of the latter are –jen, –jek and so forth.
SfV (lejitjuol- ‘to be recognized’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>met-ek lejitjuol-el</th>
<th>PL.1</th>
<th>mit-ek lejitjuol-el</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tet-ek lejitjuol-el</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>tit-ek lejitjuol-el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tudel lejitjuol-el</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>tittel lejitjuol-ŋu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ieruuče-łen lejitjuol-el</td>
<td></td>
<td>ieruučepe-k/ieruučepe-łen lejtejuol-ŋu-l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SXfV (lejitjuol- ‘to be recognized’, uraričiiče ‘teacher’, –lek ‘INS’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>met uraričiičelek lejtjeuod’ęń</th>
<th>PL.1</th>
<th>mit uraričiičelek lejtjeuod’elí</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tet uraričiičelek lejtjeuod’ęk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>tit uraričiičelek lejtjeuod’emut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tudel uraričiičelek lejtjeuon’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>tittel uraričiičelek lejtjeuolŋi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As already noted above, the paradigms correspond to those of intransitive verbs. Note how focal constituents occupy the immediate preverbal position, further strengthening the assumption referred to earlier that this slot is reserved for them in TY syntax.

5.2.8 Paradigmatic deviations

5.2.8.1 Initial general observations

Up to this point the mainstream application of the morphological focus system by TY speakers was presented. The very notion of a ‘mainstream’ implies that there are ‘undercurrents’ too. Indeed, there is quite some variation in encoding the pragmatic function of focus in the TY speaking community. Some instances of this variation are the subject of attention in the present section.

The investigation of the morphological focus system of TY presented here was performed against the background of Krejnović’s (1958) relevant findings which were taken as the standard. Far from wishing to be prescriptive, I used Krejnović’s (1958) description as an orientation or a reference point because it reflects, after all, the grammar of TY as spoken only half a century ago. The assessing remarks in the following discussion are to be understood as reflecting purely empirical facts and are not to be taken as normative judgments of what is appropriate in the language use and what is not.

Some informants deviate in their choice of a focus pattern from what could be expected according to Krejnović’s (1958, 1968, 1982) descriptions. One of them was VNK, who translated the sentences from a diagnostic pilot-questionnaire. His deviant usage of TY is illustrated by (886a-889a). The constituent which is meant to be focalized, as conditioned by the question (in (886a) and (889a)) or requested explicitly during the elicitation session (888a), is written in capital letters in the translation. The sentence in (887a) is intended as a neutral statement. The morphemes responsible for the focus assignment are highlighted by bold italics.

who-FOC.ABS play-DUR-GER.SF     Ivan play-DUR-INTR.3SG
‘Who is playing?’ – ‘IVAN is playing.’

The pilot-questionnaire was prepared by C. Ode. This section contains examples from it.
While (887a) and (888a) could, at least theoretically, simply represent the informant’s free interpretation of what he was requested to translate, the answers in (886a) and (889a) cannot be accounted for, especially so as the respective questions show the expected focal patterns which should have been repeated in the answers. It is interesting that VNK did decidedly agree with the objection when this nonconformity was pointed out to him and accepted or formed himself the alternative following sentences that were perfectly consistent with Krejnović’s (1958, 1968, 1982) descriptions:

(889b) *Katja jaqte-le möri-mle.*

‘Katia heard a/the SONG.’

It is confusing that informants sometimes not only produce TY sentences that contradict what is known from the existing descriptions of the language, but also sometimes contradict themselves as was the case with VNK. He had translated the sentence pair in (890) that is structurally identical with the one in (889a), in a predictable and conformant way:


‘What did Ivan see?’ – ‘Ivan saw a/the REINDEER.’

Yet, later on he uttered the already discussed sentence pair in (889a).
Inconsistencies occur in many other informants’ elicitations. It could almost be said that each and every of them spoke his or her own version of TY. With pragmatics there is always room for some licit variation because the speaker’s (and the listener’s) subjectivity plays an important role in encoding pragmatic meanings. But the fact that the particular pragmatic function of focus in TY is highly grammaticalized and cannot be treated separately from morphosyntax which is supposed to follow fixed rules, such nonconformities make the established system appear wobbly. The point made here is that although a speaker is free to choose (within certain limits depending on the discourse conditions) which constituent he focalizes, the grammatical means for that would be expected, apart from being systematically applied by the same speaker, to be the same for all speakers. The existing literature does not suggest the existence of alternative encoding patterns of focus.

As a striking example of similar divergences the following sentence pairs in (891a) and (891b) uttered by AGV, the late senior teacher of TY in the Andriushkino school, are quoted.

(891a) Ieričče neme-le köjle-s-mele?
herdsman what-FOC.ABS break-CAUS-TR.3SG.OF
‘What did the hunter break?’

Ieričče lalime-le köjle-s-mele.
herdsman sledge-FOC.ABS break-CAUS-TR.3SG.OF
‘The hunter broke a sledge.’

This translation is perfectly conformant with the existing descriptions of TY focus system and thus expected. What is confusing about it, is the fact that according to AGV it is, at least as far as the second sentence is concerned, merely a conventional form of an answer which does not accentuate the direct object, which, in turn, totally contradicts all previous accounts of TY focus system. When AGV was asked to reformulate the sentences in such a way that the direct object be logically stressed, she produced the following sentence pair.

(891b) Ieričče neme-le köjle-s-sum?
herdsman what-FOC.ABS break-CAUS-TR.3SG
‘What did the hunter break?’

Ieričče köjle-s-sum lalime-le.
herdsman break-CAUS-TR.3SG sledge-FOC.ABS
‘The hunter broke a sledge.’

When asked about his opinion on this interpretation of the sentence pairs in (891a) and (891b), GNK, author of many linguistic works and competent native speaker of TY, said that it was incorrect.

The following examples illustrate the differences in encoding AF by different native speakers. The sentences in (892a) and (892b) were elicited from MNT, an elderly female speaker.
(892a) *Kin-ek paaj?*  
who-FOC.ABS hit[AF]  
‘Who hit?’

(892b) *Kin-ek laame-le paaj-nun?*  
who-FOC.ABS dog-ACC hit-HAB[AF]  
‘Who has been beating a/the dog?’

GNK rejects these sentences. In his opinion, the form of question word *kin-ek* cannot be used with a bare verb stem. Instead the verb should appear in the form of a nomen actionis, encoded by the flexional affix –l.299

(893a) *Kin-ek paaj-l?*  
who-FOC.ABS hit-GER.AF  
‘Who hit?’

(893b) *Kin-ek laame-le paaj-nu-l?*  
who-FOC.ABS dog-ACC hit-DUR-GER.AF  
‘Who is beating a/the dog?’

The sentences in (893a) and (893b), in turn, had been rejected as incorrect by MNT, the woman who uttered the sentences in (892a) and (892b). This mutual rejection holds true for affirmative sentences as well.

Generally, it can be stated that the deviations are of two basic types: the focus pattern of the answer is in conflict with that of the question (deviant form) or the focus patterns in the question and answer are in harmony but their meaning contradicts the available knowledge (deviant interpretation).

Divergences in encoding certain pragmatic meanings manifest themselves not only amongst different speakers but within one and the same speaker as well.

5.2.8.2 Systematic deviations from the standard usage (particular focus articulations)

Some of the seemingly unwarranted deviations from the common encoding patterns recur, which makes it plausible to assume that they are an integral part of the morphological focus system. This conclusion is most readily applicable to the use of the BC verb form to express the narrow OF that is characteristic to a varying degree of the speech of several speakers of different age. In PIP, a relatively young TY speaker, it has become the default choice as long as the subject of the sentence is 3rd person although she regards using the formal OF pattern in order to actually encode the pragmatic meaning of OF correct too. For SAA, an older informant, the BC form is the only choice to express the narrow OF in answers irrespective of the person of the subject:

(894a) *Ieruuče neme-le köjle-s-um?*  
hunter what-FOC.ABS break-CAUS-TR.3SG

---

299 But see (844c). It parallels structurally (892a).


Encoding of a focal object using the BC form of the verb seems to be a relatively widespread strategy. The fact that it has a systematic character and can be found in elderly speakers, indicates that alongside the focus system described by Krejnovič (1958) there has been an alternative focus subsystem in TY involving sentences with transitive verbs as predicates which cannot be explained in terms of language deterioration.

The encoding of the focus articulation $SFV$, on the other hand, is probably the clearest example of how the focus system gradually begins to deteriorate in TY resulting in simplification and generalization.

Among the informants pertaining to the younger generation different ways and degrees of deviation were found. They were least pronounced in PIP who did not use the nominal focal marker in the sentence with the configuration $SF(V)$. The next stage was represented by DNT, a slightly younger informant. Not only did she fail to attach the nominal focal marker $-leŋ$, but explicitly regarded the form with it as incorrect. Apart from that she used the basic conjugation verb form\(^{300}\) in the answer, which should be considered as a rather grave mistake within the focus system of TY as described by Krejnovič (1958, 1982) and observed in elder speakers:

\[(895a) \quad Uo \quad ayal′we-ji. \quad \text{child laugh-INTR.3SG} \]

\quad ‘A/The child laughs.’

While the question formed by DNT followed the expected pattern of (3a), the remaining two informants, yet younger IIK\(^{301}\) and AST, took the generalization made in (895a) one more logical step further and formed not only the answer but also the question with the basic conjugation verb form. This represents the final stage of deterioration of the focal pattern associated with this particular focus articulation lumping it completely with the basic forms of the verb that do not express any type of focus:

\[\text{\footnotesize \(300\) It has to be noted that when confronted with the matter DNT admitted that the sentence with the SF form of the predicate and the subject carrying the nominal focus marker could be formed and was more precise. However, she regarded it only as an alternative to her own sentence which she continued to see as correct.}

\[\text{\footnotesize \(301\) IIK did use the nominal focal marker \(-leŋ\) with the subject in the answer, though. He made in connection with this focus articulation a few confusing remarks. Firstly, he admitted the possibility of usage of the SF form of the predicate along with that of the basic conjugation in the answer. The former would then mark a male referent of the subject and the latter would refer to a female one. This is a very odd comment, to say the least, since there is no grammatical category of gender in TY. Secondly, in the answer with the configuration $SF(V)$ he uttered two forms. The one with the nominal focal marker $-leŋ$ would designate a referent within the visual field of the interlocutors; the one without it would stand for an invisible referent.} \]
(895b) *Kinek ayal’waanuj?*

kin-ek  ayal’we-nu-j?

Who-FOC.ABS laugh-DUR-INTR.3SG

‘Who is laughing?’

*Uo ayal’waanuj.*

Uo  ayal’we-nu-j.

child laugh-DUR-INTR.3SG

‘A/The child is laughing.’

**Appendix**

Structure of the questionnaire:

- **SVF**: What is S doing? – S V<sub>INTR</sub>.  
- **AOVF**: What did A do with O? – A V<sub>TR</sub> O.  
- **SfV**: Who V<sub>INTR</sub>? – S V<sub>INTR</sub>.  
- **AfOV**: Who V<sub>TR</sub> O? – A V<sub>TR</sub> O.  
- **AVOF**: What did A V<sub>TR</sub>? – A V<sub>TR</sub> O.  
- **AfOVF**: What happened to O? – A V<sub>TR</sub> O.  
- **AOVF**: What did A do? – A V<sub>TR</sub> O.  
- **AfOFOV**: What did one give to X? – A gave X O.  
- **SfV/AFOFVF**: What happened?/Well, what’s new? – S V<sub>INTR</sub>, (V<sub>INTR</sub> …)/A V<sub>TR</sub> O, (V<sub>TR</sub> O …)

Peripheral constituents: e.g. Where did A V<sub>TR</sub> O?/When did S V<sub>INTR</sub>? – A V<sub>TR</sub> O in X./S V<sub>INTR</sub> X.

Structure of the questionnaire for studying contrast (sketched for predicate contrast):

- **Focus/Contrast**
  - Replacing: S V<sub>INTR</sub>1. – No, S V<sub>INTR</sub>2.
  - Expanding: S V<sub>INTR</sub>1. – S also V<sub>INTR</sub>2.

- **Topic/Contrast**
  - Rejecting: S V<sub>INTR</sub>. – No, S does not V<sub>INTR</sub>.
  - Restricting: S V<sub>INTR</sub>1 and V<sub>INTR</sub>2. – No, S only V<sub>INTR</sub>1.
  - Selecting: Does S V<sub>INTR</sub>1 or V<sub>INTR</sub>2? – S V<sub>INTR</sub>1.

- **Topic/Contrast + Focus/Contrast**
  - Parallel: e.g. S<sub>1</sub> and S<sub>2</sub> COP S<sub>3</sub>. – S<sub>1</sub> V<sub>INTR</sub>1 and S<sub>2</sub> V<sub>INTR</sub>2.
  - Rejecting + Replacing: S V<sub>INTR</sub>1. – No, S does not V<sub>INTR</sub>1, S V<sub>INTR</sub>2.
  - Expanding (fuller form): S V<sub>INTR</sub>1. – S not only V<sub>INTR</sub>1 but also V<sub>INTR</sub>2.

- **Topic/Contrast + Topic/Contrast**
  - Restricting (fuller form): S V<sub>INTR</sub>1 and V<sub>INTR</sub>2. – No, S does not V<sub>INTR</sub>1, he only V<sub>INTR</sub>2.
Summary

The present thesis is an attempt at a grammatical description of Tundra Yukaghir (TY), a minority language spoken in north-eastern Russia. The thesis consists of an introduction and chapters dedicated to phonology, morphology, syntax and information structure.

In the introduction, constituting the first chapter of the thesis, the genetic and ethno-linguistic issues are in focus. TY is identified as one of the two surviving Yukaghir languages, the other being Kolyma Yukaghir. Both languages are most probably remotely linked to the Uralic family although they are sometimes considered language isolates. For sociolinguistic reasons it is hard to identify dialects within TY. Tentatively, the eastern Khalarcha dialect and the western Olyora dialect of TY can be posited. The ethnonym ‘Yukaghir’ is not an autonym. Rather it is of Tungusic provenience since it displays the suffix –gir, typical for Tungusic tribal names. Speakers of TY call themselves wadun čii (sg. wadul). This designation is assumed to derive from the reconstructed stem *waδ- ‘firm’, ‘strong’. Yukaghirs are autochthonous inhabitants of north-eastern Siberia, who once occupied a huge area between the Lena River and the upper reaches of the river Anadyr. Latitudinally, they might have dwelled from as far as the river Vitim in the south to the coast of the North Polar Sea. Tungusic peoples contributed considerably to the ethnogenesis of TY speakers and to their lexicon although the exact extent of the latter is yet to be established. Nowadays the area inhabited by speakers of TY is greatly restricted. Most of them live in just three settlements in the Nizhnekolymsk district and the nearby tundra. The major source of income for Yukaghirs residing there are activities associated with reindeer herding. Fishing and sewing are important supplementary means of subsistence. TY is a heavily endangered language with only around 60 speakers left, whose linguistic competence varies. The language has almost ceased to be passed on to children. Impressionistically, only seniors over 60 years of age possess full command of the language. Hardly anyone of them is monolingual in TY. One of the important factors leading to the decline of TY in modern times is the fact that its speakers live in multiethnic settlements and do not form a majority there having to speak the local lingue franche, Russian and Yakut, in order to be able to communicate with inhabitants from other linguistic groups. It is maintained by the author that the lack of necessity to speak TY in these communities is the crucial factor for the moribund state of TY at present since the possibility to speak TY and transmit it to younger generations, which is there for a few decades at least, is far from being fully taken advantage of by TY speakers, as many of them deem the knowledge of TY an unnecessary luxury. The introduction ends with a note on the spelling and glossing system adopted in the thesis, preceded by a section on methodology, which stresses the importance of typological considerations in descriptive linguistics and provides a specification of primary data sources studied.

Chapter 2 treats TY phonology. It opens with a phonemic inventory arrived at on the basis of the existence of minimal pairs. TY has 14 vowels, 4 out of which are diphthongs, and 21 consonants. The most important positional restriction concerns voiced obstruents. They are prohibited in coda position. In onsets they can occur primarily only word-internally while word-initially they are always a result of voicing. The main adjacency
restrictions are on the existence of hiatus and onset consonant clusters. Coda consonant clusters are allowed. A fairly wide range of syllable types is encountered. A number of properties, e.g. high degree of syllable complexity paired with TY being a head-final language, make the TY syllable typologically interesting. There are traces of vowel harmony. (Sub)sets of vowels often harmonize along the parameters of backness and rounding. The domain in which the harmony is more or less consistently observed are the two first syllables of a root. Exceptions from the vowel harmony rule exist and are numerous if the first syllable is closed. The significance of the prosodic foot is discussed and it is demonstrated that this concept does not provide a universal tool to explain the registered phonological phenomena unequivocally. The phonological alternations either stem from phonological restrictions, e.g. hiatus and consonant cluster resolution, or are assimilatory: (de)voicing. The morphophonemic alternations affect vowels and consonants equally. Vowels experience (de)diphthongization, lengthening, shortening, deletion and dis-/assimilation. Among consonant alternations the \( j \)-related alternations are prominent since \( [j] \) is the first sound of many verbal endings and is subject to the largest number of adjacency restrictions among consonants. The main strategy applied in case of \( j \)-related alternations is coalescence, sometimes accompanied or replaced by affrication. Other morphophonemic alternations of consonants are deletion and dis-/assimilation. The application of some rules presupposes the application of some other rules, thus rule ordering obtains. Stress is a controversial topic. Some syllables do seem to have a measurable prominence compared to others, however no decisive answer could be proposed to explain the regularities of stress assignment. Stress appears to be phonologically irrelevant. Two specific intonation patterns can be distinguished: that of polarity questions and of declaratives with verb or argument focus. Chapter 2 concludes with a short section on the orthography employed to render TY in writing.

Chapter 3, dealing with morphology, takes up the most part of the thesis. First a general morphological characteristic of TY is given. It is predominantly agglutinating with considerable traces of inflectional behavior. It is neither exclusively head- nor dependent marking. The predominant morphological process in TY is suffixation. Stem modification and suppletion are attested. Compounding is not uncommon. The following parts of speech can be identified: noun, verb, pronoun, adjective, adverb, postposition, conjunction, and particle. Nouns inflect for 11 cases (nominative, accusative, absolutive, ergative, genitive, dative, instrumental, locative, ablative, prolative and comitative), number (singular and plural) and may carry the pertensive suffix indicating being possessed by a possessor in the third person. Nouns are formed by means of suffixation, conversion and compounding. Verbs can be divided into subclasses: action, qualitative, quantitative and denominal verbs as well as one deictic verb. Verbs inflect for person (1, 2, 3), number (singular, plural), (in)transitivity, TAM and focus type (argument focus, predicate focus and adjunct focus). Only a future and a non-future tense are distinguished. The aspectual system with its 8 values (inchoative, durative, habitual, semelfactive, iterative, resultative, proximative and periphrastic perfective) is rather rich. Equally differentiated is the mode system: indicative, potential, imperative, jussive, hortative, desiderative, inclinative, prospective, obligative and non-visual. Modal verbs are, however, scarce. The non-finite verb forms are represented by 3 participles and 5 converbs. The voice system comprises 5
values (active, passive, causative, reflexive and reciprocal). A number of (de)transitivizing suffixes exist. The verb has affective forms with diminutive, augmentative and commiserative values. Compounding is much less productive than with nouns.

TY has personal, possessive, demonstrative, interrogative, negative and indefinite pronouns as well as universal quantifiers. Special forms of possessive pronouns exist only in the third person. In the five-way system of demonstrative pronouns there are attributive and independent forms. The latter occur in three series with varying functional scope.

Basic adjectives are confined to the words for ‘big’ and ‘small’ and have no degree of comparison. Relational adjectives are commonly derived by the genitive case ending and a special relational suffix.

Adverbs fall into three groups: attributive, circumstantial and relational. Attributive adverbs can, in turn, be further subdivided into manner, degree and quantitative adverbs, while circumstantial adverbs are represented by spatial and temporal adverbs. The derivational base for manner adverbs is the 3SG form of the verb.

Postpositions display many nominal characteristics and could be regarded as a subgroup of nouns. While there are 4 basic postpositions, most postpositions are derived from, partly obsolete, nominal stems. Two functionally postposition-like items are interpreted as petrified converbs.

Conjunctions are not numerous since TY is mainly a chaining language. There are copulative, adversative and disjunctive coordinating conjunctions. Subordinating conjunctions are represented by temporal, conditional, causal, consecutive and comparative conjunctions.

TY is very rich in particles, both original and borrowed from Yakut. They convey modal shades of meaning or emphasis, serve as deictic devices, discourse markers or interjections.

Chapter 4 presents TY syntax. In its three sections the noun phrase, simple sentence and complex sentence are presented successively. The word order in a noun phrase can be described by the formula DEM/POSS NUM ADJ HEAD, where NUM stands for numeric bases equivalent to numerals in other languages and realized as participles, while ADJ subsumes alongside adjectives proper, attributively used verb forms, i.e. participles. A NP can be modified by another NP in a possessive construction or in an instance of apposition. A possessive relation can be marked on the head, the modifier or remain unmarked. Marking of the possessive relation on the dependent is rather infrequent and is normally reserved for human possessors. With hosts denoting inanimate referents the genitive case ending acquires a derivational value and forms relational adjectives. Various marking constellations emerge when a possessive construction is embedded in another possessive construction. Both the head noun and the modifier can occur in apposition. Modifiers do not agree with their head. Coordination of NPs is achieved by means of juxtaposition, the comitative case ending or a copulative conjunction. Modifiers can be coordinated too.

The basic word order in a simple clause is SO(X)V. Deviations from this order are normally dictated by pragmatic considerations. They can be roughly subdivided into instances of left and right dislocation, with the predicate being the pivot. Both core
arguments as well as adjuncts can occur postverbally and then denote reactivated referents or concepts, they serve to focalize a constituent with syntactic means. Left dislocation is meant for topicalization of constituents other than the subject or for emphasis. Question words typically occupy the clause final position, but can be found clause-initially or, though rarely, clause-internally. The alignment system is characterized by ergativity splits. The primary split is conditioned by the pragmatic status of the core argument. When focal, it follows the ergative pattern, otherwise the accusative one. A secondary split depends on the place of the argument in the person hierarchy. Third person pronouns show neutral alignment under focus. When non-focal, the alignment of both pronominal and nominal third person arguments is either neutral (if the subject is an interlocutor) or accusative (if the subject is a non-interlocutor). Since only one core argument of a clause can be focalized, the pragmatically conditioned split is trans-clausal. Non-verbal predicates belong to three semantic subclasses distinguished on the basis of the copular devices – a copula and three copular verbs – employed to form them. The meanings are distributed among the copular devices as follows:

- identification, equation
- existence, location, possession
- comparison

Verbal predicates act as nuclei of intransitive, including zero-place predicates such as meteorological verbs, transitive, ditransitive and semi-transitive clauses. The latter can be of two types. The first type is represented by intransitive verbs taking two arguments. The second type is engendered by the pragmatic split leading to a constellation in which a transitive predicate takes two arguments with ‘incompatible’ case endings: nominative and absolutive or ergative and accusative. Sentence types include declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives in the broad sense and exclamatives. Declarative sentences exhibit 6 morpho-syntactic patterns depending on the focus type and (in)transitivity. A peculiarity of declarative sentences under negation is that transitive verbs undergo a formal detransitivization unless the direct object is in the focus of the utterance. In interrogative sentences a special interrogative conjugation is employed systematically only with intransitive verbs and under adjunct focus. Otherwise the morpho-syntactic pattern is the same as in a corresponding declarative sentence. Obligatory detransitivization does not take place in negative polarity question. Imperative sentences, except for jussives, normally lack a subject. The negative imperative makes a combined use of the common verbal negator and a prohibitive suffix. Exclamatives differ from declaratives in that they are introduced by corresponding particles. Verbs agree with their subjects in person and number although discrepancies in number are attested, the verb having the plural form and the subject being in singular. Apart from that verbs agree with the focalized constituent irrespective of its syntactic function, giving rise to different focus agreement patterns. Impersonal constructions are encoded as subjectless clauses with the predicate in 3PL or as having the noun köde ‘person’ as their subject.

Under the label ‘complex sentences’ complement clauses, adverbial clauses, relative clauses and compound sentences are discussed. Complements can be both reduced (gerunds or converbs) and sentence-like. No complementizers are employed. Complements can be taken by some intransitive verbs despite their only argument
position being already filled. Among the speech reporting strategies, a special case of complementation, direct speech greatly prevails over indirect speech. Adverbial clauses can be linked to the main clause with the help of a conjunction or, more frequently, have conjunctionless junction. In the latter case all non-final predicates of a sentence are represented by either converbs (in the case of co-referential subjects) or locative case forms of gerunds (in the case of disjoint reference). Switch-reference is semantically determined; however, strict semantic considerations can be overridden by pragmatic ones. Due to the sameness of the formal apparatus for encoding adverbial clauses they are often ambiguous as far as the semantic relation between their predicate and the predicate of the main clause is concerned. The following semantic relations can be expressed: temporal, conditional, causal, consecutive, final, concessive and comparative. Relative clauses are normally realized as participles or gerunds. They are presented with reference to the parameters of orientation and presence of a head. Headless relative clauses can be interpreted as possessive constructions. As for the criterion of restrictiveness, only focal gerundial forms, and probably –me-participles, are sensitive to it and consistently render restrictive relative clauses. Occasionally, interrogative pronouns serve as relativizers. Clauses can be coordinated both via a conjunction and without one. In the latter case, the co-referentiality of the subjects and identical focal patterns are chosen as diagnostic properties to distinguish compound sentences from a juxtaposition of unrelated simple sentences. The following types of compound sentences can be identified: copulative, adversative, disjunctive, explanatory, contrastive and additive.

Chapter 6 concludes the thesis describing the organization of information structure in TY. Unlike topic, focus profoundly affects the morpho-syntactic shape of a clause determining the choice of a conjugational paradigm and conditioning the alignment split. The focus type is marked on both predicate and core arguments. Different focal patterns are presented in terms of focus articulations, which are combinatory possibilities of constituents carrying given and new information. Three hierarchies are established that describe the preferential tendencies for marking a certain constituent as the focus of the sentence in those cases in which there is more than one candidate:

- $X_F > V_F$
- in non-thetic sentences: $O_F < A_F/V_F$
- in thetic sentences: $V_F > S_F$ and less consistent but tendentially $V_F > A_F/O_F$

In most cases the topic remains unmarked and does not exert any influence upon the morpho-syntactic properties of a clause. There are dedicated markers to express a contrastive topic, though. Focal topics, especially in so called relative presentative sentences, do receive the focus marker. The exponent of contrast coincides with that of focus. Apart from marking focus and contrast, these markers can indicate emphasis alone. Deviations from the overall focus system are observed. Some of them are systematic in younger speakers and can be taken as signs of the incepting erosion of the sophisticated focus system still employed by senior speakers.
Samenvatting

Dit proefschrift, getiteld “Aspecten van de grammatica van het Toendra Jukagir” is een poging tot een grammaticale beschrijving van Toendra Joekagir (TJ), een minderheidstaal, die in Noordoost-Rusland wordt gesproken. Het proefschrift bestaat uit een inleiding en hoofdstukken die aan fonologie, morfologie, syntax en informatiestruktuur zijn gewijd.

In de introductie, het eerste hoofdstuk van het proefschrift, is bijzondere aandacht aan de problemen van de verwantschap met andere talen en etnolinguïstische vraagstukken besteed. TJ wordt samen met Kolima Joekagir als een van de twee nog bestaande Joekagirische talen gezien. Beide talen hebben waarschijnlijk een verre verwantschap met de Uralische taal familie, al worden zij soms als geïsoleerde talen beschouwd. Om sociolinguïstische redenen is het moeilijk om dialecten van TJ teidentifieren. Voorlopig kunnen het oostelijke dialect van Chalartja en het westelijke dialect van Oljora worden verondersteld. Het etnoniem ‘Joekagir’ is geen autosyn. Het is eerder van Toengoezische herkomst, wat blijkt uit het achtervoegsel –gir, dat typisch is voor Toengoezische stammen. Sprekers van TJ noemen zichzelf wadun čii (enk. wadul). Er wordt ervan uitgegaan dat deze benaming van de gereconstrueerde stam *wađ- ‘firm’, ‘strong’ is afgeleid. Joekagirs zijn autochtone inwoners van Noordoost-Siberië, die ooit een reusachtig gebied tussen de rivier Lena in het westen en de bovenloop van de rivier Anadir in het oosten bezetten. De noordelijke grens van het door Joekagirs bewoonde gebied was en is de Noordelijke IJszee, en de zuidgrens heeft in het verleden mogelijk bij de rivier Vitim gelegen. Toengoezische volkeren hebben een aanzienlijke bijdrage geleverd aan de etnogenese van TJ sprekers en aan hun woordenschat, hoewel de precieze omvang van de laatste nog niet is vastgesteld. Tegenwoordig is het door sprekers van TJ bewoonde gebied sterk beperkt. De meesten van hen leven in slechts drie nederzettingen in het Nizjnekolimsk district en de nabijgelegen toendra. De belangrijkste bron van inkomsten voor de daar wonende Joekagirs wordt gevormd door activiteiten omtrent het fokken van rendieren. Visserij en naaien zijn belangrijke aanvullende bestaansmiddelen. TJ is een zwaar bedreigde taal die nog maar door ongeveer 60 mensen gesproken wordt. Deze sprekers verschillen bovendien in hun kennis van de taal. De taal wordt bijna niet meer doorgegeven aan kinderen. Naar het schijnt, beheersen alleen senioren boven de 60 jaar de taal nog volledig. Bijna niemand van hen is eentalig in TJ. Een van de belangrijke factoren die leiden tot de huidige neergang van TJ is het feit dat de sprekers in multi-etnische nederzettingen leven waar zij geen meerderheid vormen en dus de lokale lingua franca’s, Russisch en Jakutisch, moeten spreken om te kunnen communiceren met bewoners uit andere taalgroepen. De auteur concludeert dat het ontbreken van de noodzaak om TJ te spreken in deze gemeenschappen op dit moment de cruciale factor in het uitsterven van TJ is. Hoewel de mogelijkheid om TJ door te geven aan de jongere generaties vroeger beperkt was, is deze restrictie sinds een paar decennia opgeheven. Ondanks dat wordt op dit moment het TJ nauwelijks doorgegeven aan kinderen, omdat vele sprekers de kennis van TJ een overbodige luxe achten. De inleiding eindigt met een opmerking over de spelling en het glosseersysteem die toepast zijn in het proefschrift, voorafgegaan door een behandeling van de methodologie, die wijst op
het belang van typologische overwegingen in de beschrijvende taalkunde en een specificatie biedt van de primaire gegevensbronnen.

Hoofdstuk 2 behandelt de fonologie van TJ. Allereerst wordt de fonemische inventaris besproken, die is samengesteld op basis van het bestaan van minimale paren. TJ heeft 14 klinkers, waaronder 4 tweeklanken, en 21 medeklinkers. De belangrijkste positionele beperking betreft stemhebbende obstruenten, die niet in de coda positie kunnen voorkomen. In de onset kunnen ze primair alleen woord-intern optreden, terwijl ze als eerste klink altijd een gevolg van alternantie zijn. De belangrijkste beperking die met belending van klanken te maken heeft is het verbod op hiaten en medeklinkerclusters in de onset. Medeklinkersclusters in coda positie zijn toegestaan. Een vrij breed scala aan lettergreepsoorten wordt aangetroffen. Een aantal eigenschappen, bijvoorbeeld de hoge mate van complexiteit van de lettergroepe in een hoofd-finale taal zoals TJ is, maken de lettergroepe in TJ typologisch interessant. Er zijn sporen van klinkerharmonie. (Sub)sets van klinkers harmoniëren vaak in de ronning en in de mate waarin ze voorin of achterin de mond worden gevormd. Het domein waarin de harmonie zich min of meer consequent voordoet zijn de twee eerste lettergroepe van de woordstam. Er bestaan uitzonderingen op de harmonieregel, die talrijk zijn als de eerste lettergroepe gesloten is. Het belang van de prosodische voet wordt besproken en er wordt aangetoond dat dit concept niet in een universeel middel voorziet om de geregistreerde fonologische verschijnselen ondubbelzinnig uit te leggen. De fonologische alternanties vloeien ofwel voort uit fonologische beperkingen, bijvoorbeeld hiaat en resolutie van medeklinkerclusters, of zijn het gevolg van assimilatie: het stemhebbend/stemloos maken. De morfofonemische alternanties betreffen zowel klinkers als medeklinkers. Klinkers ervaren di- en monofoftongering, verlenging, verkorting, verwijdering en dis- en assimilatie. Onder de medeklinker alternanties zijn de /j/-gerelateerde alternanties prominent; het eerste geluid van vele verbale uitgangen is en onderworpen is aan het grootste aantal beperkingen van klankbelending onder medeklinkers. De belangrijkste strategie die wordt toegepast in het geval van /j/-gerelateerde alternanties is samenvoeging, soms vergezeld of vervangen door assimilatie. Andere morfofonemische alternanties van medeklinkers zijn verwijdering en dis-/assimilatie. De toepassing van sommige regels veronderstelt de toepassing van sommige andere regels, wat leidt tot het ontstaan van een regelvolgorde. Klemtoon is een controversieel onderwerp. Sommige lettergroepe lijken meetbaar opvallender te zijn in vergelijking met anderen, maar er kan geen definitieve uitleg van de regelmatigheden van de klemtoonverdeling worden gegeven. Klemtoon lijkt fonologisch niet relevant te zijn. Twee specifieke intonatiepatronen kunnen worden onderscheiden: die van ja/nee-vragen en van mededelende zinnen met werkwoord of argument focus. Hoofdstuk 2 wordt afgesloten met een kort gedeelte over de spelling die wordt gebruikt om TJ schriftelijk weer te geven.

Hoofdstuk 3 gaat over morfologie en omvat het grootste deel van het proefschrift. Allereerst wordt een algemene morfologische karakterisering van TJ gegeven. TJ is overwegend agglutinerend met aanzienlijke sporen van verbuigend gedrag. De taal is niet uitsluitend hoofd-danwel dependent-markerend. Het overheersende morfologische proces in TJ is suffixatie. Stamwijziging en suppletie bestaan en compounding is niet ongewoon. De volgende woordsoorten kunnen worden geïdentificeerd: zelfstandig
naamwoord, werkwoord, voornaamwoord, bijvoeglijk naamwoord, bijwoord, achterzetsel, voegwoord en partikels. Zelfstandige naamwoorden worden verbogen naar elf naamvallen (nominatief, accusatief, absolutief, ergatief, genitief, datief, instrumentaal, locatief, ablatief, prolatief en comitatief), nummer (enkelvoud en meervoud) en kunnen het achtervoegsel van de pertensief dragen die aangeeft door een bezitter in de derde persoon bezet te zijn. Zelfstandige naamwoorden worden gevormd door middel van suffixatie, conversie en samenstelling.

Werkwoorden kunnen worden onderverdeeld in subklassen: actie, kwalitatieve, kwantitatieve en nominale werken evenals één deictisch werkwoord. Werkwoorden worden vervoegd naar persoon (1, 2, 3), nummer (enkelvoud, meervoud), (in)transitiviteit, TAM en focus type (argumentfocus, gezegdefocus en bepalingfocus). Alleen de toekomende tijd en niet-toekomende tijd worden onderscheiden. Het aspectuele systeem met zijn 8 waarden (inchoatief, duratief, habitualis, semelfactief, iteratief, resultatief, proximatif en perifrastisch perfectief) is nogal rijk. Even gedifferentieerd is het systeem van wijzen: aantonende wijs, potentiële wijs, gebiedende wijs, jussief, hortatief, desideratief, inclinatief, prospectief, volitief en niet-visueel. Modale werkwoorden zijn echter schaars. De infinitie werkwoordvormen worden vertegenwoordigd door 3 deelwoorden en 5 converben. Het vormsysteem bestaat uit 5 waarden (bedrijvende vorm, lijdende vorm, causatif, reflexieve en wederzijdse vorm).

Er bestaan een aantal (de)transitiverende achtervoegsels. Het werkwoord heeft affectieve vormen met een verkleinende, vergrotende en meelijdende betekenis. Samenstelling is veel minder productief dan met zelfstandige naamwoorden.

TJ heeft persoonlijke, bezittelijke, demonstratieve, vragende, negatieve en onbepaalde voornaamwoorden evenals universele kwantoren. Speciale vormen van het possessief pronom bestaan alleen in de derde persoon. Er zijn in het vijf-ledige systeem van demonstratieve voornaamwoorden attributieve en onafhankelijke vormen. De laatstgenoemde treden in drie series met verschillende functionele toepassingsgebieden op.

Onafgeleide bijvoeglijke naamwoorden zijn beperkt tot de woorden voor ‘groot’ en ‘klein’ en hebben geen trappen van vergelijking. Relationele bijvoeglijke naamwoorden worden vaak afgeleid door de uitgang van de genitief alsook een speciaal relationeel achtervoegsel.

Bijwoorden worden in drie groepen onderverdeeld: attributieve, omstandighedsadverbia en relationele bijwoorden. Attributieve bijwoorden kunnen, op hun beurt, verder worden onderverdeeld in adverbia van hoedanigheid, mate en kwantitatieve bijwoorden, terwijl omstandighedsadverbia worden vertegenwoordigd door ruimtelijke en temporele bijwoorden. De derivationele basis voor bijwoorden van hoedanigheid is de 3SG vorm van het werkwoord.

Achterzetsels vertonen veel nominale kenmerken en kunnen worden beschouwd als een deelgroep van zelfstandige naamwoorden. Hoewel er 4 onafgeleide achterzetsels zijn, zijn de meeste achterzetsels afgeleid van, ten dele verouderde, nominale stammen. Twee functioneel achterzetsel-achtige elementen worden geïnterpreteerd als versteende converben.

Voegwoorden zijn niet talrijk aangezien in TJ gezegden voornamelijk aaneengeregen worden. Er zijn copulatieve, tegenstellende en disjunctieve nevenschikkende
voegwoorden. Onderschikkende voegwoorden worden vertegenwoordigd door temporele, voorwaardelijke, causale, consecutieve en vergelijkende voegwoorden. TJ is zeer rijk aan partikels, zowel origineel als geleend van het Jakutisch. Ze drukken modale betekenismuancen of nadruk uit, dienen als deictische elementen, discoursmarkers of tussenwerpsels.

Hoofdstuk 4 presenteert de syntaxis van het TJ. In de drie secties worden de nominale constituent, eenvoudige zin en complexe zin achtereenvolgens gepresenteerd. De woordvolgorde in een naamwoordengroep kan worden beschreven door de formule DEM/POSS NUM ADJ hoofd, waar NUM staat voor numerieke stammen, die functioneel gezien equivalent met telwoorden in andere talen zijn en als deelwoorden worden gerealiseerd. ADJ bevat naast echte bijvoeglijke naamwoorden, attributief gebruikte werkwoordvormen, dat wil zeggen deelwoorden. Een NP kan worden bepaald door een andere NP in een bezittelijke constructie of in geval van bijstelling. Een bezittelijke relatie kan worden gerealiseerd op het hoofd, het attribuut of kan ongemarkeerd blijven. Markering van de bezittelijke relatie op de bijvoeglijke bepaling is vrij zeldzaam en is normaal gereserveerd voor menselijke bezitters. Met substantieven die levenloze referenten aanduiden verwerft de uitgang van de genitief een derivatieve waarde en vormt relationele bijvoeglijke naamwoorden. Verschillende markeringspatronen ontstaan wanneer een bezittelijke constructie is ingesloten in een andere bezittelijke constructie. Zowel het substantief dat als hoofd van een naamwoordengroep dient als zijn attribuut kunnen optreden in appositie. Bijvoeglijke bepalingen congrueren niet met hun hoofd. Coördinatie van NPs wordt bereikt door middel van voegwoordloze nevenschikking, de uitgang van de comitatief of een copulatief voegwoord. Attributen kunnen ook worden gecoördineerd. De basiswoordvolgorde in een eenvoudige zin is SO(X)V. Afwijkingen van deze volgorde worden normaal bepaald door pragmatische overwegingen. Zij kunnen grofweg worden onderverdeeld in gevallen van links- en rechtsverschuiving, met het predicaat als het referentiepunt. Zowel kernargumenten evenals bijvoegelijke bepalingen kunnen na het werkwoord optreden waar ze opnieuw geactiveerde referenten of concepten aanduiden, ze dienen om een zinsdeel met syntactische middelen te focussen. Linksverschuiving is bedoeld voor topicalisering van andere zinsdelen dan het onderwerp of voor nadruk. Vraagwoorden nemen meestal de finale positie in de zin in, maar kunnen ook aan het begin van of, hoewel zelden, binnen een zin worden gevonden. De argumentstructuur wordt gekenmerkt door gespleten ergativiteit. De primaire splitsing is geconditioneerd door de pragmatische status van het kernargument. Wanneer in focus, volgt het ergatieve patroon, anders het accusatieve patroon. Een secundaire splitsing is afhankelijk van de plaats van het argument in de persoonshiërarchie. Persoonlijke voornaamwoorden in de derde persoon tonen neutrale argumentstructuur als ze in focus zijn. Wanneer ze niet in focus zijn, is de argumentstructuur van zowel pronominaal als nominale kernargumenten in de derde persoon of neutraal (als het onderwerp een gesprekspartner is) of accusatief (als het onderwerp een niet-gesprekspartner is). Aangezien slechts één kernargument van een zin in focus kan zijn, is de pragmatisch geconditioneerde splitsing trans-clausal. Non-verbale predicaten behoren tot drie semantische subklassen, onderscheiden op basis van de koppelwoordsoorten – een echt
koppelwoord en drie koppelwerkwoorden – waarmee ze worden gevormd. De betekenissen zijn als volgt verdeeld onder de koppelwoorden:

- identificatie, vereenzelviging
- bestaan, locatie, bezit
- vergelijking


Onder de benaming ‘complexe zinnen’ worden voorwerp- en onderwerpszinnen, bijwoordelijke bijzinnen, bijvoegelijke bijzinnen en samengestelde zinnen besproken. Voorwerp- en onderwerpszinnen kunnen zowel gereduceerd (gebaseerd op gerundia of converben) als zin-achtig zijn, waarbij geen voegwoorden werkzaam zijn. Sommige overgankelijke werkwoorden kunnen met onderwerpszinnen voorkomen ondanks dat hun enige argumentpositie al is ingevuld. Onder de strategieën van toespraakrapportage, wat een speciaal geval van de voorwerpszin is, prevaleert de directe rede sterk op de indirecte rede. Bijwoordelijke bijzinnen kunnen worden gekoppeld aan de hoofdzin met de hulp van een conjunctie of kunnen, wat vaker het geval is, zonder voegwoord verbonden zijn. In het laatste geval worden alle niet-finiëte predicaten van een zin vertegenwoordigd door converben (in het geval van coreferentiële onderwerpen) of door locatiefvormen van gerundia (in het geval van disjuncte referentie). Referentieomschakeling wordt semantisch bepaald; strikte semantische overwegingen

In hoofdstuk 6 volgt een beschrijving van de organisatie van informatiestructuur in TJ. In tegenstelling tot het onderwerp beïnvloedt focus diep de morpho-syntactische vorm van een zin doordat het de keuze van een vervoegingparadigma bepaalt en de splitsing in argumentstructuur veroorzaakt. Het focustype wordt zowel op het gezegde als op de kernargumenten gemankeerd. Verschillende focuspatronen zijn gepresenteerd naar de zogenaamde focusarticulaties, die combinatorische mogelijkheden van zinsdelen zijn die bekende en nieuwe informatie bevatten. Drie hiërarchieën zijn vastgelegd die de preferentiële tendensen beschrijven voor het markeren van een bepaald zinsdeel als de focus van de zin, in die gevallen waarin er meer dan één kandidaat is:

- \( X_F > V_F \)
- in niet-thetische zinnen: \( O_F < A_F/V_F \)
- in thetische zinnen: \( V_F > S_F \) en minder consequent maar tendentieel \( V_F > A_F/O_F \)

In de meeste gevallen blijft het topic onge.markeerd en heeft het geen invloed op de morfo-syntactische eigenschappen van een zin. Er zijn echter speciale markeringen voor een contrastief topic. Een topic in focus krijgt, met name in de zogenaamde relatieve presentatieve zinnen, de focusmarkering. Het teken van contrast valt met dat van focus samen. Afgezien van de markering van focus en contrast, kunnen deze markeringen alleen nadruk aangeven. Afwijkingen van het algemene focussysteem komen voor. Sommige zijn systematisch in jongere sprekers en kunnen gezien worden als tekenen van het beginnende verval van het verfijnde focussysteem dat door oudere sprekers nog gebruikt wordt.
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